The Jewish Quarterly Review.

EDITED BY

I. ABRAHAMS AND C. G. MONTEFIORE.

VOLUME VII.

LONDON: D. NUTT.

1894.

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

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

THE JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW.

VOL. VII.

CONTENTS.

PAGE

APOCALYPSE OF MOSES. By F. C. Conybeare 216

CRITICAL NOTICES.

"As Others Saw Him" 775

Bäck "Die Geschichte des Jüd. Volkes" 168

Berliner's "Geschichte der Juden in Rom" 353

Bardowitz "Orthographie des Althebraïschen ... 357

Charles, R. H. "Ethiopic Book of Jubilees" 546

Drummond's "Via, Veritas, Vita" 548

Friedländer (M.) "Zur Entstehungsgeschichte des Christenthums" 554

Goldsmidt "Das Buch der Schöpfung 360

Harkavy on the Qaraite Al-Qirqisani 355

König's "Introduction to the Old Testament" ... 329

Kuenen's "Gesammelte Abhandlungen" 340

Nathanel Ibn Yeshaya's "Light of Shade, and Lamp of Wisdom" 350

Maimonides' Arabic Commentary to the Mishnah ... 346

Ratner's "Introduction to the Seder Olam" ... 348

Rosenmann's "Studien zum Buche Tobit" 349

Simon, Lady, "Records and Reflections" 164

Simon (O. J.), "Faith and Experience" 770

Strack's "Introduction to the Talmud" 338

DARMESTETER (JAMES) AND HIS STUDIES IN ZEND LITERATURE. By Prof. F. Max Müller 173

PAGE

DEATH, BURIAL, MOURNING. By A. P. Bender 101, 259

DOMNINUS, A JEWISH PHILOSOPHER OF ANTIQUITY. By Dr. S. Krauss 270

(See also p. 567).

EMANUELE DA ROMA'S NINTH MEHABBERETH AND THE TRESOR OF PEIRE DE CORBIAC. By Gustavo Sacerdote 711

EXPULSION OF THE JEWS FROM ENGLAND. By B. L. Abrahams 75, 236, 428

FOURTH GOSPEL, NOTES ON ITS RELIGIOUS VALUE. By C. G. Montefiore 24

IDEAL IN JUDAISM. By Rev. M. Joseph 169

IDEAL MINISTER OF THE TALMUD. By Nina Davis 141

INCARNATION: THE PHILOSOPHICAL ASPECTS OF THE DOCTRINE OF DIVINE INCARNATION. By F. C. Conybeare 607

ISAIAH, GLEANINGS FROM. By G. H. Skipwith... 470

JEREMIAH, STUDIES IN THE BOOK OF. By G. H. Skipwith 564

JEWISH ARABIC LITURGIES. II. By Dr. H. Hirschfeld. ... 418

"JUBILEES": NEW TRANSLATION OF. By Rev. R. H. Charles 297

"KING": "THE REFERENCES TO THE "KING" IN THE PSALTER, IN THEIR BEARING ON QUESTIONS OF DATE AND MESSIANIC BELIEF. By Rev. G. Buchanan Gray 658

LAZARUS DE VITERBO'S EPISTLE TO CARDINAL SIRLETO CONCERNING THE INTEGRITY OF THE HEBREW BIBLE. By Prof. D. Kaufmann 178

PERLES (JOSEPH). By Prof. W. Bacher 1

(See also p. 364.)

PERSIAN HEBREW MSS. IN THE BRITISH MUSEUM. By Rev. G. Margoliouth 119

PHILO: FLORILEGIUM PHILONIS. By C. G. Montefiore ... 481

PHILO: CONCERNING THE CONTEMPLATIVE LIFE. By F. C. Conybeare 755

The Jewish Quarterly Review.

OCTOBER, 1894.

JOSEPH PERLES.

1835-1894.

THE modern science of Judaism was not invented by Rabbis. Rappoport (in his creative period), Luzzato, Zunz, Krochmal, Dukes, Grätz, Munk, Derenbourg, Steinschneider, Jost, Neubauer—to mention but a few of the best names—these were no Rabbis as far as their office and dignity are concerned. It was not their outward position, but their inward mission that led these men to scientifically cultivate the field of Judaism and its literature, and to create the solid foundation of our present-day Jewish science. But partly contemporaneous with these, partly their successors, there have also been found Jewish pastors—the religious guides of large communities, those holding most important pulpits, who laboured very successfully to build up this many-sided branch of learning, and gave practical proof that the modern Rabbi is as well adapted to cultivate and develop the new science of Judaism as those Rabbis of former centuries were fitted to deal with and advance the Jewish learning of their own times. It will suffice to name but such men as Frankel, Geiger, Sachs, Jellinek, Löw and Kayserling in order to make it clear what part the Rabbis have taken in this great work of our century, viz., the founding and building up of Jewish science. The

connection between the official post of Rabbi and Jewish science (solely dependent upon the spontaneous activity of individuals), was strengthened when Rabbinical seminaries arose, the almost exclusive business of which consists in endowing their disciples with scientific qualifications, so as to fit them the better for their future office. And since, on the other hand, the number of those in other walks of life, who devoted themselves to Jewish learning and cultivated its literature, has during the last decades gradually become less, it naturally follows that a closer bond of union has arisen between Jewish learning and the Rabbinate, which has the significance of a real union, considering the nature the historical origin, and the mission of this office: with the result that the dignity of the position of Rabbi is enhanced by reason of its devotion to learning, and that literary activity is invested with a sort of halo by the very dignity of the Rabbinic position. As a matter of fact, the connotation, so to speak, of the term Rabbi implies a Jewish scholar; while it depends of course upon the gifts, the turn of mind and the career of each individual, as to whether he will take part in originating or advancing any work and in enriching the storehouse of literature. The Breslau Seminary has the merit of having impressed its disciples with this duty of the modern Rabbi, namely, that he should be actively engaged in the paths of science and literature: and to those of its disciples who were the earliest to proceed from its walls belongs the merit that they ever kept this ideal of duty before them, and knew how to combine the exercise of the laborious and many-sided office of Rabbi with a successful literary career. As the first and most important among these, it was customary to name the man who has but lately been taken from our midst at the early age of barely sixty years. And Joseph Perles will in future, too, be named as the pattern of a modern Rabbi, whose calling was Jewish learning, as the type of a modern Jewish scholar, who, with the utmost love and devotion, discharged the duties of teacher and leader of a large

congregation. But the virtues of Rabbi and scholar which Joseph Perles combined within himself reposed upon the stable foundation of the best qualities of a brave and noble heart, so that he presented the rare example of an harmonious life ever actively directed towards the highest ideals, and had a fascinating influence upon all who came in contact with him, impressing them with the example of an accomplished and sympathetic personality. But in these pages we do not intend to pourtray his personality, nor to speak of his labours as Rabbi. These pages are to be devoted to his literary activity; and within the biographical limits of this notice there shall appear the picture of his life-work, by means of which he joined the ranks of the leading workers in the field of Jewish learning, upon which he himself made a substantial advance, and by means of which he has secured for his memory a reputation far beyond the term of his earthly existence.

Joseph Perles was born at Baja, a small town in Southern Hungary, on the 25th of November,[1] 1835. He was the son of the Rabbinic Assessor (Dayan), Baruch Perles, who was descended from an old family of Rabbis. In a brief note on the expulsion of the Jews from Prague in 1744 (Frankel's *Monatsschrift*, 1866, p. 231), Joseph Perles mentions a work printed in 1739, the author of which was his ancestor, who was Dayan in Prague (the work is ethical, and cited in Benjacob's *Bibliographical Lexicon*, p. 379, No. 2441).

The family name Perles (or Perls) is traced back, according to an ancient tradition, to Perl, the second wife of the "hohe Rabbi Löw" — the renowned Rabbi of Prag, after whom it is said her children surnamed themselves

[1] In his short *Vita*, attached to his Doctor's Dissertation, Perles gives the 26th of December as the day of his birth. But it seems that this was afterwards found to be incorrect, for the date communicated to me by letter by his youngest son, Felix Perles, and that which appeared in the obituary notice of the *Münchener neueste Nachrichten*, was the 25th of November.

(*v.* Kaufmann, *Monats.*, xxxvii. 384). The education which fell to the lot of young Perles was quite in consonance with so learned a descent. He was in early life introduced to a knowledge of Biblical and Rabbinic literature, and was at the same time sent to the Gymnasium in his native city, at which he received a certificate for proficiency. The Jewish community of Baja belonged to those of Hungary who were in the van of culture and the most progressive and enlightened in matters of religion. It therefore offered the most favourable spiritual atmosphere for the comprehensive cultivation of a youth aspiring to the office of Rabbi, both as regards Jewish and general knowledge. And Perles had the good and rare fortune, when his own city could offer him no more in the way of higher knowledge, that providentially the seat of learning was founded, at which he could prepare himself in so beneficial a manner for his future profession. In the same summer in which he passed the highest class of the Gymnasium, there was opened in Breslau (August 10th, 1854) the Jewish-Theological Seminary, which Perles entered in 1855, matriculating at the same time at the University. Both Seminary and University offered the richest opportunity for the acquisition of sound knowledge and for the scientific training of the mind. While at the seminary the teaching and example of men like Frankel, Grätz, Bernays, Zuckermann and Joël introduced him to the various branches of Jewish learning, he applied himself at the University during seven "semesters" to Oriental, philosophic, and historical studies. Of Oriental languages he studied with great zeal in addition to Arabic and Persian, chiefly Syriac, under the direction of Bernstein, the best Syriologist of his time. The exact knowledge of this language, and also his thorough acquaintance with Persian, were most significant for his later etymological researches. But the study of Syriac bore rich fruit even during his University career : I mean his critical researches into the Peschito, the important products of which he set down in his Dissertation for the Degree of Doctor (to

which we shall refer more fully), his renowned "Meletemata Peschitthoniana."[1]

Two years before the appearance of his Dissertation Perles had already appeared in public as a worker in literature, by means of a series of anonymous reviews signed with the Greek π, which appeared in the 6th, 7th and 8th Annuals (1857-1859) of the "*Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judenthums.*" It shows the remarkable esteem and confidence which he received from the editor of the *Monatsschrift*, Director Frankel, that he entrusted his youthful student with reviews of the most varied literary subjects; and we might specially dwell upon the fact as most suggestive, that the first work upon which Perles had to give his opinion was actually written by one of the teachers at the seminary. It was the monograph of Zuckermann: "Ueber Sabbath-Jahrcyclus und Jubel-Periode" (6th Annual, pp. 194-198). These reviews, the first-fruits of Perles' literary work, by no means bear the impress of youthful production, and they already give evidence of the characteristics of his later efforts. Strict relevancy, a careful avoidance of all general observations not belonging to the subject, the gift of brief and clear language, simple and perspicuous statements, an almost obvious dislike of any attempt at rhetorical display—these peculiarities which differentiated Perles as a scientific and literary author, and from which ensued a certain refreshing dryness and plainness in harmony with the severity of his material — these characteristics are already apparent in those reviews by which he anonymously made his *début* in the literary world. It is true that they concern themselves chiefly with giving a thorough survey of the contents of the book under criticism; but they are not devoid of expressions of judgment in which we find resoluteness, and, where

[1] *Meletemata Peschitthoniana:* Dissertatio Inauguralis. Vratislaviæ, 56 pp. Vide *Monatsschrift* (1859), pp. 223-225, and Ben Chananja, 2nd Ann., pp. 371-378.

necessary, unreserved severity combined with benevolent appreciation and grateful praise.

The works he reviewed are further a valuable testimony to the fact that Perles accustomed himself in early years to those branches of literature on which his later activity was spent: the History of Exegesis, Researches into the language of the Talmud and into Archæology, Legend and the History of Literature. He treats of Löw's "Hamaphteach, Introduction to the Holy Scriptures and History of Exegesis" (6th Annual, pp. 433-435), Jehuda Ibn Koreisch's Risâle, edited by Bargés and Goldberg (ib., pp. 470-473), Beer's Life of Abraham (8th Ann., pp. 315-316), Kayserling's Sephardim (ib., pp. 41-44). Perles discussed at greater length, this time giving his name, and adding copious remarks and original explanations concerning words, Lewysohn's Zoology of the Talmud (ib., pp. 354-359, 390-396). His delight in etymology is evidenced in his review of the "*Etudes sur la formation des racines semitiques*," by Abbé Leguest (7th Ann., pp. 231-236). His knowledge of Italian, which stood him in good stead in his later works, is shown in his treatment of some speeches by Lelio della Torre (ib., pp. 315-316). We might specially refer to his review of two Hebrew works, the Hebrew translation of the Korân by Reckendorf (6th Ann., pp. 357-359), and the philosophic encyclopædic work of I. Barasch, with an introduction by Rappoport (ib., pp. 274-278). In the latter Perles expresses his disapproval of treating in the Hebrew language modern scientific themes. And as far as I am aware he never published his researches in a Hebrew garb, although the short preface attached to his edition of his father-in-law's work on the Targum clearly shows that he knew how to write Hebrew simply and well. As early results of his lexicographical studies we ought to mention his explanation of several foreign words occurring in the Halachoth Gedoloth, which Frankel attached to his own review of an article by Reifmann (8th Ann., pp. 158-160). Had this review been consulted in the preparation

of the glossary found in the new edition of the Halachoth Gedoloth (by Hildesheimer), it would have been an advantage.

In the year 1857 Perles gained out of seven candidates the prize for an essay on Moses Nachmanides' Commentary on the Pentateuch, and this work appeared in the *Monatsschrift* as the first independent product of the young scholar.[1] His taste for the historical treatment of literary subjects and his capacity to seize on the vital and essential parts of a scientific work were shown to be already highly developed in this essay, which included an adequate discussion of the historical environment and importance of Nachmanides. The spirit of Frankel, who set the subject of the essay and with whom Nachmanides' Commentary was a favourite, as well as the spirit of Perles himself, may be said to be well reflected in the following sentence employed by him to characterise the subject of his work:—"Thus Nachmanides proves himself to be a man of moderate progress, clinging to the old views hallowed by centuries, yet following the tide of his own age and taking account of the spirit of the time." In these words Perles, to a certain extent, expressed the nature both of his teacher Frankel and of his own views. Perles' work on Nachmanides remains a valuable and lasting contribution to the history of exegesis. The characteristics and contents of this Pentateuch Commentary are fully given, as well as the sources, and all literary and historical references. In a supplement which appeared two years later, Perles treats of Nachmanides' teachers, the chronology of his halachic works, his halachic authorities, and edits also his epistle to the French Rabbis on the subject of Maimonides' writings.[2] With this work Perles commenced

---

[1] "Über den Geist des Commentars des R. Moses b. Nachman zum Pentateuch und über sein Verhältniss zum Pentateuch-Commentar Raschi's." *Monatsschrift* (1858), pp. 81-97, 113-116, 117-136, 145-159.

[2] "Nachträge über R. Moses b. Nachman." *Monatsschrift* (1860), pp. 15-1795.

his labours as a careful editor of the unpublished stores of literature.

On the 30th of March, 1859, Perles received the degree of Doctor from the Breslau University, having passed the Examination *summa cum laude*, a rare distinction. He dedicated his Dissertation to "his most-beloved Teachers" (*præceptoribus dilectissimis*), G. H. Bernstein and Zacharias Frankel. This Dissertation for the Doctorate was, as it seldom happens with such attempts, truly epoch-making. Within somewhat narrow limits it contained a fulness of most interesting matter and many new points of view. His subject was in the main nothing less than that the old Syriac Translation of the Bible, though it had been preserved by the Christian Church alone, was yet a product of Judaism, and, like the other ancient Jewish Translations of the Bible, reflected the Jewish exegesis of the Bible as well as Jewish traditions. This view has, it is true, been combated, and with good reason partly narrowed down; but it advanced to a considerable degree the knowledge of the Peschito, and for the first time brought to light its historical setting. I may just refer in passing to the two theses which Perles appended to his Doctor-Dissertation, in order, as was the custom at the time, to defend his views in public—subjects germane to the comparative researches of the author and which have not yet received adequate consideration:—"*Traditionum quæ in re divina valent, similis apud Arabes atque apud Judæos est ratio:*" and "*Cabbalistarum doctrina cum Ssufiorum arcte cohæret.*"

In the summer of 1859 Perles made a stay in his native town, and he employed his run through the Hungarian capital in looking through the Hebrew and other Oriental MSS. contained in the National Museum of Hungary. A short account of the former he contributed to Löw's Ben Chananja,[1] which periodical contained other contributions

[1] "Die Hebraica im ungarischen Nationalmuseums in Pest." Ben Chananja, 2nd Ann., p. 571. Details concerning these manuscripts are

from his pen in 1859 and 1860:[1] his intention to refer to the other Oriental MSS. in the proper place was not carried out. In the course of the last two years of his studentship at Breslau, Perles published two most valuable and interesting archæological studies, having collected scraps of material with the greatest industry and care, which contributed greatly to the understanding of these subjects.[2] He further published some reviews and notices.[3] The time was approaching when he was to leave College and take up the profession for which he had been preparing himself with so much diligence and devotion. Before he had reached the end of his College term at Breslau he received a call in the autumn of 1861 as Rabbi of the *Brüdergemeinde* of Posen; but it was not before the 30th of April, 1862, that Perles, in conjunction with his two colleagues, M. Güdemann, at present Rabbi in Vienna, and M. Rahmer, at present Rabbi in Magdeburg, was at a public celebration declared fully qualified to undertake the position of Rabbi and Preacher. It was the first celebration of its sort at the Breslau Rabbinical Seminary, and one can quite understand the following proud terms in which the Director reported upon it in the *Monatsschrift*, 12th Ann., p. 56:—"This

---

given by Sam. Kohn, *Die hebräischen Handschriften des ungarischen National-museums:* Berlin, 1877.

[1] "Über den Ausdruck נחמה als Bezerchnung der Auferstehung." B. Ch. II. 466. "Die Nabatäer im Thalmud und Midrasch." B. Ch. III. 81. "Chrysostomus und die Juden." *Ib.*, 569-571.

[2] "Die jüdische Hochzeit in nachbiblischer Zeit," *Monatsschrift* (1866), 339-360, appeared in separate form: Leipzig, 1860. "Die Leichen-Feierlichkeiten im nachbiblischen Judenthum," *ib.*, 1861, pp. 345-355, 376-394, also separately printed: Breslau, 1861. Both appeared in English in the Hebrew Characteristics of the American Jewish Publication Society: New York, 1875.

[3] The reviews are now signed with the initials J.P., and refer to—*Die Fabeln des Sophos*, of Landsberger (9th Ann., 71-74); *Don Joseph Nasi*, of M. A. Levy (*ib.*, 118, 119); *Die Juden-Frage*, of M. Kalisch (*ib.*, 387-391); *Ueber die Chronik des Sulpicius Severus*, of J. Bernays (10th Ann., 152-155). *Vide* also, in 8th Ann., pp. 319, 320, a note upon das Targumwort חנסנם. *Ib.*, 435, concerning several remarkable statements made by a Persian lexicographer relating to a Jewish money-forger.

Institution has now by means of these young men redeemed the promise which it made to the public at the time of its inception; then it could but beg for the confidence of its supporters, now it has the consciousness of not having abused that trust."

Perles worked for a whole decade in Posen. Concerning his position there we have the following statement of a trustworthy writer (in a necrologue in the *Israelitische Wochenschrift*, March 30th, 1894): "Perles was a very young man when he came to Posen; but even then he was invested with a certain dignity and loftiness of mind which made him respected by the entire large congregation. Not that he had the talent or the desire to cast a halo about his own person; there was, in fact, no one simpler and plainer than he was. That sanctimoniousness of the pastor, which, however much it may impress the ignorant, is repugnant to and repels the enlightened, was foreign to Perles' nature; it was, in truth, abhorrent to him. But, nevertheless, there was a charm about his personality which captivated those who were admitted into his family circle. For fortune had favoured him with a helpmate who had the most exalted notions concerning the dignity of the office of preacher, and who cherished the thought that it was within the power of a preacher's wife—aye, that it was incumbent on her—to help and even sustain her husband."

It was on June 2nd, 1863, that Perles contracted the matrimonial alliance, which proved a truly happy one, with the partner of his life, as she is described in the words I have just quoted. Now she and her two exemplary sons mourn the loss of husband and father, so early taken from their midst; but what a source of comfort must the widow find in the recollection of three decades passed together with her husband in a work so heartily taken up and jointly carried out to the blessing of both! The father-in-law of Perles, who died in 1885, was a learned merchant, who made the *Targumim* his favourite study, and whose *Hebrew*

Commentary on Targum Onkelos may be described as the best and most thoroughly scientific manual, free from dilettantic speculation, which exists for the study of the *Targum*. It was edited by Perles in 1888.[1]

Almost simultaneously with his marriage Perles was able to publish the first-fruits of his studies in Posen—the monograph concerning R. Salomon b. Abraham b. Adereth (Adret), which, in consequence of its subject-matter, stands in close relation to his prize essay on *Nachmanides*.[2] Conspicuous in it appears the controversy regarding the Philosophy and Freedom of the Study of Science, in which Salomon b. Adereth took a leading part, and which is presented to the reader by Perles by means of a careful analysis of the most important collection of statements upon the subject contained in the book *Minchath Kenaoth*. In the Appendix Perles publishes two hitherto unknown writings of S. b. Adereth,[3] and the preface to Jacob b. Anatoli's homiletic-philosophical work, which subsequently appeared in a complete form.

The archives of the congregation at Posen gave Perles an opportunity of turning his attention to another phase of Jewish history. He wrote the *History of the Jews* in Posen,[4] according to Professor Kaufmann's opinion (Sup-

---

[1] *Biure Onkelos*, Scholia zum Targum Onkelos von Simon Baruch Schefftel. Edited after the death of the author by Dr. J. Perles: Munich, 1888. 288 pp.

[2] *R. Salomo b. Abraham b. Adereth. Sein Leben und seine Schriften*, nebst handschriftlichen Beilagen zum ersten Male herausgegeben: Breslau, 1863. 83 and 61 pp. See *Reviews* by Frankel (*Monatsschrift*, 12th Ann., pp. 183 and 188) and Geiger (*Jüdische Zeitschrift*, 2nd Ann., pp. 59 and 63). The work is dedicated "in loving devotion" to Dr. H. Graetz, "the valued teacher and friend."

[3] They are: The beginning of a commentary upon the Agada of the Babylonian Talmud (24-56); A polemical treatise defending the Jewish religion against the attacks of a Mohammedan. In the latest volume of the *Z. d. M. G.* (vol. 48, pp. 39-42), Schreiner shows that these attacks on the part of an unknown Mohammedan are identical with those of the Mohammedan polemical writer, Abû Mohammed Ibn 'Hazm.

[4] *Monatsschrift*, 13th Ann. (1864), 281-295, 321-334, 361-373, 409-420,

plement to the *Allgemeine Zeitung*, of Munich, March 17th, 1894) "the most important monograph in German which has appeared to this day on the subject, distinguished alike by the evidence it affords of researches into archives, and of deep acquaintance with what has been written on the topic by Rabbis of the Middle Ages and modern times." To the same class of writings belongs the work which was published two years later, *Records Concerning the History of the Jewish Provincial Synods in Poland.*[1]

Such historical studies in nowise drew Perles away from his never-ending task of investigating and explaining the language of the Talmudic and Midrashic literature.

When I. Levy's *Chaldee Lexicon of the Targumim*, etc., appeared, Perles contributed to the first six parts most valuable appendices, chiefly concerned with Persian.[2] In an interesting article he points to an older worker in the field of Rabbinic vocabulary, and shows that many of the explanations of foreign words given by M. Sachs are already to be found in De Lara's work,[3] and that his etymologies are often to be preferred to those of later scholars. He soon showed in how masterly a manner he had conquered the subject of Talmudic etymology by the appearance of a very important work, the last that he finished in Posen. Few books present, within such narrow limits, such a richness of material combined with a host of fresh views and observations as his Etymological Studies,[4]

449-461 ; 14th Ann. (1865), 81-93, 121-136, 165-178, 205-216, 256-263. In separate form : Breslau, 1865.

[1] *Monatsschrift*, 16th Ann. (1867), 108-111, 152-154, 222-226, 304-308 343-348.

[2] *Zu dem Chaldäischen Wörterbuch* von Rabbiner Dr. J. Levy. *Monatsschrift*, 15th Ann., 148-153 ; 16th Ann., 297-303.

[3] David Cohen de Lara's *Rabbinisches Lexicon Kheter Khehunnah*. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der rabbinischen Lexicographie. *Monatsschrift*, 17th Ann. (1868), pp. 224-232, 255-264, separately: Breslau, 1868.

[4] "Etymologische Studien zur Kunde der rabbinischen Sprache und Alterthümer. *Monatsschrift*, 19th Ann. (1870), 210-227, 253-267, 310-326, 375-384, 415-431, 457-478, 493-524, 558-567. Also printed in separate form (with a short preface and four registers): Breslau, 1871.

which deserve to rank with such works as Michael Sachs' *Contributions to the Science of Language and Archæology.* Both Perles and Sachs, had a two-fold object, namely, by means of proper etymologies, to advance the knowledge of the Rabbinic texts, and to deepen the historical knowledge of Rabbinic antiquities.

It is difficult, considering the nature of the subject, to give in a few sentences an idea of this work. Perles, as was his custom, did not furnish it with any general introduction, but plunges his readers at once *medias in res*, inasmuch as he uses a string of examples to show how a right etymology is conditional upon a previous correction of the text. He makes ample use of this need for copious textual emendation, but never in a capricious and unscientific manner. The etymological studies of Perles may be regarded as a rare and rich fund for the explanation of foreign words, Greek as well as Persian, occurring in Rabbinic literature, and they carry out the author's wish as expressed in the preface to the special edition, that "they might advance the scientific enquiry into the yet much-confused language of Rabbinic literature."[1]

The decisive period of the Franco-German war was an important turning-point in the life of Perles. The Jewish congregation of Munich elected him their Rabbi, and he was thus transferred from the provincial city of Posen to the capital of Bavaria, in which it was his lot to labour incessantly until the very end of his life. On the first day of Shevuoth, May 26th, 1871, he delivered his Installation Sermon, from which we would extract a few sentences and give them as a sample of the sense in which Perles re-

[1] A few of the writings of Perles during his labours in Posen have yet to be noted here:—"A Review of S. Kohn De Pentateucho Samaritano." *Monatsschrift*, 14th Ann. (1866), pp. 356-359. "Die Leichenverbrennung in den alten Bibelversionen," *ib.*, 18th Ann., pp. 76-81. A Review of Stein, Talmudische Terminologie," *ib.*, 473-477. In 1864 there appeared "Gottesdienstliche Vorträge," held in the Synagogue of the Jewish Community of Posen, in aid of the Riesser-Stiftung: Posen, 1864.

garded his vocation and the manner in which he discharged its duties:—"I regard it as the first and indispensable demand made upon the conscientious guide of a congregation, that he be impressed with the exalted and important character of his office, which is, that he is the bearer and proclaimer of pure and unadulterated doctrine, and that he shall ever have present before his mind the weighty responsibility which rests upon his shoulders. . . . . I regard it as the second demand made upon the conscientious guide of a congregation, that he shall never tire in the task of proclaiming those truths of which he has become convinced by reason of his uninterrupted investigation of the Word of God, such truths, the acquisition of which have only become possible for him by reason of his contact with noble spirits and earnest thinkers. . . . . I regard it as the third and highest demand made upon the conscientious guide of a congregation that, by means of the example of his own life, he should point the way to his congregation in morality and uprightness of character. . . . . I shall conscientiously make enquiry into the present conditions of the congregation and see what is necessary for the development of its religious life. I shall oppose that want of moderation which flies to extremes, the unconditional reverence of all that is ancient, simply because it is ancient, and the unconditional apotheosis of all that is new, simply because it is new. . . . . It shall be my earnest endeavour to bring about, in conjunction with my congregation, an adequate and proper form of divine service in harmony with the times, one that shall satisfy both the mind and the heart, one that while it will draw to the House of God the cultured members, the younger generation, our wives and daughters, shall not repel from its midst that faithful band of fellow-worshippers who belong to the old school."[1]

[1] "Antrittspredigt gehalten bei der Übernahme seines Amtes als Rabbiner der israelitischen Cultusgemeinde München. Proceeds to be devoted to the sick and wounded in the German army": Munich, 1871. 15 pp.

Perles was, in fact, the conscientious guide of his congregation, to the members of which, in the sixth year of his ministration among them, on the occasion of the fiftieth (jubilee) celebration of the Synagogue, he addressed the following words:[1] "As in the past half-century, so shall there be proclaimed during the coming time in this Synagogue the principles of truth, the fear of God, and the love of one's fellow-man; there shall be reared and educated in this place a generation of peace—peace with God, with the State, with the community, and with society at large." And God's blessing rested upon the efforts of Perles. Just as he offered his congregation the best at his disposal as regards the treasures of mind and heart and the power of the will, in the same manner did his congregation give him the best that a congregation is able to offer its pastor—unlimited confidence, an affection begotten of unbounded respect, full appreciation of his instruction, and reverence for his personality. Under his lead the Munich community, the largest in Southern Germany, grew in outward dignity and internal possessions; and coming generations will find an evidence of his activity as Rabbi in the new Synagogue, which was founded mainly by his efforts, and consecrated on the 16th September, 1887, and which stands as "a monumental work of architecture, much admired," and which, in a city abounding in works of art, "ranks among the numerous large and beautiful houses of prayer, or at least takes a modest place in their midst." In the Dedication Sermon,[2] from which these words are taken, Perles, while apostrophising the pulpit, the seat of his own eloquence, makes the following remarks: "O place whence words of instruction flow, be thou and remain for all times a seat of

---

[1] Predigt zur fünfzigjährigen Jubelfeier der Synagoge zu München, am 1. Pesach-Tage, 5636 (April 9th, 1876): Munich, 1876. 20 pp.

[2] Reden zum Abschiede von der alten und zur Einweihung der neuen Synagoge in München, am 10. und 16. September, 1887: München, 1887. 18 pp.

fruitful impulse and religious teaching. Let all impatient expressions, all words of hatred and enmity, be ever banished from thy midst! May vanity and arrogance be foreign to those who preach from thee! From this spot may the inexhaustible treasure-stores of God's word be unlocked for the thorough instruction of the congregation assembled, so as to arouse a clear understanding of life's duties, a right and proper conception of the higher truth, a strengthening of the conscience and of the heart, a cheerful disposition in the fulfilment of those duties which devolve upon us as Germans and as Israelites, as citizens of the narrower and of the wider Fatherland! O that this might be brought about in the spirit of truth, of love, and of peace!" We would utter the wish that all succeeding occupants of this pulpit, once and for ever hallowed by Perles himself, will work in the midst of the congregation in this self-same spirit.

Munich, with its rare collection of printed and manuscript works, supplied the zeal of Perles, untiring in investigation, with never-ending means and subjects for fresh activity. Just as he once jocularly said, in reviewing the Jewish-German *Chrestomathy*[1] of his learned friend, Max Grünbaum, the well-known investigator of the legendary literature, that he "lived in Munich, I would fain say, in the Royal and National Library of Munich," so was also henceforth the life of Perles, as a scholar and learned author, indissolubly bound up with this famous Library. Munich, moreover, possessed in Abraham Merzbacher one of the most high-minded lovers of Jewish literature, who had formed a large and valuable collection of printed books and manuscripts, and with whom Perles associated himself in true friendship. One of the few addresses of Perles[2] which have appeared in print is a funeral oration on the occasion of the death of his

[1] *Monatsschrift*, 31st Ann. (1882) pp. 128-138.

[2] "Trauerrede an der Bahre des am 21. Sivan (4. Juni 1885) verewigten Herrn Abraham Merzbacher": München, 1885. 12 pp.

friend. Perles pays a warm tribute of eulogy[1] also to the learned and indefatigable R. N. Rabbinowicz, who was enabled by the help of Merzbacher to collect and publish his *Variæ Lectiones* to the Babylonian Talmud. As for Perles himself, he too possessed a tolerably important and ever-growing private library, which contained many valuable and rare works, and which, as I am informed by his son Felix, numbers over three thousand volumes. As an instance of his personal relations, I would cull the following words from the obituary notice of a Munich newspaper:[2] "The respect in which the deceased was held was deeply rooted, not alone in the Jewish circles of Munich, Bavaria, and Germany, but also in the circles of Christian theology of both denominations. As scholar Dr. Perles was greatly honoured by the late Bishop Haneberg, formerly Abbot of the Benedictine Order here, and by Dr. Döllinger. The Rabbi of this city stood in constant communication on matters of learning with a number of eminent Catholic theologians."

The first important work which Perles published while in Munich follows, as far as concerns its contents, close upon his etymological studies. It consists of fifteen larger and smaller studies upon philological and archæological subjects growing out of Rabbinic literature.[3] There is evidence here of the abundant use made of the Midrash MSS. contained in the Munich Library. Soon followed a contribution to comparative folklore, a subject to which Perles had always paid great attention; he pointed out with much learning and in a convincing manner the Jewish sources of the *Thousand and one Nights*.[4] He published both works in separate form, dedicating them to "Herr Abraham Merzbacher, the

[1] "Beilage zur Allgemeinen Zeitung," vom 4. December 1888.

[2] "Münchener Neueste Nachrichten," vom 6. März 1894.

[3] "Miscellen zur rabbinischen Sprach- und Alterthumskunde." *Monatsschrift*, 21st Ann. (1872), pp. 251-273, 358-375.

[4] "Rabbinische Agada's in 1001 Nacht. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Wanderung orientalischer Märchen." *Monatsschrift*, 22nd Ann. (1873), pp. 14-34, 61-85, 116-125.

friend and patron of Rabbinic studies."[1] He edited simultaneously a highly interesting Midrash, which in his thorough and masterly manner he showed to be a monument of the Byzantine influence upon Judaism,[2] and described the "Memorialbook of the Pfersee Community," which, like other memorial books of this sort that have been brought to light in modern times, contained several accounts of persons and events of former times.[3] A discovery in the Munich Library soon led him into quite another field. He found in a well-preserved codex the oldest Latin translation of the *Môre* of Maimonides, with the result that the Latin rendering of the *Môre* by Giustiniani (Justinianus), which appeared in Paris in 1520, was proved to be none other than a faulty copy of this very translation. He published these and other important results of his investigations of MSS., together with specimens from them in another and larger treatise.[4] Rare Hebrew printed books, chiefly belonging to mediæval popular literature, and manuscripts chiefly bearing on the Liturgy, form the subject-matter of the article published in 1876, entitled: "Bibliographische Mittheilungen aus München."[5] In the next year he gave an account of the contents of a work in the Merzbach collection of MSS., important in many directions, viz., the commentary upon the Piyutim by Abraham b. Asriel of Bohemia, and he published out of it several explanations of the Text given by the great Exegete, R. Samuel b. Meir.[6] In a

---

[1] "Zur rabbinischen Sprach- und Sagenkunde": Breslau, 1873. x. and 99 pp.

[2] "Thron und Circus des Königs Salomo." *Monatsschrift*, 21st Ann., pp. 122-139. Also in separate form. Breslau, 1873.

[3] *Monatsschrift*, 22nd Ann., pp. 508-515, 572.

[4] "Die in einer Münchener Handschrift aufgefundene erste lateinische Übersetzung des Maimonidischen Führers." *Monatsschrift*, 24th Ann. (1875), pp. 9-24, 67-86, 99-110, 149-159, 209-218, 261-265. Also in separate form: Breslau, 1875.

[5] *Monatsschrift*, 25th Ann., pp. 350-375.

[6] "Das Buch 'Arûgath Habbosem des Abraham b. Asriel.'" *Monatsschrift*, 26th Ann. (1877), pp. 360-373. Also in separate form: Krotoschin, 1877.

collection of Responsa of the 17th century, he thought he had found some mention of the unfortunate Uriel Acosta; but his surprising discovery met with serious doubt.[1]

The Breslau Seminary, to the memory of whose first director, Zacharias Frankel, Perles in 1875, also devoted a faithful and mournful tribute,[2] celebrated on August 10th, 1879, the twenty-fifth anniversary of its establishment. At the request of the former students of the institution, Perles issued in celebration of the event a remarkable monument of mediæval literature, which led him back once again to that period of ferment and strife with which, on the occasion of his monograph on Solomon b. Adereth, he had identified himself. His edition is based upon the only extant MS. which happened to be contained in the Munich Library.[3]

When the *Revues des Etudes Juives* was established, Perles became one of the contributors, and wrote in the third volume two articles concerning some disputed Talmudic expressions, offering divers bold hypotheses in relation to them.[4] The same year there appeared in the *Z.d.D.M.G.* a splendid review of a Syriac work, use being made of some newly expounded Talmudic expressions and phrases.[5] And now a long pause ensued in his publications, only broken by the appearance (1882) of the review already referred to, of Grünebaum's Jewish-German *Chrestomathy,* but which was

---

[1] "Eine neuerschlossene Quelle über Uriel Acosta." *Monatsschrift*, 26th Ann. (1877), pp. 193-213. In separate form: Krotoschin, 1877. *Vide* Güdemann and Graetz on the same (*Monats.*, *ib.*, pp. 327-330). In the 27th Ann. of the *Monatsschrift*, pp. 317-324, Perles described "Eine hebräische Handschrift der Fürstlich Oettingen-Wallersteinischen Bibliothek."

[2] "Worte der Erinnerung....." : München, 1875. 12 pp.

[3] "Kalonymus ben Kalonymus. Sendschreiben an Joseph Kaspi": München, 1879. *Vide* Steinschneider, *Hebr. Bibliographie*, vol. XXI., pp. 115-118; Neubauer-Renan, *Les écrivains Juives de XVI. siècle*, pp. 95-99.

[4] "Revue des Études Juives," III., 1881, pp. 109-120: "Études Talmudiques."

[5] "Bemerkungen zu Bruns-Sachau." Syrisch-Römisches Rechtsbuch aus dem fünften Jahrhundert. *Z.d.D.M.G.*, XXXV., pp. 139-141, 725-727.

ultimately ended by the work which came as a joyful surprise to all friends of Jewish learning, in which Perles united the rich fruits of long years of study and the results of a diligent and thoroughgoing course of literary enquiry.[1] This book, which is dedicated to Leopold Zunz on his ninetieth birthday, consists in a series of studies reproducing newly-discovered or newly-adduced materials with a copiousness and variety rarely met with, the titles of which can give but a very inadequate idea of the richness of its contents. Its headings may nevertheless be repeated here: (i.) The small Aruch; (ii.) The Makre Dardeke and the Munich MS. of the same; (iii.) Elia Levita's Nomenclature; (iv.) Jewish-German Glosses by a disciple of R. Moses Hadarshan of the 13th century; (v.) Unpublished letters of the years 1517—1555. As was Perles' manner, there was not even the shortest introduction attached to this collection of studies, bristling as it did with new data and explanations. The history of Hebrew and Rabbinic Lexicography, the history of the Humanist literature, the history of the beginnings of Jewish learning among Christians, the history of manners and customs, and middle High German philology (as well as French and German), receive a rich addition from the important, ample and trustworthy materials presented in this volume. To the same class of literature as the "Contributions" belongs an article which appeared two years later in the *Revue des Etudes Juives* on the Jewish Scholars of Florence.[2] Perles continued his investigations concerning the small Aruch in a neat article forming the beginning of the German portion of the Grätz-Jubelschrift, the appendix to which contains

---

[1] "Beiträge zur Geschichte der hebräischen und aramäischen Studien": München, 1884. 247 pp.

[2] "Les savants juifs à Florence à l'époque de Laurent de Médicis." *Revue des Etudes Juives*, XII. (1886), pp. 244-257. Separately: Paris, 1887.

some highly learned contributions to the History of Literature, specially to that of the habits and customs of the Jewish people.[1]

In 1888 Perles edited the work on the Targum, written by his father-in-law, to which reference has already been made, and allowed, apparently through continued ill-health, a somewhat long pause to ensue before he again rejoiced the hearts of friends and adorers with the fruits of his uninterrupted labours. Then in a tolerably lengthy publication he wrote of the Sicilian Bible Exegete Aboulrabi,[2] who had become famous by reason of his free and original views, and dealt more briefly with the Legend of Asenath.[3] The reappearance in the autumn of 1892, after a long interval, of the *Monatsschrift*, for many years the home of his literary activity, afforded Perles a welcome opportunity to publish what he had been collecting for some time, new *Contributions to Rabbinic Philology and Archæology.*[4] Here again, after a lapse of twenty years, he proved himself to be still the tried master of etymological studies. It seemed as if he returned with renewed pleasure and undiminished vigour to his favourite investigations. Partially collating the results of former inquiries, partially widening their range and presenting new matter, he wrote a most fascinating article upon "Jewish Byzantine Relations."[5] Everything tended to show that a new period of active originality and fruitful research had begun in his life. Even his health had

---

[1] "Die Berner Handschrift des kleinen Aruch." Jubelschrift zum siebzigsten Geburtstage des Prof. Dr. H. Graetz: Breslau, 1887, pp. 1-38.

[2] "Ahron b. Gerson Aboulrabi." *Revue des Etudes Juives*, XXI. (1890), pp. 246-269.

[3] "La légende d'Asenath, fille de Dina et femme de Joseph." *Revue des Etudes Juives*, XXII. (1819), pp. 87-92. Perles let this article appear in Hungarian in the 8th Ann. of the *Magyar Zoidó Szemle*, pp. 249-252.

[4] *Monatsschrift*, 37th Ann. (new series, 1st Ann.), 1892-1893, pp. 6-14, 64-68, 111-116, 174-179, 356-378.

[5] "Byzantinische Zeitschrift," herausgegeben von Karl Krumbacher. Vol. II., pp. 569-584.

become better. In the summer of 1892 he visited, after a long absence, his native place in Hungary, to which, in spite of his having become a thorough German, he was deeply attached, watching with sustained interest the social and literary movements of the Jewry in Hungary.

In the spring of 1893, on my return from a mournful journey to Paris (whither I had gone to pay my last respects to a dear brother of mine), I spent almost an entire day in the family circle of Perles, and realised the picture of the noblest form of domestic life of a man who found in his vocation, his learning, and his near and dear ones, the concentration of all fortune and felicity, the picture of a man who looked into the future with the fullest confidence and security. There was no trace then of a shattered constitution; he showed me some new and valuable acquisitions to his library, and spoke of continuing his contributions to Rabbinic philology, and of other work that he had in view. Full of pride, justified in a father, he spoke of the progress made by the younger of his two sons (the elder had already earned for himself distinction as an ophthalmologist), who seems to have inherited the talent for languages and the spirit for research, as well as the philological turn of mind, which characterised his father, and whom he trained to continue his vocation and his scientific labours. When I bade him "Auf Wiedersehen," I little dreamt that my words would never be realised. In the beginning of the following year the news spread of his serious illness, though the hope of his recovery was not abandoned. When I forwarded to him, in the middle of February, the Hebrew poems of my late father, which had just appeared, he thanked me through his son, at the same time informing me that he was progressing slowly. But the hope was vain. On Sunday, March 4th last, Joseph Perles breathed out his noble soul, and on the 6th his mortal remains were laid to their eternal rest, amid the deepest manifestations of wide-felt

mourning, in the cemetery belonging to the Israelitish community of Munich. His name and memory are honoured and blessed among the Jews of Hungary, whence he sprang, as they are honoured and blessed in the Jewry of Germany, in whose midst and for whose welfare he laboured. But he will be ever mentioned in the annals of Jewish learning among the best spirits, among those whose life was one uninterrupted work in spreading this learning and advancing the knowledge of this science. Blessed be his memory!

W. BACHER.

Budapest, May, 1894.

NOTES ON THE RELIGIOUS VALUE OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL.

My title sounds presumptuous. It is not, however, presumptuously meant. I merely wish to indicate the limits of my intention. It would be foolish and unnecessary on my part to attempt to give any systematic representation of the religious doctrine contained in the Fourth Gospel. In the case of St. Paul it was almost obligatory, even to a writer who was bold enough to print his first impressions, to cast them into the form of exposition. The readers for whom he specially wrote were not only, as he imagined, unfamiliar with the actual wording of the Pauline Epistles, but from upbringing, association and temperament, were unable, without effort and assistance, to understand or appreciate their meaning. On the other hand, though the Epistles of Paul are not fully to be explained or understood without a study of the religious and intellectual environment of their author, they can, nevertheless, to some extent be expounded from themselves, or, at any rate, from data known to the average Jewish reader of magazines. But as regards the Fourth Gospel the case is different in both directions. It is at once harder and easier than the Epistles. Let a fairly-cultivated Jew, ignorant of the New Testament (the two qualifications are at present quite compatible), read the Epistles to the Galatians and the Romans, and I believe his main sensation will be one of bewilderment; let him read the Fourth Gospel, and he will at all events *think* he understands a fair amount of it. Moreover, in a sort of way he will understand it; for the oppositions between "spirit" and "flesh," or "of this world" and "not of this world," the metaphorical and spiritual use of words like "bread," "light,"

"life," and many others, have become familiar to him in other ways. Yet, *per contra*, he who would fully understand "St. John" must understand two of his predecessors. It is true that the Jewish outsider can *partially* understand and *partially* appreciate the Fourth Gospel far more readily than he can appreciate and understand St. Paul. And yet *properly* to understand that Gospel you must in the first place understand Paul. And, secondly, to properly understand that Gospel you must be acquainted with and even understand Philo. But Philo, though, as I imagine, no savour of unorthodoxy attaches to his name, is necessarily no more than a name to all but the professed student.

It would not be difficult to assign other reasons for the comparative comprehensibility of the Fourth Gospel, in spite of its dependence upon two obscure or even unknown quantities. For one thing there is the style so lucidly clear and simple, so different from the involved and excited utterances of Paul. Then, again, just because the Fourth Gospel is so much further removed from Judaism, it is easier for a Jew to understand it. The period of conflict and creation is nearly over; the Gentile Church is fully formed. The Law is no longer a burning question; the opposition of faith and works, no longer prominent, is even partially reconciled, for "faith" has become the supreme "work." The Pauline paradoxes have done their duty; they have been absorbed and disappeared. In spite of the subject and its tragedy, we have passed into a serener air. Again, as the books on "St. John" fully explain, the death of Christ is no longer the main feature of the Gospel. There is a sense in which that death and its effects are still a stumbling-block to the Jew, even as they were when first enunciated by the daring genius of St. Paul—a stumbling-block in two senses: impossible to accept, difficult to appreciate or understand.

Once more putting questions of authorship on one side, there seems much more agreement among theologians

as regards the Fourth Gospel than as regards St. Paul. There seems less room for endless diversities of interpretation. Even on the critical side the commentators on St. Paul differ a good deal one from the other, so that much time is taken up by one man in pointing out the degrees of error in others. But in explaining St. John, the exponents of the critical school show a much greater unanimity. Of course, there are varieties, and you learn things in one book which you do not find in another. Still the views of Pfleiderer, and Thoma, and the two Holtzmann's, and Scholten, and Martineau, and Cone, all bear a very marked likeness to each other; and there is a fair amount of repetition as you pass from the first book to the second, and from the second to the third and fourth. The consequence is that anybody who will work a little at Philo, should be able with the help of some two or three of these scholars to get a very fair idea of the contents of the Fourth Gospel.

A principal question which I have set before myself in reading, and in reading about, the "Gospel according to St. John" is, What is the religious value of this book to those who have not been brought up in Christianity, and who do not believe in some of its most distinctive dogmas? What is its religious value to the average modern Jew?

For a Jew to ask this question is partly but not entirely equal to asking without qualifications "What is the religious value of the Fourth Gospel?" Such an identification is only conceited in appearance. Each one of us in estimating the religious worth of another creed, is bound to regard his own belief to a considerable extent as a fixed standard of value. The Christian judges Buddhism favourably by its real or supposed resemblances to Christianity, and so on. But this identification need not and should not be complete. To the more philosophic believer at any rate, no religion (his own included) is ever perfect, and none is without its partial though perhaps temporary defects. One religion may be onesided in one respect, a second

in another. A third may have the defects of its qualities. The exaggerations of one religion may be of a certain use to the opposite exaggerations of another. It is, therefore, quite possible that certain points in the Fourth Gospel, themselves perhaps not wholly true or accurate, may be of religious value to a Jew. He may realize their onesidedness, while they help him to correct his own.

It must at once be allowed that this method of approaching the Fourth Gospel is the one of all others which would probably be least sympathetic to its author. I *assume* that the main contention of the Gospel—the contention or argument laid down in its opening prologue (*e.g.*, i. 1-14) or in its closing verse (xx. 31)—is false: and then I coolly proceed to ask, What is its religious value? As the believer would answer, "Infinite," so might he maintain that the unbeliever must answer, "Nil." For the object of the Gospel is not to teach ethics; it is not to teach any aspect of religion, or any phase of the spiritual or moral life, which may be independent of or only mediately connected with its supreme and central propositions, that the Eternal and Divine Word became flesh, that Jesus was the Christ, the Son of God, and that he is the Way, the Truth, and the Life. As Thoma most rightly says, "*Die Lehre des Johannesevangeliums ist eigentlich nichts anderes als Christologie,*"[1] "The doctrine of the Fourth Gospel is pure Christology." Does it not seem ridiculous that any one should find religious value in a book the essential and all-pervading object of which he, *ab initio*, assumes to be untrue? If we want a florilegium of ethical and religious sayings, we should go elsewhere than to the Fourth Gospel, where almost every verse is made subservient to and dependent on the main doctrine and purport of the whole. "Take away the *Godhead* of Christ," says Dr. Martineau, "and there is not an incident or a speech in the Fourth Gospel which does not lose its significance."[2]

---

[1] Thoma, *Die Genesis des Johannes-Evangeliums*, 1882, p. 302.

[2] Martineau, *The Seat of Authority in Religion*, 1890, p. 426.

What, then, can be the value of this book to the Unitarian or the Jew? Is it not almost an affront to the book and almost an insult to its author to ask the question, when you defiantly shut your ears to the very thing they have to say? Yet the Unitarian, Dr. Martineau, can find in this same Gospel at least "one vital element" of permanent value. And so, perhaps, may a Jewish reader, though (putting the central proposition on one side) he finds some things that are ethically and spiritually dangerous, and as he hopes erroneous, find also others which are ennobling, beautiful and true.

Few persons, at any rate, be their religion what it may, can read the Fourth Gospel through without yielding to its spell. Few persons, I imagine, can remain proof to its remarkable fascination. May I briefly indicate wherein probably (to the outsider) the causes of this fascination consist?

First of all there comes the beauty of the manner, apart from the matter of the book. Its simplicity and elevation of style, the sustained dignity and, occasionally, the dramatic power, all hold the interest of the reader. The greatest subjects in heaven or on earth are dealt with, and while the sentences are clear and unadorned, the sense of grandeur is usually well maintained. We feel that we are reading the work of a genius, and, moreover, the work of one who has full control over his material, his thought and his words. How delightfully the shortness and pointedness of St. John contrast with the diffuse rhetoric of Philo. The very same ideas sometimes offend us in the one writer which charm us in the other. A single crisp verse takes the place of pages of involved and florid rhetoric. The taste of the one was doubtless excellent for his own age and environment; the taste of the other still seems excellent to our own. A thought strangely expressed in Philo fails to arrest our attention. The same thought in the Fourth Gospel compels reflection or astonishment. Again, the Fourth Gospel, like so many other books, both of the

Hebrew and the Christian Scriptures, is alone of its kind. It is very short; but there is no other book exactly resembling it. Like the Prophets, the Psalms, or the Epistles of St. Paul, it has a uniqueness and isolation of its own.

But these reasons have only skimmed the surface. Others lie deeper. Most fairly cultivated persons, who are not naturally indifferent to one important side of our complex humanity, will be attracted by the spirituality of the book, by its idealism. This Fourth Gospel has, I suppose, gone a good way to form the religious consciousness of civilised humanity such as it now exists, and we have not yet, I imagine, got beyond—it may be hoped that we never shall get beyond—these oppositions between the seen and the unseen, the outward and the inward, the flesh and the spirit, which our Gospel has helped to make a permanent item in the forms and categories of cultivated, and even uncultivated, thought. When Plato talks about the true beauty and the true goodness, unseen and yet real, more real far than the world of sense, when he speaks of a life that is death, and of a death that may be life, though his ideals be often "vacant forms of light," they will always awaken a sympathetic response from our higher nature —a yearning, sometimes vague and untutored, but not phantastic or spectral, towards a truth and goodness of which we could not dream if they were not real. So with the Fourth Gospel. On the purely religious side it has been the great source for those spiritual antitheses and truths with which mankind is now familiar. And great primal phrases such as "God is a spirit," the "Bread of Life," "Peace not as the world giveth," in their striking simplicity and at their fountain source, will always, I should imagine, continue to attract and fascinate the spiritual and religious consciousness of man. Connected with this spirituality, or only another expression of it, is the symbolic language of the Gospel. As artistic limits of length and degree are not outstripped, the double meaning with which the actions and words of

Christ are often charged cannot fail to cause pleasure and profit. The scene where Christ washes his disciples' feet is in itself striking and beautiful, but its inner and symbolic meanings, half concealed and half revealed, add materially to its effect. As sometimes we feel that the respondents in the Platonic dialogues are made to misapprehend the meaning of the questions too clumsily, so sometimes the gross misconceptions of Christ's auditors are exaggerated in the Gospel. But the spiritual use of such words as light and darkness, slavery and freedom, bread and water, life and death, through their very background of material application, moves our admiration and quickens our discernment. The spirituality of the Gospel liberates and appeals to what is spiritual in ourselves; we are not reminded of or impelled to any particular duty, but we are rendered alert and responsive to that ever-recurrent opposition of sense and spirit, on which much that is best and noblest in life seems to depend. There is a possible danger in this. A mere tickling of the spiritual instincts, a mere spiritual palpitation, may be of little use or even of positive harm to our moral nature, and may not make us fulfil the better, but even the worse, our definite duties and obligations. It is much better to fulfil these well and not to appreciate the ethereal spirituality of the Fourth Gospel, than to succeed in the latter and to fail in the former. Moreover these sundered capacities are quite possible and probably not unfrequent. But the fascination, beyond which at this stage I should perhaps not have gone, is independent of the question of ethical profit and loss.

What has been said of the spirituality and symbolism of the Fourth Gospel applies in even greater measure to its mysticism. Putting aside the religious *value* of mysticism, whether generally or for the average modern Jew, there can be no question of the fascination which mystic religious sentiment, if expressed with adequate simplicity and conciseness, exercises upon the mind and the feelings. These qualifications are eminently complied with in the Fourth

Gospel. The eternal need of a God within as well as a God without, of breaking down or bridging over the gulf which seems to separate the human from the divine, and of yet maintaining the separateness and "personality" of both — these needs are felt and realised in the Fourth Gospel with considerable power and penetration, and for the believer of its main hypotheses, they are largely satisfied and appeased.

To these causes of fascination there may perhaps be added, not only the beautiful use of the ideas of love and sacrifice, a use so beautiful that we are apt to overlook the limitation of their range, but also the fact, however unconscious the average reader may be of it, that the author of the Fourth Gospel is a philosopher, and that his book is a form of popularised, or rather religionised, philosophy, transfigured by his genius and by his faith. The simplicity of this Gospel is not the simplicity of nature. It is the elaborate simplicity of art. It is carefully wrought out and worked up. Even while we admire, we feel that our admiration puts us into the category and fold of the elect. We are initiated into the mystery, and those who accept the Gospel become, as it were, the chosen few out of the condemned mass—in the world, but not of the world. Unconsciously to ourselves we philosophise, and this philosophy may truly be called divine. More even than with Plato, we are elevated and carried out of ourselves. In Plato we are invited to side with Socrates; in the Fourth Gospel we are invited to side with Christ. The distinction fascinates. We seem to breathe a purer and rarer air, and this higher atmosphere quickens and gladdens us. We are free and even bidden to enter within the holy place, to take our seats and be enrolled in the spiritual aristocracy of the world.

Such might be said to be some of the causes of that fascination which the Gospel of St. John is likely to exercise upon most cultivated and religious minds even outside the pale of believing Christianity. And these

causes of its fascination are partly the causes of its abiding religious value. Nevertheless, emotional fascination is one thing, critical appreciation is another. And upon this a due appraising of the Fourth Gospel must largely depend.

Religious belief, while not without its intellectual basis, is notoriously different from belief in matters of science or history. I believe that in the year 841 A.D. a battle was fought at Fontenay. Firmly as I believe this, it has not, as an isolated fact, any effect upon my thought, feelings, character, actions, happiness, or power. I believe that there is a good God in the ordinary sense of that word; or I believe that there is a devil into whose power I may fall for all eternity, or I believe that an aspect of God became flesh at a particular time, and while I believe these things to be facts, just as true as the occurrence of the battle of Fontenay in the year 841, they may also have a tremendous effect upon my life and character.

The power and influence of true belief are intensely prominent in the Fourth Gospel. In its emphatic insistence on truth, as in its frequent use of the very word, it is at once separated from the Synoptics (ἀλήθεια occurs between twenty and thirty times in John, once in Matthew). The true knowledge of the only true God, and of Jesus Christ, his Son, is in itself eternal life: the lack, still more the rejection, of that knowledge, is in itself the absence or the forfeiture of that life. The whole man is transformed by his belief.

We shall, I think, find that the Fourth Evangelist goes beyond even this, and here we shall probably part company with him. To all Jews, presumably to all liberal Christians, the action of God on man is not determined by the accuracy of his belief about God. We do not believe that the relation of God to man is different in the case of a Jew and in the case of a Christian. We realize that varying religious beliefs may and do have varying effects upon character, but so far as God is con-

cerned we do not believe that he has other laws of influence and judgment for those who believe concerning him more truly or less truly, or even for those who have failed to find him altogether. Least of all do we believe that these variations of belief affect the destiny of the soul beyond the grave. And in these negations, which can also be presented as the most solemn affirmations, we find comfort and consolation, even as we find glory and rest. But inconsistently, as we believe, with the justice of God and the universalism of his providence, the author of the Fourth Gospel did presumably believe that the result of true belief is not merely the moral and spiritual transformation of the believer, but the bestowal on him by God as a gift of his grace, the prerogative of eternal life, the special influx of the divine spirit.

Once more. Not merely is it true that religious belief may ethically transform, but it is also true that the essential character of your belief, as realised and appropriated by you, is partly dependent upon your prior or present ethical condition. The interaction and interrelation of morality and religion are notoriously complex in the extreme. Every man, good or bad, is at once capable of believing that a great battle was fought at Fontenay in 841. As the belief in the battle has no effect upon him hereafter, so it makes no demand upon him beforehand. But the belief in God—and here is one aspect of its solemnity—is not as easy as the belief in the battle. At all events there is, I apprehend, a sense in which it is true to say, that though a scamp can believe in God as well as a saint, his belief must be of a different texture and complexion. He may believe; he cannot realise. He may say that he believes in communion with God, but that belief in it which is more than verbal, because based on experience and feeling, he cannot possibly possess. Without goodness a man cannot sound the depths of belief in God. A man may be very good, and not believe in God —and this is where the Johannine writers (like Philo)

were naturally in the wrong—but he cannot adequately realise God and not be good. "He that loveth not, knoweth not God; for God is love." It is a great saying.

While we shall have to reject the Fourth Gospel's dualism, and its identification of the good man and the believer, we must always bear in mind that it was written when Christianity was still comparatively new, and fresh adult adherents, drawn from Paganism, were continually coming in. We can hardly appreciate the ethical effect which the discarding of heathenism, and the adoption of Christianity, may have had upon such persons. The recollection of it may also serve to partly excuse the peculiar dogma of the Evangelist, that he who rejected Christianity was morally bad. Among ourselves religion and morality grow up together, and their intermixture and interaction are far more subtle and complicated than anything which the writer of the Fourth Gospel could possibly have conceived.

Proceeding now from these points of view to the main religious ideas of this remarkable book, we perceive that what it contains is a new revelation of God in his own nature and in his relation to man. And by God must be also included those other aspects or phases of him, which are known as the Word or the Son, and as the Holy Spirit or the Spirit of Truth. We are told that before the advent of the Incarnate Son none knew the Father, for none can come unto the Father but through the Son. So tremendous an assertion, that the true nature of God was unknown before Christ, makes us ask what fuller revelation of God is given in this Gospel than we had known before, whether through the Old Testament, Philo, or the Synoptics? Now, apart from the metaphysical question of a distribution of the divine nature and function among double or triple aspects within the Godhead itself, there is very little in the Fourth Gospel to make good this claim. There is, indeed, far less than in the Synoptics, where Jesus, with perhaps one exception, never casts so overwhelming a

disparagement upon the religious knowledge of the generations which had preceded him. We find one statement of grand simplicity and permanent value: "God is spirit, and they that worship him must worship in spirit and truth." It cannot be said that the statement contains a truth which was wholly new, for it is already implied in Isaiah and Philo.[1] But in its setting, in its final overthrow of that dangerous localization of deity which still attached to the temple of Jerusalem, in its bold and distinct denial of the notion that God can be nearer to one spot than to another, its value is undoubted and abiding. It takes its place with the 139th Psalm as one of the great spiritual possessions of humanity. With this exception, the Fourth Gospel contains little that is of value to the outsider about God, even as regards the more metaphysical relations of his being. In v. 17: "My Father worketh until now," we get the idea of God's ceaseless activity, which, however, is more clearly enunciated by the Evangelist's predecessor, Philo.[2] On the moral side we notice that the appellation Father is used far more to mark the relation of God to the Word than to man. Scholten has pointed out that the use of the term is reserved for the Logos: man may be the *child* of God; Christ is his *son*.[3] Passing over the restricted character of God's beneficence, of which there will be more to say later on, it is also true, as Cone observes, that the Evangelist "shows no predilection for dwelling on the goodness and mercy of God, and in this respect he is not to be compared with some of the prophets and psalmists, and even with Philo."[4] It is not unnatural that the Jew, familiar with a catena of

---

[1] Cp. Reuss: *Historie de la Théologie Chrétienne au siècle Apostolique*. Vol. II. p. 433.

[2] Cp. especially I. *Alleg*. III. (M. I. 44): "God never ceases to create, but as it is the property of fire to burn, and of snow to be cold, so also it is the property of God to create."

[3] Scholten: *Das Evangelium nach Johannes*, 1867, p. 82.

[4] Cone: *The Gospel and its earliest Interpretations*, p. 275. Why "*even* with Philo"?

the best and noblest sayings about God in those psalmists and prophets, rejects with something like indignation the right of the Fourth Evangelist, whose divine hero prays not for the world which he has come to save, to assert that the Father was not known before the coming of the Son, or to teach the Jew something more of the nature and goodness of God than he already knew and revered. If the Jesus of the Synoptics claims this right, there is something to be said for its accuracy. Challenged by the Fourth Gospel I deny it. But it must not be overlooked that the First Epistle of St. John has succinctly summed up in a single formula or epigram the ethical truths about the nature of God already enunciated by earlier writers. "God is love," on the ethical side, ranks worthily with "God is spirit," on the metaphysical side. For both we are grateful. But I have sometimes wondered whether, if goodness or righteousness had been used instead of love, and if it had been said, therefore, "God is righteousness," or "God is goodness," rather than "God is love," the religion of Christ would have been stained by so many sins and cruelties committed in his name. Perhaps, however, human nature, in its corruption and blindness, is indifferent to the meaning of words.

When we pass from God as he is in himself, to God in his relation to the world, we are at once plunged into the theory of the Logos. It is true that the Logos constitutes part of the eternal nature of God, as well as the predominant factor in his dealings with the universe; but to the Evangelist the importance of the Logos centres in its incarnation and in its relations with humanity. Consistently with my special purpose, I do not propose to give any analysis of the doctrine of the Logos or of its genesis. I am only concerned with its value. Seeing, then, that the doctrine may be represented as an adaptation of the Philonic theory to the person and story of Christ, we can hypothetically regard it under two aspects, distinguishable in our thought, though not in its author's,

first as a division or separation of the single Godhead into divers aspects or phases; secondly, as the incarnation of one particular aspect in the person of Christ.

Now to those who stand outside the Christian pale, these various aspects of God are only ideal. We make them for our purposes because we conceive that they may approximately answer to that which we think must be *included* in God's own nature, and in his relation to the world. With our human capacities and knowledge, we do not presume to take the immense further step of constructing any hypothesis as to the relation of these ideal aspects to each other. Most of us would, I think, feel that any introduction of such human relationships (for they can only be human) between the aspects of the one and only true God, would be an infringement of the Unitarian point of view, a violation of monotheistic purity. What we lose thereby in warmth and colour we gain in truth, sublimity and self-restraint.

But even the strictest monotheist may recognize that the ideal separation of the Divine unity into various aspects may have had in the past, and may have in the present, a religious value of its own. It is in the change of aspects into persons that the danger begins; in the second part of the Athanasian creed rather than in the first. For the theory of a Logos, or of a spirit, or of both, represents one way of realising to ourselves, whether popularly or philosophically, that relation of God to the world and to man which we not only *want* to be true, but which we also trust *is* true; that relation, in other words, which not only satisfies our feeling, but our thought. The metaphysical difficulties, for which the Logos seemed a solution to Philo, no longer press so hardly upon us. God in his lonely greatness must be kept apart from the world; God, in his perfect purity and abstractedness, is unapproachable and unknowable by man. And yet a way there must be in which God and the world, and God and man, must be brought together, just as a way there must

be in which the self-sufficing God must be conceived to have created both the world and man. These oppositions and difficulties, of which we can easily find traces in the Fourth Gospel, scarcely hamper and trouble us to-day as they troubled and hampered the Alexandrian divines and philosophers of eighteen hundred years ago. For one thing, we are less worried by the conception of matter as something in itself opposed or resistent to God. For another, we are perhaps less sensitive of logical difficulties in matters of religion, more willing to leave them unsolved, but to believe them soluble. But, perhaps, also, we are less easily taken in by the creations of our own thought. We do not suppose that we have really bridged the gulf or solved the puzzle by any theory of a Divine "Word" or a Divine "Spirit." We merely put back the difficulty another step. Just as, on the moral side, the theory of a devil, with which the Fourth Gospel thinks it can take away from God the responsibility of giving over to evil the souls which he himself has created, merely removes the problem in one form to raise it more sharply in another, so the theory of the Logos does not really *harmonise* the dual aspects of the Divine nature, it merely expresses them more clearly.

Nevertheless, a Logos theory is not an arbitrary and even immoral hypothesis like the theory of a devil. We feel that while God is omnipresent and infinite, he must also be self-conscious. Not less than "personal," we say, however much he may be more. He is something in himself, to himself, and for himself; above and beyond the world. We call him "transcendent." But then comes the recoil. He is also something for the world and for ourselves. We are not wholly without God. "Whither shall I go from thy spirit, and whither shall I flee from thy presence?" God is omnipresent. Moreover, there is reason *in* the world, and above all there is self-conscious reason in man. There is a relation, partly constant and partly variable—constant as regards God, variable as regards our-

selves—between us and him. He is "there," though we see him not. He is within us, though he is also without. We grope for words to express this realised feeling and this believed truth. The psalmist speaks of the Holy Spirit within him; Philo speaks of the Logos. Some such hypothesis, some such method of verbally expressing in separate terms this aspect of the Divine, we may perhaps always stand in need of. It is possible that a too exclusive consideration of God as the transcendent cause (though not without its justification), a too complete avoidance of those other appellations of him, the manysided One, which the Hebrew Scriptures, the Alexandrian philosophers, and the older Rabbinical writers created or employed, may have reacted not without prejudice upon the religion of our later Judaism. It may to some extent have robbed us of those elements of "personal religion" which are partly conditioned, or, at least, aided by emphasizing more markedly, through the help of separate words and titles, the "immanent" aspect of God's complex personality and being.

We feel at any rate that a theory such as that of the Logos has a distinct value in helping us to realize that aspect of God turned outwards to the world and to man, which seems as much a part of him as any other. Human thought and human love are not merely the gift of God, but as the product of reason are themselves partly divine. Man is created in the image of God, says Genesis: through thy light we see light, says the Psalter. We can commune with God and aspire towards him, because, in however fragmentary a degree, we are akin to him. And if akin to him, this means that there is a sense in which, though we are we and God is God, he may be said to be within us as we may also be said to be within him. "There is a sense" in which these seductive words have a meaning and a value: although let it never be forgotten that there is a sense, only too easily reached, in which they can become dangerous, immoral and untrue.

For these reasons such a theory as the Philonic Logos has not only an historical interest, but also, as I venture to think, something of permanent and religious value. Perhaps its value is not wholly out of relation to its vague and floating character, to its inconsistencies and contradictions. We feel that the theory cannot be hardened into a fixed dogma; it is always more or less metaphorical or symbolic —a way of expressing the inexpressible. For these reasons too the Logos of the Fourth Gospel may also have its value even to outsiders. Whether *for them* it has greater *religious* worth than the Logos of Philo may well be doubted. They cannot accept a human relationship between the two aspects of the one God, and therefore the love of the Father to the Son, and the love of the Son to the Father, however movingly and delicately expressed, is for them meaningless and inapposite. The single and complete incarnation of the Logos at a particular time and place gives the theory, to their eyes, something of that hard and fast character which the fluid nature of Philo's Logos avoids. Instead of a constant divine and spiritual operation, we have—at all events for the period of the incarnation—something mechanical, sensuous, spasmodic, magical. It seems as if the work of the Logos before Christ had been a failure, and a new and miraculous method was conceived as necessary. The gradual development of God's purpose in human history seems interrupted by a divine interposition, which comes athwart and between the relation of God to man both before it and after. Such considerations will seem both unphilosophic and unmeaning to those who take their stand upon the dogma of Christ's divinity; but I think they may partially explain the impression which that dogma makes upon those who have been from their very childhood brought up in a different environment and with different notions of the divine nature and rule.

If we pass to the relation of the Evangelist's Logos—that is, of Jesus Christ—to man, and of man to the Logos, we are immediately confronted by the intense Johannine

dualism. The main object of the incarnation is to save; but then there is only a certain number for whom salvation is possible. Those who are potentially good attend to the words of Christ, and believe in him and in his works; those who are potentially children of God, become so *de facto* by the life and death of the incarnate Logos and by the Spirit which he sends. But more than the children of God are the children of the Devil. For them no salvation is possible. Their life is no true "life," and with the end of their earthly existence their separate personality is concluded. For the children of God the "life eternal," begun on earth, is continued in heaven; for the children of this world, that is, for the children of the Devil, there would appear to be no hope. Their end is not eternal punishment, but sheer annihilation. In no other point is the Fourth Gospel more antipathetic to the outsider than in this. We object to this dualism, both in itself and in its test. That it is but the culmination of a tendency does not make it truer or more acceptable. There is a dualism discernible in the Psalter and in other portions of the Hebrew Scriptures; but it is not so theoretic and complete as the dualism of "St. John." It is more natural and ordinary; the dualism of the average hot-blooded patriot, not the thought-out dualism of the philosopher in his study. Jewish particularism is very objectionable; to identify the enemies of your people with the enemies of God, the Gentile with the wicked, is utterly repugnant to our modern notions of justice and religion. But this particularism was happily not part and parcel of the real Jewish creed. It could be, and has been, easily got rid of. The Johannine doctrine involves a particularism more deadly than the Jewish form of it, because it is more intertwined with the very essence of the Evangelist's creed, and receives a more theoretic and logical basis. It is, therefore, less easily got rid of.

Philo too teaches a dualism analogous to the dualism of "St. John." But as Réville, in his admirable pamphlet, *La doctrine du Logos dans la quatrième Evangile et dans les œuvres*

de Philon, has well pointed out, Philo's dualism is less sharply defined, less consistent and less irreversible. Between the two extremes there are various shades and modifications of character, partly inclining towards the flesh, partly aspiring towards God. Moreover Philo admits the possibility of a passage from one division to the other; he finds a place for Repentance. But in the Fourth Gospel, those who belong to Christ's flock believe and are saved, those who do not belong to it cannot believe. The "world" cannot receive the spirit: it knows him not. Those who are not of God cannot hear his words. He that is of the "earth" cannot receive that which comes from "heaven." The Fourth Gospel knows nothing of Repentance. The very word μετάνοια is not found in it. Those who receive the words of Christ no longer include a contingent of publicans and sinners; they are morally good.[1] A forgiveness of sins is only cursorily mentioned: it is inconsistent with the main doctrine, an importation from without, or rather a survival of a rejected element. It is true that the wrath of God abides on the unbeliever, but this would seem to be not so much because the unbeliever can help his unbelief, but because God, as pure light and goodness, must by his own nature be eternally hostile to what is corrupt, evil and diabolic. The intense dualism of the writer is finally and consummately revealed to us in the great prayer in the seventeenth chapter, where Christ is made to say, "I pray not for the world, but for those whom thou hast given me." Surely the defenders of the Gospel's authenticity and historical character do Jesus of Nazareth an evil turn. Surely "I come to call sinners to repentance," "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do," were more characteristic of the historic Jesus than all the elaborate speeches of "St. John."

For the exquisite beauty of the Fourth Gospel tends to

---

[1] Oscar Holtzmann, *Das Johannes Evangelium*, 1887, p. 89.

blind us to the full meaning and implication of its dualistic doctrine. We do not realise that all the love which God and the Logos, God's son, bear to the world is only to an elect portion, and that the sublimer pity of the Synoptic Gospel to the outcast and the sinner is wholly and necessarily wanting. Nor do we easily realise that the human reflection of that love is only to be exercised within the brotherhood of believers. If it be charged against the Rabbis—with some truth and with some falsehood—that they interpreted the love of one's neighbour enjoined in Leviticus to mean the love of one's fellow-Jew, it may with better accuracy be said that the love enjoined by the famous "new commandment" of St. John is restricted to fellows in faith. Is love restricted by race much more objectionable than love restricted by creed?

Moreover, the moving splendour and calm assurance of language, which adds so greatly to the Gospel's perennial charm, has tended to make men think that its dualism, if not justified in itself, was justified by the environment and age in which the author lived. I find this excuse for the Evangelist in Thoma,[1] and I find it also, where it seems far more surprising, in Dr. Martineau. He speaks of the "inevitable but imperfect dualism forced upon human thought by the contrasts of experience." "A new religion," he goes on to say,

> gives birth to an entrancing affection, and, going apart with its own enthusiasm, sees all else at variance with it, and needing either conversion or rejection. It cannot live without its outcasts: the Israelite has his Gentiles: the apostle Paul his false "brethren," that "make the cross of Christ of none effect" through their "dead works"; and now the mysterious evangelist, who finds in union with Christ the whole spiritual distance annihilated between the life of man and God, looks upon a world made up of dissolute Paganism and embittered Judaism as in the mass delivered over to the power of evil. Between the low passions that reign there of greed and lust, of ambition and envy, and the aspirations and trust, the humility and love that breathe through the prayers and sweeten the inner life of a true Christian

[1] Thoma, *Die Genesis des Johannes Evangeliums*, 1882, p. 283.

community, the contrast presents itself to him as little less than infinite ; so that only now does the genuine history of humanity open, with the planting of a sacred colony in the midst of the dark continent of earthly sin and shame.[1]

Now, in the first place, the immense ethical difference between "conversion" and "rejection" is somewhat ignored by their close juxtaposition in this passage; but in the second, what right has Dr. Martineau even to *imply* that the world upon which the author of the Fourth Gospel "looked forth" was not only seemingly to the Evangelist, but *really* made up of a "dissolute paganism" and an "embittered Judaism"? Within the Christian pale, nought but aspirations and trust, humility and love; without, nothing but greed and lust, ambition and envy! At the very period when the Fourth Gospel was composed, Paganism was not without its spiritual revival and its ethical nobility. Surely there were many Pagans who rejected Christianity and yet led lives of purity and goodness; and as for Judaism, was there no spirituality among its martyrs and heroes who perished in all the sublimity of perfect faith at the scaffold and by the sword? It is a mournful fact that the good men among the Jews thought that the good men among the Christians were bad, and *vice versâ;* but it is still more mournful to perpetuate their error, and to think that either side could arrogate to itself an exclusive possession of goodness, humility and love.

A number of points relative to the moral and religious

[1] *Seat of Authority*, p. 493. Still more one-sided is a passage on p. 434 : "This intense moral dualism in the Johannine writings, which allows no gradations, drives all antitheses into contradictions, and invokes God and devil to settle every disputed cause, doubtless indicates that the interval had become practically hopeless between the spiritual ideal of life and character reached by the Christian conscience, and the low types of motive and conduct into which the unconverted Judaism and heathenism had set." If one met this sentence in any unorthodox German Protestant divine, one would pay no notice. It seems to belong to their business to misrepresent Rabbinic Judaism ; it lies, perhaps, in their blood. But from the English Dr. Martineau it is amazing.

condition of the world before and at the advent of Christ are left obscure. Those who "come to the light," that is, believe in Christ, are good. Did then the Incarnation not increase the capacity of human goodness? Did it merely give the means of acquiring "truth," the chance of a fuller bliss, a purer enlightenment, but not the power of becoming more good? The command to love one another is described as new. Were then people not really good before Christ, but only potentially so, seeing that the only definition of goodness recognized by the Evangelist seems to be love? If they were in any true sense good, why should they have been in danger from the devil? The redemption of the good seems less urgent than the redemption of the evil, and yet the purpose of the Incarnation is for the sake of the good and not for the sake of the evil. The Logos shone into the world before it became flesh. The darkness did not apprehend it. But was that darkness universal both among the Jews and among the heathens? Were there good men who died before the Incarnation, and in what sense? What knowledge of God, what light had they, whether in Judæa or outside it? One of the best features in the Gospel is its universalism, for on this point the author is no inept disciple of St. Paul. Gentiles rather than Jews come readily to the light. Other sheep there are not of this fold. But what then of all the great mass of heathen who died before Christ came? Was the pre-Christian action of the Logos too feeble to generate in them the spiritual life? Was nobody born anew, or born from above, whether Gentile or Jew, in all that immense period of waiting and preparation? If yes, why did not this normal action of the Logos and the grace of God suffice? If not, and if no man was "spiritual," could any have been good? Are we to suppose that the new birth and the true goodness which it includes were coincident with Christ? And lastly, was everybody before Christ annihilated at death, or are we to

believe with Dr. Martineau that two or three obscure and doubtful passages refer to a resurrection and a judgment both of punishment and of reward for the endless generations of the dead?[1] Just in proportion as the Fourth Gospel leaves us with no clear answer to questions such as these its religious value seems to me to halt and fail. If you set up a great religious theory, involving mighty miracles and tremendous presuppositions, you should at least make that theory complete. A religious *Weltanschauung*, which intellectually and morally is fraught with difficulty, should at least be co-extensive with the world which it seeks to interpret. If in crucial points of urgency and moment, it leaves us in the lurch and in the dark, if it not only does not satisfactorily explain the facts of history and human nature, but even ignores them, its religious value, both theoretically and practically, is, I venture to think, most seriously impaired.

We pass from these unexplained and unsolved difficulties to consider how "eternal life," in the bestowal of which are contained both the prerogative and the mission of Christ, is won, and wherein it consists. So far as it is bestowed *ab extra*, as a gift from without, it does not concern us. So far as it is conditioned by the fact of Christ's death and by a participation in baptism and the eucharist, it also lies outside our sphere. Whatever spiritual meanings the author attached to these material processes, he would apparently have believed that they exercised upon the rightly disposed person a special and semi-miraculous influence. He would probably have objected to any abolition of these ceremonies, just as Philo objected to a merely spiritual interpretation of the Pentateuchal laws.[2] But the details of his views do not affect our present enquiry, just as the degree of atoning or sanctifying efficacy which he assigned to the death of Christ is of little importance to the outsider

[1] *Seat of Authority in Religion*, p. 439, n. 1.

[2] Cp. Pfleiderer, *Das Urchristenthum*, p. 774.

except historically. What we want to know is how this eternal life can be won by man. We have already seen that the attainment of it is, partially at any rate, predetermined. Those who have not the spiritual germ within them can not be quickened by the spiritual sun. For them darkness is light and light is darkness. The opportunity of salvation to the one class is but the means of completer damnation to the other. Therefore it is that the "judgment" of Christ is one of sifting: the rejected become worse and worse as the light shines brighter and brighter. But in addition to all this, human effort is needed for the acquisition of life eternal, and there is a method by which it can be won. This may not be wholly logical, but it is certainly more in accordance with experience and fact. So in Philo all spiritual attainment is due to the grace of God, and Philo's insistence on this point, implying man's incapacity to move upward without divine help and the necessity of humility, is quite parallel to John v. 41-44 and vii. 18; but, nevertheless, there is room and need for moral effort and endeavour. You are reborn by the spirit, and the spirit is given you from above; and yet you may struggle to attain the spirit, or at any rate to develop the potentialities of the divine gift. Any obscurity and inconsistency here need not surprise us: no one can precisely allocate to man and God their exact share in the moral and religious development of the human character. Yet most religious persons feel that there are both human and divine agencies helping towards the ultimate product.

Now, in most of the higher religions, the attainment of the best life is supposed to depend upon two main elements. One of these elements is moral and one is religious. These separations are somewhat misleading, but nevertheless they have their uses. The elements may also be described thus: eternal life is partly won by works and partly by faith.

Which element comes first in time and in importance? The modern and Jewish view is that the ethical element

comes first. What society needs is the most developed goodness; with what fashions and dogmas of religious belief this goodness is combined is of inferior moment. *That* belief is of the greatest value to society which has the best ethical effect upon its believers. Moreover, we recognise that in faith, do and say what we will, there does enter an intellectual element which is not wholly under the control of our will. We are aware, though Philo was not, that a man may be very good who is an Atheist or an Agnostic, though we are far from thinking that society would not morally degenerate if Atheism and Agnosticism were immensely to increase. That we become good by doing good is still true. And the content of "life eternal" is interpenetrated by morality. Remove morality and it is vague, ascetic, selfish—a refined egoism.

But this ethical element is not unaffected by the other element, which consists in man's attitude towards God, in his belief in him, his love of him, his more or less constant sense of his abiding omnipresence. "Solet enim dei amator illico etiam hominum amator esse." Yet while these two elements influence and interact upon each other, we feel that the primary one of the two is morality. If we may separate inseparables, we might say: Through morality to religion.

And in the Fourth Gospel the need of these two elements is also recognised. But, on the whole, the emphasis seems placed on the wrong factor, on faith rather than on morality. Through religion to morality, rather than through morality to religion, is the tendency of the Gospel. In this respect, the First Epistle of St. John takes a saner and more ethical line. But both Gospel and Epistle incline to identify the one element with the other or to gloss over the difference between them.

As we have already seen, the man who believes in Christ is at least potentially good. The bad man is an unbeliever, and even the reverse holds also true—the unbeliever is a bad man. Now, apart from his metaphysical

and *à priori* dualism, what reason has the Evangelist to say that the unbeliever is morally bad? "Every one that doeth evil hateth the light." "Except ye believe that I am he, ye shall die in your sins." The second quotation seems, with doubtful consistency, to imply that even in spite of sin, belief may be won and sin destroyed (cp. v. 14). You might argue that only those who were hardened to goodness could be insensible to the moral beauty of Christ's words, or doubt that he was inspired. The argument is plausible though not convincing. But even if admitted, it does not suit the case. For what the moral beauty of Christ's words can never prove is that the speaker of them was metaphysically connected with Deity, the Incarnation of the eternal Word.[1]

It is, however, also true that the Gospel teaches morality as the condition precedent of faith. "If any man willeth to do his will, he shall know of the teaching, whether it be of God, or whether I speak from myself." "He that doeth the truth cometh to the light." "He that keepeth my commands, loveth me." And this teaching is wholesome and sound. Let God and duty prove themselves to you in your life by living on as if they truly were.[2] The Epistle is more definite still on this point. "If a man say, I love God, and hateth his brother, he is a liar"; through the love of man we pass to the love of God. Practically this teaching comes to this: theoretic belief is of no spiritual value; the test of true faith is that it should rest on a moral basis and issue in a moral life. Through morality to religion, and when there, from religion to morality. These excellent utterances of the Epistle (*e.g.*,

[1] Cp. Chavannes' *La Religion dans la Bible*, II. p. 183:—"Certes Jésus me révèle la veritable vie; mais en quoi cela me prouve-t-il qu'il est un être divin incarné? Pourquoi veut-on absolument que je le croie pour aimer la vie qui mène à Dieu? . . . Cette théosophie est un hors-d'œuvre dangereux. C'est elle qui est cause que notre auteur se soit si malheureusement exprimé, par exemple, lorsqu'il écrivait: 'Quiconque croit que Jésus est le Christ, est né de Dieu.'"

[2] T. H. Green, "Address on Faith." *Works*, III., p. 273.

"whosoever doeth not righteousness is not of God, and he that loveth not knoweth not God"), suffice to give it value to the outsider as to the insider, to the Jew as to the Christian.

But, as we have seen, neither Epistle nor Gospel stops there. They do not merely say, morality shall be the test of your faith, and the method by which you reach it. They have led the way to the dangerous doctrine that unbelief is necessarily as much moral as intellectual. If you can win faith by goodness, you miss it because of vice. The unbeliever is a sinner. It seems to me that for the terrible consequences of this doctrine, the Johannine writings are partially responsible. Their matchless beauty tends to hide the danger and the cruelty of the doctrine which they preach. For let us pass from the work of a great genius such as the Fourth Gospel to the writings of a soulless fanatic, and what do we find there? The fanatic would be reprobated now by all; nevertheless, views such as his have had great influence in the world, and if he had been asked to justify them, he could have quoted the Fourth Gospel with great cogency and aptitude for his uncharitable purpose. That Gospel undoubtedly maintains that moral evil is the root of unbelief. And is not this what Dr. Cumming, as quoted by George Eliot, in that striking essay of hers, on Evangelical Teaching, in the *Westminster Review* of October, 1855, also maintained?

> I once met with an acute and enlightened infidel, with whom I reasoned day after day, and for hours together; I submitted to him the internal, the external, and the experimental evidences, but made no impression on his scorn and unbelief. At length I entertained a suspicion that there was something morally, rather than intellectually wrong, and that the bias was not in the intellect, but in the heart. One day, therefore, I said to him: "I must now state my conviction, and you may call me uncharitable, but duty compels me; you are living in some known and gross sin." The man's countenance became pale; he bowed, and left me.

One point more. The author of the First Epistle of St. John is urgent to impress upon his readers the importance

of morality. In simple adages of great power and beauty he preaches, as we have seen, the noble doctrine that the doer of righteousness is begotten of God, and that the lover of God must be also a lover of man. But there is another side to this picture. Even with him the element of faith frequently overcomes and predominates over the element of morality. That he should be blind to goodness outside his own community is natural. But what of the sinners within its pale? He cannot consistently maintain the paradox that the man who calls himself a Christian is not a Christian if he be a sinner. It conflicts with language and experience. He therefore equivocates. The Christian sins, but it is a "sin not unto death." What is a sin unto death? It is clearly apostasy. Therefore the intellectual sin of abandoning a belief in Christ would seem to be more unpardonable in the author's eyes than a moral sin of indefinite intensity. Here again we are confronted with a false doctrine which has worked grievous evil in the history of the world. The believer's sins are judged by a different standard from the sins of his unbelieving neighbour. No longer "Ye are my people: *therefore* will I visit upon you all your iniquities." But rather, "Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is begotten of God; and whosoever is begotten of God doeth no sin." The individual who is proudly conscious that he so believes and is so begotten, may rapidly become convinced that he is incapable of sin. Take care of your faith, and your deeds will take care of themselves—a perversion doubtless of the Epistle's general doctrine, but not without possible support from the ambiguous language of a document which exalts faith at the expense of morality even while it attempts indissolubly to combine the two.[1]

The content of eternal life, according to the Fourth Gospel, we have already heard defined as the knowledge of the only true God and of Jesus Christ, the Divine Word

[1] Cp. Chavannes' *La Religion dans la Bible*, p. 184.

made flesh. But it would be improper to infer from this single passage that no ethical elements entered into its composition. With equal or greater injustice the same attack might be made on Philo when he defines this life as a taking refuge with the true God (ἡ πρὸς τὸ ὂν καταφυγή); or where in many other similar passages he gives to it an exclusively religious character. The moral element is certainly not wanting in the Fourth Evangelist, though by the very purpose and object of his Gospel moral teaching as such is very slightly dwelt upon. But in the flush and glow of his spiritual enthusiasm, faith in Christ seemed necessarily to involve a regeneration of the whole man. Man receives by it the fullest truth and highest knowledge, and it so transforms his character as to bring out its best and divinest possibilities. Personal devotion and emotional love are part and parcel of that knowledge of the Son and of the Father wherein life eternal consists. Today we are bound to separate, at least in language, our moral and religious life more clearly, and the intellectual element in "faith," through its very difficulty, presses itself the more strongly and distinctly upon our attention.

All the same, the ethics of the Fourth Gospel are certainly its least original part. If you subtract all that seems a reproduction of Paul and all that seems a reproduction of Philo, you have little left that is at once admirable and new. So, for example, with the conception of spiritual freedom and the slavery of sin (viii. 31-36). So also, in the main, with the conception of self-glory as preventing the possibility of spiritual enlightenment. As with Socrates the vain man who thinks he knows but is really ignorant is intellectually hopeless and helpless, so to our Evangelist they who love the glory of men more than the glory of God are also those who think they see but are really blind. "If they were blind they would have no sin; but now they say We see; therefore their sin remaineth." To this conception also there are

several parallels, both in the Epistles of Paul and in the treatises of Philo.

Yet everyone who reads the Gospel and Epistles of St. John with a fair measure of sympathy, will probably find in them a certain ethical elevation. They are not only spiritual in religion, but also in morality. And when in this essay the word "morality" has been used, and all things in heaven and earth have been appraised by a moral standard, I have always had in mind the fullest connotation that could possibly be given to this expansive term. I was not thinking only of mere work-a-day and *bourgeois* morality (though this, as Rauwenhoff says, includes a good part of man's moral worth), but of the morality which is exhibited in self-sacrifice and devotion. Morality does not stop short of love; and, though the highest morality to our modern notions does not consort with useless asceticism or isolation, it does, I should imagine, always include that antagonism to the "world," in one specific and spiritual sense, which is characteristic of the Johannine writings. The precise meaning which their authors gave to the word κόσμος has doubtless passed away. We do not approve their antithesis between this world and another world when they mean by it that this world is under the sway of diabolic agencies. Nevertheless, softened and modified though our notions of the "world" may be, there is a sense in which we do find ethical meaning and religious value in the famous sentences: "Love not the world, neither the things that are in the world. If any man love the world, the love of the Father is not in him. For all that is in the world, the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the vainglory of life, is not of the Father, but is of the world. And the world passeth away, and the lust thereof; but he that doeth the will of God abideth for ever." So far as these words are true, they are true for those without, as well as for those within, the limits of Christianity; and, seeing that the measure of abiding truth which they con-

tain is nowhere else, to my knowledge, more simply and effectively expressed, the outsider, as well as the insider, may rightly render them both gratitude and admiration.

Ethics certainly owes more to the Epistle than to the Gospel. It is undoubtedly true that in the long speeches in the Gospel, "the ethical teaching of the Synoptic Christ falls wholly into the background."[1] Not unconnected, I should imagine, with this lack of ethics is another fact pointed out by the same acute commentator, that the predominance of the Fourth Gospel in the Christian Church has regularly produced a tendency to asceticism and mysticism, from the days of Clement of Alexandria to those of Schleiermacher.[2] The one positive moral command of the Johannine Christ is that contained in the word ἀγάπη, or love. "A new commandment I give unto you, that ye love one another." But is not this, it may pertinently be asked, sufficient and all inclusive?

Without attempting to depreciate in a nasty or grudging spirit the value of so famous an injunction, it must be pointed out that this love is merely reciprocal. It is restricted to the fellow disciple, and is thus in sharp and violent contrast to the bidding of the Synoptic Jesus. The particularism of race is exchanged for the new and more dangerous particularism of creed. Leviticus xix. 18 is perhaps supplemented by Luke x. 33, and enlarged by Matthew v. 44; it is not improved by John xiii. 34. That is no new command which does not go beyond the old. Enlargement fulfils, and therefore Matthew v. 44 does not (it may be contended) contradict Matthew v. 17, but John xiii. 34 is not only in conflict with Leviticus xix. 18, but with Matthew v. 17 as well. And the supplementary

[1] "Die sittliche Verkündigung des synoptischen Christus tritt vollkommen in ihnen zurück." (O. Holtzmann, p. 89.)

[2] "Das Hervorheben des johanneischen Christusbildes vor dem synoptischen hatte in der Kirche regelmässig ein Ueberwiegen des weltfremden Lebens der Christen zur Folge, in Askese und Mystik, von Clemens Alexandrinus an bis auf Schleiermacher und Luthardt." (O. Holtzmann, p. 136.)

command of Leviticus xix. 34 finds no parallel in St. John. The stranger in creed need not be loved. Too accurately has Christianity recognised the difference: too closely has she followed the Christ of the Fourth Gospel rather than the Christ of the First.

Nevertheless within the limit of the brotherhood, the force and beauty with which the command of love is urged and emphasized, cannot be gainsaid. All of us may be grateful for such passages, and can apply them in our own way. As a picture of the love which lays upon itself willingly the lowliest duties, the scene where Christ washes the feet of his disciples will always retain its power. This service of love is to rise to the heights of sacrifice. "Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends." But it is again characteristic of the Evangelist that whereas to Paul the supremacy of Christ's sacrifice consisted in his dying for sinners, those whom his death benefits in the Fourth Gospel are no longer ἀσεβεῖς, but φίλοι, not the ungodly, but the good. The dualism is preserved unto the end.

One integral portion of the Evangelist's conception of love has thus far been omitted. The followers of Christ are to love one another. But wherefore? By what force or example is this love to be set in motion, stimulated, maintained? Here we come to the great and distinctive ethical motive characteristic of the Fourth Gospel. The love of man to man is conditioned by the love of man for Christ, and of Christ for man. It may also be said to be partly conditioned by the love of God both for Christ and man. (But we must always remember that neither God nor Christ has love for the man who will not or cannot be saved by faith in the Incarnate Son.)

No outsider would dream for a moment of denying the ethical power which the love of man for Christ and the belief in the love of Christ for man have exercised in human history. This is not the place to consider how far that power can be, has been, or is supplied by Judaism with its more direct

appeal and immediate relationship to God the Father. It is probably harder to love God, and to feel the joy of loving him, than to love Christ; and it must not be forgotten that this emotional feeling of love and of joy in loving—reaching up to and passing into a mystic feeling of union and communion with the beloved and Divine object—may, within certain limits, have excellent ethical results. Now, as Rauwenhoff has so clearly pointed out, every excitement of feeling, however noble the feeling may be, partakes to some extent of the character of enjoyment. This enjoyment is easier if the spiritual is clothed in sensuous forms. An image impresses us much more keenly than an abstract conception. For how, he adds, could the worship of Jesus and the worship of Mary have so obscured the worship of God in Christianity if it were not that the humanised God appeals so much more to the feelings than the Infinite One? [1]

It is certainly true that one element in the love of Christ and also in the conception of God, produced by the Christian theory, can never be filled up by concentrating our love upon God alone. It is the element of sacrifice. Christians are convinced of God's love for man, because he sent his Son to save them. They love God the more because they think he so sacrificed himself. And the exemplar of human love is given them to all time in the divine sacrifice of Christ. It has been said in this Review by a gentle and gifted Christian writer, that if we say that self-sacrifice is the greatest of the virtues, but that it has not been or cannot be displayed by God, then God's character is less noble than man's. This argument appears to me to assimilate the divine and the human nature too closely. To resist temptation is a human virtue, but it cannot be attributed to God: the same might be said of other virtues that imply effort. Is there not still a truth in the Aristotelian dictum, that we praise virtue (and virtue is

[1] Rauwenhoff, *Wijsbegeerte van den Godsdienst*, 1887, pp. 175, 176 (German translation, p. 117).

human), τοὺς θεοὺς δὲ μακαρίζομεν? At any rate the "inner contradiction" of which Hausrath speaks in the conception of a being who is *both* God *and* man, the vivid feeling that "human life becomes an empty phantom (*ein leerer Schein*) if it is lived by a God," prevent those who stand without the Christian pale from realising how the notion of a Divine sacrifice, offered at a given moment in time and once for all, can be assimilated with the idea of God, or what exact meaning it can convey.[1]

It may be questioned whether the Fourth Gospel, though it lays so much stress upon the love which Christ bore to his disciples, has been the Gospel which has chiefly contributed to create that wonderful figure of the pitying and suffering martyr, the divine ideal of humanity, in whom so many countless souls have found comfort in trouble, strength in temptation, light in darkness, and love amid hate. "Inasmuch as ye did it unto one of these my brethren, even these least, ye did it unto me." Such sayings, and others like them, are more characteristic of the Synoptic than of the Johannine Christ. Are they not also more characteristic of a conception of Christ in which he reveals the love of God and the "divine image" of man, inasmuch as, though inspired, he was, nevertheless, human, and not God himself, incarnate and complete? It would be very interesting to consider what share the human or Unitarian conception has really had in the motive power for good which the worship and love of Christ have produced in the course of the ages. Or is that motive power dependent upon a belief in his absolute divinity? Can we have no Father Damiens without the Incarnation?

Putting these ultimate questions on one side, let us note some peculiar features of the Fourth Gospel's conception of human and divine love, and how these are partially modified in the first Epistle. In the Gospel the Logos, still more than in Philo, occupies the position of intermediary

---

[1] Cp. Hausrath, *Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte*, iv., p. 493, *fin.*

between God and man. Through the Son to the Father; other approach there is none. Where such a theory is merely metaphysical, as we may say it is in Philo—for whom the aspect of Deity revealed in the Logos is the means whereby man may ultimately pass to the fuller knowledge and love of the absolute God—it is not objectionable. The danger of its presentment in the Fourth Gospel is that the Logos is no longer merely a philosophical aspect of God, but a "person" in our modern sense of the word, who became flesh for a definite period of time. If you say "only through the Son to the Father" with this definite and personalised sense attaching to the Son, you run near to saying that the Father cannot be known except by those who may have heard of, and hearing may believe in, the dogma of the pre-existent, incarnate and resurrected Son. And this implies, as it seems to me, an improper and intolerant limitation of the knowledge and love of God to the followers of a particular creed.

In the Gospel the love of the Father is mainly directed to the Son. That love is insisted on several times with marked emphasis. On the other hand, the love of the Son for the Father is only once alluded to (xiv. 31). The love of the Son is directed mainly to his disciples. The love of the disciples is directed to the Son. The love of God by man is only once alluded to (v. 42). The object of Christian love in this Gospel is not the Father, but the Son. Yet it is only fair to say that the Father's love for those who are capable of loving the Son, and hence of winning life eternal, is the motive of the incarnation. "He that loveth the Son will be loved of the Father. The Father loveth you because ye have loved the Son." Finally the love of the Son for them conditions and causes the love of the disciples for each other. "A new commandment I give unto you, that ye love one another; even as I loved you, that ye may also love one another."

In contrast with this markedly mediatorial position of

the Son in the Gospel stands the relation of the believer to God in the Epistle. That relation is more immediate, and therefore more sympathetic with the Jewish point of view. Professor Pfleiderer would, of course, be outraged to hear that what he calls, "*die tiefsinnige Erfassung des Kernes der christlichen Religion*," and the immediate relation of the human soul to the Divine Father—*enger und einfacher* in the Epistle than in the Gospel—is essentially Jewish. And yet, outraged as he and his friends would be by such a statement (as if Rabbinic Jews could possibly know anything of an immediate love of God by the individual believer), it is nevertheless strictly true. Moreover, this love of God is brought into direct relation with the love of man. None can love God if he love not his brother. When Professor Pfleiderer asks whether it would not have been possible for the Church to have abided by the teaching of the Epistle in this respect, and whether it could not have thus avoided many quarrels, useless alike for piety and for morality, his Jewish readers are in full accord with him.[1] Such has ever been the contention of Judaism, to put no separable divine "person" between man and God. It is running on the same unconsciously Jewish lines when Cone, quoting and following Pfleiderer, remarks that the author of the Epistle "establishes an immediate relation of the soul to God, which Christian theologians since Paul have unhappily disregarded, apparently solicitous lest the person of Christ should not be sufficiently exalted and his mediatorial office magnified."[2]

One more characteristic and essential feature of "life eternal," according to the Johannine conception of it, remains. That element may fitly be called mystic. It is the glad and keen consciousness of God and of his love, the sense of nearness to him, by our being in him and his being in us, which is often supposed to constitute

[1] Pfleiderer, *Das Urchristenthum*, p. 799.

[2] Cone, p. 326.

the core of the inner religious life. In the Fourth Gospel this consciousness is once more strictly limited to the Christian believer. It is so limited because it partly depends on a definite and supernatural act, namely, the bestowal of the Spirit to the disciples after the death of Christ. The gift of that Spirit is not granted in various measures to those who seek God by many creeds and divers pathways. It is rigidly restricted to those who seek the Father through the adoration of the Son. They only are capable (through their incipient spiritual nature) of receiving it. It is therefore necessary, before the doctrine of the Fourth Gospel can be appreciated by the outsider, to disentangle it of the narrow and circumscribing form in which it is presented. As it stands, it is too closely connected with a miraculous dispensation of a supernatural gift at a particular season, and too limited in its application and its sphere, to be true generally and for all time. The parallel presentment of the theory in Philo may be arid and rhetorical, yet it is more human, because it is consonant with a variety of creeds. Many of those who have extolled the Johannine mysticism seem to forget its narrowness. But mysticism above all things should be broadly human.

It is "the intimate relation between God and man" which the Fourth Gospel teaches—at least for the believer. "If a man love me, he will keep my word; and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him and make our abode with him." "He that abideth in me, and I in him, the same beareth much fruit." "I will pray the Father, and he will give you . . . . the spirit of truth . . . . he abideth with you, and shall be in you." "Even as thou, Father, art in me and I in thee, that they also may be in us; that they may be one, even as we are one; I in them, and thou in me, that they may be perfected into one; . . . . that the love wherewith thou lovedst me may be in them, and I in them"—in other words, God's immanence in man, and man's glad consciousness of that immanence and love of it.

As an introduction to the study of this subject, many people might find it useful to read those pages of Rauwenhoff's book which deal with what he calls the Psychological Forms of Religion, Intellectualism, Mysticism, and "Moralism."[1] To the Understanding, to the Feelings (or rather to *Gemüt*), and to the Will, are there assigned their proper part and function both in the religious history of the past, and in the religious life of the individual. He shows that of these three forms, "Moralism," which lays the stress of religious life on moral action, is on the whole the most important and the most wholesome.

Judged from the outside, moralism presents little attraction, especially when compared with mysticism (*Mystik*). Putting aside everything which savours of emotion, God is considered as the supreme Lawgiver, and the test of piety is exclusively sought for in virtue. Man's future is usually regarded as a reward or retribution of the use to which he has put his life on earth.[2]

There is an undoubted onesidedness in "Moralism," but nevertheless that onesidedness is not religiously so dangerous as the onesidedness of "Intellectualism" and "Mysticism."

In a onesided emphasis of Morality lies an adequate means to prevent the practical character of religion being misconceived --an error into which "intellectualism" so readily falls—and at the same time a means to prevent religion being made sensuous, which is the besetting danger of mysticism. If for a "Moralist" religious life becomes little more than a discharge of what he thinks to be his duty, he is at least preserved both from sterile orthodoxy and from an immoral running riot of the religious emotions. The discipline of the moral consciousness may never lead to the sunny heights, whereon the purest life of religious sentiment is passed: it keeps men at any rate upon the right path. No such sins can be charged to the school of Kant as to the school of Calvin or of Spener.[3]

---

[1] Pp. 109—124, in the German translation.

[2] Rauwenhoff, p. 180, German translation, p. 120.

[3] Rauwenhoff, p. 182, German translation, p. 122.

Nevertheless, religion needs and implies something more than mere "moralism" can supply :—

The one-sided conception of religion as a sanctifying power which acts upon the will is unable to perceive that there is also something else in religion which can never be dispensed with without harm. The *unio mystica*, the yearning of the heart to a more intimate relation with Deity, for that "Thou in me and I in thee," which forms the fundamental thought of the theology of the Fourth Gospel, may easily lead the way to hurtful aberrations. It, nevertheless, always remains a truly religious phenomenon and an essential constituent of the normally-developed religious life. To this mystic union and yearning, "moralism," to its own great loss, can do no justice ; for it thereby fails to realise that in these emotions lies the great motive which lifts morality above legalism, and so ennobles the consciousness of duty till it becomes a mighty impulse and passion towards moral perfection. "Thou shalt" will presumably always remain the basis of all morality ; but when religion transforms it into "God wills," and God is no longer a mere lawgiver, but the object of heartfelt love and spiritual desire, you reach the "Da quod jubes et jube quod vis," which unites religion and morality, and brings morality to its highest possible perfection.[1]

This *unio mystica* of which Rauwenhoff here speaks is the source or the content of those blissful experiences wherein, according to Oscar Holtzmann, the perennial value of the Fourth Gospel consists. He says :—

The blissful experiences which Christ declares concerning himself in Matthew xi. 25-30, and to which Paul briefly alludes (Gal. ii. 20), are described in the Fourth Gospel as the permanent possession of the Christian community (x. 14, xiv. 20-24, xv. 10, 11-15, xvi. 12-15, 33). They are, in short, the experiences which accrue to the individual from his consciousness of the love of God and the redemption through Christ. In its expression of this thought lies, to my idea, the absolute and eternal value of the Johannine Gospel.[2]

Now, if Rauwenhoff be right, and if the yearning of the spirit towards a closer relation and communion with God be in truth an essential constituent of the properly developed religious life, the presentment of that yearning and of its

[1] Rauwenhoff, p. 181 ; German Translation, p. 121.

[2] *Das Johannesevangelium*, p. 90.

satisfaction in the Fourth Gospel will probably always retain its attraction and its value, however unnecessary and even intolerable Jews and Theists may find it to split up the Deity into two so markedly personal aspects as the Father and the Son, and however repugnant it may be to them to put any mediatorial agency—human and divine in one—between the human soul and God. Philo's less personal Logos is in this respect far more universal and less restrictive than the Johannine Christ.

"Nearer, my God, to thee" is a true and fundamental feeling of the religious mind. Their sense of the nearness of God is the stepping stone on which men have risen to the consciousness of the "Unio mystica." This nearness is fully recognised and asserted in the Hebrew Scriptures. God is described as near, because, in the first place, he is lovingly omniscient. "The Lord is nigh unto all them that call upon him, to all that call upon him in truth." "The Lord is nigh unto them that are of a broken heart, and saveth such as be of a contrite spirit."

This certainty of God's saving solicitude, his ever present and watchful care of those who pray to him in truth, passes over into a glad sense of communion. It is not merely that the Old Testament psalmist believed in God's *protective* nearness, but he also felt that nearness as a possession and a joy. This feeling was partly, as we know, conditioned by the Temple, but it was perfectly real, and it reaches classic and forcible expression in such Psalms as the 63rd, the 73rd, the 84th, and several others. It is quite a mistake to suppose that this living sense of communion with God was lost by the Rabbis. Both in the Old Testament and in the Talmud it is, however, purely popular. It has not been given any foundation in religious psychology or metaphysics, showing how this sense of communion *with* God and nearness *of* God is based upon a theory of man's nature and God's immanence. It could, as I imagine, only receive such a foundation by the fructifying contact of Greek philosophy.

And I believe that it is this union of practical Hebrew religiousness with Greek philosophy which has produced that religious mysticism, that idea of "Thou in me and I in thee," which constitutes a main conception of the Fourth Gospel. So, too, in the famous speech attributed to St. Paul in the seventeenth chapter of the Acts, we may notice, I believe, this union of Greek and Hebrew. "That they should seek God, if haply they might feel after him, and find him, though he is not far from each one of us," is a Hebrew thought, hardly going beyond what might have been said by a Psalmist or a Rabbi. But the philosophical justification of the divine nearness passes beyond the Hebraic limit. And it is just this philosophic justification which is, to our modern notion, the kernel or essence of the whole—*ἐν αὐτῷ γὰρ ζῶμεν καὶ κινούμεθα καὶ ἐσμέν*: "In him we live and move and have our being." It may be noted that J. Holtzmann in his Commentary cites a curious parallel from the Greek rhetorician Dion Chrysostom. One could, perhaps, find other parallels in Philo.

The Hebrew had no definite theory of man's nature or of God's ubiquity. He was not in the least disturbed by any philosophical difficulties about a God outside the world who must be "far" from man. He had no difficulty in finding God: or rather he had no doubt as to the road. Through goodness unto God: but not through perfection. Pride stood in the way: to the repentant sinner the path lay open. "To them that repent he granteth a return, and he cheereth them that fail in hope." He had no theory of God being within him and of himself being in God, but without the theory he practically realised its results.

I do not say that for the Jew reared mainly on the Old Testament, the Liturgy and Rabbinical excerpts, there is nothing in this respect to be gained from Philo and the Fourth Gospel. We want the justification as well as the simpler and more popular expressions of that faith which it seeks to justify. Nor can we afford to lose this union

of Greek and Hebrew thought as exemplified in the Johannine Gospel. For it is no mere union : it is religious genius working upon its twofold material with majestic effect and thrilling beauty. Nor again would I for a moment deny that, owing to the absence of this union between Greek and Hebrew, and also to the greater difficulty of loving God and feeling him near than of loving and feeling near the less abstract Christ, the Jewish religion, at any rate from the days of Moses Mendelssohn, the rationalist, has been somewhat exposed to the dangers of "Moralism." Hence it is that a sympathetic study of the Johannine writings may help some of us (without the least infraction of our purer monotheism) to a more vivid and habitual sense of communion between ourselves and God, and a keener consciousness of the Divine presence.

Dr. Martineau, the great Unitarian philosopher and divine, goes further than this, and becomes, as I think, not only unjust to the Judaism, whether Palestinian or Hellenistic, which had preceded Christianity, but exaggerates the debt we owe to the Fourth Gospel itself. In the Johannine theology he tells us "there is contained one vital element, which, however questionably reached, transcends in truth and power the level of the Synoptists' Gospel."

> It so construes the personality of Christ, so avails itself of his characteristics, as to abolish the difference of essence between the Divine and the human nature, and substitute for the obedience of dependence the sympathy of likeness and the fellowship of trust. In appearance, it unites the qualities of God and man in *one* case only, and centres the blended glory in a single incarnation. But there it does not end. The unexampled spectacle of such "grace and truth," of heavenly sanctity penetrating all human experiences, startles and wins hearts that never were so drawn before, and wakes in them a capacity for that which they reverence in another. This attraction of affinity there could not be, were there not divine possibilities secreted and a divine persuasion pleading in each soul. There cannot be a chasm of forbidding antipathy and alienation, rendering for ever inaccessible to man the very "beauty of holiness" which he already adores ; nor is there any hindering curse to be bought off, before he can enter on the new life of self-consecration. There is no longer

need of despair at the seemingly hopeless task of climbing the heavens and finding the unapproachable God. For He himself comes unsought, and lifts the latch of our nature when we thought the door was shut, and makes his abode with us (John xiv. 23), seeking us with his love, finding us with his truth, and claiming us with his righteousness. Thus does the Paraclete perpetuate and universalise the impersonation of the Son of God in the Son of Man, and carry it through the spiritual history of the world, and convert the life of Humanity itself into a Theophany.[1]

He emphasizes the newness of the Johannine teaching in another passage more definitely still—

And so the great end is reached, that the mingling of the Divine and the human in Christ is not there on its own account, as a gem of individual biography, unique and unrepeated ; but as the type and the expression of a fact in the constitution of our nature. The intimate relation between God and man, which declared itself in the utterance, "I am not alone, but the Father is with me," belongs to the essence of the soul and consecrates every human life. Nor is it anything but simple and indisputable truth to say that the consciousness of this has taken its commencement from the experience and religion of Jesus, and has imparted to Christendom its deeper tone of feeling, its higher conception of purity, and its inextinguishable hope for humanity.[2]

Now I think it is nothing but "simple and indisputable truth" to *deny* that the consciousness of the intimate relation between God and man took its commencement from the experience and religion of Jesus. He probably felt that relation with intense keenness, but the relation itself, as a known joy and satisfaction, is far older. It existed among the men who wrote the Psalter, and, *mirabile dictu*, it existed among the men who wrote the Talmud. "The chasm of forbidding antipathy and alienation, the hindering curse to be bought off," never existed for the Jewish consciousness at all, and therefore it was not the Fourth, or any other Gospel, which did away with them. There never existed as a dominant feature in the Jewish religion, from Isaiah to Jesus, or from Jesus to Mendels-

[1] *Seat of Authority*, p. 449. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 509.

sohn, any "despair at the seemingly hopeless task of climbing the heavens, and finding the unapproachable God." Therefore, it was not the Fourth, or any other Gospel, which had to annul a non-existent despair.

Whether we indeed can say that there is no difference of essence between the Divine and the human nature, so that we should be grateful to the Fourth Gospel for abolishing it, is another and more doubtful question. So far as this merely means that "there are divine (*i.e.* rational) possibilities secreted and a divine persuasion pleading in each soul," that there is an affinity between the human and the divine reason, and *therefore* between human and divine goodness, we may admit it; but in that case the double theory of the Fourth Gospel, first, that only a select number of men possess this affinity, and secondly, that the sense of it was never wakened and the power of it never realized before the teaching of Christ, or since his advent by unbelievers, is wholly and radically false. When, therefore, it is said of the Fourth Gospel that it is *one* writing out of others, which teaches this affinity and its possible issues, however "questionable" the manner of its presentment of the doctrine may be, we accept and register the claim. But when the discovery and the sense of glad communion with God, and of the intimate relation between the human and the divine, is asserted to be the patent and prerogative of one religion only and of a single book, we are bound to demur and to protest. We render our homage to the genius of the Fourth Evangelist: we recognise his great contribution to the spiritual store of humanity, but, in homely, though pregnant language, we must not give him more than his due, nor in order to pay our debt of gratitude to the Hellenistic Christian, rob the Jew, whether from Palestine or Alexandria, of all we owe him and still shall owe.

Of the Fourth Gospel an outsider can say and feel what a student of philosophy can feel and say of the great philosophers. Such a student may learn and profit from

them all, though he be a disciple and follower of none. So Dr. Martineau says of the philosophers whose teachings he expounds so lucidly in his *Ethical Theories*, that there is none to whom he is not grateful for intellectual service or delight. So to the outsider a great work of genius such as the Fourth Gospel must always be suggestive, helpful, stimulating. There must be many ways of expressing the inexpressible, many ways, in other words, of setting forth by and to our human minds the nature of God and of his relation to man. One way will seem truer to us than another, but the less true in one respect may be the more true in another; and in whatever form a theory of God may be presented, and however unacceptable it may seem, it may yet contain aspects and germs of valuable truth, which in another form, though, as a whole, purer and truer, are either wanting or less prominent. So from the doctrine of the Logos, as it is presented to us both by Philo and the Fourth Evangelist, we may find something to learn and to cherish, some religious profit and truth for the nurture and benefit of our souls. The Logos of Philo is more abstract, but also more impersonal; far less capable of rousing emotion and enthusiasm, but at the same time less invasive of the Divine unity. There is nothing in the Philonic Logos to stimulate affection or move to self-sacrifice; no ideal of love and pity to imitate and adore; but at the same time no devolution of the Divine perfections upon any aspect of Deity separate or separable from the self-sufficient and infinite Father. For these reasons the two presentments of the Logos theory have, for the outsider, each its own merits and each its own defects. The identification of the Logos with Jesus, and the plenary incarnation of the Godhead in the person of Christ, were fraught, as it seems to him, with peculiar danger. The Jew as well as the Unitarian can, I should imagine, largely appreciate and concur in the judgment of Dr. Mackintosh, who says:—

> The moment the Church, by recognising the divinity of Christ,

abandoned the position of monotheism pure and simple, it placed itself on an inclined plane, or on what a popular preacher has called the "down grade"; and that it should descend, sooner or later, to the worship of the Virgin and the saints was inevitable. Nothing but the evangelic doctrine in its purity and freshness—the living conception of God as our heavenly Father—could deliver the soul of man from the spirit of fear and diffidence before the Unseen Power so as to enable it to dispense with the Logos idea, and, consequently, with all inferior and subordinate agents of the divine will. The monotheistic doctrine, in its physical or non-moral aspects, is to this day, and always has been, the strength of Mahometanism. In the moral and humane aspect of it, as presented by Jesus, it has yet to prove the strength of Christianity by the overthrow of all competing cults, and of superstition in every shape.[1]

But this moral and humane aspect of the monotheistic doctrine is nothing but the purest Judaism. What seems to one student a return to the best and earliest Christian teaching seems to another a return to the best and most developed presentation of Judaism. The doctrine of Jesus may be regarded either as pure Christianity or pure Judaism. Either way of looking at it contains a truth.

Nevertheless, though men may possibly learn to dispense with the "Logos-idea," they will scarcely without detriment to the richness and variety of their religious life, dispense with some of the thoughts which it fostered and diffused. To the Jew the Evangelist's "Even as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be in us" will seem to involve a false and needless subtlety of distinction in the Divine nature. But the Epistle's simpler doctrine: "If we love one another, God abideth in us;" "he that abideth in love, abideth in God, and God abideth in him," remains, and the Jew and the outsider may seek to appropriate and realize its truth as well as the Christian believer. "Love" is more universal than "wisdom," and therefore the Epistle's doctrine is in this sense wider and nobler than the equivalent and parallel teaching of Philo, for whom

---

[1] *The Natural History of the Christian Religion.* By Dr. William Mackintosh. 1894. p. 503.

the soul of the wise is inhabited by God. The fool may transcend the philosopher: Parsifal is nearer God than Faust. And with these sayings of the Johannine epistle we may fitly combine the adage of the Acts: "In him we live and move and have our being." For this more abstract statement, which, as we have seen, gives an Hellenic and philosophic justification to the Hebrew idea of God's nearness and omniscience, goes also beyond the notion which it justifies. Its value to many persons consists in this, that without destroying or infringing upon the idea of God's transcendence, it uses the omnipresence of God in such a way as to make man himself contained in that Divine ubiquity. Of course it does not really *explain* the true relation of God to man, and it is liable to perversion. If we are in God, we are a part of God, and if we are a part of God, every aspect of ourselves is equally divine. What then becomes of goodness and sin; and where is their difference? What becomes of human responsibility, without which no moral life is possible, and the facts of morality incapable of explanation? If God is *in* nature, we may try to believe that its horrors are really beneficent, its cruelty imaginary, its malignancy merely apparent; but what we must not try to believe is that our own sin and our own vileness are only apparent too, or that they can be explained away by any theories of "absolute idealism" or of divine immanence. These lead perilously near to many pantheistic aberrations. The Jewish conception of God and of his relation to man will take its stand upon the separate self-consciousness of both man and God. Judaism will, I imagine, thoroughly concur with that splendid chapter of Dr. Martineau's "Study of Religion," in which he deals with Pantheism.

> The voluntary nature of moral beings must be saved from Pantheistic absorption, and be left standing, as, within its sphere, a free cause other than the Divine, yet homogeneous with it . . . . Are we then to find God in the sunshine and the rain, and to miss him in our thought, our duty, and our love? Far from it. He is with us

in both ; only in the former it is his *immanent life*, in the latter his *transcendent* with which we are in communion. It is not indeed *He* that, under the mask of our personality, does our thinking, and prays against our temptations, and weeps our tears ; these are truly our own ; but they are in presence of a sympathy free to answer, spirit to spirit, neither merging in the other, but both at one in the same inmost preferences and affections.[1]

But within these limitations, the doctrine, " In him we live and move and have our being," or " Thou in me and I in thee," has still its value. It is a way of expressing this further truth, not only that God helps man as from without, but that in the Psalmist's phrase the Divine Spirit helps him from within. It means that man is only then most free when he may most fitly be called the child of God, and that at his best the difference between his action and the action of God in him falls away. He is then most himself, when he is most at one with God: " Not my work, but God in me." It implies not merely that God, if you are good and humble, helps you in your toil, sustains you in your struggle, and lifts you to himself, but that all your best work and striving are part and parcel of the divine process of things, links in the chain of evolution, lapped round and embraced by the divine infinitude, but yet a portion of it, however infinitesimal, fulfilling its allotted space, and necessary to the whole. It looks away from sin and lust and madness, and thinks only of the good, whether in failure or success, and it finds in this thought of man's best life as lived in God—the everlasting arms beneath us and around—a consolation and a solace, a sustainment and a strength, which no mere outward God, however wise, powerful and good, could possibly inspire.

I feel inclined to ask in conclusion whether there is anything in these selected excellencies of the Johannine writings which is not in full accord with Judaism, or which is out of harmony with the main drift and current of its teaching. The answer, I believe, is " None."

---

[1] *Study of Religion*, 2nd ed., Vol. ii., p. 167, 179.

For certainly the spiritual or symbolic use of words like life and death, light and darkness, bread and water, is not un-Jewish. We find it in the Hebrew Scriptures. That "God is a Spirit," is, as we contend, in easier accord with Jewish than with Christian orthodoxy, and the true method of his worship, indicated by the Evangelist, is now as axiomatic in the Jewish as in the Christian Church. If the adage that "God is love," may be looked upon as a brief summing up in three words of such verses as Psalm cxlv. 8 and 9, and other parallel passages; if love is goodness raised to the highest power, then is the doctrine of the Johannine Epistle the doctrine also of the modern Synagogue.

Nor is there any reason why the Immanence of God, so far as we hold it to be true, should not be taught and maintained by Judaism. It suits certain theologians to caricature the Jewish "transcendental" or "outside" God, but Jews need not be irritated by these foolish misrepresentations. So long as we suffer no violation of the Divine unity and spirituality, we are free to teach, as even orthodox Jews throughout the ages have taught, an immanent as well as a transcendent aspect of the Divine Being. So long as we keep rigidly within the limits of Theism, we may include within our conception of God, and of His relation to man, whatever truth we can find in the idea of the "Divine within the human." The oldest historic Theism of the world is serviceable still. And lastly there is one more point in the catalogue of the Fourth Gospel's merits which we may also with, I trust, increasing accuracy, accept as consistent with Judaism—I mean its universalism. Indeed, the Judaism of to-day is far more universal than the Gospel. For we have attained to a universalism of creed, as well as of race, and the famous "other sheep I have, which are not of this fold," if we only interpret the Shepherd as God, is nowhere now preached more earnestly than from Jewish pulpits. I trust that in God's own good time it will become a

principle of action, as well as of faith, so that when the bond of race shall be recognised as obsolete, the bond of religion shall wax firmer and still more firm. Community in religious practice shall yet, perchance, be wedded to community in religious belief, and in this union shall lie the Jewish kinship of the future. *Τὸ συγγενὲς οὐχ αἵματι μετρεῖται μόνον, πρυτανευούσης ἀληθείας, ἀλλὰ πράξεων ὁμοιότητι καὶ θήρᾳ τῶν αὐτῶν.* We may well take to heart and apply, with due measure of enlargement and difference, these striking words of the Alexandrian sage.

NOTE.—From some friendly hands, through which this article passed in proof, I received certain criticisms upon it, of part of which the following is the substance :—

"You are not so sympathetic a critic of the Fourth Gospel as of Paul. Parts of it, at any rate, you interpret in too narrow and literal a way. For example, your judgment of the writer's ethical point of view is not as wide and scholarly as it should be. You touch his weak points, it is true, but you do not distinguish finely in doing so. A fuller attempt to search for the *humanity* of the author, his character, the possible influences round him, and the purpose with which he wrote, would not have altered your main conclusions, but would yet have given a more sympathetic tone to your criticism, and have been more impressive to your readers.

"You isolate the Fourth Gospel too severely ; you criticise it rather too much as if its sayings had been written yesterday for our special edification. Now, in the author's day, there would have been probably far fewer examples of a belief which was a mere intellectual assent, and so, too, the divorce between belief and action would not have been as common as it is now. 'In the glow of the moment,' to use your own words, while not forgetting the wideness of God's mercies, a man might yet have asserted that between the believer in Christ and the non-believer, not as a matter of intellect, but in a moral and spiritual sense, the difference was real and wide. It was the very spirituality and idealism of the author which drove him to assume that the whole man was transformed by his belief, so that 'believer' and 'unbeliever' tended to become synonymous with 'righteous' and 'unrighteous.' And if, on the other hand, he asserted that only the good could believe, that in a sense is accepted by you also, for you say that the scamp cannot realize God. You seem readily to perceive

and allow for enthusiasm and excitement in Paul, but not in the Fourth Evangelist. But perhaps there is excitement, though of a different kind, in the Evangelist too. It is a sort of intellectual white-heat. Thus throughout it seems as if the criticism was a little harder and cruder than it should, or need have been, because you have not taken a sufficiently historical and understanding view of the whole.

"Perhaps the new truth (as it seemed to him) came upon the writer of the Fourth Gospel like a dazzling blaze of light, which half-blinded him, as Paul, some think, was physically half-blinded, by its very excess of splendour. He looks out, ever after, with what one might perhaps rather oddly call a dualistic vision upon the world. But he was not a philanthropist like Paul. Keenly anxious that the light which he saw should shine throughout the world, he was impatient and incredulous of those who passed it by. Possibly, nevertheless, you might have been more accurate had you shown more tenderness for the man who said so much about love, but who in his intense antagonism to sin, or to what he too rashly thought sin, seemed unable, or was afraid to let love come in."

How far this criticism is cogent I cannot now inquire. It is at any rate interesting and suggestive. Any stray reader of the article will, I am sure, be glad to read its Note.

C. G. MONTEFIORE.

THE EXPULSION OF THE JEWS FROM ENGLAND IN 1290.[1]

THE expulsion of the Jews from England by Edward I. is a measure concerning the causes of which no contemporary historian gives, or pretends to give, any but the most meagre information. It was passed by the King in his "secret council," of the proceedings of which we naturally know nothing. Of the occasion that suggested it, each separate writer has his own account, and none has a claim to higher authority than the rest; and yet there is much in the circumstances connected with it that calls for explanation. How was it that, at a time when trade and the need for capital were growing, the Jews, who were reputed to be among the great capitalists of Europe, were expelled from England? How did Edward, a king who was in debt from the moment he began his reign till the end, bring himself to give up the revenue that his father and grandfather had derived from the Jews? How could he, as an honourable king, drive out subjects who were protected by a Charter that one of his predecessors had granted, and another had solemnly confirmed? To answer these questions we must consider what was the position that the Jews occupied in England, how it was forced on them, and how it brought them into antagonism at various times with the interests of various orders of the English people, and at all times with the teachings of the Catholic Church. We shall thus find the origin of forces strong enough when they converged to bring about the result which is to be accounted for.

---

[1] The Arnold prize in the University of Oxford was awarded to this Essay in 1894.

I.—The Jews from their Arrival to 1190.

Among the foreigners who flocked to England at, or soon after, the Conquest were many families of French Jews. They brought with them money, but no skill in any occupation except that of lending it out at interest. They lent to the King when the ferm of his counties, or his feudal dues were late in coming in;[1] to the barons, who, though lands and estates had been showered on them, nevertheless often found it hard, without doubt, to procure ready money wherewith to pay for luxuries, or to meet the expense of military service; and to suitors who had to follow the King's Court from one great town to another, or to plead before the Papal Curia at Rome.[2]

But though they thus came into contact with many classes, and had kindly relations with some, they remained far more alien to the masses of the people around them than even the Normans, in whose train they had come to England. Even the baron must, a hundred years after the Conquest, have become something of an Englishman. He held an estate, of which the tenants were English; he presided over a court attended by English suitors. In battle he led his English retainers. He and the Englishman worshipped in the same church, and in it the sons of the two might serve as priests side by side. But the Jews remained during the whole time of their sojourn in England sharply separated from, at any rate, the common people around them by peculiarities of speech, habits and daily life, such as must have aroused dread and hatred in an ignorant and superstitious age. Their foreign faces alone would have been enough to mark them out. Moreover, they generally occupied, not under compulsion, but of their own choice, a separate quarter of each town

---

[1] J. Jacobs, *Jews of Angevin England*, 43-4; 64-5.

[2] Cf. the account of the litigation of Richard of Anesty in Palgrave's *Rise and Progress of the English Commonwealth*, Vol. II. (Proofs and Illustrations), pp. xxiv.-xxvii.

in which they dwelt.[1] And in their isolation they lived a life unlike that of any other class. None of them were feudal landowners, none farmers, none villeins, none members of the guilds. They did not join in the national Watch and Ward. They alone were forbidden to keep the mail and hauberk which the rest of the nation was bound to have at hand to help in preserving the peace.[2] They were not enrolled in the Frankpledge, that society that brought neighbours together and taught them to be interested in the doings of one another by making them responsible for one another's honesty. They did not appear at the Court Leet or the Court Baron, at the Town-moot or at the Shire-moot. They went to no church on Sundays, they took no sacrament; they showed no signs of reverence to the crucifix; but, instead, they went on Friday evening and Saturday morning to a synagogue of their own, where they read a service in a foreign tongue, or sang it to strange Oriental melodies. When they died they were buried in special cemeteries, where Jews alone were laid.[3] At home their very food was different from that of the Christians. They would not eat of a meal prepared by a Christian cook in a Christian house. They would not use the same milk, the same wine, the same meat as their neighbours. For them cattle had to be killed with special rites; and, what was worse, it sometimes happened that, some minute detail having been imperfectly performed, they rejected meat as unfit for themselves, but considered it good enough to be offered for sale to their Christian neighbours.[4] The presence of

---

[1] See Jewries of Oxford and Winchester, in the plans in Norgate's *England under Angevin Kings*, I., pp. 31, 40; and Jewry of London, described in *Papers of Anglo-Jewish Historical Exhibition*, pp. 20-52.

[2] *Chronica Rogeri de Hoveden* (Rolls Series) II., 261; *Gesta Henrici II. et Ricardi I.* (Rolls Series), I. 279.

[3] *Gesta Henrici II. et Ricardi I.* (R. S.), I. 182; *Chronica Rogeri de Hoveden* (R. S.), II. 137.

[4] Depping, *Les Juifs dans le Moyen Age*, 170; Jacobs' *The Jews of Angevin England*, 54, 178; *Statutes of the Realm* (Edition of 1810), I. 202

Christian servants and nurses in their households made it impossible that any of their peculiarities should remain unobserved or generally unknown.[4]

Thus, living as semi-aliens, growing rich as usurers, and observing strange customs, they occupied in the twelfth century a position that was fraught with danger. But, almost from their first arrival in the country, they had enjoyed a kind of informal Royal protection,[5] though, as to the nature of their relations with the King during the first hundred and thirty years of their residence, very little is known. It was probably less close than it afterwards became, for the liability to attack and the need for protection had not yet manifested themselves.

But, at the end of the eleventh century, there began to spread throughout Europe a movement which, when it reached England, converted the vague popular dislike of the Jews into an active and violent hostility. While the Norman conquerors were still occupied in settling down in England, the King organising his realm, and the barons enjoying, dissipating, or forfeiting their newly-won estates, popes and priests and monks had been preaching the Crusade to the other nations of civilised Europe. At one of the greatest and most imposing of all the Church Councils that were ever held, where were present lay nobles and clerics of all nations, attending each as his own master, and able to act on the impulse of the moment, Urban II., in 1095, told the tale of the wrong that

---

(Judicium Pillorie) and 203 (Statutum de Pistoribus). See also *Leet Jurisdiction in Norwich* (Selden Society, 1891), p. 28, where, in a list of amercements inflicted at the Leet of Nedham and Manecroft, the following entry occurs :—"De Johanne le Pastemakere quia vendidit Carnes quas Judei vocant trefa, 2s."

[4] Mansi, *Sacorum Conciliorum Collectio*, Venice, 1775, XX. 399; Wilkins, *Concilia Magnae Britanniae*, I. 591, 675, 719; *Gesta Henrici II. et Ricardi I.* (R. S.), I. 230. *Chronica Rogeri de Hoveden* (R. S.), II. 180.

[5] Cf. the words of John's Charter :="Libertates et consuetudines sicut eas habuerunt tempore Henrici avi patris nostri.—*Rotuli Chartarum*, p. 93.

Christians had to suffer at the hands of the enemies of Christ. He told his hearers how the Eastern people, a people estranged from God, had laid waste the land of the Christians with fire and sword ; had destroyed churches, or misused them for their own rites ; had circumcised Christians, poured their blood on altars and fonts, scourged and impaled men, and dishonoured women.[6] Such denunciations, followed by the appeal to all present to help Jerusalem, which was "ruled by enemies, enslaved by the godless, and calling aloud to be freed," excited, for the first time in Europe, a furious and fanatical hatred of Eastern and non-Christian races. The Jews were such a race, as well as the Saracens, and between the two the Crusaders scarcely distinguished. Before they left home and fortune to fight God's enemies abroad, it was natural that they should kill or convert those whom they met nearer home. Through all central Europe, from France to Hungary, the bands that gathered together to make their way to the Holy Land fell on the Jews and offered them the choice between the sword and the font.[1]

The disasters that followed the first Crusade brought with them an increase in the ferocity of the attacks to which the Jews of Continental Europe were subjected, and S. Bernard, when he preached the second Crusade, found that he had revived a spirit of fanaticism that he was powerless to quell. He had wished for the reconquest of the Holy Land as a result that would bring honour to the Christian religion ; but his followers and imitators thought less of the end than of the bloodshed that was

---

[6] *Recueil des Historiens des Croisades—Historiens Occidentaux* (Paris, 1866), III. 321, 727. Cf. especially (p. 727), Altaria suis foeditatibus inquinata subvertunt, Christianos circumcidunt, cruoremque circumcisionis aut super altaria fundunt aut in vasis baptisterii immergunt (Roberti Monachi *Historia Iherosolimitana*).

[1] Neubauer and Stern, *Hebräische Berichte über die Judenverfolgungen während der Kreuzzüge ;* Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*, V., 224, 270 ; Graetz, *Geschichte der Juden* (second edition) VI., 89-107.

to be the means. A monk, "who skilfully imitated the austerity of religion, but had no immoderate amount of learning,"[2] went through the Rhineland preaching that all Jews who were found by the Crusaders should be killed as enemies of the Christian faith. It was in vain that Bernard appealed to the Christian nations whom his eloquence had aroused, in the hope that "the zeal of God which burnt in them would not fail altogether to be tempered with knowledge." He himself narrowly escaped attack: and the Jews suffered from the second Crusade as they had suffered from the first.[3]

England was so closely related to the Churches of the Continent that it could not fail to be affected by the great movement. But the first Crusade was preached when the Conquest was still recent, and the Normans had no leisure to leave their new country; the second, during the last period of anarchy in the reign of Stephen.

Thus there were, during the first hundred years after the Council of Clermont, few English Crusaders. Yet the Crusading spirit, working in a superstitious mediæval population, called forth a danger that was destined to be as fatal to the English Jews as were the massacres to their brethren on the Continent. The Pope who preached the first Crusade had told his hearers that Eastern nations were in the habit of circumcising Christians and using their blood in such a way as to show their contempt for the Christian religion. This charge was naturally extended to the Jews as well. What alterations it underwent in its circulation it is hard to say; but in 1146, a tale was spread among the populace of Norwich, and encouraged by the bishop, that the Jews had killed a boy named William, to use his blood for the ritual of that most suspicious feast, their Passover. The story was supported by no evidence more trustworthy than that of an apostate Jew, which was so worthless that

---

[2] C. U. Hahn, *Geschichte der Ketzer im Mittelalter*, III. 17.

[3] Graetz, *Geschichte der Juden* (second edition), VI., 155-170. Cf. Hefele, V., 498, *n* 2.

the Sheriff refused to allow the Jews to appear in the Bishop's Court to answer the charge brought against them, and took them under his protection. But the popular suspicion of the Jews lent credibility to the story, and so terrible was the feeling which was aroused that many of the Jews of Norwich dispersed into other lands, and of those who remained many were killed by the people in spite of the protection of the Sheriff.[1] The accusation once made naturally recurred, first at Gloucester, in 1168, and then at Bury St. Edmund's, in 1181. "The Martyrs" were regularly buried in the nearest church or religious house, and the miracles that they all worked would alone have been enough to continually renew the belief in the terrible story.[2]

Under the firm reign of Henry II., anti-Jewish feeling found no further expression in act. The King, like his predecessors, gave and secured to the Jews special privileges so great as to arouse the envy of their neighbours. They were allowed to settle their own disputes in their own *Beth Din*, or Ecclesiastical Court, and in so far to enjoy a privilege that was granted only under strict limitations to the Christian Church.[3] They were placed, apparently, under the special protection of the royal officers of each district.[4] They lived in safety, and they made considerable contributions to the Royal Exchequer.

The death of Henry II. and the accession of Richard I., the first English Crusading King, might naturally have been expected to bring trouble to the rich and royally

---

[1] Jacobs, *Op. Cit.*, 20, 257.

[2] *Historia et Cartularium Monasterii S. Petri Gloucestriae*, R. S., I., 21; *Chronica Jocelini de Brakelonda* (Camden Society), 12, 113-14; *Annales Monastici* (R. S.), I., 343, II., 347; Matt. Paris, *Chronica Majora* (R. S.), IV., 377, V., 518; Jacobs' *Jews of Angevin England*, 19; and cf. *Chronicles of Reigns of Stephen, Henry II., Richard I.* (Rolls Series), I., 311.

[3] *Materials for History of Thomas Becket* (Rolls Series), IV. 148; Jacobs, *Jews of Angevin England*, 43, 155.

[4] Cf. the protection given to Jews of Norwich by the Sheriff, Jacobs, 257.

favoured infidels of the land where the blood accusation had its birth. The interregnum between the death of one King and the proclamation of the "peace" of his successor was always a time of danger and lawlessness during the first two centuries after the Conquest, and the growth of the crusading spirit, and of the popular belief in the truth of the blood accusation, caused all the forces of disorder to work in one direction, viz., against the Jews. The day of Richard's coronation was the first opportunity for a great exhibition of the anti-Jewish fanaticism of the populace. The nobles from all parts of the country brought with them to London large trains of servants and attendants, who were left to occupy themselves as best they might in the streets, while their lords were present at the ceremony. The Jews, who had been refused permission to enter the Abbey, took up a prominent position outside. Their appearance exasperated the crowd, and in the mediæval world a crowd was irresistible. While the service was proceeding, the Jews were fiercely attacked by the "wild serving men" of the nobles and the lower orders of citizens. One at least was compelled to accept baptism to save himself from death. Later in the same day, when the King and magnates were banqueting in the palace, the attack was renewed. The strong houses of the Jewry were besieged and fired, and the inhabitants were massacred. But soon "avarice got the better of cruelty," and in spite of the efforts of the King's officers the city was given up to plunder and rapine.[1]

Though the King was bitterly angry at what had happened, the first attempt at punishment showed him how powerless he was against the forces hostile to the Jews. Had the offenders been nobles or prominent citizens, he could, when the first irresistible disorder had subsided, have taken vengeance at his leisure. But what could he do against a collection of serving-men and poor citizens, whom

[1] *Chronicles of the Reigns of Stephen, Henry II., and Richard I.* (Rolls Series), I. 294-9.

no one knew, who had come together and had separated in one day? When he departed for the Crusades, he left behind him all the materials for more outbreaks of the same kind. In the more populous towns Crusaders were continually gathering together in order to set out for the Holy Land in company: and they, aided by the lower citizens, clerics, and poor countrymen, and in some cases by ruined landholders, fell on and killed the Jews wherever they had settlements in England, at Norwich, York, Bury St. Edmunds, Lynn, Lincoln, Colchester, and Stamford.[1] Again the Royal officers were unable to touch the offenders. When the Chancellor arrived with an army at York, the scene of the most horrible of all the massacres, he found that the murderers were Crusaders, who had long embarked for the Holy Land, peasants and poor townsmen who had retired from the neighbourhood, and bankrupt nobles, who had fled to Scotland. The citizens humbly represented that they were not responsible for the outrage and were too weak to prevent it. No punishment was possible except the infliction of a few fines, and the Chancellor marched back with his army to London.[2]

It was clear that the King must strengthen his connection with the Jews. He could not afford to lose them or to leave them continually liable to plunder. They were too rich. In 1187, when Henry II. had wanted to raise a great sum from all his people he had got nearly as much from the Jews as from his Christian subjects. From the former he got a fourth of their property, £60,000, from the latter a tenth, or £70,000.[3] It is of course improbable that, as these figures would at first seem to show, the Jews held a quarter of the wealth of the kingdom, but

[1] Radulfi de Diceto, *Opera Historica* (R.S.), II. 75-6. Jacobs, *Jews of Angevin England*, 176; *Chronicles of the Reigns of Stephen, Henry II., and Richard I.* (Rolls Series), I. 309-10, 312-322.

[2] *Chronicles of the Reigns of Stephen, Henry II., and Richard I.* (R.S.) I. 323-4.

[3] Jacobs, *Jews of Angevin England*, pp. 91-6; Gervase of Canterbury (R.S.) I. 422.

they were as useful to the King as if they had. He had a far greater power over their resources than over those of his other subjects; their wealth was in moveable property, and what was still more important, it was concentrated in few hands. It was easily found and easily taken away.[1]

II. The Constitution of the Jewry.

Richard's policy, or his councillors', was simple. On the one hand, in order to encourage rich Jews to continue to make England their home, he issued a charter of protection, in which he guaranteed to certain Jews,[2] and perhaps to all who were wealthy, the privileges that they had enjoyed under his father and great-grandfather. They were to hold land as they had hitherto done; their heirs were to succeed to their money debts; they were to be allowed to go wherever they pleased throughout the country, and to be free of all tolls and dues. On the other hand he asserted and enforced his rights over them and their property by organising a complete supervision of all their business transactions. In 1194 he issued a code of regulations, in which he ordered that a register of all that belonged to them should be kept for the information of the treasury. All their deeds were to be executed in one of the six or seven places where there were establishments of Jewish and Christian clerks especially appointed to witness them; they were to be entered on an official list, and a half of each was to be deposited in a public chest under the control of royal officers.[3] No Jew was to plead before any one but the King's officers, and special Justices were appointed to hear

---

[1] For instance, the enormous wealth of Abraham fil Rabbi, Jurnet of Norwich and Aaron of Lincoln. Jacobs, *Op. Cit.*, 44, 64, 84, 90, 91.

[2] Rymer, *Fœdera* I. 51.

[3] *Chronica Rogeri de Hoveden* (R.S.), III. 266-7.

their cases and exercise a general control over their business.[1]

Their constitution underwent various modifications under Richard's successors. The privileges which had at first been granted to certain Jews by name were extended by John to the whole community;[2] and the royal hold over them was tightened by an edict, issued in 1219, which ordered the Wardens of the Cinque Ports to prevent any Jews who lived in England from leaving the country.[3]

This elaborate constitution did not indeed afford complete security against a repetition of the massacres of 1189 and 1190, but its existence was a more solemn and official recognition than had been given before of the fact that the King was the sole lord and protector of the Jews, and that he would regard an injury done to them as an injury to himself. And thus it went far to secure to him his revenue and to them their safety. From this time forward, the Jews yielded to the king, not simply irregular contributions, such as the £60,000 they had paid to Henry II., and the sums they had paid to Longchamp towards the expenses of Richard's Crusade,[4] but a steady and regular income. They paid tallages, heavy reliefs on succeeding to property, and a besant in the pound, or ten per cent., on their loan transactions; they were liable to escheats, confiscation of land and debts, and fines and amercements of all kinds.[5] Their average annual contribution to the Treasury, during the latter part of the twelfth century, was probably about a twelfth of the whole Royal revenue,[6] and of the greater part of what they owed the realisation was nearly certain. Other debtors might find in delay, or resistance, or legal formalities, a way of

[1] *Chronicon Johannis Brompton* in Twysden's *Historiæ Anglicanæ Scriptores* X., col. 1258.

[2] *Rotuli Chartarum* (Record Commission), p. 93.

[3] Tovey, *Anglia Judaica*, 81.

[4] *Gesta Henrici II. et Ricard. I.* (R.S.), II. 218; M. Paris, *Chronica Majora* (R.S.) II. 381, and Jacobs, 162-4.

[5] Jacobs, 222, 228-30, 239-40.

[6] *Ibid.* 328.

avoiding payment. But the Jews were in the King's hands. He could order the sheriffs of the county to distrain on defaulters, and there was no one between the sheriffs and the Jews.[1] He could despoil them of lands and debts. He could imprison them in the royal castles. In the reign of John, all the Jews and Jewesses of England were thrown into prison by his command, and are said to have been reduced to such poverty that they begged from door to door, and prowled about the city like dogs.[2] The only way they had of removing any of their property from his reach was by burying it. Whereupon the King, if he had any suspicion that a Jew had more treasure than was apparent, might order him to have a tooth drawn every day until he paid enough to purchase pardon.[3]

Powerless as the Jews were against royal oppression in England, the position that was offered to them by Richard and John was no worse than that of their co-religionists in other countries of Europe. Those of Germany were the Emperor's *Kammerknechte*;[4] those of France had been expelled in 1182, and though they were soon recalled, might at any time be expelled again.[5] A Jew in a feudalised country was liable to be the subject of quarrel between the lord on whose estate he dwelt and the king of the country, and he could be handed about, now to the one and now to the other.[6] The right to live and to be under jurisdiction, was everywhere still a local privilege that had to be enjoyed by the permission of a lord, lay or clerical, and had to be paid for. In England, the Jews, so long as they were protected by the King, were at any rate under the greatest lord in

---

[1] Jacobs, 222.

[2] M. Paris, *Chronica Majora* (R.S.) II. 528; *Annales Monastici* (R.S.) I. 29, II. 264, III. 32, 451; *Chronicles of Lanercost* (Maitland Club), p. 7.

[3] M. Paris, *Chronica Majora* II., 528.

[4] Depping, *Les Juifs dans le Moyen Age*, 185.

[5] Bouquet, *Recueil des Historiens des Gaules et de la France*, xvii. 9.

[6] Depping, *Les Juifs dans le Moyen Age*, 59, 60, 185, 194. Cf. *Rotuli Chartarum*, I. 75 (*Carta Willielmi Marescalli, de quodam Judaeo apud Cambay*).

the land. The towns where especially they wished to settle for the purposes of their business, were, thanks to the policy of William the Conqueror, mostly on the royal domain. And the royal power acting through its local officers was used to the full to protect the Jews. The sheriffs of the counties were especially charged to secure to them personal safety and the enjoyment of the immunities that had been granted to them.[1]

The arrangement by which Jewish money-lenders received on English soil the protection of the King against his own subjects was not very honourable to either of the parties. But the King had no compunction, and the Jews had no choice. It could endure so long as the royal power was strong enough to override the objections of barons and abbots to a measure in favour of their creditors, of the towns to an encroachment on their privileges, and of the Church to the royal support of a body of infidel usurers.

At the end of the twelfth century neither towns nor landholders nor Church were in a position to offer any effectual protest. In the thirteenth century the strength of the opposition of each of these three orders grew steadily. But in each it pursued a separate course, though to the same end; and each order struck its decisive blow at a different moment. Hence the various forms of opposition must be separately considered.

III.—The Conflict with the Towns.

The towns were the first to carry out a practical and effective anti-Jewish policy. It was they that suffered most keenly and constantly from the presence of the Jews. They had bought, at great expense, from King or noble or abbot, the right to be independent, self-governing communities, living under the jurisdiction of their own

[1] Tovey, *Anglia Judaica*, 78-9.

officers, free from the visits of the royal sheriffs, and paying a fixed sum in commutation of all dues to the King or the local lord; and yet many of them saw the King protecting in their midst a band of foreigners, who had the royal permission to go whithersoever they pleased, who could dwell among the burgesses, and were yet free not only from all customs and dues and contribution to the ferm,[1] but even from the jurisdiction of those authorities which were responsible for peace and good government.[2] This was exasperating enough; but there was more and worse. The exclusion of the sheriff and the King's constables was one of the most cherished privileges of towns, but, wherever the Jews had once taken up their residence, it was in danger of being a mere pretence. At Colchester, if a Jew was unable to recover his debts, he could call in the King's sheriffs to help him. In London, Jews were "warrantised" from the exchequer, and the constable of the Tower had a special jurisdiction by which he kept the pleas between Jews and Christians. At Nottingham, complaints against Jews, even in cases of petty assaults, were heard before the keeper of the Castle. At Oxford the constable called in question the Chancellor's authority over the Jews; contending that they did not form part of the ordinary town-community.[3] Moreover, the debts of the Jews were continually falling into the King's hands, and whenever this happened, his officers would no doubt penetrate into

---

[1] Stamford was an exception in this respect, Madox, *Firma Burgi*, p. 182.

[2] Et Judæi non intrabunt in placitum nisi coram nobis aut coram illis qui turres nostras custodierint in quorum ballivis Judæi manserint, *Rot. Chart.*, 93.

[3] Cutts, *Colchester*, 123; Tovey, *Anglia J.*, 50; *Forty-Seventh Report of Deputy-Keeper of Public Records*, 306; Lyte, *History of the University of Oxford*, 59; *Papers of Anglo-Jewish Historical Exhibition*, 35-6; *De Antiquis Legibus Liber* (Camden Soc.), p. 16, (A.D. 1249, Nam rex concessit quod Judei qui antea warantizati fuerunt per breve de scaccario, de cetero placitassent coram civibus de tenementis suis in Londoniis). *Chronica Jocelini de Brakelond* (Camden Soc.), p. 2, (Venit Judeus portans literas domini regis de debito sacristæ).

the town to make on behalf of the royal treasury a collection such as had never been contemplated when the burgesses made their agreement, which was to settle once and for all their payment to the King.[1]

In some of the towns the feeling against the Jews was expressed in riots as early as the reign of John, and the beginning of that of Henry III. But the King in each case took stern measures of repression. John told the mayor and barons of London that he should require the blood of the Jews at their hands if any ill befell them.[2] In Gloucester and in Hereford, the burgesses of the town were made responsible for the safety of the Jews dwelling amongst them. In Worcester, York, Lincoln, Stamford, Bristol, Northampton, and Winchester, the sheriffs were charged with the duty of protecting them against injury.[3] Such measures only increased the ill-feeling of the burgesses. At Norwich in 1234 the Jewry was fired and looted.[4] The Jews were maltreated and beaten, and were only saved from further harm by the timely help of the garrison of the neighbouring castle. At Oxford the scholars attacked the Jewry and carried off "innumerable goods."[5]

But the towns soon began to use a far more effective method than rioting in order to rid themselves of the Jews. Just as they had found it worth while to pay heavily for their municipal charters, so now they were willing to pay more for a measure which would secure them in the future against a drain on their revenues and a violation of their privileges. Whether a town held its

---

[1] Cp. *Chronica Monasterii de Melsa* (R.S.), I., 177. Interea mortuus est Aaron Judæus Lincolniæ, de quo jam dictum est, et compulsi sumus, regis edicto totum quod illi debuimus pro Willielmo Fossard infra breve tempus domino regi persolvere.

[2] Rymer, *Fœdera*, I., 89.

[3] *Calendar of Patent Rolls from* 1281 to 1292, p. 15; Tovey, *Anglia Judaica*, 77, 78, 79.

[4] Tovey, 101, *Norfolk Antiquarian Miscellany*, I., 326.

[5] *Annales Monastici* (Rolls Series), iv. 91.

charter from the King or was still dependent on an intermediate lord, the motive was equally strong. An abbot or a baron would be glad to second the efforts made by the inhabitants of one of his vills to expel a portion of the populace which took much from the resources whence his revenue came and added nothing to them.[1] The abbot of Bury St. Edmund's induced the King to expel the Jews from the town in 1190.[2] The burgesses of Leicester obtained a similar grant from Simon de Montfort in 1231, those of Newcastle in 1234, of Wycombe in 1235, of Southampton in 1236, of Berkhampsted in 1242, of Newbury in 1244, of Derby in 1263; at Norwich the citizens complained to the King, but without any result, of the harm that they suffered through the growth of the Jewish community settled in the city.[3] In 1245 a decree in general terms was issued by Henry III., prohibiting all Jews, except those to whom the King had granted a special personal license, from remaining in any town other than those in which their co-religionists had hitherto been accustomed to live.[4] This series of measures did not simply deprive the Jews in England of a right which had been solemnly granted them and which they had long enjoyed. It went much further.

---

[1] Especially irritating must have been the fact that the one restriction on the business of Jews, as money-lenders, was the order that forbade them to take in pledge the land of tenants on the royal demesne. W. Prynne, *The Second Part of a Short Demurrer to the Jews' long discontinued remitter*, etc., London, 1656, p. 35; *Norfolk Antiquarian Miscellany*, I. 328.

[2] *Chronica Jocelini de Brakelonda* (Camden Society), p. 33.

[3] Thompson, *Leicester*, 72; Madox, *Hist. of Exchequer*, I. 260, notes O and P; J. E. Blunt, *Establishment and Residence of Jews in England*, 45; Papers Anglo-J. H. Ex. 190; Prynne, *The Second Part of a Short Demurrer*, etc., p. 37; *Norfolk Antiquarian Miscellany*, I. 326, (De Judeis dicebant quod major multitudo manet in civitate sua quam solebat, et quod Judei qui aliis locis dissainati (*sic*) fuerunt venerunt ibidem manere ad dampnum civitatis).

[4] Prynne, *The Second Part of a Short Demurrer*, etc., p. 75; Madox, *History of the Exchequer*, I. 249: Et quod nullus Judaeus receptetur in aliqua villa sine speciali licentia Regis, nisi in villis illis in quibus Judaei manere consueverunt.

For, by circumscribing the area in which they could carry on their business, and so diminishing their opportunities of acquiring wealth, it threatened their very existence in a land where their wealth alone secured them protection.

IV.—The Conflict with the Barons.

At the same time that the towns were making their attack on the Jews in their own way, there was growing up within the baronial order a new party, stronger than the towns in the elements of which it was composed and in its capacity for joint action, and filled, on account of the private circumstances of its members, with a deeper hatred of the Jews than the greater barons, who had hitherto represented the order, had ever known. For the old Baronial party which had forced Magna Carta on John was too rich to be seriously indebted to the Jews, and the anti-Jewish feeling of its members must have been blunted by the fact that, when they had to pay their debts, they could raise the money by benevolences levied on their tenants.[1] Moreover some of them imitated on their own estates the King's policy of sharing in the profits of usury.[2] Hence they were little influenced by personal grievances, and it was no doubt partly from political considerations, and partly as a concession to the lesser and poorer members of their order, that they had introduced into Magna Carta certain limitations of the power of the Jews, or of their legatee, the King, over the estates of

---

[1] Jacobs, *Jews of Angevin England*, 269-271.

[2] M. Paris, *Chronica Majora*, V. 245. Cf. the article in the Constitutions enacted by Walter de Cantilupe, Bishop of Worcester, at his diocesan synod in 1240 : Quia vero parum refert, an quis per se vel per alium incidat in crimen usurarum, prohibemus ne quis Christianus Judæo pecuniam committat, ut eam Judæus simulate suo nomine proprio mutuet ad usuram. Wilkins, *Magnæ Britanniæ Concilia*, I. 675,676. Stubbs, *Select Charters*, 385-6.

debtors, a measure which, small as it was, was repealed on the re-issues of the charters, when, during the minority of Henry III., the Barons had to undertake the duty of Government. And yet even the greater Barons must have felt, after twenty years' experience of the personal Government of Henry III., that an alteration in the Royal system of managing the Jewry was necessary if their order was ever to succeed in the constitutional struggle in which it was engaged. They knew that many of those among the King's acts which they hated worst would have been impossible but for the Jews. It was by money extorted from them that he had been enabled to prolong his expeditions in Brittany and Gascony, to support and enrich his foreign favourites, and to baffle the attempts of the Council to secure, by the refusal of supplies, the restoration of Government through the customary officers. In 1230, and again in 1239, he took from them a third of their property; in 1244, he levied a tallage of 60,000 marks; in 1250, 1252, 1254, and 1255 he ordered the royal officers to take from them all that they could exact, after thorough inquisition and the employment of measures of compulsion so cruel as to make the whole body of Jews in England ask twice, though each time in vain, for permission to leave the country. Thus the whole Baronial order was for a time united, on the ground of constitutional grievances, in a policy which found its expression in the successful attempt of the National Council in 1244 to exact from the King the right of appointing one of the two justices of the Jews, so as to gain a knowledge of the amount of the Jewish revenue, and a power of controlling its expenditure.[1]

---

[1] For the nature and duration of the earlier struggle between the king and the barons, see Stubbs, *Constitutional History of England* (Library Edition), II., 40, 44, 63, 67, 69-77. For the king's acts of extortion from the Jews, see Matthew Paris, *Chronica Majora*, III., 194, 543; IV., 88; V., 114, 274, 441, 487; Madox, *History of the Exchequer*, I., 224-5, 229; Prynne, *Second Part of a Short Demurrer*, 40, 48, 66, 70, 75, 57. For the appointment by the Council of one Justice of the Jews, M. Paris, *Chronica Majora*, iv. 367.

But such a measure did nothing to relieve the personal grievances of the lower baronage, and it was naturally from this class that further complaints proceeded. Its members, unlike the greater barons, made no profit from the encouragement of usury. On the other hand, they were among the greatest sufferers from the practice. Many a one among them must, when summoned to take part in the King's foreign expeditions, have been compelled to pledge some land to the Jews in order to be able to meet the expenses of service; and no doubt the Jews derived from such transactions a large share of the profits that enabled them to make their enormous contributions to the exchequer. A landholder's debt to a Jew would, when once contracted, have been, under any circumstances, difficult to pay off. But the lower baronage, or knight's bachelors, were threatened, when they had fallen into debt, with new dangers, the knowledge of which intensified their hatred of the whole system of money-lending. "We ask," they said in the petition of 1259, "a remedy for this evil, to wit, that the Jews sometimes give their bonds, and the land pledged to them, to the magnates and the more powerful men of the realm, who thereupon enter on the land of the lesser men, and although those who owe the debt be willing to pay it with usury, yet the said magnates put off the business, so that the land and tenements may in some way remain their property, ... and on the occasion of death, or any other chance, there is a manifest danger that those to whom the said tenements belonged may lose all right in them." [1]

The special wrongs of the lower baronage were, in the course of the Civil War, temporarily lost sight of. Nevertheless, the action of the whole baronial party throughout the war contributed greatly, though indirectly, to the ultimate banishment of the Jews from England. Just as the

[1] Stubbs, *Select Charters*, 385-6.

towns had, by their measures of exclusion, weakened the mercenary bond that united the Jews to the King, so now the barons, by their wholesale destruction of Jewish property, worked, as unconsciously as the towns had done, to the same end. They attacked and plundered the Jewry of London twice in the course of the war, and destroyed those of Canterbury, Northampton, Winchester, Cambridge, Worcester, and Lincoln. Everywhere they carried off or destroyed the property of their victims. In London they killed every Jew that they met, except those who accepted baptism, or paid large sums of money. They took from Cambridge all the Jewish bonds that were kept there, and deposited them at their head-quarters in Ely. At Lincoln they broke open the official chests, and "trod underfoot in the lanes, charters and deeds, and whatever else was injurious to the Christians."[1] "It is impossible," says a chronicler, in describing one of these attacks, "to estimate the loss it caused to the King's exchequer."

V.—The Beginning of Edward's Policy of Restriction.

When the Civil War was over, the position of the King's son Edward as, on the one hand, the sworn friend of the lower baronage, and, on the other hand, the leader of the Council and the most powerful man in England,[2] made it impossible that the Jews should continue to carry on their business under the royal protection as they had hitherto done. And Edward's personal character and political ideals were such as to make him execute with vigour the policy

---

[1] *Annales Monastici*, II. 101, 363, 371, III. 230, IV. 141, 142, 145, 449, 450; *Liber de Antiquis Legibus* (Camden Society), 62; *Chronicle of Pierre de Langtoft* (R. S.), II., 151; *Chronicle of William de Rishanger* (Camden Society), 24, 25, 126; *Florentii Wigorniensis Chronicon ex Chronicis* (English Historical Society), II. 192.

[2] Tout, *Edward I.*, 13, 39.

towards the Jews that was forced on him by his relations with the lower baronage. He was a religious prince, one who could not but have felt qualms of conscience at seeing the "enemies of Christ" carrying on the most unchristian trade of usury in the chief towns of England. He was a statesman, the future author of the Statutes of Mortmain and *Quia Emptores*, and he wished to see the work of the nation performed by the united action of the nation, and its expenses met by due contributions from all the National resources. But in so far as the Jews had any hold on English land they prevented the realisation of this ideal. Sometimes they took possession of land that was pledged to them, and then the amount of the feudal revenue and the symmetry of the feudal organisation suffered, though the King might gain a great deal in other ways;[1] very often they secured payment in money of their debts by bringing about an agreement for the transfer to a monastery of the estates that had been pledged to them as security,[2] and then the land came under the "dead hand"; sometimes they contented themselves with a perpetual rent-charge,[3] and then it would be hard, if not impossible, for the struggling debtor to discharge his feudal obligations.[4]

The indebtedness of the Church must have shocked Edward's sympathies as a Christian, just as much as the indebtedness of the lay landholders thwarted his schemes

---

[1] Palgrave, *Rotuli Curiæ Regis* (Record Commission), II., 62 (Judaei habeant seisinam); *Gesta abbatum Monasterii S. Albani* (R. S.), I., 401; *Placitorum Abbreviatio* (Record Commission), p. 58; Jacobs, pp. 90, 234.

[2] *Chronicles of the Abbey of Melsa* (Rolls Series), I., 173, 174, 306, 367, 374, 377; II., 55, 109, 116; *Archæological Journal*, vol. 38, pp. 189, 190, 191, 192.

[3] Blunt, *Establishment and Residence of the Jews in England*, 136; Prynne, *Second Part of a Short Demurrer*, p. 105.

[4] A very long list of landowners indebted to the Jews could be extracted from Madox, *History of Exchequer*, Vol. I., p. 227, *sq.* Cf. Prynne, *Second Part*, etc., pp. 96, 98, 106; *Calendar of Patent Rolls from* 1281 *to* 1292, p. 25.

as a statesman. For the condition of ecclesiastical estates was indeed deplorable. They had begun to fall into debt in the twelfth century, no doubt in consequence of the expense that was necessary for the erection of great buildings, and their debts had gone on growing, partly in consequence of bad management, partly through the necessity of fulfilling the duties of hospitality by keeping open house continually, partly through the exactions of the Pope and the King. The Bishop of Lincoln pledged the plate of his cathedral, the Abbot of Peterborough the bones of the patron-saint of his Abbey; at Bury St. Edmunds each obedientiary had his own seal, which he could apply to bonds which involved the whole house; and loans were freely contracted which accumulated at 50 per cent.[1] Hence in the thirteenth century Matthew Paris wrote that "there was scarcely anyone in England, especially a bishop, who was not caught in the meshes of the usurers."[2] "Wise men knew that the land was corrupted by them."[3] The literary documents of the latter half of the century fully confirm these accounts. The See of Canterbury was weighed down with an ever-growing load of debt when John of Peckham first went to it.[4] The buildings of the cathedral were becoming dilapidated for want of money to repair them.[5] Those of the neighbouring Priory of Christ Church were in an equally bad state, and its revenue was equally encumbered.[6] The bishop of Norwich was so poor that in spite of the extortions regularly practised by his officials, he had to borrow six hundred marks from the Archbishop of Canterbury.[7] The Bishop of Hereford had been compelled to seek the intervention of Henry III., in order to obtain respite of his debts to

---

[1] *Gesta Henrici II.* (R. S.), I., 106; *Giraldi Cambrensis Opera* (R. S.), VII., 36; *Cronica Jocelini de Brakelonda* (Camden Soc.), p. 2.

[2] III., 328. [3] V. 189.

[4] *Letters of John of Peckham* (Rolls Series), I., 20, 156,

[5] *Ibid.*, I., 203. [6] *Ibid.*, I., 341.

[7] *Ibid.*, I., 177, 187.

the Jews.[1] The Abbey of Glastonbury was weighed down by "immeasurable debts," and, in order to save it from further calamities, the Archbishop had to order a reorganisation of expenditure so thorough as to include regulations concerning the number of dishes with which the abbot might be served in his private room.[2] The Prior of Lewes asked permission to turn one of his churches from its right use, and to let it for five years to any one who would hire it, in order that he might thus get together some money to help to pay off what the priory owed.[3] The Church of Newneton could not afford clergymen.[4] Even the great Monastery of St. Swithin's, Winchester, in spite of the revenue that its monks drew from the sale of wine and fur and spiceries, and from the tolls paid by the traders who attended its great annual fair, was always in debt, sometimes to the amount of several thousand pounds.[5] Except in the cutting down of timber and the granting of life annuities in return for the payment of a lump sum, the religious houses had no resources except the money-lenders.[6] They borrowed from English usurers, from Italians, from Jews, and from one another.[7]

If the lay and ecclesiastical estates of England were to be freed from their burdens, heroic measures were necessary. The barons had done their part in the work by carrying off or destroying such bonds as they could find. But the financial revolution, to be effective, must be carried out by due process of law.

When, on the restoration of tranquillity, the Council under Edward's influence began its attempt to redress the grievances against which the barons had been fighting, the

---

[1] Roberts, *Excerpta e Rot. Finium* (Record Commission), II., 68.

[2] *Letters of John of Peckham*, I., 261. [3] *Ibid.*, I., 380.

[4] *Ibid.*, I., 194.

[5] *Obedientiary Rolls of S. Swithin's, Winchester* (Hampshire Record Society), 1892, pp. 10, 18.

[6] *Letters of John of Peckham*, I., 244; Kitchin, *Winchester*, 55; *Obedientiary Rolls of S. Swithin's*, pp. 22, 25.

[7] Cf. *Letters of John of Peckham*, I., 542.

first measure in the programme of reform was one for the relief of the debtors to the Jews. Any interference with Jewish business would, of course, entail a loss to the Royal Exchequer, and, honest and patriotic as Edward was, his poverty was so great that he could not afford to sacrifice any of his resources. But the exhausting demands that the King had made on the Jews in the time of his difficulties, and the terrible destruction of their property that had taken place during the war, must have so far diminished the revenue to be derived from the Jews as to make the possible loss of it a far less serious consideration than it would have been twenty years earlier. Accordingly, at the feast of St. Hilary in 1269, a measure, drawn up by Walter of Merton, was passed, forbidding for the future the alienation of land to Jews in consequence of loan transactions. All existing bonds by which land might pass into the hands of Jews were declared cancelled; the attempt to evade the law by selling them to Christians was made punishable with death and forfeiture; and none to such effect was to be executed in future.[1]

But this was only a slight measure compared with what was to follow. The Jews might still acquire land by purchase, and needy lords and churches, when forbidden to pledge their lands, were very likely, under the pressure of necessity, to sell them outright. Already the Jews were "seised" of many estates,[2] and, according to the story of an ancient historian,[3] they chose this moment to ask the King to grant them the enjoyment of the privileges that regularly accompanied the possession of land, viz., the guardianship of minors on their estates, the right to give wards in marriage, and the presentation to livings. Feudal law recognised the two former privileges, and the

---

[1] Tovey, *Anglia Judaica*, 175-7.

[2] *Gesta Abbatum Monasterii S. Albani* (Rolls Series), I. 401; *Placitorum Abbreviatio* (Record Commission), p. 58, col. 2.

[3] *De Antiquis Legibus Liber* (Camden Society), 234 *sq.*

Church recognised the latter,[1] as incidental to the possession of real property. It was strange, however, that the Jews should present a demand for new social privileges of this kind to a council that had already shown its determination to deprive them of their old legal rights; and it was only natural that the churchmen should take the opportunity of denouncing their "impious insolence." Certain of the councillors were at first in favour of granting the Jews' request; but a Franciscan friar, who obtained admittance to the Council, pleaded that it would be a disgrace to Christianity, and a dishonour to God. The Archbishop of York, and the Bishops of Lichfield, Coventry, and Worcester were present, and argued that the "perfidious Jews" ought to be made to recognise that it was as an act of the King's grace that they were allowed to remain in England, and that it was outrageous that they should make a demand, the granting of which would allow them to nominate the ministers of Christian churches, to receive the homage of Christians, to sit side by side with them on juries, assizes and recognitions, and perhaps ultimately to come into possession of English baronies. Edward and his equally religious cousin, the son of Richard, King of the Romans, were present at the council to support the argument of the Bishops,[2] and not only were the original requests refused, but the Jews were now forbidden by the act of the King and his Council to enjoy a freehold in "manors, lands, tenements, fiefs, rents, or tenures of any kind," whether held by bond, gift, enfeoffment, confirmation, or any other grant, or by any other means whatever. They were forbidden to receive any longer the rent-charges which had been a common form of security for their loans. Lands of which they were already possessed were to be redeemed by the Christian owners, or in default of them, by other Christians, on repayment without interest

[1] Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*, V., 1028.

[2] *Annales Monastici* (R.S.), IV., 221.

of the principal of the loan in consequence of which they had come into the hands of the Jews. In the interest of parochial revenues, Jews were forbidden to acquire houses in London in addition to those which they already possessed.[1]

B. Lionel Abrahams.

(To be continued.)

---

[1] Blunt, *Establishment and Residence*, etc., 134-9.

BELIEFS, RITES, AND CUSTOMS OF THE JEWS, CONNECTED WITH DEATH, BURIAL, AND MOURNING.

(AS ILLUSTRATED BY THE BIBLE AND LATER JEWISH LITERATURE.)

IV.

As the soul is leaving the body, a threefold call is heard from Heaven, 'O son of Adam, hast thou abandoned the world, or has the world abandoned thee; hast thou gathered of the world, or has the world gathered of thee; hast thou slain the world, or has the world slain thee?" (*Muhamm. Eschat.*, ch. viii.)

In this moment the sound occasioned by the divorce of soul from body reaches from one end of the world to the other, but none hears it (T.B. *Joma*, 20*b*; *Pirqe R. Eliezer*, ch. xxxiv.). It is stated, however, in מסכת יצירת הוולד (*Beth Ha-Mid.*, Jellinek, I., p. 153) that the sound is heard by the cock alone.

As the soul of the Jew wings its flight to the Soul of the universe, those present rend their garments, and express their resignation to the will of God by reverently exclaiming, בָּרוּךְ דַּיַּן הָאֱמֶת, "Blessed be the true Judge!"

When the last breath has left the body, and no trace of life can be discerned, the eyes of the dead are reverently closed, generally by the eldest son, but, failing him, by the nearest relative (*Zohar*, Ed. Krotoschin פ' שלח לך, 169*a*. In מעבר יבק, 128*a*, it says that it is but right that this office of love should be performed by the heir, and that the act in itself is beneficial to the deceased). It is distinctly stated however, that one is

"guilty of death," if one closes the eyes before one is fully satisfied that life is wholly extinct (T.B. *Semach.* I.), or even עם יציאת הנפש, *i.e.*, while the soul is in the act of emerging from the body (*Mish. Shabb.* xxiii. 4), as seems to have been usual among the Arabs. This custom is reputed to be one of great antiquity. Thus there is supposed to be an allusion to it already in Gen. xliv. 4, where God tells Jacob in a vision: "Joseph shall put his hands upon thine eyes" (Nachmanides, *Comm. in loco*). It is likewise not confined to the Jews. The practice was observed by the ancient Greeks and Romans (cf. Hom. *Il.* XI. 453; *Odys.* XI. 426; xxiv. 296; Eurip., *Phoen.* 1465 and *Hec.*, 430; Virg. *Æn.*, IX. 487; Ovid, *Heroid.* I. 102; Euseb., *Hist. Eccl.* VII. ch. xxii. § 9). It represents one of the directions given by Bar Hebraeus in his well-known *Book of Conduct* (*Die Canones Jacob's von Edessa*, Ed. C. Kayser, p. 152); and it also prevails among the Egyptians. "When the rattles in the throat, or other symptoms, show that a man is at the point of death, an attendant (his wife or some other person) turns him round to place his face in the direction of Mekkah and closes his eyes." (*Modern Egyptians*, Stanley Lane-Poole, 1875, II. ch. xxviii.)

The "motif" of this custom is explained in מעבר יבק 128*a*). As man is supposed to behold the Shechina in the moment when he expires, it is not proper that his eyes should be permitted to rest upon a profane object after this divine vision. He is likewise deemed unworthy to obtain a view of yonder sphere, until this world has been completely hidden from his sight. Pliny (*Nat. Hist.* xi. § 150, quoted by Mr. Frazer) also assigns as a reason for the custom, that the dead should be seen for the last time, not by man, but by Heaven. Mr. Frazer, however, is of opinion that its basis is to be sought elsewhere. "The very general practice of closing the eyes of the dead appears to have originated with a similar object (that the ghost might not be able to find his way

back); it was a mode of blindfolding the dead, that he might not see the way by which he was carried to his last home. At the grave where he was to rest for ever, there was, of course, no motive for concealment, hence the Romans, and apparently the Siamese, opened the eyes of the dead man at the funeral pyre, just as we should unbandage the eyes of an enemy after conducting him to his destination. In Nuremberg, the eyes of the corpse were actually bandaged with a wet cloth. In Corea, they put blinkers, or rather blinders, on his eyes; they are made of black silk and are tied with strings at the back of his head. The Jews put a potsherd, and the Russians coins, on each of his eyes. The notion that if the eyes of the dead be not closed his ghost will return to fetch away another of the household still exists in Bohemia, Germany, and England" (*Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, xv. 64ff.).

But while this explanation is no doubt, in the main, the correct one, is it not possible that the Jews, who, as history proves, had a remarkable capacity for spiritualising every heathen usage which they assimilated, may have originally had no other motive in carrying out this practice than that set forth in יבק מעבר? It seems to have been a general belief among the Jews that man was privileged to catch a passing vision of his Creator just as the soul was leaving the body; and we find even Job, when sunk in the slough of despond, breathing a confident hope that he will himself behold God with his own eyes (Job xix. 27). Thus it was only natural that such a people should have considered it sacrilege to suffer anything earthly to be seen by eyes which had once peered beyond the mysterious veil which cannot be riven by the soul of man while it remains in contact with aught that is subject to corruption.

Besides the eyes, the mouth is closed, and the cheek-bones are bound together, to prevent them dropping asunder (T.B. *Semach.* I. and references).

The Bible records an isolated instance of kissing the dead (Gen. l. 1). But this act of Joseph's was probably due to nothing else but an irresistible impulse of affection. In the *Book of Jubilees* it is recorded that when Rebekah, accompanied by Isaac, found Abraham dead in his bed, the son of the patriarch fell upon his father's face and kissed him. But, of course, there is no historical foundation for this incident. Among the ancient Romans, if not an universal, still it was not an uncommon habit, apparently, to give the dying a last kiss in order to catch the parting breath. The passages from which this is inferred are Cic. *Ver.* V. 45; Virg. *Æn.* IV. 684 (quoted by Becker). There is also some reference (though it is likewise not very distinct) in Lucian, *De Luctu* (Ed. Heitland) § 13, to the custom among the Greeks of a father and mother embracing their departed son (περιχυθεὶς="flung his arms around" the corpse). The modern Greeks, when bidding farewell to a dead relative, usually imprint a kiss upon the lips of the corpse (*Customs and Lore of Modern Greece*, Rennell Rodd, p. 129). The Copts and the Druses likewise kiss their dead before interment (Vide *Social History of the Races of Mankind*, Featherman, Div. V. 254-482). But the practice does not seem to have been generally popular in ancient times. In the book צרור המור, a philosophical and cabbalistic commentary on the Pentateuch, quoted by מעבר יבק (101*b*) the kiss which Joseph imprinted upon his deceased father is explained as the "kiss of leave-taking," one of the three kinds of kisses recognised as permitted by the law of decency (*Schir. Hasch. Rab.* I. 14), the other two being the kiss of homage and the kiss on meeting those near and dear to one. Hence the author infers from Gen. l. 1 that it is proper to kiss a dead relative in token of farewell. In *Mid. Lekach Tob*, or *Pesikta Sutarta* (Ed. Buber) I. 121*a*, Joseph's kiss is likewise described as נשיקה של פרידה. For examples of this latter type of kiss see 1 Kings xix. 20, where Elisha asks permission of Elijah to go and kiss his father and mother before

consecrating himself to the ministry of God; and Acts xx. 37f, where the people fall upon the neck of Paul on the eve of his departure from their midst, and kiss him. מעבר יבק itself remarks that when one's son or daughter dies one is not allowed to kiss them, notwithstanding the instance cited above of a son embracing his deceased father. We find the same view expressed in ספר החסידים, paragraph 236. And there are no other examples of such a practice in post-Biblical Jewish Literature.

An hour after death has taken place, the corpse is reverently lifted, while straw is spread under it, a prayer (for the text of which *vide* מעבר יבק, p. 55), being recited the while. The feet of the dead are turned towards the door, and a black cloth is stretched over the body (T.B. *Shabb.* 151*a*; cf. Sirach xxxviii. 16, "And then cover his body according to the custom"). The ancient Greeks also placed the dead on a couch in the same posture, and among the Romans, the corpse was laid out on a state-bed in the atrium with its feet turned towards the door. (*Vide* Seyffert's *Dict. of Class. Antiqs.* Ed. Nettleship and Sandys.)

I come now to the ancient mode of announcing that a death had occurred in a household. This was done by the sound of the Shouphar and work was at once temporarily suspended, so that all might be enabled to participate in the obsequies (T.B. *Moed. Kat.* 276). The Jews had great reluctance to communicating evil tidings to those concerned (Cf. Prov. x. 10; xvii. 27; and see Zunz, *Zur Geschichte und Literatur*, p. 308.) Thus, when Rabbi Jehuda ha-Nâsi was dying at Sepphoris, the inhabitants said: He who brings us the news that Rabbi is no more, shall be put to death. Bar Kappara looked down from a window attired as a mourner, with garments rent and head covered, and spoke thus: "Brethren, the strong and the feeble have had a contest for the possession of the Tables of the Law, and the strong have asserted their claim successfully and have taken the Tables unto themselves." Thereupon the people burst forth: "Rabbi

is dead!" "You have declared it," he answered, "not I" (T. B. *Kethub.* 104*a*; T. J. *Kilaim* ix. 3; *Kohel. Rab.* vii. 12). Likewise when Rab Kahana was dangerously ill, the Rabbis sent Rabbi Joshua bar Rab Idi to him, and he found Rab Kahana dead. He returned with rent garments and dissolved in tears, when the Rabbis asked, "He is dead, is he not?" "You have announced the fact," he replied, "not I" (T.B. *Pesach*, 3*b*).

While on this subject, I may mention another peculiar usage of the Jews supposed to be connected therewith, which is observed on the occasion of a death and which has been adopted by other nations, between some of whom there is no ethnological affinity. Hence it is impossible to trace its original birth-place. All the water in the house at the time when the death occurs, is immediately poured out, and the same is done in a few of the adjoining dwellings on either side (בקור חולים ס' L. M. Landshuth, xxx.). Various attempts have been made to explain this practice satisfactorily; but in the multitude of reasons there is confusion.

The Kolbo offers two alternative explanations of the afore-mentioned custom, thereby throwing doubt upon the veracity of either.

(1.) As it is objectionable to communicate bad news to any one directly, water is poured out to make manifest to the neighbours and passers-by that a death has taken place.

(2.) It symbolises the fact that the Angel of Death cleanses his dripping knife in water after it has been steeped in gall, and all water is poured away in case he may dip the bloodstained weapon into any vessel that comes across his path, and so scatter death broadcast (See also מעבר יבק, 111*b*).

Mr. Frazer, a recognised authority on such matters, thinks the practice is to be traced to a fear "lest the ghost should fall in and be drowned."

In support of Mr. Frazer's plausible theory, we may note

that in Haute Bretagne, as well as in Basse Bretagne, when there is a death in the house, the water which is found in the vessels is thrown out for fear lest the soul of the deceased should be drowned in it (*Coutumes de la Haute Bretagne*, P. Sébillot, 155f). Also Mr. Andrew Lang tells us ("Folklore of France," in *Folklore Record*, I. 101) that "the water in the house must be poured out of pitchers and glasses (as among the Jews), lest the flying soul should drown itself" (Cf. Souchè, *Croyances, Présages et Traditions Divers*, p. 5). In Germany, the water and milk which may be left in uncovered vessels at the moment when a death has taken place, are immediately thrown out. This is done, according to some, because the departed soul, on its return to wash off its pollution after having discarded its earthen envelope, might be drowned; according to others, because one should not expose one's self to the risk of taking a draught of the sins of the deceased (Liebrecht, *Zur Volkskunde*, p. 350).

That there was a current belief that the soul might perform a lustration after it had passed out of its ephemeral frame is shown by the following. In some parts of Bohemia, after a death, the water-bath is emptied, because, if the ghost happened to bathe in it and anyone drank of it afterwards, he would be a dead man in the year (James G. Frazer in *Journal of Anthrop. Inst.* xv. 64ff). There is a German tradition to the same effect (Liebrecht, *Zur Volkskunde*, p. 350). It is likewise an Indian burial custom, that after the death of a person, milk and water are placed in an earthen vessel in the open air, and the relatives exclaim: "Departed one, here bathe" (the commentary adds) "and here drink" (*Ibid.* p. 351).

In some cases another reason altogether different is assigned for the practice, whilst in others, no explanation seems to be forthcoming, it having possibly been lost in process of transmission from one generation to another.

"In many parts of Germany, in modern Greece and in Cyprus, water is poured out behind the corpse as it is being

carried from the house, in the belief that if the ghost returns, he will not be able to cross it. Sometimes, by night, the Germans pour holy water before the door, the ghost is then thought to stand and whimper on the further side" (James G. Frazer in *Journal of Anthrop. Inst.*, xv. 64ff). A somewhat confusing explanation of the custom as observed in Cyprus, is given in "Notes on Greek Folk-lore" (E. M. Edwards) in *Folklore Journal*, II. 170: "In Cyprus, after the funeral has passed out of the street, they pour from a large vessel the water which it contains, and then throw down the vessel. This custom is referred to the basins of lustral water, '*χέρνιβα*,' which were placed at the doors of the house in which there was a deceased person, to be used by those who had touched the body, but with the Cypriotes it is thought to be for the refreshing of the soul that has left the body, or according to another version, for washing off the blood from the sword of the Archangel Michael, who is supposed to be invisible after having taken the soul of the departed." In Corfu, the poor people throw water from the windows, when a funeral has passed by (*Customs and Lore of Modern Greece*, Rennell Rodd, p. 124.) Similarly, in some parts of Calabria (Castrovellari and Nocara) and of Germany, all the vessels are emptied at death (James G. Frazer, *Journal of Anthrop. Inst.*, xv. 64ff). That the practice was also prevalent in ancient Greece is shown by an inscription found in Iulis (Tzia) which prohibits it: *μηδε τὸ ὕδωρ ἐκχεν* (Dittenberger, *Syllog. Inscrip. Graec.* II., No. 468). Among the Polynesians, "as soon as the corpse was committed to its last resting-place, the mourners selected five old cocoa-nuts, which were successively opened, and the water poured out on the ground (*Anthropological Religion*, Max Müller, p. 278). "In Burma, when the coffin is being carried out, every vessel in the house that contains water is emptied" (James G. Frazer, *Journal of Anthrop. Inst.* xv. 64ff). In the north-east of Scotland, all the milk in the house is poured out on the ground (*Folklore of North-East Scotland*, W.

Gregor, p. 206). The same custom is observed in parts of England, and thus the vulgar expression "kicking the bucket" is explained, evidently deriving its origin from the act of turning over the pail and upsetting the water (Liebrecht, *Zur Volkskunde*, p. 351).

Furthermore, an examination of versions of the custom in vogue among various races, seems to point to its possible derivation from four other causes than that suggested by Mr. Frazer.

1. All water remaining in open vessels after a death had occurred was regarded as unclean, and people were afraid of being contaminated by it.

2. It represented an offering in honour of the dead.

3. It is a survival of the practice of providing food for the departed spirit, in anticipation that it would return in quest of nourishment.

4. It is a symbol of the pouring-out of the soul before God.

With reference to the first, we know from numerous passages in the Bible the precautions taken by the ancient Hebrews against being defiled by contact with the dead, as well as the remedial measures necessary in the event of such a mishap. But it is a special passage in the book of Numbers (xix. 14f) which, according to some authorities forms the basis of the custom referred to above. "This is the law when a man dieth in a tent: Every one that cometh into the tent and every one that is in the tent, shall be unclean seven days. And every open vessel, which hath no covering bound upon it is unclean" (*Vide* Buxtorf, *Synagoga Judaica*, ch. xxxiii.). Even modern Jews, as they leave the graveyard, wash their hands, while reciting some verses of Scripture. In ancient Greece and Rome, the mourner had to be cleansed by lustration from the contaminating presence of death. "At the door of the Greek house of mourning was set the water-vessel (*ἀρδάνιον*), that those who had been within might sprinkle themselves and be clean; while the

mourners returning from a Roman funeral aspersed with water, and stepping over fire, were by this double process made pure" (*Vide* Tylor, *Primitive Culture*, ii. 398). In the former case, the water had to be brought from another house, in which no dead body lay (*Poll.* viii. 65). "In modern Greece, Cappadocia and Crete, persons returning from a funeral wash their hands. In Samoa, they wash their faces in hot water. In ancient India, it was enough merely to touch water. In China, on the fifth day after a death, the mourners wash their eyes and sprinkle their faces three times with water. The Wends of Geiszlitz, make a point of passing through running water as they return from a burial; in winter, if the river is frozen they break the ice in order to wade through the water" (James G. Frazer, *Journ. of Anthrop. Inst.*, xv. 64ff.). It is a Malagasy custom that after a funeral the mourners all wash their dress, or at least dip a portion of it in running water ("Malagasy Folklore, etc.," James Sibra, Junr., in *Folklore Record* II.). Among a number of South African tribes, whose manners, customs, superstitions, and religions have been described by the Rev. J. Macdonald (*Journ. of Anthrop. Inst.*, xix.), "those who handled the body were unclean, and had to bathe in running water before associating with other men, or partaking of food." And Professor Max Müller relates of the Indians (*Anthropological Religion*, p. 254), that "when they have come to a place where there is standing water, they dive once, throw up a handful of water, pronounce the name of the deceased and his family (Gotra), go out from the water, put on new garments, wring the others once, spread them out towards the north, and then sit down till they see the stars or the sun." It also appears that in parts of Scotland, the chairs, etc., in the house are sprinkled with water, and the clothes of the dead are treated in like manner (W. Gregor, *Folklore of N.E. Scotland*, p. 206).

Thus we see how wide-spread is the belief that the occurrence of a death in a house tends to promote general uncleanness.

As to the possibility of the emptying of the water representing a libation to the dead, or an offering on its behalf, with the object of assisting the soul of the departed towards beatitude, the sacrifices to the manes are familiar to all students of classical history. To the Jews, however, such sacrifices were strictly forbidden. Embodied in the declaration to be recited by the Israelite who should be privileged to enter the Promised Land, and to fulfil the law of tithe, was the following:—"I have not given thereof to the dead; I have hearkened to the voice of the Lord my God; I have done according to all that thou hast commanded me" (Deut. xxvi. 14; cf. *Book of Jubilees*, c. xxii.). Yet there are some traces of the violation of this prohibition by the chosen people. Does not the Psalmist, in his succinct poetical history of the Children of Israel, reproach them with having eaten the sacrifices of the dead? (Ps. cvi. 27; but possibly the author is thinking of Deut. xxxii. 38.)

That water might have formed part of such sacrifices gains credence from the following:—

In India, "the man who is performing the obsequies, when the body is placed in an urn (after burning), walks three times round the place, turning his left to it, and with a Samî branch sprinkles milk and water over it, reciting a verse, R.V. x. 16, 4. Again, on the day of the new moon after the obsequies, the performer of the expiatory service for the dead pours out a continuous stream of water, reciting a verse, R.V. x. 16, 9" (Max Müller, *Anthropological Religion*, p. 258). If a wife, or one of the chief Gurus (a father or Akârja dies), they pour out water consecrated in such a manner that the dead shall know it to be given to them ("Apastamba: Aphorisms of the Sacred Laws of the Hindus," II. 8—10, in Vol. III. of *Sacred Books of the East*). The custom of giving offerings to the dead lingers, to a similarly slight extent, among the Buddhists. At the interment, after the body is laid in the grave, wrapped in linen, another cloth is placed over it, and the monk takes

hold of the corner of this cloth; and while another person pours water on the upper end of the corpse, the monk says, "As water rolling down from higher ground, flows over the lower land, so may that which is given in this world benefit (the prêtas or) the departed" (Vide *Buddhism, Primitive and Present, in Magadha and in Ceylon.* T. W. Copleston).

On the whole, there is no reliable evidence to support the conjecture that the Jews were accustomed to offer libations to the dead.

On behalf of the assumption that the pouring out of the water is a survival of the widely prevalent custom of providing refreshment for the departed soul, there is certainly more to be said.

It is well known that the ancients imagined that the ghost of the departed would need the same nourishment in its new abode that it had required in its earthly home. Among the Assyrians and Babylonians "it was believed that the spirits of the dead needed sustenance in their new home, and clay vases were accordingly placed in the tombs, some of them filled with dates and grain, others with wine and oil; but a more bountiful provision was made in the case of water, which, it was thought, was wholesome to drink only when it was fresh and running" (*Social Life among the Assyrians and Babylonians,* A. H. Sayce, Chap. IV.). Among the Arabs, too, "the dead are thirsty rather than hungry, and water and wine are poured upon their graves. Thirst is a subtler appetite than hunger, and therefore more appropriate to the disembodied shades, just as it is from thirst rather than from hunger that the Hebrews, and many other nations, borrow metaphors for spiritual longings and intellectual desires" (*Religion of the Semites,* W. Robertson Smith, p. 217). In India, "one requirement of a burning-ground (Smasâna, the place for burying as well as burning) is that the water should run down from it on all sides" (Max Müller, *Anthropological Religion,* p. 243). When one of the Yese-

dees (a race inhabiting several valleys near Mosul and ancient Nineveh) is at the point of death, "a 'cawal' is called in, who pours a quantity of water into the mouth of the dying man ; and if at his arrival, life is already extinct, the ceremony is performed before the body is consigned to the grave" (*Social History of the Races of Mankind*, Featherman, Div. V., p. 63.) Likewise among the Nubas, as soon as the mortal remains are committed to the earth, vessels filled with water are placed by the side of the grave (*Ibid.*, p. 263).

It certainly seems difficult to believe that even in primitive times, man should have thought that water poured out promiscuously, and at some distance from the grave, could serve the useful purpose of supplying refreshment for the thirsty soul of the dead underneath the ground. But the act of placing food and drink in vessels on the tomb is altogether different, and the modern practice of pouring out the water on the occasion of a death may be a filtered form of this ancient and almost universal custom.

With regard to the fourth possible explanation suggested above, it is only entitled to consideration because it may represent the current interpretation of the custom in rationalistic times, when its real drift had been forgotten for some generations, and it became necessary to invent a pedigree for it.

Inman, in *Ancient Faiths*, etc., I. 85 (quoted by Liebrecht), remarks: "The ancient Egyptians, and the Jewish people to the present day, have the custom of pouring out all the water contained in any vessel in a house where a death has taken place, under the idea that as the living being comes by water, so does it make its exit through water." What this is intended to convey is not quite clear. We know, of course, that the theory of some of the ancients was that man was created from water. But the popular Jewish belief was that God formed the first man of dust gathered from the four corners of the earth, so that in whatever

part of the world it might be his lot to die, no portion of the ground "from whence he was taken" could refuse to receive his remains on the pretence that it had no kinship with him (*Pirqe R. Eliezer*, Chap. xi., etc.) But the probable drift of Inman's explanation is that water, fresh and flowing, represents life; and water, stale and stagnant, typifies death. Or at least, this is the sense in which I interpret his statement.

"Springing water" is symbolical of life. Thus it is designated "living" in Gen. xxvi. 19, Lev. xiv. 5-20, and Song of Songs iv. 15. God is the "fountain of living waters," *i.e.*, the source of life (Jer. ii. 13, xvii. 13). Bileam predicts of Israel: "Waters shall flow from his buckets," *i.e.*, he shall live and flourish (Numb. xxiv. 7). "The righteous is like a tree planted by streams of water," *i.e.*, receiving continual moisture, so that he never ceases from yielding fruit (Jer. xvii. 8; Ps. i. 3). Water cleanses from moral filthiness, *i.e.*, regenerates the soul (Ezek. xxxvi. 25). Thus "springing" (*i.e.*, "living") water is used for the purification of one who has been defiled by contact with the dead (Numb. xix. 17). Likewise, at the ceremonial of cleansing the leper, the birds that were employed had to be killed over running (*i.e.*, living) water (Lev. xiv. 5f; cf. LXX., *i. l.*). And when Aaron and his sons entered the tent of meeting, they had to wash with water that they should not die, since having been previously unclean (in a ritual sense), they required to be purified before approaching the sacred symbols of the fountain of life (Exod. xxx. 20). For "water puts off the deadness; it is one of the means by which we must be born again" (*The Witness of Hermas to the Four Gospels*, C. Taylor, p. 88). "Except a man be born of water and of the spirit, he cannot enter the kingdom of heaven" (John iii. 5). Thus Jesus offers the woman of Samaria "living water" which shall spring up into eternal life (John iv. 10f). And on the day when God's unity and universal sovereignty shall be acknowledged by all man-

kind, living waters shall come forth from the apparently inanimate Jerusalem, after which the holy city shall dwell safely, *i.e.*, have a new lease of life (Zech. xiv. 8). Likewise in Ezekiel's dream of the regenerated Jerusalem (xlvii. 1-12), perennial waters flow on all sides, nourishing fruit-yielding trees that shall never fail, because the waters issue out of the sanctuary where dwells "the Source of living waters." In this connection it is worthy of record that the ancient Assyrians and Babylonians made "little rivulets by the tombs, through which a constant supply of water could be kept flowing for the spiritual needs of the dead." This represented "the water of life," of which we hear so often in the inscriptions. Pure water was indispensable in all religious ceremonies, and ancient legends recorded that there was a "spring of life" bubbling up beneath the throne of the spirits of the under-world, of which whoever drank would live for ever. It was of this spring that the water which ran in numberless rills through the cities of the dead was a symbol and outward sign" (*Social Life among the Assyrians and Babylonians*, A. H. Sayce, ch. iv.).

On the other hand, the pouring away of water is figuratively equivalent to death. Thus when we die we are "as water (*i.e.*, life) poured out upon the ground, that cannot be gathered up again" (2 Sam. xiv. 14; cf. *Targ. in loco*). Job compares a man who dieth and wasteth away to waters failing (*i.e.*, poured out) from the sea (Job xiv. 11f). And David poured out the water that the three mighty men had fetched for him in jeopardy of their lives (2 Sam. xxiii. 16) as an outward sign of the death they had risked. Again, we are taught that "the blood is the life," therefore it is not to be eaten, but to be poured out on the earth as water (Deut. xii. 23, 24; xv. 23). "I am poured out like water," exclaims the Psalmist (Ps. xxii. 15), *i.e.*, I am drawing near to the end of my life. "Waters flowed over my head; I said, I am cut off," is the metaphor employed in Lam. iii. 54. "Pour

out thine heart like water," the poet addresses the daughter of Zion (Lam. ii. 19), *i.e.*, exhaust thy vitality in weeping, that God may take pity upon thy children. Further, when all Israel had assembled to acknowledge their sin in worshipping the Baalim and the Ashtaroth, they poured out water before the Lord, to show that the "old Adam" had passed away (1 Sam. vii. 6). And when an end shall come upon the four corners of the land, "all knees shall be weak (properly "go") as water," *i.e.*, cease to exist (Ezek. xxi. 12).

Thus the pouring-out of the water at a death may be an outward sign of the pouring-out of a human soul before God.

Yet another idea seems to have been extant among the Indians, but I have not found a parallel to it. It is that the sprinkling of water drives away the spirits hovering round the place of burial, just as the Jews believed that the kindling of light in the room of the dead had the effect of causing the demons wandering about to vanish. Thus, in India, "when they have reached the place (of interment) the performer walks three times round the spot with his left side turned towards it, sprinkles water on it with a Samî branch and says (to the imaginary spirits):—

> "Go away, disperse, remove from hence;
> The fathers have made this place for him,
> Yama grants him this resting-place,
> Sprinkled with water day and night."
>
> (*Rig-Veda*, x. 14, 9.)

When it is said that the place is sprinkled with water day and night, this implies that it ought to be thus honoured by the relatives of the dead. (Max Müller, *Anthropological Religion*, p. 245.)

It is a remarkable fact that in Jerusalem, the sanctuary of Jewish tradition, this custom is not in vogue. Thus Joseph Schwarz, writing to his brother from the Holy City in the year 1837, says: "Here they know nothing of the practice of pouring out the water in the house of the dead

or in its vicinity" (*Wissens. Ztschr. f. Jüd. Theol.*, Geiger, 1839, iv. 159).

Besides the custom of which I have written at such length, it is also usual to turn the mirrors towards the wall or to cover them up entirely in the house of the dead (See Taylor, *The Dirge of Coheleth*, JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, IV. 539). Likewise in parts of Germany, the moment anyone dies, everything of a bright colour or glittering aspect, such as looking-glasses, windows, pictures, and clocks, is veiled in white cloth till after the funeral (Liebrecht, *Zur Volkskunde*, p. 350; H.R., in *Folklore Journal*, vi. p. 77). In parts of Scotland, at a death, the mirrors used to be turned to the wall, or were covered up (*Death and Burial Customs*, Scotland, James F. Frazer, in *Folklore Journal*, iii. p. 281). Notably, in Ross-shire when a death takes place . . . looking-glasses are removed from the apartment in which the death occurs and the body is to be laid out (*Folklore Journal*, vi. p. 263).

Mr. Frazer regards the custom as having arisen from the fear "that the soul projected out of the person in the shape of his reflection in the mirror, might be carried off by the ghost of the departed, which is commonly supposed to linger about the house till the burial" (*The Golden Bough*, i. 146).

Might it not rather be traceable to a fear lest the disembodied spirit, wandering about in search of its former abode, might project itself into the mirror in which it beheld its likeness, and thus be irretrievably injured?

An explanation given by a writer (H. Prahn) in *Ztschr. d. Vereins f. Volkskunde* (I., p. 185) is that, if the looking-glasses in the room of the corpse were not covered up, people would be prone to see the coffin twice (the coffin itself and its counterfeit presentment), and that would betoken a second death in the house during the current year.

In the event of a death taking place on the Sabbath, some of the rites detailed above must not be carried out until the termination of the Day of Rest. These are the

closing of the eyes, the stretching out of the hands and feet, and the covering of the head (*Vide* T.B. *Shabb.* 30*b*, 43*b*, 142*b*).

The corpse may, however, be washed and anointed on the Sabbath, provided the limbs be not strained out of joint; the pillow may be moved from under the head, and the body may be laid on sand that it keep the longer from putrefaction; the jaws may also be tied, not to force them closer, but to prevent them dropping lower (*Mish. Shabb.* xxxiii. 5).

The reason for only a partial observance of the rites connected with the dead on the Sabbath is that they involve a profanation of the Day of Rest, which is only permitted in the case of a *living* person (See T.B. *Shabb.* 151*b*). Thus we are told that King David having died on the Feast of Weeks, which fell coincidently with the Sabbath, Solomon asked the Sanhedrin who had come to greet him on his accession (we must pass over the anachronism), whether the corpse might be removed on the Day of Rest. They replied: The Mishna teaches that the corpse may be covered and washed, but no limb dare be moved (*Ruth. Rab.* I. 17). On High Festivals, however, the dead may be cared for as on week days.

On no account is it permitted to leave the corpse alone from the moment death has supervened. The reason assigned by מעבר יבק (112*b*) is that evil spirits, which are of course incorporeal (cf. *Mid. Tanch.* ed. Buber *Gen.* 6*b*), and, as such, anxious to effectuate their completeness, which they can only do by becoming incarnate, might avail themselves of the opportunity of entering into the dead body.

How pathetic and refreshing in its natural simplicity is an explanation such as this, which comes to us as an echo from the distant, boundless realms of the primitive imagination.

A. P. BENDER.

(*To be continued.*)

PERSIAN HEBREW MSS. IN THE BRITISH MUSEUM.

THE British Museum recently acquired a small collection of MSS. from Teheran, which will be of special interest to students who combine a sufficient mastery of Persian with a knowledge and appreciation of Hebrew literature. It will be best to arrange them in the numerical order which they occupy in the Oriental Series of the Museum MSS., after prefixing the general statement that they are all written in the Hebrew character, but that the language is Persian :—

1. A Persian translation of the Psalms, followed by several liturgical poems in the same language. Dated A.D. 1822. [Or. 4,729.]

2. "Haft Paikar" (*i.e.*, the Seven Images) of Nīzāmī. Eighteenth century. [Or. 4,730.]

3. Timsāl Nāmah, known as the "Story of the Seven Vizirs," in the redaction of Rabbi Yehūdah ; the legends of Eldad the Danite; Makhzan ul-pand (*i.e.*, Treasury of Advice), etc. Nineteenth century. [Or. 4,731.]

4. The Prince and the Sufi (*i.e.*, Barlaan and Josaphat), in metrical form, translated from Abraham ben Hasdai's בן המלך והנזיר. Nineteenth century. [Or. 4,732.]

5. Bible Stories in Persian verse, by Molla Shāhīn. Dated A.D. 1702. [Or. 4,742.]

6. Dāniyāl Nāmah, or History of Daniel, by Khwājah Bukhārai. Dated A.D. 1816. [Or. 4,743.]

7. Another copy of the work named under 4, followed by liturgical poems in Hebrew and Persian. Dated A.D. 1812. [Or. 4,744.]

8. The Divan of Hafiz. Dated A.D. 1739. [Or. 4,745.]

In order to complete the account of the Persian Hebrew MSS. in the Museum, it will be useful to draw attention to the following numbers in the "Descriptive List of the Hebrew and Samaritan MSS. in the British Museum":— Or. 2,452 (p. 11); Or. 2,459-60 (p. 21); Or. 2,456 (p. 42); Or. 2,453 (p. 69); Or. 2454 (p. 72); Or. 2,455 (p. 85). The first three are Biblical; the fourth contains Persian glosses on Maimonides' ספר המדע; the fifth Jāmī's Yusuf and Sulaikha, etc.; the sixth is a Vocabulary of difficult words in the Bible, with explanations in Persian; and the last is a treatise on compound medicaments, preceded by a calendar for the reading of the Torah and פתרון חלומות.

G. Margoliouth.

THE SAMARITAN LITURGY, AND READING OF THE LAW.

I.

IT is not intended to attempt here a description of Samaritan literature, a satisfactory account of which is to be found elsewhere,[1] nor even to deal exhaustively with the liturgical section of it, but simply to call attention (so far as is possible within the limits of an article) to some of the chief points of interest in the latter. With the exception of the few hymns published by Gesenius in 1824, and the fuller selection of Dr. M. Heidenheim in recent years, the Liturgy is only accessible in MSS., so that its extent and elaborate character have not been very generally recognised. To give some idea of this, it may be mentioned that the collection in the Berlin library, for example, consists of some twelve stout quarto volumes—not to mention duplicates. Much of this, of course, is biblical: the rest will shortly be published, with a translation, by the Clarendon Press.

The interest of the compositions consists not in their antiquity, for the earliest date that can be certainly assigned to any is the fourth century C.E., but in the view they present of the religious development of an obscure tribe surrounded by conflicting religious systems, and yet holding aloof from all. The beginning of the Liturgy, as at present constituted, may be safely placed in the time of Baba Rabba, 322 to 362 C.E., who, according to a chronicle,[2]

---

[1] See Nutt, *A Sketch of Samaritan History, Dogma, and Literature*, London, 1874.

[2] Called Eltholideh, of various dates. Edited by Neubauer, with translation, in the *Journal Asiatique*, 1869, p. 385 *seq.*

restored the services of the Synagogue. That some sort of Liturgy was in use previously is indeed probable, and some of the existing prayers, of which no author is named, may have formed part of it; but there is no proof one way or the other. It is more than probable that the earlier Liturgy consisted of passages of the Law almost exclusively. Under the direction of Baba Rabba a new departure was apparently made, a large and important body of prayers and hymns for various occasions being composed by Marqah[1] and Amram Darah. Amram's work is called after him the דראן, and their joint productions form the larger part of the Defter (*διφθέρα*), a common Arabic word for book. Before them stand a few prayers for daily and Sabbath use, whose authors are not named, and also the so-called prayers "of Joshua b. Nun," "of Moses b. Amram," and "of the Holy Angels." These *may* be from the earlier Liturgy. The following from the opening prayer, to be said at the beginning of every service, will give some idea of their general character[2]:—

"I stand before thee at the door of thy mercy, O Lord! my God, and the God of my fathers, to speak forth thy praise and thy manifold greatness, according to my feeble strength, for I know[3] mine infirmity this day, and consider in my heart that thou, Lord, art God in heaven above and upon the earth beneath; there is none else beside him. Wherefore in thy hands I stand, and turn my face towards the chosen place, Mount Gerizim, the house of God, toward Luz, the mount[4] of thine inheritance and of thy presence, the place which thou hast made thy dwelling, O Lord, the

---

[1] Several pieces were published by Heidenheim in his *Vierteljahrsschrift*, *passim*, more in his *Samaritanische Liturgie*, Leipzig, 1885. Part of a commentary by him was edited by Baneth (*Des Samaritaners Marqah . . . Abhandlung*, Berlin, 1888), and another part of the same by E. Munk (*Des Samaritaners Marqah Erzählung, etc.*, Berlin, 1890, *v.* JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW), both from the unique MS. at Berlin.

[2] It is cited as על פתח רחמיך. The text published by Heidenheim, *Op. cit.*, p. 130, is here corrected from two MSS.

[3] Deut. iv. 39. [4] Exod. xv. 17.

sanctuary, O Lord, which thy hand hath fashioned. The Lord shall reign for ever and ever, for great is the Lord above all gods: righteous and upright is he. This, my prayer, is to the Preserver, the Living, for it goeth up to the Unseen, before him who knoweth the unseen things. Where is any God that helpeth his worshippers but thou? Blessed be thy name for ever. There is no God but one!"

The Defter contains by far the most important, the earliest, and most frequently-used pieces. It would seem, in fact, that until the fourteenth century this was a sort of *Corpus Liturgicum*, whence selections were made for special occasions. In the eleventh and twelfth centuries, C.E., this *corpus* was further extended (as was the case with Rabbinical liturgies) by the admission into the Defter of hymns and prayers by Abulhassan (אב חסדה), the Tyrian,[1] who died some time before 1070, and Ab Gelugah (אב גלוגה), about the middle of the twelfth century, possibly a grandson of the former. Considering the miserable condition of the people from the fourth century onward, it is not likely that they produced much liturgical work in the interval, It is not, however, impossible that some has been lost, for even in Samaria they had prayer-book revisers who omitted older and better prayers to make room for the recent compositions of their friends. This was certainly the fate of some of Ab Gelugah's work, for two long prayers of his in *Cod. Vat.* iii. are not found either in the Berlin copy or in the two copies belonging to the Earl of Crawford.[2] This second period, which was poor in liturgical work, was exceedingly rich in theology. Abulhassan himself was the author of polemical and exegetical works, and Abu Said,

---

[1] Eltholideh mentions colonies of Samaritans at Acco, Gaza, Gerar, Cæsarea, Damascus, and in Egypt. Jacob, who wrote the continuation of Eltholideh in the middle of the fourteenth century, was priest at Damascus, and there was a congregation there still in the sixteenth century; but it must have died out soon after.

[2] Or perhaps some of the prayers were only local. Ab Gelugah belonged to Acco.

probably his son, wrote the Arabic version of the Pentateuch.[1]

The third period of liturgical composition began in the fourteenth century. Up to that time, it will be remembered, there existed only the Defter in an extended form; there were no special services, properly speaking, for Feasts or Fasts. The credit of first starting these is due to Pinhas b. Joseph, High Priest at Shechem from 1331 to 1387, a man who, though his sphere of action was restricted, fully deserves the title of "Great." By his own writings and by encouragement of others he gave an impulse to religion and to literature which lasted through the next two centuries, and can hardly be said, even yet, to have entirely died away. To his time and influence belong not only all the special services, but also the *Chronicle of Abulfath*, and other works on grammar, lexicography, theology, and the like.[2] The writers of liturgy, with whom alone we are now concerned, are, of course, unknown ontside the narrow circle of Samaritan history. The most famous are: Abisha, son of the great Pinhas (not to be confounded with the biblical Abisha), an author second only to Marqah in popular esteem; his brother Eleazar, often called, for the sake of distinction, אחי אדונן אבישע; Abisha's son, Pinhas, with his guardian, Abd Allah b. Shelomoh, a prolific writer; and Saad Allah, or Saad ed-Dîn. These all come within the century 1330—1430. The evidence for their dates is very much scattered, but fairly well established. As an instance of the way in which it has to be gathered, and of the curious phenomenon of personal history mixed up with liturgical composition, the following, by Pinhas b. Abisha, from a hymn for the Day of Atonement,

---

[1] For other writers, see Nutt, *op. cit.*, pp. 138, *seqq.* Also Wreschner, *Samaritanische Traditionen*, Berlin, 1888, pp. xvii. *seqq.*, whose conclusions differ from mine in some points.

[2] I am inclined also, with Vilmar (*Abulfalthi Annales*, Gothæ, 1865, p. xxxvi.), to ascribe the "invention" of the famous roll of Abisha to this Pinhas.

may be of interest[1]:—"Before we read in the Book of Moses the Prophet, I will make mention of that which is meet to be remembered; for that which is worthy is stored up in my thoughts, concerning the pious ones (?) your ministers. The head of them is my grandfather Pinhas, and after him came the affliction (*i.e.*, death?) of my father. I saw not his face, and he beheld not my face, nor taught me his words nor the divisions of the Scripture. After him was none left save only my uncle Eleazar. By him I was cherished, and my heart was strengthened. I was left (?) an orphan, yet he ceased not to love me. But behold the star (*i.e.*, Abd Allah b. Shelomoh) who taught me and brought me up! The Lord reward his work with good, and command the blessing upon him!" etc. The next important Liturgist is Abraham (קבצי), early in the sixteenth century—the last, perhaps, who can claim much literary merit. The remaining authors are chiefly indebted to Marqah, Abisha, and the earlier writers for such inspiration as they can show; they are for the most part either members of the Danfi family, as Marjân (also called אב סכוה), and Meshalmah, in the last century; or of the Levitical[2] family, as Tobiah (also called Ghazâl), and his son Shelomoh in the present century. The latest composition I have seen is by Pinhas b. Isaac, written within the last twenty years. The present priest, Jacob b. Aaron b. Shelomoh b. Tobiah, seems to inherit the *scribendi κακόηθες* of his family.

At the risk of being tedious, the above very imperfect list is given to show the range of this class of literature. The names have been identified and dates assigned (in the absence of history) only by a careful examination of the epigraphs of all available MSS.

---

[1] From *MS. Samar.*, *e.* 5 fol. 68^b, in the Bodleian Library. The text is not quite certain, but I have no opportunity of collating it at present.

[2] The "House of Aaron" died out in 1624, up to which time the priest called himself הכהן הגדול The office then went to another branch, the priest being called הכהן הלוי.

Before proceeding to describe the contents of the Liturgy, it may be well to say a word as to their language. All is not Samaritan which comes from Samaria. The name should properly be restricted to the Aramaic dialect of the Targum; that is to say, the language spoken by the Samaritans in the fourth century C.E. Its form, however, is not very well fixed even by Petermann's splendid edition, and a careful examination of his various readings shows not only a great variety of forms and of words, but a distinct Hebraizing tendency in at least one of the MSS. (C.) used.[1] In this dialect are written the compositions of the first Liturgical period, by Marqah, Amram, etc. Since these are numerous, and the MSS. (at least of some texts) are many, it might be thought that they would help considerably in fixing the forms of the dialect. But this is not so. The oldest Liturgical MS. now in Europe (of the Defter, in the Vatican) is not earlier than the fourteenth century, when the dialect had already long been supplanted in popular use by Arabic. Later MSS. vary so much that it is often difficult to decide whether, *e.g.*, לו for לה, כם for כון, and more important differences, are due merely to the carelessness of the scribe. Even when the text is tolerably certain it is often difficult to interpret. The following from a Litany of Marqah will illustrate this. The text, which is quite certain, is :—

תשבחן ורבואן נימר אלא מפּנה מן אכה למן דמורך עד לעלם
חילה מוחי לן מגן ואנן מקנין לה על מגן אן מוחי לן ואן
ממית לן תרתיה בשלטן רבותך :

"Praise and glory let us speak, before we turn away from this place, to him who endureth for ever, the Almighty who giveth us life freely, though we anger him wantonly. Whether thou give us life or death, both are in the power of thy majesty!"

Heidenheim[2] translates אלא מפּנה מן אכה "dem Gotte

[1] These may be due to local differences of translation.

[2] *Vierteljahrsschrift*, vol. ii. (1865), p. 487.

bereitet von dem Vergänglichen." Geiger[1] corrects "without ceasing, from henceforth." Geiger translates חֵילֵה "his strength"; but the word is חֵילָה, "the power," the equivalent in meaning (and probably in sound) of אלה. Heidenheim translates מוחי לן מגן ואנן מקנין לה על מגן, "our protector is destroyed, and we bewail our protector." Both translate תרתיה "thou art merciful."

In the second period (eleventh and twelfth centuries) the language is still Aramaic, but it was by then "a tongue not understanded of the people." It has an admixture of Hebrew, and many words already must be explained from Arabic. In the third period the language is Hebrew, which deteriorates more and more in quality, until it reaches its complete decadence as it approaches our own time. It was clearly in no sense a living language, and was only employed, as among the Jews, because it was the sacred tongue.

We may now pass to the *arrangement* of the religious year, which depends upon the two conjunctions (צמות) of the sun and moon (1.) of Pesah, (2.) of Succoth. The calculation of these is so important that, according to Ben Manir (*MS. Samar.* E. 2, fol. 13*b*., in the Bodleian Library), the secret of it comes down preserved "from the days of the creation, from the angels to the father of mankind, from Noah to Shem and Eber, to Abraham, the son of Terah, to him who dwelt at Gerar, to him who said, 'How dreadful,' to Moses, who received the Law, to Aaron, the venerable priest, to Eleazar, who offered the incense, to Phinehas, who stayed the plague, and set up the calculation on Mount Gerizim, by the oak of Moreh," etc. But the word צמות not only meant the conjunction of sun and moon, which regulates the beginning of the month, it has the secondary meaning of an assembly of the congregation, for the purpose of paying the half-shekel (Exod. xxx. 13). "Why is it called צמות?" says Abisha. "Because in it

[1] *Z. d. M. G.*, xxi., p. 181.

Israel are gathered together in their assemblies, which are hallowed, ... and they take and give every man a ransom for his soul."[1]

Taking the festivals in order, there is then a special service for the Sabbath of the צמות of Pesah,[2] which is פתח מועדי יי—for the first of Nisan—for Pesah and Mazzoth—for the six Sabbaths following—for Pentecost (חמשין). In the latter part of the year there is the Sabbath of the צמות of Succoth—the first of Tishri,[3] שבתון זכרון תרועה מקרא קודש—the ten penitential days, יומי הסליחות—the great Day of Atonement, when the service lasts the whole of the twenty-four hours, the whole Law is read, and at the end of it they exhibit the great roll said to have been written by Abisha, in the thirteenth year after the children of Israel entered Canaan. Then follow the seven days of Succoth and the festival of the eighth day of Succoth, called וחו חתמת מועדי יי-מועד השמיני.[4] For each of these occasions (except the Day of Atonement) there is a short form of evening prayer, a form for the morning prayer, and generally, as for ordinary Sabbaths, a form for the out-going (מפוק) of the festival. On the great festivals of Pesah, Mazzoth, Hamsîn, and Succoth, they make a חג, or pilgrimage to the sacred mountain, Gerizim. An interesting account of the חג הפסח, when the Paschal sacrifice is still slain, and the lambs eaten on Mount Gerizim, is given by Mills,[5] who witnessed the ceremony in 1860. The services

---

[1] During a visit I paid to Nâblus in the spring of this year, the priest informed me that the צמות of Pesah was to commemorate the meeting of Moses and Aaron (Exod. iv. 27), and that of Succoth in memory of the death of Aaron. The צמות falls two lunar months before the festival from which it has its name; or rather the date of the festival depends on the date of the צמות.

[2] See below, in the order for the Reading of the Law.

[3] They do not use the ceremony of the *Shophar*.

[4] There is no mention of שמחת תורה, but they begin the Law on the Sabbath after מועד השמיני: see below.

[5] *Nablus and the Modern Samaritans*, pp. 248 *seqq*.

for the three other pilgrimages are much alike. That for the חג המצות directs that "the people and the elders shall assemble at the door of the synagogue before dawn," when certain parts of the Law are recited. Then they march up the mountain to the twelve stones which they believe to have been placed there by Joshua, according to Deut. xxvii. 4, reading Gerizim for Ebal. Taking off their shoes (for it is holy ground) "they shall approach them and bow down and kiss them"; then, after several prayers, "they shall descend to the altar of Adam," reciting the passage from Marqah's Litany, quoted above (p. 126)—thence to the altar of Seth, the altar of Isaac, and the altar of Noah, where the service comes to an end.

The other festival services resemble one another in their general plan. They open with the קטף (see below); then follow certain general prayers, among others the על פתח רחמיך quoted above, then sections of the Law usually accompanied by parts of the Durrân or Marqah. Next come short ascriptions of praise (ישתבח) interspersed with either passages of the law or hymns. Here is an example of a ישתבח from the service for the צמות הסכות: "The God of gods in his greatness blessed and sanctified this day of the Sabbath of the conjunction, which is the gate of the feasts of the Lord, which he appointed by the hand of the great prophet Moses, the man of God. Happy art thou, O holy people! if thou pray with heart and soul and say earnestly: And the Lord God planted [then the readers answer] A garden in Eden . . . ." Then follow more passages from the Law, and afterwards the distinctive part of the service, hymns specially composed for the occasion. Besides the festival services, there are special prayers for marriage, circumcision, and burial. The קטף, a great feature of the Liturgies, requires some description. The following is a specimen from the beginning of the קטף הזכרון: "and God remembered Noah and every living thing (Gen. viii. 1); and I will remember my covenant which is between me and you (Gen. ix. 15), and I

will look upon it that I may remember the everlasting covenant' to the end[1] (Gen. ix. 16); and God remembered Abraham (Gen. xix. 29); and God remembered Rachel (Gen. xxx. 22)," and so on. It will be seen that it simply consists of biblical passages containing a mention of remembering, strung together without any connection. Sometimes the קטף is made up of whole verses, sometimes, as in this specimen, of short fragments. Various explanations of these selections have been proposed. Perhaps the truth may be that they served originally, when the Liturgy consisted chiefly of biblical passages, as headings of the parts to be recited (something like the Talmudic סימנים), and that afterwards, when the services grew in length, the headings only were read.

Now even a cursory inspection of the contents of the festival services in the light of the chronology here sketched will show that they date no farther back, as mentioned above, than the fourteenth century. The question then arises, Whence came the plan of these special services, and whence the views expressed in the later hymns? A few passages in answer to the latter question may perhaps indicate the answer to the former. If the Samaritans, while priding themselves on observing the law in every detail, did not develop certain doctrines till late in their history, the Pentateuch cannot indicate them with any clearness. But it is well known that the Samaritans reject all the Jewish Canon except the five books of Moses;[2] and from the fact that they have no dealings with the Jews, it is generally supposed that they have no acquaintance with Jewish literature either canonical or rabbinical. If it can be shown that the contrary is true, we shall be justified in suspecting that most of the later developments of doctrine, which they hold in common with the Jews, as

[1] *I.e.*, to the end of the *section*: see note 2 on the Order for reading the Law.

[2] Their book of Joshua, in Arabic, is quite different from the biblical book, and comparatively late.

well as the general plan of the liturgy, may be referred to Jewish sources. The Talmudic passages relating to intercourse with Samaritans have been often quoted,[1] so that it is unnecessary to go into them here. Let us see what evidence there is from the Samaritan side. It is admitted that their Targum[2] bears some relation to Onqelos, and Abu Said (11th century) was evidently indebted to Saadiah in making his version. He was in fact led to translate the Law because he found the people using Saadiah's work, under the impression that it was by Abulhassan.

But even in the 14th century, when it might be supposed that there was less intercourse, we find the same. In the "Legends of Moses,"[3] reference is made to Moses Maimonides, who is cursed as a heretic and perverter of the Law: and the history of Saul, David and Solomon is noticed, with an endeavour to cast discredit upon them. The last is especially singled out for condemnation as being the cause of schism in Israel by building the "rival" Temple at Jerusalem. In the same treatise a passage of Isaiah (ii. 3), כי מציון תצא תורה ודבר יי מירושלם, is quoted and explained in the sense that "the true law shall desert Jerusalem, the abode of falsehood," and thus the passage is made to bear a meaning agreeable to Samaritan bitterness. Heidenheim in his notes,[4] points out several parallels in the "Legends" with Rabbinical literature, and argues that the writer had a good knowledge of Midrash. He also thinks that the use of the phrase "Ancient of Days" shows an acquaintance with the book of Daniel—but it may perhaps be derived rather from the Kabbala, a knowledge of which is, from other places, probable. By far the most remark-

---

[1] See Nutt, *op. cit.*, pp. 42 and 43, note.

[2] The date of the Samaritan Targum can no more be fixed than that of Onqelos. Traces, however, already occur in Marqah of the existence of some sort of Targum, though it was perhaps only oral.

[3] Translated by Dr. Leitner in Heidenheim's *Vierteljahrsschrift*, vol. iv., pp. 184 *seqq.*

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 212.

able, however, in this connection is a commentary by an unknown author, on part of Genesis.[1] It was written in Arabic in 1053 C.E. The author quotes in Hebrew illustrative passages from the books of Joshua, Samuel, Kings, Isaiah, Ezekiel, Psalms, Job, Nehemiah, and Chronicles, besides the Mishna. His quotations are adduced for grammatical, not doctrinal or polemical, purposes. Again, Abulfath, in compiling his Chronicle in 1356, seems to have made a careful study of the historical books of the Bible, even going so far as to imitate the phraseology of the Hebrew original in some cases.[2] Somewhat later the commentator Ibrahim quotes Eccl. xii. 7: והרוח תשוב אל האלהים אשר נתנה לנו, and Ezek. xxii. 22: כהתוך כסף בתוך כור. The same willingness to borrow (of course without acknowledgment) may be observed in the Liturgies. In a hymn for the Day of Atonement, Abd Allah b. Shelomoh says: השמים מספרים וגם כל הבוראים כבוד יי ומעשיו הנוראים יגידו לנו בנסתרים ונגלאים כי גדול יי מכל האלהים · "The heavens declare, and also all creation, the glory of the Eternal; and his terrible works show to us, in things hidden and revealed, that the Eternal is great above all gods." Cf. Psalm xix. 2: השמים מספרים כבוד אל ומעשה ידיו מגיד הרקיע. The words וגם כל הבוראים look as though they had been added by Abd Allah to complete the thought which he considered inadequately expressed in the Psalm. In the same hymn he says: איך עשית בלא יד שמים ושמיהם ואיך בראת בדבר לכל צבאותם, "Hast not thou made without hands the heavens and their heavens, and created by a word all the host of them?" Cf. Ps. xxxiii. 6: בדברי יי שמים נעשו וברוח פיו כל צבאם. Farther on, in the same hymn, he says: אלהינו קרוב לאשר ידרוש אתו, "Our God is nigh unto him that seeketh him," as Ps. cxlv. 18: קרוב יי לכל קראיו לכל אשר יקראהו באמת. But Abd Allah may have been copying from Amram, whose words are

---

[1] Published by Dr. Neubauer in *Journ. Asiat.*, for 1873.

[2] See *Vilmar, op. cit.*, p. xcviii., and cf. pp. lviii and lxxxviii. *seq.*

nearer to the Psalm: צלואן בקשט לשמך יתמרן·····קריב אתה לסגודיך, "Prayers shall be made unto thy name in truth . . . . thou art nigh unto them that worship thee." The whole of this hymn of Abd Allah is exceptionally full of Biblical parallels. He seems, like other writers, to have known Ps. cxlv. thoroughly, perhaps from the fact of its popularity among the Jews.[1] In a hymn of Abisha we read: הראש לכל חכמה והעקבה היא יראת דכונן עלמה, "The beginning of all wisdom and the end thereof is the fear of him who fashioned the world." Cf. Prov. i. 7: יראת יי ראשית דעת (Targ.: ראש חכמתא דחלתא דיי׳) and Prov. iii. 19: יי בחכמה יסד ארץ כונן שמים — the two having been read together.

Coincidences of thought are of course commoner. In some hymns in the Defter addressed to the Law (כתבה רבה) the writer says: זאן אתה לשמעיך חיים ומכלל אמוריך חסד, "Thou feedest with life them that hear thee, and crownest with grace them that read thee." Farther on: כל רגז רב אתה ממתן כל אסו בגללך אתו, "Every great plague thou makest to cease: all healing cometh through thee." In the next hymn: הו אסותן דחייה הו מדכי רוחיה הו מקדש נפשאתה הו דממיר לבביה, "It is the healing of life: it cleanseth the spirit: it halloweth the soul: it converteth the heart." So in the hymn which follows, it is called קוממה דחיינו, "The restoring of our life," and ממלל דחיי, "The word of life." The similarity of these hymns to Ps. cxix. in general is so striking, that it is sufficient to mention the fact; but other passages may also be compared, as Ps. xix. 8 *seq.*: תורת יי תמימה משיבת נפש פקודי יי ישרים משמחי לב מצות יי ברה מאירת עינים יראת יי טהורה וגו׳. So the Law is called often כתיב נהיר. It is curious to observe that on Ps. xix. 8, Rashi says of the Torah: גם היא מאירה כשמש וכו׳, and refers to Prov. vi. 23, while the Samaritan writer of the hymn quoted goes on to say, without much

[1] Talm. *B. Berach.*, 4*b*, כל האומר תהלה לדוד בכל יום שלש פעמים מובטח לו שהוא בן העולם הבא :

consequence of thought: ליתו ד׳מי ׳למאוריה דאנון כסין וגלין כל יום דו·····מניר בלילה ואימה, "It (the Torah) is not like the lights (of heaven), for they set and rise every day, but this is the great roll which gives light among us night and day." It looks as though he had read Rashi's comment and was anxious to correct his comparison, since elsewhere the Torah is compared to the sun.

These passages are only meant as a slight indication of the extent of the Samaritan debt to Jewish literature, which will become more evident on a careful study of the texts. Nor is this surprising. Jewish literature was easily accessible at least to the learned among Samaritan writers, and through their means the later Jewish teaching, by its harmony with the divine law, could not fail eventually to gain general acceptance. Much might be written on this gradual development of the implicit teaching of the Torah; but the source of a doctrine is often difficult to trace, while the borrowing of a phrase is more easily detected, and it is for this reason that the above instances only are here chosen.

II.

The order for reading the Law may suitably be added to the above remarks on the Liturgies. After the learned articles of Dr. Büchler, which lately appeared in this Review, it will perhaps not be uninteresting to notice the Samaritan system, as the subject has not been hitherto treated. The text, of which the following is a translation, is in Arabic, prefixed to a MS. (Petermann, i.) of the Samaritan Pentateuch, in the Royal Library at Berlin. I copied it during my last visit there, and give it here precisely as in the text (though the Hebrew quotations are not always exact) only adding the references and numbering the Sabbaths, for convenience. The text is dated A.H. 1172. The cycle, it will be observed, is for one year.

"If God will! We will set forth in this place the arrangement of the order of the holy Law, according to the Sabbath days every year, the course whereof has continued from the earliest times unto our day. This is the order of each book severally. The order of the first book in an ordinary year is for thirteen Sabbaths, beginning with the last Sabbath of the seventh month [Tishri]; that is to say, the Sabbath immediately succeeding the festival of the eighth, and ending with the last Sabbath of the tenth month. But when the first of the seventh month falls on a Friday, then a fifth Sabbath is reckoned in that month, and an additional division is necessary, because the sections must suffice for two Sabbaths in the seventh month, namely, the fourth and fifth Sabbaths. If there be a fifth Sabbath in the eighth, or ninth, or tenth month, then the aforementioned extra section will be necessary, making fourteen Sabbaths. When the first of the seventh month is a Sabbath, the extra division is not necessary, because in that case the order is only begun on the fifth Sabbath. But God knows best.[1] This is the complete division of the first book in an ordinary year, as follows:—

(1) From בראשית to וידע אדם, Gen. iv. 25; (2) from וידע אדם to אל לבו, viii. 21[2]; (3) from אל לבו to לך לך, xii. 1; (4) from לך לך to ויהי אברהם (*sic*) xvii. 1; (5) from ויהי

---

[1] This is to say, if Tishri 1st be a Sabbath, then the eighth day of Succoth (Tishri 22nd), will be the fourth Sabbath of the month. But it is laid down above that the law is to be begun on the Sabbath after Tishri 22nd. Hence the fifth Sabbath of Tishri only necessitates an extra subdivision when Tishri 1st is a Friday.

[2] The Samaritan text of the Law is divided into sections (קצין), which are carefully marked in all MSS., and their total number given at the end of each book. In doubtful cases, as here, this division is important, since they always end the lesson with the end of a section, and the words quoted in the text, are always the beginning of a new section, except when the first words are not distinctive. Hence this אל לבו cannot be Gen. vi. 6, where the words end the section, but must mean the section beginning אל לבו (ויאמר יי), viii. 21, in the middle of the verse. The קצין are given in Walton's Polyglot, and in Petermann's Targum, but not in Blayney.

אברהם to ויי פקד, xxi. 1; (6) from ויי פקד to ואברהם זקן, xxiv. 1; (7) from ואברהם זקן to ואלה תולדת יצחק, xxv. 19; (8) from ואלה תולדת יצחק to וישא יעקב רגליו, xxix. 1; (9) from וישא יעקב רגליו to ותצא דינה, xxxiv. 1; (10) from ותצא דינה to ויוסף הוֹרִד, xxxix. 1; (11) when there is no additional Sabbath, as explained, the lesson shall be from ויוסף הוֹרִד to ויבא יוסף הבירתה, xliii. 26; but when there is the additional Sabbath, the lesson shall be from ויוסף הוֹרִד to וליוסף ילידו, xli. 50; and (11*a*) from וליוסף ילידו to ויבא יוסף הבירתה, xliii. 26; (12) from ויבא יוסף הבירתה to אֵל שדי, xlviii. 3; (13) from אֵל שדי to the end of the book.

As regards the order of the Holy Law in an intercalated year, the first book shall then be divided between eighteen Sabbaths, beginning in the 7th month and continuing to the last Sabbath of the 11th month, including the fifth Sabbath which must fall in one of the five months, to wit: the 7th, 8th, 9th, 10th, or 11th month. But a subdivision is made at וליוסף ילידו to allow for the fifth Sabbath, whether it be in an ordinary or an intercalated year.

The following is the division of the first book in an intercalated year:—

(1) From בראשית to והאדם ידע, Gen. iv. 1; (2) from והאדם to ואני הנני ידע, iv. 17; (3) from ואני הנני to אל לבו, viii. 21; (4) from אל לבו to לֶךְ לך, xii. 1; (5) from לֶךְ לך to ויהי אברם, xvii. 1; (6) from ויהי אברם to ויי פקד, xxi. 1; (7) from ויי פקד to ואברהם זקן, xxiv. 1; (8) from ואברהם זקן to ואלה תולדת יצחק, xxv. 19; (9) from ואלה תולדת יצחק to וישא יעקב רגליו, xxix. 1; (10) from וישא יעקב רגליו to ויקם יעקב, xxxi. 17; (11) from ויקם יעקב to ותצא דינה, xxxiv. 1; (12) from ותצא דינה to וישב יעקב, xxxvii. 1; (13) from וישב יעקב to ויוסף הוֹרִד, xxxix. 1; (14) from ויוסף הוֹרִד to וליוסף ילידו, xli. 50; (15) from וליוסף ילידו to ויבא יוסף הבירתה, xliii. 26; (16) from ויבא יוסף הבירתה to ואלה שמות, xlvi. 8; (17) from ואלה שמות to אֵל שדי, xlviii. 3; (18) from אֵל שדי to the end. Throughout the reading of the first book shall be said, after the lesson, the first[1] שמור את יום

[1] The text has "second" erased, "first" being written in the margin.

השבת, Exod. xx. 8 (where the Samaritan text has שמור for זכור).

In some intercalated years it happens that there are two fifth Sabbaths, the first of them when the 7th month begins on Friday, and the second occurring in the 11th month. When this happens a further division, besides the above, will be necessary, and it shall take place at בן פרת, thus: from אל שדי, xlviii. 3, to בן פרת, xlix. 22, and from בן פרת to the end. But this is of rare occurrence. And God most High is above all and knows all!

The order of the second book is for eight Sabbaths beginning with the first Sabbath of the 11th month and extending to the last Sabbath of the 12th month. If the year contain an intercalary month the Sabbaths are to be reckoned in the 12th month and in the last month. If a fifth Sabbath fall in one of the two months in which this book is read, then the order is for nine Sabbaths: the place (of the extra division) being ויסע משה, Exod. xv. 22. The following is the order of the second book:—

(14) From אלה שמות to כי ידבר, Exod. vii. 9 (8); (15) from כי ידבר to ואל אהרן, xii. 1. On these two Sabbaths, after the lesson, shall be said also the first שמור, Exod. xx. 8; (16) from ואל אהרן to בחדש השלישי, xix. 1. This is the section appointed for the day of the conjunction (*i.e.*, צמות הפסח), and after the section is to be read כי תשא, Exod. xxx. 12. If there be a fifth Sabbath, as mentioned, the lesson shall be from ואל אהרן to ויסע משה, xv. 22, and (16*a*) from ויסע משה to בחדש השלישי, xix. 1; (17) from בחדש השלישי to ויקחו לי תרומה, xxv. 2; (18) from ויקחו לי תרומה to וזה הדבר, xxix. 1; (19) from וזה הדבר to ויתן אל משה, xxxi. 18; (20) from ויתן אל משה to ויעש את הקרשים, xxxvi. 20; (21) from ויעש את הקרשים to the end. From the Sabbath after the conjunction to the lesson וזה הדבר, there shall be said after the lesson, ואתה דבר, Ex. xxxi. 13, and on the last (of those) Sabbaths (*i.e.* No. 19) the passage mentioned closes the lesson, and the reader shall read with a loud voice מחלליה מות יומת, xxxi. 14, and the congregation shall finish the

reading from the place ושמרו בני ישראל את השבת, xxxi. 16, to the end of the passage. On the last two Sabbaths (*i.e.* Nos. 20 and 21), after the lesson, shall be said דבר אל כל עדת, Lev. xix. 2.

The order of the third book is for eight Sabbaths, every year, without addition or exception. They are the first two Sabbaths of the first month (Nisan) and the six Sabbaths in Hamâsîn, ending with the Sabbath of Amalek. The order is as follows:—

(22) From ויקרא אל משה to צוי את אהרן, Lev. vi. 2; (23) from צוי את אהרן to וישא אהרן, ix. 22. On these two Sabbaths, after the lesson, is to be said מועדי, xxiii. 2.[1] (24) from וישא אהרן to the first ואיש או אשה, xiii. 38; (25) from ואיש או אשה to אחרי, xvi. 1; (26) from אחרי to ובקצירכם, xix. 9; (27) from ובקצירכם to מועדי, xxiii. 2; (28) from מועדי to אם בחקותי, xxvi. 3; (29) from אם בחקותי to the end. On the Sabbath of חים, the Sabbath of מרה, the Sabbath of אילים and the Sabbath of המן, after the lesson, shall be said וספרתם, xxiii. 15. On the Sabbath of הצור and the Sabbath of עמלק, after the lesson, shall be said שבעה שבעות, Deut. xvi. 9.

The order of the fourth book is for eight Sabbaths, but in some years it extends over only seven Sabbaths, namely, when no fifth Sabbath falls in any of the first four months, for the beginning of this book takes place on the Sabbath next after the festival of the Pilgrimage of the Harvest (מועד חג הקציר), and extends to the first Sabbath of the fifth month, as follows:—

(30) From במדבר סיני to נשא את ראש בני קהת, Num. iv. 2; (31) from נשא את ראש בני קהת to דבר אל אהרן, viii. 2 (1). On those two Sabbaths, after the lesson, shall be said דבר אל אהרן; (32) from דבר אל אהרן to שלח לך, xiii. 2; (33) from שלח לך to ויקח קרח, xvi. 1; (34) from ויקח קרח to וישלח משה מלאכים, xx. 14; (35) from וישלח משה מלאכים to פנחס, xxvi. 11 (10). On these four Sabbaths, after the

[1] Then follow Pesah and Mazzoth, with their proper lessons.

lessons, shall be said צוֹי את קרבני, xxviii. 2; (36) from פנחס to ויהי המלקח, xxxi. 32; (37) from ויהי המלקח to the end of the book. On these two Sabbaths, after the lesson, shall be said the second שמור, Deut. v. 12, to the end of the section (ver. 15). If there be no fifth Sabbath in any of the four months named above, the lesson, from פנחס to the end of the book, shall be taken as one.—And God is more wise!

The following is the order of the fifth book for eight Sabbaths, beginning with the second Sabbath of the 5th month and extending to the second Sabbath of the 7th month, called the Sabbath of Hiscantî.[1] If a fifth Sabbath fall in the 5th or 6th month, the order shall be for nine Sabbaths, dividing at בנים אתם (xiv. 1). In some years this Sabbath, called Hiscantî, does not occur, because, when the first of the 7th month falls on a Thursday, it (Hiscantî) coincides with the Day of Atonement; and if the first of the 7th month fall on a Sabbath, it (Hiscantî) will be the Sabbath of the ten days of Penitence. In such case the order of the fifth book will be for seven Sabbaths, and the completion of the Holy Law will take place on the last Sabbath of the 6th month, and its lesson will be increased so as to finish the book, from היום הזה to the end of the Holy Law.[2]

The order is as follows:—

(38) From אלה הדברים to ראו למדתי, Deut. iv. 5, and after the lesson is to be said the second שמור, Deut. v. 12; (39) from ראו למדתי to כי יביאכם, vii. 1. This is the lesson appointed for the day of the conjunction (*i.e.*, צמות הסכות). In the last section of it, והיה כי ישאלך, vi. 20, the reader shall read with a loud voice אשר נשבע יי לאבותינו, ver. 23, and the congregation shall finish it together, with a loud voice,

---

[1] הסכנת should stand for הַסְכַּנְתָּ, but it apparently has some reference to Num. xxii. 30 (הַסְכַּנְתִּי), the only place in the Pentateuch where the word occurs.

[2] The first Sabbath of the 7th month, having a proper lesson in any case, is not counted.

from ויצונו, ver. 24, to the end of the passage. After that they say כי תשא, Exod. xxx. 12; (40) from כי יביאכם to כי אתם עברים, xi. 31; (41) from כי אתם עברים to שופטים, xvi. 18. When there occurs a fifth Sabbath, as mentioned above, the lesson shall be from כי אתם עברים to בנים אתם, xiv. 1, and (41*a*) from בנים אתם to שופטים, xvi. 18; (42) from שופטים to the first כי יקח איש אשה, xxii. 13; (43) from כי יקח איש אשה to היום הזה, xxvi. 16; (44) from היום הזה to והיה כי יבאו, xxx. 1; (45) from והיה כי יבאו to the end of the Holy Law. If the order happen to be for seven Sabbaths, as afore mentioned, then the (last) lesson shall be from היום הזה to the end of the Law. And God is more wise!

After the Sabbath of the conjunction, shall be said at the end of the lesson וישכן, Deut. xxxiii. 28 (?), and on the Sabbath of the lesson כי יקח איש אשה (No. 43), the end of which is the passage כי תכלה xxvi. 12-15, the reader shall read with a loud voice, עשיתי ככל אשר צויתני (ver. 14), and the congregation shall finish it together from השקיפה ממעון קדשך (ver. 15) to the end of the passage. And God most High is above all and knows all!"

A. Cowley.

THE IDEAL MINISTER OF THE TALMUD.

Talmud Babli, Taanith, Mishnah, 15*a*, *Gemara* 16*a and b.*

Introduction.

MISHNAH.—What is the order of service for the [seven][1] fasts ?

They brought the Ark [containing the Scrolls of the Law] into an open place of the city and sprinkled ashes upon it, and upon the head of the Prince, and upon the head of the Chief of the Beth Din, and every man placed ashes upon his own head. An Elder said before them words of great solemnity : — " Our brethren, it is not said of the men of Nineveh, ' And God saw their sackcloth and their fasting '; but, ' And God saw their works that they turned from their evil way '; and in Holy Writ it is said, ' Rend your hearts and not your garments.' "

They stood in prayer, and brought before the Ark an Elder who was qualified, and who had children, and whose house was free from transgression, so that his heart should be perfect in prayer, and he said before them twenty-four blessings — the eighteen blessings of the Amedah, and added six thereto ; and these are they :—

זכרונות שופרות

" In my distress I cried unto the Lord, and he heard me " ;

" I will lift up mine eyes unto the hills . . . " ;

" Out of the depths have I cried unto thee, O Lord " ; " A prayer of the afflicted when he is overwhelmed."

---

[1] These seven fasts were appointed by the Sanhedrin to follow a series of six in the event of the continuance of the drought in Palestine.]

Rabbi Judah says he need not say זכרונות and שופרות; but he could say in their place:—

"If there be in the land famine, if there be pestilence";

"The word of the Lord that came to Jeremiah concerning the dearth."

And he completed them in the following manner:—

For the first he said:—"He who answered Abraham on Mount Moriah, may he answer you, and listen to the voice of your cry this day. Blessed art thou, O Lord, who redeemest Israel."

For the second he said:—"He who answered our fathers by the Red Sea, may he answer you, and listen to the voice of your cry this day. Blessed art thou, O Lord, who rememberest forgotten things."

For the third he said:—"He who answered Joshua in Gilgal, may he answer you, and listen to the voice of your cry this day. Blessed art thou, O Lord, who hearest the trumpet-blast."

For the fourth he said:—"He who answered Samuel in Mizpah, may he answer you, and listen to the voice of your cry this day. Blessed art thou, O Lord, who hearest cries."

For the fifth he said:—"He who answered Elijah on Mount Carmel, may he answer you, and listen to the voice of your cry this day. Blessed art thou, O Lord, who hearest prayer."

For the sixth he said:—"He who answered Jonah from the whale, may he answer you, and listen to the voice of your cry this day. Blessed art thou, O Lord, who answerest in the time of sorrow."

For the seventh[1] he said:—"He who answered David, and Solomon, his son, in Jerusalem, may he answer you, and listen to the voice of your cry this day. Blessed art thou, O Lord, who hast compassion upon the earth" . . .

GEMARA.— . . . The Rabbis have learnt:—"They

---

[1] The introduction of the "seventh" is explained in the Gemara.

stood in prayer." Even if he were an Elder, and a man of learning, they did not appoint him unless he was qualified.

Who was qualified ?

The Ideal Minister

(Suggested by the reply of the Gemara).

Behold him humble and with nought of wealth,
Except the righteousness within his soul
And knowledge which adorns his noble mind,
More precious than the riches of the earth.
Gentle and meek and lowly in his ways,
Knowing his wisdom comes not from himself.
Labour despising not nor scorning toil,
The curse of labour to a blessing turns.
And he hath children, fashioning his heart
Unto the feelings of a father's love,
So that with fervour and with earnestness
He prayeth for the sons of other men ;
And unto all he is compassionate
As hath a father pity on his son.
Closed are his portals to unrighteousness,
Guilt findeth not a place beneath his roof,
His fame is perfect and his name unstained,
From youth through life's career unknown to sin.
Unto the people ever welcome he,
For there dwells that in him which lures the heart,
A perfect and a wondrous sympathy,
Embracing all their sorrows and their joys ;
Breathing the word of comfort in their woe,
Rejoicing in the welfare of their lives.
What can surpass the sweetness of his voice,
Revealing all the beauty of his soul ;

Unto his heedful hearers, gathered round,
Intoning solemn words of holiness.
Enthralled they listen when he reads the Law;
The sacred words sink deep in every heart,
And leave an impress of authority,
Holding them there with true and mighty force.
They hear from him the Prophet's holy words,
The thunder of their warning and reproach,
The bitter lamentation for their sin,
The pleadings and the promises of good;
And in the sound outpouring from his lips,
They seem to hear the Prophet's voice again.
And when he reads the books of Holy Writ,
Telling of glory which hath passed away,
His throbbing heart wells forth in song so sweet,
It seems an echo of the voice Divine,
Inspiring them with hope that yet once more
The glory will return which hath been theirs.
His lips are steeped in wisdom handed down
In golden links unbroke from sire to son,
Long treasured race-traditions old and dear,
To be preserv'd through ages yet unborn.
Speaking in glowing words of metaphor,
He shows the beauty of their ancient faith.
His prayers mount up like incense from the shrine,
And bear a people's anguish to the Throne.
And when he stands before the sacred Ark,
A thousand prayers unite and rise as one.
This is the chosen Minister of God,
To lead his people in the righteous way;
Yet not alone a picture of the mind,
A dream of what a minister must be,
Behold the Rabbis in their wisdom gazed
On Rabbi Iscah, Immi's noble son.

NINA DAVIS.

AGADATH SHIR HASHIRIM.

(*Concluded from* Vol. VI., p. 697).

[פרשה ב׳]

א) **אני חבצלת השרון** · שהיא נאה כך ישראל נאים במעשיהם מכל האומות ד״א אני חבצלת השרון אין השרון אלא שהיא שרה למקום · למי שברא את העולם · שושנת העמקים · שאין שושנה בעולם נאה אלא שושנת העמקים · כדרך שהשושנה נאה כך ישר׳ נאים בזמן הבכורים שהיה שבט יהודה מביא והשיר בראשם ועטרה של זהב (126*a*) בראשן · הגיעו למקדש היו השלוחין מעטרין את בכוריהן הקריבו · היו מביאים ענבים ותאינים ותמרים והשיר היה מכה לפניהם והיו הסגנים והפחות והגיזברין עומדין מפניהם · הגיעו לעזרה היו הלוים מכין בשיר ואומר׳ אודך יי׳ כי דיליתני מאד · לכך נאמר אני חבצלת השרון שושנת העמקים שממנו שבח למי שברא העולם : ד״א אני חבצלת השרון · אימתי שרו ישר׳ למקום כיון שעלו ישר׳ מן הים · אמרו שירה · ויש או׳ שושנת עמקים · זה היה נחשון שירד לתוך הים והיה מהלך במים עד שהגיעו המים בחוטמו · שנ׳ הושיעני אלהים כי באו מים עד נפש : ויש או׳ שושנת העמקים בשעה שירדו ישר׳ לתוך הים בעימקי הים נכפפו מי בראשיהם עליהם והיו הימים בימינם ובשמאלם על גביהו · התחילו ישר׳ בוכים ומצטערין · ואו׳ מה מתונים והטעה כל הקהל הזה · או׳ הקב״ה עשיתי נסים לעמי ולא ידעו קח המטה אשר בידך והכה את הים וקרב הכיפין של מים ויחזרו המים למקומן וכך עשה משה · ומניין לך שכך היה הרי חבקוק מפרשת נקבת במטיו ראש פרזיו ישערו להפיצני · אותה שעה העלה עליהם המקום וימרו על ים סוף ולא עשו אלא נותנין אחת מרגליהן ביבשה ואחת על הים והיו אומר׳ שירה · לכך נאמר אני חבצלת השרון : ד״א זה אברהם ששר למקום כשעלה מן כבשן האש · לכך נאמר חבצלת השרון : ד״א זה חנניה מישאל ועזריה ששרו למקום בשעה שעלו מתוך כבשן האש : ד״א זה דניאל כשעה שעלה מגוב אריות :

ב) **כשושנה בין החוחים** כדרך שהשושנה נאה בין החוחים · כך ישר' נאים בין האומות · אימתי נאים בשעה שעלו וצהלו ממצר' כחבצלת : ד"א כשושנה בין החוחים אימתי השושנה נאה כשהיא נראית למעלה מן החוחים אם נתחייבה (126*b*) השושנה הרוח ישבת בחוחים והן מכים אתה :

ג) **וכתפוח בעצי היער** וג' · מה התפוח הזה כשאדם רואה אותו בסתיו אינו מכירו כיון שהוא מוציא עליו הנץ קודם את העלין · כך היו ישר' עד שלא עמדו לפני הר סיני · כך קדמו ישר' המעשה לשמיעה ואמרו כל אשר דבר יי' נעשה ונשמע : ד"א כתפוח בעצי היער וגו' הרי ישר' אמרו למקום כדרך שהתפוח הזה נאה בתוך אילני סרק כך ברקונו של ע"ז לא היה מואב ועמון וצידון · לקיים מה שנ' בצילו חמדתי וישבתי ופריו מתוק לחיכי · אני חמדתי לדברי תורתך לא אתה כפפת אותי לא דומה בא לו מנוס לבא מעצמו · נחמדנו לישב בצילך · ופריו מתוק לחכי · אלו דברי תורה לקיים מה שנ' ממני פריך נמצא :

ד) **הביאני אל בית היין** זה דורו של משיח ודגלו עלי אהבה אילו האבות :

ה) **סמכוני באשישות** וג' · מה החולה הזה מצפה להרווחה כך ישר' מצפין לגאולה : ד"א למה נמשלו ישר' לחולה מה החולה אינו אוכל לא דבילה ולא פת בריא אלא פת חמה מיני · כך הדור הזה אינו מבקש מסכות ולא קולין וחמורין אלא טעמי האגדות ושיחת חכמים :

ו) **שמאלו תחת לראשי** · וימינו תחבקיני · זה משה כמה שנ' מוליך לימין משה זרוע תפארתו : ד"א שמאלו תחת לראשי שבח לפני הקב"ה · השמאל מרחקת והימין מקרבת : ד"א שמאלי תחת לראשי אילו ענני כבוד שהיו מקיפין ישר' מלמעלה ומלמטה :

ז) **השבעתי אתכם בנות ירושלם** · איזה אהבה זה ירושלם שאמר הקב"ה לישר' בניתם את בית המקדש וחרב לא תבנו עוד עד שתשמעו קול מן השמים · לקיים מה שנ' כנשוא גם הרים וכתקוע שופר תשמעו : אם תעירו אם תעוררו וגו' השבי' הקב"ה שלא לעמוד כנגד מלכות · כך נאמר בצבאות · במי שהוציא את צבאותי ממצר' · ד"א במה משביע אותן בצבאות בישר' שנקראו צבאות כמלך שהוא נודר בחיי בנו : בו (127*a*) באיילות השדה במי שהוא מזדעזע את המדברות · כמה שנ' קול יי' יחול מדבר קול יי' יחולל איילות : ד"א בצבאות או באיילות השדה · אם מרדתם על המלכיות הרי דמיכם כצבי וכאייל :

ח) **קול דודי הנה זה בא** אילו הקולו' שעתידין לבא קודם למשיח:
ד"א קול דודי הנה זה בא: כיון ששמע קול השופר עשרה זועות עתידין לבא ועשרה מקומות נהפכין ועשרה נשרפין · מלמד שאין הפתח נפתח כולו כאחד אלא אליהו בא לו לעיר אחת ונעלם מחבירתה ומדבר עם האיש ונעלם מחבירו:

ט) **דומה דודי לצבי** וגו' · יכול לצבי זקן · אמר' לעופר האילים שאין מגדלין לעולם זכר זקן · ועושה אותו אומרה: ד"א או לעופר · אין לעופר אלא עולם · כמה שנ' מי מנה עפר יעקב · מלמד שנראה המקום לישר' בעולם · כך משל המקום את השכינה שהיא חוזרת למקומה: הנה זה עומד אחר כותלינו · מלמד המקום נראה מציל ומפיע: ד"א משגיח מן החלונות זה המשיח · שכיון שיבא שערי מזרח נפתחות לו · כמה שנ' מי העיר ממזרח צדק קראוהו לרגלו · ולמה הוא בא ממזרח · מהיכן שהיום עולה · זה משיח מבני בניו של דוד שהוא משול כחמה · שנ' כסאו כשמש נגדו: וכמה שאמ' עליו הכת' שהוא נעור כשהוא כולו ישן · אף הקב"ה כיון שהגיע את הקץ אמ' הכת' העירותי מצפון מאת המזרח שמש יקרא בשמי: ולמה הוא בא מן הצפון · אלא שגלו ישר' לצפון כביכול גלה עמהם הכבוד לצפון · בשביל כך נאמר העירותי מצפון · וכן אמ' יחזקאל והנה רוח גדולה בא מן הצפון · להיכן הוא הולך לדרום · למקום ישיבתו · לכך נאמר לפתוח לפניו דלתים אילו שערי מזרח · ושערים לא יסגרו אלא שערי הדרום:

י) **ענה דודי ואמר לי** וגו' · זו היא הגאולה · אין או' לאדם קום אלא שהוא יושב · שהמשיח עתיד לחזק ידיהן של יש' שנתרפו במעשה הטוב:

יא) **כי הנה הסתיו עבר** (1276) העינוי הגשם חלף והלך לו אילו ימי השיעבוד:

יב) **הנצנים נראו בארץ** · אילו מעשה הצדיקין · עת הזמיר הגיע · זמנו של מלכות כמה שנ' זמיר עריצים יענה: ד"א ענה דודי ואמר לי קומי לך רעייתי · כיון שיבאו למדבר שיגיע זכרן של מלכיות מלאכי המרום עונין עליהן · לקיים מה שנ' הידד בדרכים יענה: ד"א אמ' רב נחמן קומי לך רעייתי ביום שאו' הקב"ה ליהושע עשה לך חרבות צורים:

יד) **יונתי בחגוי הסלע** · אילו ישר' שהיה פרעה רודף אחריהן והגיעו לים אין המקום מדבר עם שליח ציבור · אלא בזמן הציבור תחילה · שכן הוא או' במשה מה תצעק אלי וגו' · וכן הוא או' ויתפלל שמואל

על ישר׳ לפני יי׳ · כיון שהשלימו עמו ענה אותו האלהים : ד״א יונתי בחגוי הסלע זו כנסת ישר׳ שנמשלו כיונה · כשראתה רץ אחריה הים סוגר מלפניה ושונא רודף אחריה · יצא פרעה כגיבור · והקב״ה יצא כנגד פרעה כגיבור ולא הודיע שהוא איש מלחמה עד שיעשה מלחמה כנגד פרעה · כמה שנ׳ יי׳ איש מלחמה יי׳ שמו : יצא פרעה בשריון · והקב״ה יצא בצדקה · שנ׳ לובש צדקה כשריון · יצא פרעה בכובע וקשת וחיצים · והקב״ה יצא בצדקה ככובע · שנ׳ וכובע ישועה בראשו : כחיצים לנוגה ברק חניתך לאור חיציך יהלכו · וצלח פרעה על הסוס · והקב״ה צלח כנגדו · שנ׳ והדרך צלח ורחב : ד״א בחגוי הסלע זו עמידתו לפני הר סיני · כמה שנ׳ ויתיצבו בתחתית ההר · משל למה הדבר דומה למלך שהוא מבקש אשה שלח שתינשא לו · קיבלה עליה · אמ׳ המלך לראותה · ראה אותה · אומ׳ לי דברי ואני שומע דבריך באזני המלך · והיה קולה ערב · לאחר כך הקב״ה לישר׳ הראיני מראיך זה הגאולה שהביא הקב״ה לישר׳ בימי ר׳ שמעון ור׳ ישמעאל שהיה מעשה בשבעה אנשים שהיו עולין לירושלם · מצא הראשון תמרה אחת · ואמ׳ יעלה חבירי (128*a*) וכן השיני כך עשו כולם עד שהגיע השביעי · וניטלה עד שהגיעו לבור · וחילקוה ביניהם · עד עכשיו היה קורא כור תמרה · כיון שהגיע המעשה לפניהם אמ׳ כדיי הוא שתבוא הגאולה על ידיהן · על אלה נאמר הראני מראיך במעשים טובים השמיעי קולך במצות : ד״א השמיעיני קולך : אמ׳ ר׳ אלעזר נותן כח לישר׳ בקולו של משה שהיה במער׳ יושב ודורש וכל ישר׳ עד שנים עשר מיל · כמה שנ׳ משה ידבר והאלהים יעננו בקול : ד״א השמיעני את קולך כל שאתם מתפללים לפני בקול גבוה כי קולך ערב בתפילתם :

טז) **דודי לי ואני לן** וגו׳ · דודי לי בשעה שאמ׳ אנכי יי׳ אלהיך ואני לו כשאמ׳ והייתם לי סגולה מכל העמים : הרועה בשושנים · כשירעה את ישר׳ שנ׳ רועה ישר׳ האזינה וגו׳ · ידוע תדע פני צאנך אילו עם הארץ ושית לבך לעדרים אילו הנשיאים :

יז) **עד שיפוח היום ונסו הצללים** · כשתעבור פורענות מישר׳ : ד״א עד שיפוח היום כשתעברו ליתן גבול בני עשו ונסו הצללים אילו בני לוט : סוב דמה לך דודי וגו׳ · זכור אני להם מעשה אברהם בין הבתרים :

יח) **אחזו לנו שועלים** אילו המצריים הזקינים · קטנים אילו בניהם שהיו רעין לישר׳ יותר מן הגדולים · שהיה נכנם לתוך ביתו של ישר׳

925 ורואה יונק ומייסרו · מחבלים כרמים אילו ישר׳ הגדולים : וכרמינו סמדר · אילו היונקים שכך כוונתם של מצריים אמרו הרי אנו הורגים קטנים והגדולים מתים והנקבות נושאות למצריים ונמצא זרעו של אברהם כלה מן העולם :

[פרשה ג׳]

א) **על משכבי בלילות בקשתי את שאהבה נפשי** · בשעה 930 שהקריבו ישר׳ בחנוכה היו סבורין שהיא בית הבחירה · אמ׳ להן הקב״ה בקשתיו ולא מצאתיו · אין אתם מקריבין בו מעתה אין קדושה אלא במקום שעקד אברהם את יצחק בנו אחזתיו ולא ארפנו · זאת מנוחתי (168*b*) עדי עד וגו׳ :

ב) **אקומה נא ואסובבה בעיר** · כשאמ׳ הקב״ה לישר׳ רב לכם 935 סוב לכם את ההר הזה : אבקשה את שאהבה נפשי · במזבח שבנה משה ברפידים : ד״א על משכבי בלילות · א״ר יהודה בשעה שהיה דוד בורח מלפני שאול בקשתיו ולא מצאתיו בשעה שירד אחריו שאול למדבר : ד״א אקומה נא ואסובבה בעיר ששלח שאול רוכלין לארץ ישר׳ שאמרו לו הרי דוד מסתתר עמנו בין הבתולות :

940 ד) **אחזתיו ולא ארפנו** · בשעה שהורידה מיכל בת שאול כביר העיזים על המטה והיה שאול סבור שהוא תפוס : ד״א אחזתיו ולא ארפנו מה היה דוד שתפס את הגרזן מיד ארונה היבוסי ואמ׳ זהו בית הבחירה עד שהבאתיו אל בית אמי · אל חדר הורתי בשעה שעלו בני ישר׳ להוסיף על המזבח ומצאו גולגלתו של ארונה נתונה תחת המזבח 945 ולא פסל הקב״ה את הקורבנות של ישר׳ :

ו) **מי זאת עולה מן המדבר** · וכי מן המדבר העלה אותן · והלא ממצר׳ העלה אותן · אלא מלמד של ישר׳ שהן חביבין לפני המקום כמציאה שבני אדם מוצאין במדבר לקיים מה שנ׳ ימצאהו בארץ מדבר : ד״א מי זאת עולה מן המדבר כתמרות עשן · וכי בעשן היו · אלא מה 950 העשן הזה כל מקום שהוא הולך מיצר · כך כל האומות מכירין בשעה שעלו ישר׳ ממצר׳ : מקטרת מר ולבונה מכל אבקת רוכל · מלמד שלא היו חסירים כלום : ד״א מקטרת מר · זה אברהם · מה המר הזה ראש לכל הבשמים · כך אברהם ראש לכל הצדיקים · וכך אמ׳ לו הקב״ה להקריב לו את יצחק בנו בהר המוריה · ולבונה זה יצחק כדרך שמקטרין 955 את הלבונה על גבי המזבח כך נעקד יצחק על גבי המזבח כלבונה · מכל

אבקת רוכל זה יעקב כמה שנ׳ ויאבק איש עמו : ד״א מקטרת מר ולבונה זה היה משה ואהרן מכל אבקת רוכל זה שבעים זקינים :

ז) **הנה מטתו ששים גיבורים סביב לה** · (129*a*) עשרים וארבע משמרות הכהנים · ועשרים וארבע משמרות ללוים · ושנים עשר שבטים :

ח) **כולם אחוזי חרב** · מעשה הטוב כמה שנ׳ ביעקב אשר לקחתי ביד האמורי בחרבי ובקשתי : וכי היכן מצינו שעשה יעקב מלחמה · ומה ליוסף יותר על אחיו הבכורה אשר לקחתי מיד האמורי זה עשו שעשה מעשה האמרי · בחרבי זה מעשה הטוב ובקשתי זו תפילה : ד״א כולם אחוזי חרב זה חרבו של אברהם שנ׳ ויקח את המאכלת לשחוט את בנו · מלומדי שהם מלמדים בניהם מלחמה · זה תורה · שנ׳ על כן יאמר בספר מלחמות יי׳ : הנה מטתו שלשלמה זה המשכן ששים גיבורים סביב לה ד״א מגיבורי ישר׳ אילו השבטים · שנ׳ והחונים לפני המשכן קדמה · וגו׳ : ד״א הנה שלשלמה מירושלם · מה מיטה זו שהיא מאהבת אדם ואשתו כך היו אוהבין זה את בירושלם : ד״א הנה מטתו שלשלמה זה שלמה ודאי ללמד על שלמה שהיה רודה בכל העולם · חזר ונתמעטה מלכותו ולא היה שולט אלא על תדמור · שנ׳ ויכו את תדמור במדבר · חזר להיות שולט על ישר׳ בלבד · חזר שלא שלט על ישר׳ בלבד · חזר שלא שלט אלא על מטתו · ואף על מטתו לא היה יכול לנוח בתוכה מפני רוחות רעות · כולם אחוזי חרב ביום שישב ר׳ אליעזר בן הורקנוס שבו ביום שמו איש חרבו על יריכו · מפחד בלילות שהיו מעבירין פורענות מישר׳ :

ט) **אפריון עשה לו המלך שלמה** · שהשלום שלום · שלו זה הארון · מעצי הלבנון · אילו הקרשים לקיים מה שנ׳ שני אדנים תחת הקרש האחד :

י) **עמודיו עשה כסף** · אילו העמודים מחושקים כסף רפידתו זהב זה הכפורת · ועשית כפורת זהב טהור : מרכבו ארגמן זו הפרוכת של ארגמן · ועשית פרוכת תכלת וארגמן · תוכו רצוף אהבה אילו הלוחות מבנות ירושלם אילו האומות מה שעשו ישר׳ הן גרמו להם : ד״א אפיריון (129*b*) זו ברית העולם מבראשית מבית המקדש נברא · שנ׳ דבר ויקרא ארץ מציון מכלל יופי עמודיו עשה כסף אילו ההרים שהן עומדין על גבי הארץ כעמודים · רפידתו זהב זה הרקיע · פעלילו של עולם · מרכבו ארגמן זה כסא הכבוד · תוכו רצוף אהבה · אילו נפשות

של צדיקים · שהן נתונות עמו במרום · שלשה הן שנכנסו לה לפנים
מזה · ומשה נגש אל הערפל · ולפנים ממנו צדק ומשפט · שנ׳ צדק
ומשפט מכון כסאו ולפנים ממנו נפשות הצדיקים · שנ׳ אשר בידו נפש
כל חי וגו · והיתה נפש אדוני צרורה בצרור החיים את יי׳ אלהיך · רצוף
אהבה · נפשות הצדיקים שאהבו את הקב״ה שנ׳ זרע אברהם אוהבי ·
וכן הוא או׳ להנחיל אוהבי יש מבנות ישראל והפרשות הן נפשות
מישראל מלאומות · ואין נפשות צדיקים מתערבות עם רשעים :

יא) צאינה וראינה בנות ציון · צאו וראו כל האומות יום שמחה
שעשה המלך שהשלום שלו · בעטרה שעיטרה לו אמו על הים כמה שנ׳
יי׳ ימלוך לעולם ועד · אמ׳ להם הקב״ה · כביכול אותם קשרתם קשר
מלכות בראשי ביום חתונתו זו עמידת הר סיני · שמחת לבו ימי
המלואים : ד״א צאינה וראינה כל האומות ניסי פלאים שהוא עושה
לבניו · והכבוד והעטרה שהוא מתעטר ביום כינוס גליות · שנ׳ ימלוך יי׳
עליהם בהר ציון מעתה ועד עולם · והלא שלו היא המלכות · שנ׳ יי׳
ימלוך לעולם ועד · יי׳ מלך עולם ועד אבדו גוים מארצו אלא שאמ׳
לישר׳ כביכול אין לי מלכות ולא חיילות עד שהעמדתם והמלכתם אותי ·
אין אתה מוצא צבאות בספר יחזקאל לומר כל ימים שאתם בגולה אין
לי חיילות ומלכות עד שתחזור מלכותכם · שנ׳ ועלו מושיעים בהר ציון
וגו׳ · ואו׳ והיתה ליי׳ המלוכה : ד״א ביום חתונתו אילו ימי המשיח ·
שנמשל הקב״ה לחתן שכן הוא או׳ ומשוש חתן על כלה וגו׳ · וביום
(130*a*) שמחת לבו · בביניין בית המקדש · שנ׳ וגלתי בירושלם וששתי
בעמים : ד״א בעטרה שיעטרה לו אמו ביום חתונתו שירדה שכינה לבית
המקדש : שנ׳ וכל העם רואים כרדת האש והכבוד על הבית · וביום
שמחת לבו · יום שחינך שלמה את הבית :

[פרשה ד׳]

א , ב) הנך יפה רעייתי · אילו הזקינים · הנך יפה עינייך יונים ·
מה העיניים הללו נתונות בגובה של ראש · כך דברי חכמים גבוהים
בעיני האדם · מה העינים שהן מאירות כך דבריהן מאירין לישר׳ · מבעד
לצמתך · אימתי הם משובחים כשאתם מצמיתין לפני לא עושין אגודות
אגודות : ד״א מבעד לצמתך כשאתם עושין דברי תורה כצמתה : שערך
כעדר העיזים · זה היה מעשה ניסים במשכן · שגלשו מהר הגלעד · אילו
ישר׳ שהלכו למדין : שערך כעדר הרחלים בביאתן של מדין זכין מעריות

ומע"ז בשלום : ולמה משל הקב"ה **כעדר הקצובות** שלא היה נבחר לקרבן אלא הקצובות כך לא נבחרו באדין שכולם מתאומות ושכולה אין בהם · שלא נשתכלו במדין לא בהליכתן ולא בביאתן · תני ר' מאיר לא נבחר מהם אלא ממאה אלף לכך שכולם מתאימות ושכולה אין בהם :

ג) **כחוט השני שפתותיך** זה הפרוכת שהיה מבדיל בין כהן גדול : ד"א כחוט השני · זה כניסתו של משה למשכן שנ' וישמע את הקול מדבר אליו מעל הפרוכת מבין שני הכרובים : לכך נאמר ומדברך נאוה : ד"א ומדברך נאוה אילו הנביא' : כפלח הרימון רקתך אילו יושבי המדרשות מבעד לצמתך · זה הציץ שהיה בין עיניו של אהרן :

ד) **כמגדל דוד צוארך בנוי לתלפיות** במקום שהיו ישר' נותנין הזיות למקום אלף המגן תלוי עליו כל שלטי הגיבורים · זה היה אברהם שאמ' לו המקום אנכי מגן לך · ונתן לשלמה בנו אלף המגן :

ה) **שני שדייך כשני עפרים** זה משה (130*b*) ואהרן · הרועים בשושנים זה יהושע וכלב :

ו) **אלך לי אל הר המור** · זה היה אברהם · אל גבעת הלבונה זה היה יצחק :

ז) **כולך יפה רעייתי ומום אין בך** · זה היה יעקב : ד"א אלך אל הר המור זה אברהם ושרה שנ' ויקח אברהם את שרה אשתו · כולך יפה רעייתי ומום אין בך זה היה יעקב שלא היה בהן רשעים ובעלי מומין :

ח) **אתי מלבנון כלה אתי מלבנון תבואי** איזהו לבנון זהו בית המקדש שנקרא שמו לבנון · ולמה נקרא שמו לבנון · אלא שכל מי שהיה עולה לשם ובידו עון לא היה זז משם עד שיהיו עונותיו מתלבנות כשלג לקיים מה שנ' אם יהיו חטאיכם כשנים כשלג ילבינו : ד"א אתי מלבנון כלה כשהגליתי את השכינה מבית המקדש הגליתי אתכם עמה : תשורי מראש אמנה · שהאמנתם בי בתחילה : מראש שניר וחרמון · זה הליכתן במדבר ארבעים וחמש מסעות · אריות מהררי נמרים · אילו מלכים · שהעבדת ביניהן שהיו רעים מאריות ונמרים :

ט) **לבבתיני אחותי כלה** · לבבתיני באחת מעינייך · משל למה הדבר דומה לתינוקת בת מלכים ששלח המלך אחריה ראה אותה באחת מעיניה ושבחה אילו ראה כל הגוף על אחת כמה וכמה · לכך נאמ' בלבתיני אחותי כלה : ד"א לבבתיני אחותי כלה · את נתת לי את הלב שאהיה מלך על הבריות :

י) **מה יפו דודיך אחותי כלה** · ביום שהקריבו ישר׳ בשילה ובנוב ובגבעון : וריח שמניך מכל בשמים ביום שנמרו מלאתן מהבמות :

יא) **נופת תטופנה שפתותיך כלה** · זה משיח הצדיק שהוא עומד מיהודה : ד״א זה משוח מלחמה שהוא עומד מיוסף ואינן מקנין זה לזה לקיים מה שנ׳ אפרים לא יקנא את יהודה ויהודה לא יקנא את אפרים : דבש וחלב תחת לשונך זה יעקב שבירך (131*a*) את השבטים : וריח שלמותיך כריח לבנו :

יב) **גן נעול אחותי כלה** · זה הקץ שהיה נעול מישר׳ : ד״א גן נעול אחותי כלה אילו קיצי דניאל הספר החתום :

יג) **שלחיך פרדס רימונים** זה הפרדס של רימונים שהוא כך היו ישר׳ נאים ומעשיהם הולכין חוץ מהן · ולמה נמשלו כפרדס רימון׳ · מה הרימון הזה גודעו פורעו · כך ישר׳ כובשין עצמן במצרים וכשהגיע הקץ פרעו עצמו ויצאו : ד״א פרדס רימונים זה הקטרת כפרים עם נרדים שהיה כפרה עליהם :

יד) **נרד וכרכום קנה וקנמון** · זה היה בצלאל זה הליוב שעשה להר סיני והראה אותו מעשה המשכן כאלו עשוי למעלה : ויש או׳ המקום הראה למשה וירד והראה לבצלאל והסכים בצלאל לדעת האלהים : ד״א קנה וקנמון זה היה אהרן וחור · כמה שנ׳ ואהרן וחור תמכו ידיו מזה אחד ומזה אחד :

טו) **מעיין גנים באר מים חיים** · זה מעיין שהמקום עתיד לטהר את הצדיקים בו לקיים מה שנ׳ ואת דמי ידיחו מקרבה : ד״א מעיין גנים באר מים חיים נוזלים מן לבנון מה הטובה הזה שהוא נותן טיפה אחת בכוס או בקדירה ונוזלה · כך המקום עתיד לטהר את ישר׳ מע״ז וגילוי עריות ושפיכות דמים · או יכול יאמרו הצדיקים על הקלות הוא מוחל אבל על החמורות לא הוא אומ׳ אל ההרים · לא אכל ועיניו לא נשא אל גילולי בית ישר׳ · ואו׳ לישר׳ כטומאת הנידה היתה דרכם לפני אילו אמ׳ בטומאת נבילה או בטומאת הארץ לא היה להם טהרה לעולם : ד״א ונוזלים מן לבנון אילו הנביאים שעמדו בבית המקדש :

טז) **עורי צפון ובואי תימן** · מיכאן אתה או׳ הצדיקים לעתיד לבא אינן צריכין לא אפרסמון ולא כל מיני בשמים רוח צפון מכבדתו וזוחלת לפניהם כל בוסמני גן עדן : ד״א עורי צפון ובואי תימן שהרוחות עתידות להכנים ובאה זו עם זו · הדרום או׳ אני מביאה גלות תימן וכל הגדר וכל הדרום : (131*b*) והצפון או׳ אני מביאה גלות צפון וכל

הצפון והמקום נותן שלום ביניהן והן נכנסין בפתח אחד לקיים מה שנ׳ באתי לגני אחותי כלה :

[פרשה ה׳]

א) **אריתי מרי עם בשמי** וגו׳ · אריתי מורי עם בשמי אילו הן שער הקרבנות · אכלו רעים שתו ושכרו דודים · אילו הן אוהבי המקום :

ב) **אני ישינה ולבי ער** אילו הן גלות בבל · מי זאת הנשקפה כמו שחר זה גלות משיח : יונתי בחגוי הסלע זו גלות מצרים : ד״א אני ישינה ולבי ער · זה היה העולם נדמה לישן הזה והדחוק עליו המקום ועוררי : רבי עקיבא היה או׳ למה היה העולם דומה לבעל הבית שעשה כלים ולא פתחן שהיו בריאים כבר · חזר ופתחן · אני ישינה ולבי ער · זה הגאולה שהוא דומה לישן והמקום מעוררו · כמה שנ׳ הערותי מצפון ליאתי ואחר ממזרח שמש וגו׳ · והמקום מעורר הגאולה מן הדרום תחילה ואחר כך מן המזרח ומן הצפון הרי רוח צפון לדרום והדרום לצפון כל זה לייבש את המעייות המים חוץ משבעה נהרות : כל עץ פרי שיזבחו שם לע״ז ויבשו · ד״א אני ישנה ולבי ער זה גאולת מרדכי ואסתר : ד״א אני ישינה ולבי ער המקום או׳ לישר׳ אני ישינה ולבי ער פתחי לי אחותי רעייתי : א״ר אלעזר ביום שאו׳ מלך בבל כל בית שיהא פתוח היו נכנסין ובוזזין אותו · וכל בית שהאו נעול אל תכנסו בתוכו ונעלו ישר׳ בתיהן · לפיכך שילח המקום נביאים לישראל ואמ׳ להם פתחו בתיכם עד מתי אתם יושבים באפילה · ד״א פתחי לי אחותי הרי זו לימי גוג שישר׳ עתידין להיות טמונים במערות ובמחילות והקב״ה מרתיק עליהן : שמעון בן שטח היה אומר שהקב״ה או׳ לישר׳ פתחי לי אחותי והן מסתכלין והמקום עושה להם ניסים והם רואים את המשיח עומד בראש מדבר מואב ועמו ארבע מאות איש והמקום נותן להם גאולה לקיים מה שנ׳ ונתתי להן (132*a*) את כרמיה משם · והמחילה נפרדת להם משם ממדבר מואב לחורב וישר׳ נוטלין והולכין את הזיין ממדבר חורב שהשם כתוב בו · ובאין ונוטלין עמון ומואב לקיים מה שנ׳ אדום ומואב משלוח ידם · ובני עמון משמעתם : א״ר יוסי כדרך שהלגינו עושי להם בית חמדה כך חורב עשוי לישר׳ ביתו חמדה הרי מלכי צפון שומעין שנהרג עמון ומואב וכולן מתכנסין ובאין וקובעין המלוכה בדמשק ומלכי המערב והדרום מתכנסין אף הן באין ונוטלין עיצה במדין וישר׳ מצירין להניח את החכמים שבמדין אי איפשר

ולהניח את אחיהן שבירושלם · ומה אליהו עושה כל המדבר שהוא הולך
מירושלם למדין שכל מי שנכנס חיה רעה עושה לו המקום ניסים · והוא
בא ועומד לפני משיח במדין · והמשיח נפטר משם · ואליהו עומד · באותה
שעה הוא מוציא את ספר הישר שכל התורה הזאת אינה אלא שירה
אחת מתוכו הארץ נפתחה מתחתיהן ושורפין ונעשה להם שם גדול ·
נמצאת מקיים פתחי לי אחותי רעייתי והמשיח בא לו ממדין ונוטל כל
ביזתה וכן לדמשק ונוטל ביזתה · לקיים מה שנ׳ ישא את חיל דמשק ·
עד שלא תפול מלכות אדום · והפתח נפתח שם לרומי לקיים מה שנ׳
שם ירעה ענל : שראשי נמלא טל · אמ׳ להם הקב״ה אדם דומה לישן
הזה ואני עוררה הרי מלכי מזרח מתכנסין לתדמור וישר׳ באין מרומי
ומקריבין לירושלם שבעת ימים · והקב״ה משיב הרוח ואמ׳ לישראל חזרו
לתדמור כנגד מלכי המזרח · ומלכי הגוים או׳ נותן לישר׳ לבנות בית
המקדש והן באין לשורפו והקב״ה יוצא ונלחם עמהם · לקיים מה שנ׳
ויצא יי ונלחם בגוים ההם והמשיח בא לו לצור ולצידון ולתדמור
ולבירי · לקיים מה שנ׳ אדום ומואב משלוח ····· ובני עמון משמעתם ·
(132*b*) וכל האומות היו עתידות לשמוע והן מתכנסות ובאות על פוגה
ועל עכו והן בוכין על סביבות עכו פרוסות וכל הירדן וכל ישר׳ מראין
לחבוש הזה שבאפילה והמקום קורע את הרקיעים ומראה לישר׳ כסא
הכבוד · לקיים מה שנ׳ ומעיי המו עלי והיו מתפללין והוא מקבלן ·
לקיים מה שנ׳ פתחי לי אחותי רעייתי :

ו) **אני לדודי** בפתח שיראה לי והן מתפללין והקב״ה מעמיד להם
חמה כדרך שהעמיד ליהושע בן נון שהשביע ביום ההוא לפניו ואחרי זה
משיח : דודי חמק עבר נפשי יצאה בדברו שהוא מוציא קרח וכל עדתו :
בקשתיו ולא מצאתיו הרי השכינה מסתלקת לשמים וישר׳ סבורים שהוא
מחיה להם את המתים · לכך נאמר קראתיו ולא ענני · ד״א קראתיו ולא
ענני · בשעה שנסתלקה השכינה בימי ישעיה עשרה פעמים עד שלא
נסתלקה השכינה מן הכרוב האחד לכרוב השיני מן הכרוב השיני למפתן
הבית כמה שנ׳ וירם כבוד ה׳ מעל הכרובים על מפתן הבית וממפתן
הבית למזבח · כמה שנ׳ וראיתי יי׳ עומד על המזבח · וממזבה לחומה ·
שנ׳ ראיתי את יי׳ עומד על החומה ומחומה לגג · כמה שנ׳ טוב לשבת
על פנת גג ונו׳ · ומפנת גג להר הזיתים · כמה שנ׳ ויעמד כבוד יי׳
על ההר אשר מקדם לעיר : מהר הזיתים למדבר · כמה שנ׳ טוב לשבת
בארץ מדבר · מן המדבר לשמים · כמה שנ׳ השמים שמים ליי׳ : הרי

ישר׳ מבקשין את השכינה והיא לא חוזרת עד שיגיע הקץ · לכך נאמר קראתיו ולא ענני :

ז) **מצאוני השומרים הסובבים בעיר** · כיון שנסתלקה השכינה באו מלכיות · ושרפו בית המקדש שהוא משול כבתובת : ד״א מצאוני השומר׳ הסובבים בעיר ביום שניתנה רשות למלאכי השרת שיהו עמהן על החומה ביום · שנ׳ על חומותיך ירושלם הפקדתי שומרים · (133*a*) אמ׳ ר׳ חנינא בנו של ר׳ יוסי הגלילי בו ביום נתנה רשות לגבריאל ליפרע מן המלכיות לקיים מה שנ׳ מקול המון נדדו עמים וכן הוא אומר קול המון בהמון דמות עם רב זה הקב״ה הוא דמות עם רב יי׳ וכלי זעמו לחבל כל הארץ · ואחר כך ריע אף יצריח על אויביו יתגבר :

ח) **מה דודך מדוד היפה בנשים** הכשרים שבאומות אומרים לישראל למי שאתם עובדים נלך עמכם · כמה שנ׳ אז אהפוך אל כל העמים שפה ברורה לקרוא כולם בשם יי ולעבדו שכם אחד : למה נאמר שככה השבעתנו · אלא שעתידין לישבע להקב״ה ולישר׳ שלא לילך אחר ע״ז מעתה : א״ר אלעזר הרי אתה למד שאברהם יום שהכה את המלכים כמה שנ׳ אל עמק שוה שנשבעו לו כל האומות שלו לילך אחר ע״ז מעתה ובמקום שנשבעו לו לאברהם כך הן עתידים לישבע למקום ולמשיח שלא לילך אחר ע״ז מעתה · לכך נאמר שככה השבעתנו :

י) **דודי צח ואדום** דודי צח שאני נותן את התורה · ואדום שהוא נפרע מן האומות :

יא) **ראשו כתם פז** · בשעה שהוא מביא את היסורין על ישר׳ לנקותם מעון קווצותיו תלתלים זה היה המזבח :

יב) **רוחצות בחלב** · אילו המדרשות :

יג) **לחיו כערוגת הבושם** אילו הלוחות · שפתותיו שושנים · איגו האגדות :

טו) **שוקיו עמודי שש** · ביום שנכנס משה ועמד לפני הכבוד :

[פרשה ו׳]

א) **אנה הלך דודך** · ביום שנ׳ ויתן מזבח תחת ההר שהיה ישר׳ סבורים סיני קדושת עולם ולא יהיה אלא קדושת שעה :

ב) **דודי ירד לגני** · ביום שירדה האש לקרבנו של הבל ולקרבנו של נח · וכן בנדב ואביהוא וכן בקרבן מנוח ושלמה ואליהו לכך נאמר דודי

ירד לגנו : עוד אחת הוא עתיד לירד כמה שנ' כן ירד יי' צבאות לצבא על הרי ציון ועל גבע · מכאן הן או' בעלייה שברא הקב"ה כשברא את העולם כן ירד על הר סיני וכן הוא עתיד לבא לקיים מה שנ' כן ירד יי' צבאות לצבוא על הר (133*b*) ציון :

1185 ג) **אני לדודי ודודי לי הרועה בשושנים** · כביכול אין הקב"ה מקרבן באהבה · אמ' אני לדודי ודודי לי הרועה בשושנים · כבני אדם שלא טעמו עבירה מימיהם :

ד) **יפה את רעייתי כתרצה** · כשאדם משבח את אשתו או' לה נאה קומתך ותרצה : שערך כערך העיזים · כבר אמרנו :

1190 ו) **שינייך כעדר הרחלים** · מה הרחל הזו שכולה קדושה · כך ישר' קדושים : עדר הרחלים לאהל מועד הצמר לפעמונים והקרבים לשופרות · והרשעים נמשלו לכלבים שאין הנייה מהן · שנ' כולם כלבים אילמים · מה הכלב הזה שהוא את האדם ביקש ממנו אדם נדמה למרוט אינו יכול לכך נמשלו לכלבים שאין בידם מעשה טוב :

1195 ח) **ששים המה מלכות** · זה היה אברהם ויוצאי יריכו · ושמנים פילגשים אילו יוצאי התיבה · ועלמות אין מספר · אילו המשפחות שאין להם מספר :

ט) **אחת היא יונתי תמתי** וגו' · אימתי כששלח משה מרגלים · מה ראו בשעה שהגיעו לחמת · אמ' משה אל תכנסו בגנבים אלא 1200 והתחזקתם ולקחתם מפרי הארץ · התחילו האמוריים אין כאן לא באו אילו אלא לקצץ את האילנות ולשרוף את הערים · יצאו השלוחין אחריהן ונכנסו האמוריין אליהם היו אחימן ששי ותלמי רודפין אחריהן עד שהגיעו למישר צל חמת שביהודה · וכלב נפל לו אחורי הגדר וכיון שמצאן שהגיעו בישר' עמד וצוח צווחה אחת ונפלו כולם לפניו וטפת 1205 לפניהם · או' להם מפני מה באתם בשביל חמשה רימונים ואשכל אחת · אמרו לו לא בנו שאמרתם הערים אנו שורפין · כשבאו לפני משה הוציאו דבת הארץ רעה · אמרו שם ראינו את הנפילים בני ענק · אמ' להם כלב סם תסם שמטה כנסת ישר' שנים עשר · לכך נאמר ראוה בנות ויהללוה :

י) **מי זאת הנשקפה כמו שחר** זו גלות משיח כדרך שהשחר יוצא 1210 ואפילה בורחת לפניו · כך האפילה בורחת על המלכיות כשיבא משיח : (134*a*) ד"א מי זאת הנשקפה כמו שחר · יפה כלבנה ברה כחמה · מה גלגל חמה והלבנה שהן באין בפרהסיא · כך כשתגלה מלכות המשיח תגלה בפרהסיא לעולם : ד"א מי זאת הנשקפה כמו שחר · כשהקב"ה

מביא טובה לעולם בהשקפה הוא מביאה · שנ׳ ויישקף יי׳ אל מחנה מצר׳ :
ד״א מי זאת הנשקפה כמו שחר יפה כלבנה ברה כחמה : מה השחר
הלבנה והחמה לא מאורו של זה דומה לזה ולא הליכתו של זה כהליכתו
של זה כך אין הצדיקין שוין לעתיד לבא אלא אדם מקבל לפי מעשיו
מה החמה והלבנה שהן מבררין את הפירות כך המקום מברר ארת
הצדיקים :

יא) **אל גינת אגוז ירדתי** · לראות באיבי הנחל זה אברהם · לראות
הפרחה הגפן זה יצחק הנצו הרימונים זה יעקב ושבטיו שנכרתה ברית
לאבות כמה שנ׳ שבועות מטות או׳ סלה : ד״א אל גינת אגוז ירדתי ·
הם ישר׳ שנתקדשו לפני הר סיני שנמשלו כאגוז : .....הזה אם
הקשתי כולן מפעפע כך ישר׳ נוחים אגוז : א״ר יוסי בר׳ יהודה מי שלא
ראה אגוז ואינו יודע מה · סבור שמא כלין הוא עצים פעפע הרי אותו
אגודות של אוכלין · כך ישר׳ האומות שאין מכירין אותו או׳ בעוונותיהן
הן לוקין בדקו אותו והן מוציאין אותן אגודות אגודות של מצות ·

יב) **לא ידעתי נפשי שמתני** · יעקב שהלך לחרן שנ׳ ויישא יעקב
רגליו : א״ר יהודה בן בבא מניין אתה או׳ שהראה לו הקב״ה מלכיות
שהן עתידות לשעבד את בניו · שנ׳ וירא והנה באר בשדה זו כנסת
ישר׳ · והנה שם שלשה עדרי צאן רובצים עליה זו מלכיות בבל ומדי
ויוון · ונאספו שמה כל העדרים זו מלכות הרשעה שהייתה מכתבת
טרוניא מכל לשון : ד״א לא ידעתי נפשי שמתני אילו ישר׳ שהיו במצר׳
שהיו מצפין לגאולה · וכשגאלו המקום הושיבן בענני כבוד · אמרו ישר׳
הרי אנו (134*b*) יושבין עם המלך ברכב שלו · לכך נאמר מרכבות עמי
נדב : ד״א למה ידעתי נפשי שמתני אילו ישר׳ בימי ברק ודבורה שבאת
גאולה על ידיהן · ד״א עמי נדב זה היום שנתרבו ישר׳ למשכן : ד״א
ואף לעתיד לבא אהבם נדבה :

[פרשה ז׳]

א) **שובי שובי השולמית** שכל באי עולם עתידין להשלים להקב״ה
והוא נותן להם הימין כדרך שנתן להם במתן תורה : ר׳ אלעזר שובי
שובי השולמית שהם המתים עתידין להחיות ולעמד זה אחר זה כדרך
שמלכו דורות כך כן באין דורות דורות : ר׳ אליעזר או׳ כולם באין
כאחת מלך ומלך בדורו על כסאו · נשיא ונשיא בדורו : כמחולת
המחנים זה דורו של אלישע שהיה ממחולה ודוד ממחנים : א״ר יהודה

יכול כי מה מנהגו לעולם הבא כרשעים · אמ׳ לאו אלא שעתידין לעמד מחנים מחנים מחולות מחולות · ומושיבן למקומן : רור הולך ודור בא · זה דור של אליהו ושל אלישע שיעצו ברעב · ודורו של אבשלום שנהרג במחנים :

ב) **מה יפו פעמיך בנעלים בת נדיב** · מה הן פעמים · אילו הרגלים שנקראו רגלים פעמים ואשורים · כמה׳ שנ׳ תמוך אשוריי במעגלותיך · בל נמטו פעמי · אימתי כשהיו ישר׳ נאות · כשהיו עולין לרגל בירושלם בזמני המועדות כמה שנ׳ שלש פעמים בשנה וגו׳ · ונאמר שלש רגלים תחוג לי בשנה : ד״א מה יפו פעמיך בנעלים · כשאדם רואה ברגלו של חבירו היו או׳ להם כמה נאה רגלך במנעל · כך כשיטלו ישר׳ את הכבוד כל האומות היו או׳ להם לא היה הכבוד נאה אלא לכם · לכך נאמר בת נדיב כמה שנ׳ בהתנדב עם וגו׳ · ד״א מה יפו פעמיך אמ׳ הקב״ה לישראל בת נדיב בת אברהם : מעשה ידי אמן למעשה הדיוט :

ג) **שררך אגן הסהר** זה השית שלא חסר נסכים ..... בטנך ערימת חיטין סוגה בשושנים ·

ה) **צוארך כמגדל** · זו סנהדרין : עינייך בריכות בחשב׳ (135*a*) אילו החכמים כשהן מתכנסין לעיצה ואין אדם יודע מה הן יוצאין והדבר נודע לרבים : אפך כמגדל צופה פני דמשק · זה היה בית יער הלבנון · שהיה אדם בראשו ומונה כמה בתים יש בדמשק :

ו) **ודלת ראשך כארגמן** הם הדלים שבישר׳ שהן עתידין לבושין כמלכים האילו שהן לבושין כארגמן : ד״א ראשך עלייך ככרמל · כדרך שעלה אליהו בהר הכרמל וגוזר על הקב״ה וקיים · כך העניים והדלים שבישר׳ כל שיש בידו מצוה אחת עתיד להיות גוזר על המקום והוא מקיים · מלך אסור ברהטים זה היה יעקב · ויצג את המקלות אשר פיצל ברהטים : ד״א מלך אסור ברהטים · זה משה שנטל שלו על המים · שנ׳ עלה אל הר המוריה הזה הר נבו :

י) **וחכך כיין הטוב** זה היה שאול שהזכיר ליהונתן בנו בן נעות המרדות : דובב שפתי ישינים · אבא יודן איש גזר היה או׳ אילו היו קין והבל שהיו תחילת העולם והיה קין בעל דובב להבל · או׳ קין להבל כך העולם נוהג במי שהמקום אוהב לו נותן אלא מה שעשה אדם אבינו שהשליטו על בריותיו כדרך שברא את העולם תחילה · כך נתן לו חנם · אבל מיכאן ואילך אינו נותן אלא למי שהוא אוהב · מתוך כך נפלה

קטטה ביניהן · נתנו הבל תחתיו · א"ל המקום אל תחמול עליו על זה הרשע · חס עליו הבל · אמ' לו המקום אתה חסתה עליו והוא יהרגך · לכך נאמר ויקם קין שהיה למטה · מניין אתה או' שגילה לו המקום מקום שהרגו והוא נובך שנשפך דמו ולא עלו צמחין עד עכשיו · לכך נאמר דובב שפתי ישינים · ראה כמה גדולה חיבת קין והבל וגביע של בנימן :

יא) **אני לדודי ועלי תשוקתו** · כדרך שאמרתי לחוה אמכם · ואל אישך תשוקתך · כשתהיו חוטאים אתם ועלי תשוקתכם · שכן מתחמדין וחוזרין למקומן · ואין תשוקה אלא (135*b*) תחמודות · הרי אתה אומר עלה שישק מלך מצר' ויקח את מגיני הזהב אשר עשה שלמה · והלא זבוב היה שמו ששק אלא שהיה מתחמד מתי ימות שלמה שהיה יודע שאין בנו שליט כמותו · כיון ששמע שלמה מיד ויקח את כל אוצרות בית יי' ואת אוצרות בית המלך ואת הכל לקח ויקח את מגיני הזהב :

יב) **לכה דודי נצא השדה** נלינה בכפרים · הרי משיח בא לעולם ואו' להם לישר' הגאולה בא לעולם : והן מתכנסין ובאין כיתות כיתות כת ראשונה כיתות זקינים שאינן יכולין לילך · שנייה נשים וטף · עליהם הכת' או' :

יג) **נשכימה לכרמים נראה אם פרחה הגפן** וגו' אילו עושה המלחמה :

יד) **הדודאים ניתנו ריח** אילו בני אדם של מעשה הצדקה כשם שדודאים נותנין ריח בעולם הזה · כך בני אדם של מעשה ושל צדקה נותנין כבוד בעולם : על פתחינו כל מגדים · א"ר יוסי זה אליהו בא ואמ' להם לישר' אני אליהו · והם אומרים לו אם אתה אליהו החיה לנו מתים · ולא מתים שאין אנו מזכירין · אלא מתים שאנו מזכירין : ועוד א"ר יוסי אם יבא אליהו ואני או' לו פירש לי פרשת נדרים שנדרת לי אתה · חדשים וגם ישנים :

[פרשה ח']

א) **מי יתנך כאח לי יונק משדי אמי** · זה רוח הקדש של משה : אנהיגך אביאך אל בית אמי תלמדני · אילו שבעה דברים שהמשיח עומד ומראה לישר' בראשון מראה להן גן עדן · בשיני מראה להן כסא הכבוד · בשלישי מראה להם קרח וכל עדתו : בביעי מראה

להן ניהנם · בחמישי מראה להם רשעים · בשישי מראה להם צדיקים · בשביעי מראה להם צדיק עתיד להחיות :

ה) **מי זאת עולה מן המדבר מתרפקת אל דודה** · משל למה הדבר דומה למי שנשא אשה ואמ' לה צאי התקדשי לי במדבר · כיון שיצאת למדבר אמ' לו שאוני על גבך · מה האשה הזאת כנסת ישר' ומי הוא המלך מלך מלכי המלכים (136*a*) הקב"ה · כיון שיצאת למדבר אמרה לו שאיני ישאנו על אבירתו : תחת התפוח עוררתיך · ר' חנינה היה או' צוה לנו משה לטעון לסוכות והיה הענן מתקרב אצל ישר' והן טוענין עליו נשיהם ובניהם עבדיהם ואמהותיהם וכלותיהם אף סוסים פרשים ופרדים והיה הענן מקיף את ארץ מצרים שהוא מהלך ארבעים יום כהרף עין · ולכך נאמר שמה חבלתך אמך ושמה חבלה ילדתך · שהיתה הארץ מתחבלת כחבלי יולדה :

ו) **שימני כחותם על לבך** · בשעה שנ' ויקרא אליו מלאך יי' מן השמים ויאמר אברהם כחותם על לבך כחותם על זרועך · כדרך התפילין הללו שנותנין על זרועותיהם של אדם ואין בהם מום · כך אין ביצחק מום : כי עזה כמות אהבה · עזה הייתה האהבה שהקב"ה אהב את ישר' בימי סנחריב · שנ' הוי היורדים למצר' לעזרה ועל סוסים וגו' · אמ' עשר מכות שהביא הקב"ה עליהם כדרך שהביא על פרעה ועל מצר' · שנ' ומטהו על הים ונשא כדרך מצר' : ר' נתן או' הרים במטה יד על השירים · שנ' הוי אשור שבט אפי ומטהו בידם זעמי : קשה כשאול קנאה · קשה הייתה הקנאה שהכנים אליהו כנגד ישראל שנ' קנא קנאתי ליי' אלהי ישר' צבאות כי עזבו בריתך בני ישר' וגו' · היה לו לאליהו לילך למקום שעמדו אבותיו ויבקש רחמים על ישר' ולא עשה כן · אמ' לו הקב"ה צורכך בקשת לך שוב לדמשק · וכן הוא או' ביחזקיהו יהיה שלום ואמת בימיי · א"ל הקב"ה צורכך בקשת · נחמו נחמו עמי יאמר אלהיכם · ואין אתם צריכין לתפילתו של אליהו · רשפיה רשפי אש שלהבת יה · עתיד זיוון של ישר' להיות יוצא כאש מתחת כסא הכבוד · שלא יהיה אור ישר' לאש · וקדושו ללהבה וגו' · א"ר חנינא בן אחיו של ר' יהושע יש נהרות של אש שהן עוברין לפני השכינה כנהרות של מים ומעורבין באש וכשנתנה רשות (163*b*) לגבריאל לשרוף את כל חיל סנחריב ניתנה רשות ללויתן לחבל את כל הנהרות · לכך נאמר רשפיה רשפי אש שלהבת יה :

ז) **מים רבים לא יוכלו לכבות את האהבה** · איזו היא אהבה

זו האש שהיא מגדלת על גבי האישים · שנ׳ ויהי ברד ואש מתלקחת בתוך הברד · ד״א מים רבים לא יוכלו לכבות את האהבה · עבירה מכבה את המצוה ואינה עבירה מכבה את התורה : ד״א מים רבים וגו׳ אילו בני אדם שבוטחין בעושרן ובממונם · שנ׳ בוטח בעושרו בו יפול : אם יתן איש את הון ביתו באהבה שאהבתי אתכם אי איפשר את כל הון ביתו באהבה בוז יבוזו לו : שנ׳ ביתאל מים והעי מקדם שעתידין כהנים מבני בניו של אברהם להיות עומדין ונושאין כפיהן על הקהל ומברכין אותן בשם המפורש.....

ח) **אחות לנו קטנה** · זה הייתה סדום ובנותיה שהיה לה שדים ואינה נותנת צדקה לעניים ואינה מפרנסת את האביונים · מה נעשה לאחותינו ביום שידובר בה לפורענות · ואילו הן חמשה כרכים · ויהי גבול הכנעני מצידון וגו׳ · ד״א אחות לנו קטנה וגו׳ מה דורו של חזקייהו שיהין דומין לאשה נאה שאין לה שדים כך היו נאים ולא היו מעשיהן טובים : מה נעשה לאחותי ביום שידובר בה לפורענות · זה דורו של אחיקם :

ט) **אם חומה נבנה עליה טירת כסף** וגו׳ · משל למה הדבר דומה לאחד שאמ׳ לחבירו על מה ימחול לך המקום על ע״ז שבידך או על גילוי עריות הרי זבולו : אבא אלעזר בן גיגי איש ברק אומר למה הדבר דומה לאחד שהיו אומרים עליו איש פל׳ חכם ואין ענווה בידי · איש פל׳ עניו ואין חכמה בידו · א״ל הכת׳ הריני נותן חכמה וענוה :

י) **אני חומה ושבי כמדגלות** · אמרה כנסת ישר׳ אני איני כדורות הראשונות לא כאנשי דור המבול ולא כאנשי דור הפלגה ולא כאנשי סדם · אבל אנו חכמים יש צדיקים יש בי מכלכלין ומפרנסין יש בי · (137*a*) שנ׳ אני הייתי בעיניו כמוצאת שלום :

יא) **כרם היה לשלמה בבעל המון** · אילו עשרת השבטים שבאו עליה גוים המונים שנ׳ הוי עמון עמים רבים וגו׳ · נתן הכרם לנוטרים · זה נבוכדנצר שעמד והחריב את ירושלם ושרף את ביתו באש והגלה את ישר׳ לבבל שנקראו כרם שנ׳ כי כרם יי׳ צבאות בית ישר׳ וגו · איש יביא בפריו וגו׳ :

יג) **היושבת בגנים** זו כנסת ישר׳ שהיא דמוה לגינה בן גנות אחרות · לפיכך אין הקב״ה מוסר את גנתו ביד אחרים חברים מקשיבים לקולך השמיעוני אילו חכמים ותלמידיהן שהן מפרשין מקרא בפני עצמה ומשנה

בפני עצמה והלכות בפני עצמן אגדות בפני עצמן אמ׳ להן הקב״ה חברים חברים לקולך השמיעוני :

יד) **ברח דודי** כבוד ישראל אימתי יום ששכר בלק את בלעם לקלל את ישר׳ שנ׳ אדום מקדם ופלשתים מאחור ויאכל׳ וגו׳ • זה עמלק • ויאכלו את ישר׳ בכל פה • אילו החמסנין והגזלנין : א״ר הגדול באותה שעה שלח עמלק ולקח את כל אלופי אדום ונתן להם אלף אלפים דינרים לכל אחד ואחד מאותן החיילים שהיו מאלופי עשו • לפיכך היה יושב ודורש את כל התיבה למפרע : ד״א האלף לך שלמה • למלך מלכי המלכים שהשלים שלו ומאתים לנוטרים את פריו אימתי יום שעמדו עליו עמון ומואב נתן להם מאתים דינ׳ ואמ׳ להם שמרו לי שלא למרוד עלי לפיכך נהגו המלכה שכיון שנהרג אחד מהן את חבירו ובא ויושב על כסאו היה בוחן דינסטם : ד״א ברח דודי • ברח כבוד ישר׳ אימתי יום שאמר בלעם לבלק בנה לי בזה שבעה מזבחות וגו׳ • כשם שבנה שלמה בטהרה והעלה בטהרה כדי שתהא תפילתו נשמעת : ד״א ברח דודי אימתי יום שכריתי ברית עם ארחומו והעלו שני טלאים אחד לצפון המזבח לשם ארחומו ואחד לדרום למזבח לשם ירושלם : ד״א ברח דודי אימתי בימי אחז בן יותם בן עוזייהו שלא (137*b*) קיים את התורה וגבר על ישר׳ שלא יתעסקו בתורה • שנ׳ צור תעודה חתום תורה בלימודיי : ד״א ברח דודי • אימתי • בימי מנחם והילל שנפל מחלוקת ביניהם ויצא מנחם הוא ושמנה מאות תלמידים מלובשים סריקונין של זהב ובא חנן בן מטרון ובעינן בו ביהודה אחיו של מנחם והרגו ועלה אלעזר והתלמידים עמו וחתכו מניות מנויות אותה שעה שלחו אנשי אורחמו והושיבו קסתרא על ירושלם והיו מטמאין כל הנשים שהיו בתוכה • ועלה אלעזר והתלמידים עמו והכו כל אנשי קסתרא אותה שעה נפלה מחלוקת בירושלם • על אותה שעה אמרו ברח דודי ודמי לך לצבי או לעופר האילים

סליק מדרש שיר השירים

[The notes to the foregoing Midrash will be given in a subsequent number of this REVIEW.]

S. SCHECHTER.

CRITICAL NOTICES.

Records and Reflections, selected from her writings during half a century (April 3rd, 1840, to April 3rd, 1890), by LADY SIMON. [Wertheimer, Lea and Co., London.]

MATTHEW ARNOLD, writing of Heine, refers much of the poet's inspiration and genius to the inner promptings of the two great spirits under whose influence he came—the spirit of Greece, and the spirit of Judæa. "Both these spirits," he goes on to say, "reach the infinite, which is the true goal of all poetry and all art—the Greek spirit by beauty, *the Hebrew spirit by sublimity.*" [1]

It is precisely this sublimity of the Hebrew spirit which is so finely illustrated in the work before us. Those of us who have taken note of the emotion which the mere contemplation of the Deity, stirred in the ancient Jewish mind, those of us who are familiar with the Hebraistic passion for the Monotheistic conception as exemplified in the prophetical writings, the Psalms, or the Book of Job, we who have observed that intense spiritual craving for the simplification of all moral and religious truth, which—doctrinal or philosophical considerations apart—dominates the writings of the greatest Jewish reformers, from St. Paul to Spinoza, we, I repeat, can bear witness to the admirable justness of Matthew Arnold's criticism.

The elements of this sublimity are more easily assumed than analysed. It is a gift peculiar to Judaism. Milton alone, among the Gentiles, can be said to have caught the spirit of it, and its possession largely constituted his greatness. This sublimity of spirit defies all attempts at definition ; it is something rarer and finer than enthusiasm, though, perhaps, falling short of actual, conscious worship.

It has nothing in common with that condition, either of mad religious frenzy or of sensuous visionary ecstasy, which has been frequently associated with weak, ignorant credulity and debased forms of religious superstition.

The materialistic tendencies of modern thought and the application of critical methods have done so much to stifle this impassioned out-

---

[1] Essays in Criticism. The italics here and elsewhere are my own.

pouring of the soul to God, that the possession of individual testimony as to the workings of the Divine within us becomes more and more precious in proportion to its rarity.

Regarded from this point of view, Lady Simon's *Records and Reflections* afford invaluable evidence as to the vitality of this religious spirit among the Jews of the present day. From cover to cover the work is characterised by one uplifted accent of religious exhortation and spiritual harmony. It exhibits a soul elevated above the things of this world, contending upon those spiritual heights to which its divine aspirations enable it to soar.

These *Reflections* are of particular value and interest to the thoughtful reader as illustrating the unbroken continuity of the Hebraistic idea of God, which to-day is apparently at one with that of the noblest Old Testament inspiration.

The Jewish conception of God is the outcome of the sublimity of the Hebrew spirit. Aspiration was, and is, characteristic of the Jewish mind. The Jew looked away from himself, outwards, upwards; never like the surrounding nations, downwards. From the very beginning of things, the Hebrew mind was dissatisfied with itself. Not content to be alone, it first conceived the notion that man was made for the knowledge of something outside and above him, but which he himself possessed in smaller measure. Examining the character of his own aspirations, and believing himself to be made in the image of the God he was seeking, he deduced the nature of the Deity from the infinite yearnings of his own spirit. He longed, with a desire he could not adequately express, for communion with that higher power of intelligence to which he felt his own spiritual nature to be akin. It was just because he realised his affinity with and relations to the Divine, that the Jew rejected all notion of an abstract Deity, as also of one who needed to be propitiated and dreaded. He utterly repudiated the idea of God as an Abstraction, an Ethical Principle, an Element, or a First Cause ; his soul yearned after a living personal Deity, the spiritual Father, whose son he felt himself to be :—"*My soul thirsteth for God, for the living God*" (Psalm xlii. 2).

To the Hebrew, God was the infinite expansion of his own finite intelligence, the answer to his craving for sympathy, love and guidance ; his spiritual Father, not far off, but very nigh to him ; the Friend that sticketh closer than a brother. The Hebrew mind became saturated with the idea of the nearness and omnipresence of an Almighty Father, so that daily, hourly communion with this God of infinite love and tenderness became, and is still, the Jewish ideal of worship.

Thus a complete absence of all mental servility, a complete exclusion of all slavish dread, was a marked characteristic of the Hebraistic mental and spiritual attitude. The pious Hebrew "walked with God," conversed with him as with a most intimate and loving friend.

It is an error to attribute—as many do—the doctrines of human dignity to the teaching of Christ alone. Certainly Christ and his followers taught it, but then Christ himself was born a Jew, and as such had learnt it from his youth upwards.

The Eighth Psalm exquisitely embodies the Hebrew estimate of man's dignity: "Thou hast made him *a little lower than the angels*, and hast crowned him with glory and honour."

It is in his subtle delineation of Adam's Hebraistic attitude that Milton's genius becomes so apparent: Adam walks and converses with God in the garden, and entertains the Archangel Raphael as little more than an equal.

It was Abraham's proudest title to be called "the friend of God."

This elevated view of man's relations to the Divine ennobled the Hebrew mind, and gave it that self-respect and dignity which has never ceased to distinguish it.

It is just such a noble, enlightened Deism as this which is set forth in the pages now before us.

There is scarcely a line, certainly not a page, which does not testify to the joy and privilege of daily, hourly communion with God, the "Father of the spirits of all flesh" (p. 2), as well as to the abiding sense of God's presence (p. 73). The author of these *Reflections* refers to the conviction of God's nearness to us as "the most purifying influence possible to man" (p. 37). God is a refuge in distress, a very present help in trouble. Not even the bitterest domestic bereavements can shake this faith in the infinite love of God. It is this implicit reliance upon God's wisdom and goodness which sustains her in hours of most severe affliction. This conception of God and of his love for man is, we read, the "basis of Judaism."

The mission of Israel, as defined by Lady Simon, is to propagate those true ideas about God which alone can stimulate men to righteousness; and she expresses it as her innate conviction that many of the miseries of human life, as well as "all the cruelties and all the persecutions that darken history, are the result of ignorance concerning God" (p. 70).

By walking with God the Israelite lives in the light of his countenance, and is influenced by God's love, mercy, peace, and righteousness. The Jewish law of life is summed up in the twice-quoted precept of the prophet Micah: "What doth the Lord require of

thee but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?" (Micah vi. 8.)

It will be observed how, in the Jewish religion, the greatest stress is laid, *not* upon belief, but upon righteous acts, which, after all, are but the outcome of a noble faith. Thus, the Jewish religion is essentially a practical one; the life, not the creed, is emphasized.

This passive bearing of witness is, I take it, one of the distinguishing features of Judaism, past and present. The Jews were rarely an actively proselytizing nation. They are perhaps the only example in history of an eminently religious community, which, whether in or out of power, was characterised by a general absence of religious fanaticism of the kind referred to. They never regarded it seriously as their mission to compel others, either by force or argument, to share their beliefs.

Their interpretation of the mission of Israel is far other, and can have no other source than that of Divine inspiration; it is to live the life of God, to convince by example rather than by precept. This duty of bearing witness to the truth is scattered throughout the Old and New Testament, and was the prophetical and apostolic, as, centuries of persecution past, it has at length become the Christian ideal.

Inasmuch as Lady Simon's *Reflections* were not originally set down with any idea of publication, the fact that the book is not put forth as a contribution to the controversial literature of the day seems to me to enhance its value as a factor in that mission of Judaism which its author has so much at heart.

The Jews hold a position which is unique in history.

Deism is the civilised world's most ancient, as it seems likely to be its latest, religion.

The intellectual world has as it were—racial traditions of course apart—come back to Judaism. This goes far to prove, if, in the face of such evidence as the Mosaic theocracy, or St. Paul's missionary system, proof were needed, that the Hebrew mind has a genius for religion, and for its most sublime expression.

I cannot close this notice without referring to an objection which, from a pitiful and mistaken sense of loyalty, is often weakly urged against Jewish writings, that, elevated as is their tone of thought, there is no mention of Christ in their pages.

But from the Jewish standpoint this silence is perfectly logical, and argues nothing either as to appreciation or non-appreciation of the Christian ideal, any more than the very rare reference made to Martin Luther in modern Protestant writings argues any depreciation of that great reformer's work in effecting the breach with Rome. I

am not aware that in the above pages from which I have quoted any allusion is made to the prophet Elijah, and yet I am convinced that his name is one of the peculiar boasts of Judaism. Things are sometimes too generally admitted to require especial reference, and so it is with the Jewish appreciation of Christ. From the Deistic standpoint, leaders of thought among the Jews have long since done ample justice to the beauty of Christ's teaching and character. The question of his divinity is another matter which need not be entered upon here.

Did space permit, I should have liked to enlarge upon the many points of general interest, which a perusal of Lady Simon's book suggests. The character of the work is such that it cannot fail to attract a wide circle of readers : one will prize it as a treasury of scriptural quotation ; another, perhaps, will read it for the references to eminent personages of the day which it contains ; a third for the charm of the author's style ; a select company among us will delight in the pure and rarefied spiritual atmosphere which we seem to breathe in its pages ; but its noble toleration, its tender, gentle humanity must touch us all.

ALICE LAW.

Die Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes und seiner Litteratur, übersichtlich dargestellt von Dr. S. BAECK. Kaufmann, Frankfort on the Main, 1894.

THE fact of a book like Dr. Baeck's *Geschichte* appearing in a second edition is sufficient evidence of its importance. Yet it may not be superfluous to point out its merits to a public which has not too many opportunities of instructing itself in the history of its ancestors ; for the English edition of Graetz's comprehensive work is, apart from its being somewhat far from perfection, too voluminous and expensive to become popular. This aim is much better attained by Dr. Baeck's book, which, in a single volume, gives an excellent sketch of the whole of the Jewish history and literature from the Babylonian exile down to the present age. A particularly pleasing feature in the new edition is the literary appendix, which contains translations from the principal works of Jewish writers, beginning with the Greek period. The selection, although not complete, is sufficient, the translations are clear and carefully made. Entirely, but unjustly, omitted, is the modern pulpit literature, which is closely

connected with the history of the emancipation of the Jews. The essential part of Zunz's *Gottesdienstliche Vorträge* is nothing but the early history of the sermon, and its last chapter treats of the later development of pulpit oratory. On the other hand, it would have been wise to leave contemporaries entirely unmentioned; for, to give only one reason, it is but natural that those persons with whom the author is at all personally acquainted, are made prominent, whilst others of equal merit are not spoken of at all. History has only to deal with what is past.

I should like to call attention to a few slight inaccuracies. The introduction of the square alphabet into Hebrew writings was not so simple a proceeding as Dr. Baeck seems to imagine. It was not a spontaneous reform, but a development which took centuries. The remark on the invention of the vowel signs is likewise inaccurate. The so-called Babylonian ones are, without exception, superlinear. It is by no means so certain that this system is older than the Tiberian, nor has it been entirely supplanted by the latter, as it appears in Yemenian MSS. of quite recent date. It is altogether injudicious to speak of these and other unestablished facts with so much certitude, or to connect names with them.

Among more modern events the representation of the Damascus affair requires some rectification. The author should not have omitted the name of the late Dr. L. Loewe, whose merit it was—as we learn from Sir Moses Montefiore's *Diaries* (vol. i., p. 252)—to have discovered the use of the term *pardon* (*afoo*) instead of *acquittal* (*itlāk vetervīhh*) in the Firmān for the release of the captives. It was due to his exertions that the terms were altered accordingly. For pardoning is only the condoning of a crime committed or believed to be committed.

It should not remain unmentioned that the book is capitally got up, for which the enterprising publisher deserves great credit. I think I may advocate the translation of the book into English.

H. H.

Note by the Author of "The Ideal in Judaism."

By the courtesy of the editors I am enabled to offer a few observations in reply to the Rev. Harold Anson's valuable notice of my volume of sermons which appeared in the July number of this Review.

It is not usual for an author to appeal against the judgment of

a critic ; and if I depart from the practice in this instance it is in order to save, not myself, but Jewish opinion and teaching from misconception. Each individual Jew, however obscure, becomes exalted by outsiders into a type, and there is some danger of my doctrine, as it is set forth by my reviewer, being taken to represent the doctrine of my people. I purposely frame the last sentence in this way, because, despite the general fairness and even kindliness of his observations, Mr. Anson has not quite accurately represented some of my views.

He thinks, for example, that I have treated "contemptuously" the religious observances of the Old Testament, meaning by "religious observances" the Mosaic sacrificial rite, and he quotes in his support my statement that the modern conception of the Divine Being will not permit us to think that He can find delight in animal sacrifices—a statement made in the teeth of the many positive injunctions to offer sacrifice which are contained in the Pentateuch. But if I am guilty of contemptuous conduct in this respect, I err in the best of all good company—in the company of the Hebrew Prophets and Psalmists, who declared unequivocally that the Supreme Being has no delight in sacrifices, and that the sacrifice He has chosen is a contrite spirit. It is strange to find a Christian, who is bound by the noblest and the most characteristic traditions of his religion to insist upon "inwardness," taking a Jew to task for his lack of sympathy with "the effete ceremonial of a semi-civilised world."

My reviewer, moreover, is disappointed at the absence of any reference in "The Ideal" to the truth that God still demands sacrifice, though sacrifice of a "more costly, because personal" kind. He has evidently forgotten my citation from the Boraitha of R. Meir, to which he himself had already alluded with approval : "This is the way of the religious life ; thou shalt eat thy morsel of bread with salt, and drink water by measure, sleep on the earth, and live a life of sorrow." The quotation is introduced into the sermon entitled "The Suffering Messiah," which from first to last is an appeal for this "personal" sacrifice which God so dearly loves.

Mr. Anson is surprised that I mention the Founder of Christianity so seldom, and thinks that the terms in which I speak of him are "not very laudatory." There are two allusions to Jesus in my book, and if they are so few, it is because the subjects dealt with did not call for more numerous references. The passages in question occur on pages 9 and 33 respectively. In the former Jesus is described as "that central figure whose sufferings and charm of character move our neighbours to alternate sympathy and emulation" ; in the latter his "winning character" is acknowledged. These, I venture

to submit, can hardly be called unsympathetic allusions. As to the fairness of my description of Christianity—how far it is essentially a dogmatic system, and whether it is possible for a Christian to deny the verbal accuracy of the Gospels, and yet preserve unimpeached his character for orthodoxy—this raises a vexed question which obviously cannot be discussed in a note. But since I am charged with being "not over-sympathetic" towards Christianity, I may appropriately call attention to my designation of the Christian Watch-Night Service as "an impressive ceremony" (page 62), and to my allusion to the open door of the City Church, "with its silent invitation to busy men," which I call "inexpressibly beautiful." (Page 117.)

Far more serious is Mr. Anson's opinion that Judaism, as I expound it, has no place for the conception of an immanent, urging, loving God. This is a familiar objection on the lips of our Christian brethren, and is all the more inexplicable seeing that the Hebrew Scriptures, which are equally accessible to Christians and Jews, are for ever crying out against it. I hope, in an early number of this Review, to show how groundless this objection is, by expounding in detail Jewish doctrine on the question at issue. Meanwhile, as regards my treatment of the subject in "The Ideal," I would submit that Mr. Anson has scarcely given to the book, as a whole, that attentive consideration which might have been expected from so conscientious a reviewer. Many of the sermons, I would urge, aim at the satisfaction of that "very real need" which, in his opinion, my book has "left unsupplied." The sermon on "The Rainbow," in particular, dwells almost exclusively upon the love of God for His earthly children, and upon the revelation of His goodness which is to be discerned in human character. "There is no life so gloomy," to quote a brief passage from that discourse, "but some rays of comfort shall steal in to illumine it; and though a whole city-full of rebellion and sin separate God from men as with a thick cloud, yet shall that barrier be pierced again and again by the sweet tokens of His mercy. . . . . And truly it is man's mercy to man that is the most eloquent witness of the Divine love. Every pang assuaged by human agency, every soothing, encouraging word that is spoken to still the complaining, to strengthen the despairing spirit, every deed of true charity, every grasp of a friend's hand, every ray of light that falls upon our life from the soul of our beloved, is a manifestation of God's mercy. Those virtues of men and women by the exercise of which they bless one another, are as truly God's angels as are the tranquillity and the strength that will sometimes mysteriously find their way into our disquieted hearts, coming we know not whence." And then, if I may be permitted one more extract, there is the sermon, entitled, "The Penitential Season,"

which, like the season that suggested it, would be utterly unmeaning, did not Judaism number among its essential constituents the belief in God's infinite love, which is freely extended to the contrite sinner :—"Year after year this season returns, with its call to repentance, eloquent of a love, a pity, a sympathetic recognition of human needs that is Divine. 'Return, ye erring children,' it cries, in the name of the Most High ; 'I will heal your waywardness. Let not your self-reproaches keep you back. My love is all-powerful ; it will receive you, it will comfort you. If you suffer because of the thought of your disobedience, you shall suffer no more.' Wise, indeed, are they who heed the sublime message, who, touched by its very mercifulness, hasten to lay the homage of their contrition before the Throne of Grace ; who read, and judge, and reform their lives under the tranquil influences of these days ; who discern their God in the still small voice of His loving appeal, and wait not till He is revealed by the mighty tempest of His rebuke." And the sermon ends with a prayer, breathing precisely the same spirit.

MORRIS JOSEPH.

CORRECTION TO PAGE 707.

Professor Bacher, who saw the MS. during his short visit to the Bodleian Library, read l. 11, בר פרקאן [צדקה]; l. 17, [הו אן]; l. 18, מכצוצה [אלפאט] ללאואמר ; *ibidem*, the word וצורהא ought to follow the word ציגהא (l. 19) ; l. 19, [פ]ו לגתהא. Dr. Harkavy is also of opinion that the Arabic fragment (ff. 705 to 707) is by חפץ (Hafs) ben Yatsliah ; it is certainly not by Samuel ben Hofni.

A. N.

The Jewish Quarterly Review.

JANUARY, 1895.

JAMES DARMESTETER AND HIS STUDIES IN ZEND LITERATURE.

1849-1894.

THE proper biography of a scholar is an autobiography, that is to say, a biography written by himself, written in his own books. The circumstances of his life may concern his friends, but in most cases they need not be published, whether they are meant to gratify the vanity of the survivors, or the vulgar curiosity of the public at large. No one could wish for a better or fuller autobiography in that sense, than may be found in the published works of James Darmesteter. They speak for themselves, and they require a very short commentary only to explain their origin and their purpose. It is right that we should know that James Darmesteter had the good fortune of being born as the son of poor, but high-minded parents, poor Jews, who seem to have lived for their children only, and to have cherished no ambition but to prepare their sons for a useful and honourable career in life. And in this they succeeded beyond all expectation. Arsène, the elder brother of James, was a rising scholar when he died at a very early age. The Dictionary of the French language, which he prepared and began to publish, will be a lasting monument of his industry, his learning, and his sagacity.

The younger brother, James, had secured to himself a foremost place in the brilliant ranks of French scholarship, when he likewise died comparatively early, at the age of forty-nine. One more feature has to be mentioned to explain the spirit in which James Darmesteter devoted his life with unflagging energy to his special studies. He was deformed, and his frail body was to him a constant reminder of the uncertainty of life. It was likewise a very valid excuse for him for declining to waste his precious hours in performing the so-called duties of society. He rather shrank from society, and even among his friends he often seemed impatient to return to his quiet study, and to his oldest and dearest friends, his books. Later in life, and more particularly after his marriage, this retiring disposition may have yielded to a sense of what he owed to his wife and to his friends. Still he always remained self-contained, aloof from the world, and truly at home in his own world only, the world of ancient thought, as preserved and revealed to us in the *Sacred Books of the East.* I did not know James Darmesteter in his younger days. But I began to hear of him from our common friends in Paris, and I was able to take his true measure when he sent me his first important publication, *Haurvatât et Ameretât, Essai sur la Mythologie de l'Avesta,* 1875, and his *Ormazd et Ahriman, leur origines et leur histoire,* 1877. In these treatises he gave proof, not only of his mastery of Zend, the sacred language of the Avesta, but likewise of a critical knowledge of comparative philology and comparative mythology. As a specimen of what he could do as a classical and comparative scholar, he published about the same time in the *Recueil des Travaux originaux et traduits relatifs à la Philologie et à l'Histoire Littéraire,* an essay written in Latin, "De Conjugatione Latini Verbi *Dare.*" What struck me in all these writings was a mind that could not brook anything obscure or nebulous, a mind that did not rest till it had discovered the rational beginnings of mythological and linguistic formations, however irrational

and unintelligible in their later appearance, a mind that could grasp a large array of facts, put them in order and present them in language both clear and bold.

When therefore I had to look out for a scholar to undertake the arduous task of translating the Avesta for the *Sacred Books of the East,* I fixed at once on James Darmesteter as most likely to fall in with my own views, that is to give a translation of these difficult documents such as could be given at the time, taking account of all that had been done before him, avoiding as much as possible all controversy, and adding only such notes as were required to enable students, ignorant of Zend, to understand the fragmentary remains of the ancient faith of Media and Persia. I was pleased to find that the young scholar was willing to accept my proposal, and the almost unanimous expression of opinion on the value of his labours, as published in vol. iv. (1880), and in vol. xxiii. (1883) of my *Sacred Books of the East,* has proved that my choice had been right. I was disappointed, however, when my excellent *collaborateur* declined to undertake the translation of the Yasna and the Vispêrad, not feeling himself, as he declared, quite prepared as yet for that work. He felt convinced, he said, that these chiefly liturgical treatises required for their proper interpretation an ocular knowledge of the sacrifices as still performed by the Mobeds of Bombay. As I could not well leave the gap unfilled, I followed the advice of Darmesteter himself, and accepted the offer of the Rev. Dr. Mills, who had been working for years at the Yasna, and whose translation of Yasna, Vispêrad, Âfrînagân, Gâhs and Miscellaneous Fragments, published in 1887, successfully completed the translation of the Avesta which I had promised in the *Sacred Books of the East.* In Darmesteter's decision to postpone his own translation of the Yasna, we can see the same caution and the same impartiality which distinguish all his work. It is well known that there are two schools of Zend scholarship, which, to judge from the severe criticisms which they pass on each other, seem irreconcilable with

regard to the method that should be followed in the interpretation of the Avesta. One school, chiefly represented by Haug, Benfey, Roth and others, see the true key to the meaning of the Avesta in the Veda and comparative philology; the other school, led by Spiegel and his pupils, consider the tradition, as handed down in Pahlavi and Parsi literature, and in the customs and opinions of living Mobeds, the safest guide of the student of the Zoroastrian religion. We may take it for granted that much is to be said in support of either view, considering the eminence of the scholars who have taken a leading part in these discussions. The first successful attempts at a scientific analysis of the Zend language came from comparative philologists and Sanskrit students, such as Bopp, Lassen, Windischmann and others, and after the publication of the Veda, Vedic scholars, such as Benfey and Roth followed in their track. They certainly brought out wonderful coincidences between the language, the mythology and the religion of the Vedic poets and the Avestic law-givers. Burnouf, however, himself the author of some brilliant discoveries as to the common fund of words and thoughts in the Veda and the Avesta, was nevertheless one of the first who pointed out that the tradition handed down from at least Sassanian times, should not be neglected by European scholars. Much as he criticised Anquetil's translation, which was entirely based on tradition, and on tradition often misunderstood, he availed himself of it whenever he could do so with the good conscience of a scholar. Darmesteter, following his example, showed the same good sense in trying to make use of everything that had been preserved in the traditions of the Mobeds, though always with the provision that it must not be in conflict with the principles of critical scholarship. Such was his faith in the continuity of tradition, particularly with regard to the ceremonial, that soon after his appointment as *Professeur des Langues et Littératures de l'Iran* at the *Collége de France* in 1885, he accepted a scientific mission from

the French Government to India. One of his chief objects was to witness at Bombay the performance of the Parsi ceremonial, and though he did not succeed in being admitted into the Holy of Holies, he saw and heard enough, with the help of some really learned Parsi priests, to gain a clear insight into the liturgical framework of the Zoroastrian faith. But he gained even more by examining a number of Zend, Pahlavi, and Parsi MSS. in the possession of native scholars at Bombay; he learned Guzerathi, and was thus enabled to hold converse with native scholars and also to avail himself of several Guzerathi translations of Zend texts. He succeeded even in adding some fragments to what had been published before of the ancient Zend literature, and he expressed a confident hope that a more systematic search might still bring to light some portions of the Avesta which existed in the third, and the fourth, possibly even in the ninth century A.D., but which have vanished since. After having done all this work at Bombay, Darmesteter travelled on to Afghanistan, in order to study the Pushtu language, and he succeeded not only in collecting a number of Afghan songs (published in *Chants Populaires des Afghans*, 1880-90), but likewise in discovering in the language now spoken at Kabul a distant descendant of Zend or Pahlavi. This was an important discovery, for it once more secured to the language of the Afghans its proper place in the pedigree of the Iranian branch, of which it had been deprived by Dr. Trumpp, who had tried to prove that the Afghan dialect was a direct descendant of Sanskrit, and more closely related to the modern vernaculars of India than of Persia. It is extraordinary how his delicate constitution could have stood the wear and tear of this journey, which, though much easier now than it was in Anquetil's time, is nevertheless both exciting and fatiguing, particularly if, as in Darmesteter's case, it was filled with the uninterrupted work of copying MSS., learning new languages, and delivering addresses both before English and native audiences. Darmesteter had, if

not an iron frame, an iron will, and visible as were often the signs of his bodily sufferings, he never would allow himself to complain. He would never say how tired he was.

And this combination of a delicacy and cautiousness almost feminine, with the courage of a lion, seems to form the distinctive character of the literary work that was to follow his return from India. We have seen how he shrank from translating the Yasna and Vispêrad till he had exhausted all the materials which might prove helpful; we can see the same prudence and circumspection in every line of his translation, in every note in which he weighs the translation of other scholars, and finally decides between the claims of the Vedic and of the traditional schools of interpretation. But when he has once surveyed the whole evidence, he shrinks from no consequences, and few scholars have given proof of greater scientific courage than he has done in the Introduction to his French translation of the Avesta. This translation appeared in the *Annales du Musée Guimet* in three volumes 4to. This magnificent collection of translations of Oriental texts is published in Paris at the expense of a private gentleman, M. Guimet, a rich merchant, who devotes a large portion of the fortune which he has made in the East to the furtherance of a better knowledge of the literary treasures of the East. In this collection Darmesteter published his new translation not only of the Vendidad, the Yashts, and the Khorda-Avesta (vol. xxii., 1892), but likewise of the Vispêrad and the Yasna (vol. xxi., 1892), which he had hesitated to translate for my collection of the *Sacred Books of the East.* The third volume (xxiv., 1893) contained the translation of Zend fragments lately discovered, and last, not least, his important essay, *Recherches sur la Formation de la Littérature et de la Religion des Zoroastriens.* It was in this treatise that he boldly dethroned the Avesta from its antiquity, and brought it down from 1500 B.C. to the beginning of the Christian era. Such an act requires what I call scientific

courage. It is certainly a very common weakness of scholars, more particularly of Oriental scholars, to wish to assign as remote a date as possible to the literary works which they have brought to light. It is the same in China, in Babylon, in Egypt, in Palestine, and in India. Dates such as 5000, 3000, 2000, and 1000 B.C. are freely assigned to inscriptions or to books, though no honest scholar can suppress misgivings that the scaffolding on which these dates repose may some day collapse, and be replaced by a chronology of much humbler proportions. We are too apt to forget that real chronology is possible with synchronisms only, and that when we once ascend to 2000 to 5000 B.C. there are few synchronisms left. There are no nails by which we can fasten the parallel dates of China, India, or Babylon. When there is a certain willingness all seems plausible enough. The Avesta having at first been assigned to the age of Vîshtâspa, the half mythical father of Darius, was afterwards raised to the age of 1200 or even 1500 B.C. This was done chiefly on the supposition that the Avesta was a branch of ancient Vedic poetry, and that therefore it could not be much later than the Veda. But what the exact relation of the Avesta to the Veda was has never as yet been fully explained, and the very date of the Veda belongs to those which require what I call a certain amount of willingness on the part of those who accept them. The date of 1200 B.C. or 1500 B.C., which I suggested for the Veda, and the dates of the successive periods of Vedic literature previous to the rise of Buddhism in India, have formed, I believe, a useful working hypothesis, but they cannot claim to be more than that. It is curious, however, that at the very time when the date of the Avesta has been so much depressed, that of the Veda should, on the strength of purely astronomical calculations, have been raised to 3000, nay even to 5000 B.C. To me, all these dates, I must confess, seem to be as problematical now as when I wrote my preface to the fourth volume of the Rigveda in 1862, in which this astronomical chronology was fully discussed.

The argument constructed by Darmesteter in proof of the recent date of the Avesta is extremely sagacious, and yet I cannot say that I am quite convinced by it. In order to arrive at a mutual understanding, both the defenders and the opponents of the antiquity of the Avesta and of other sacred books of the East ought, first of all, to distinguish very carefully between the date of a book, in the form in which we possess it, and the date of the original composition of its component parts. I still hold, in spite of all assertions to the contrary, that the existence of books, in our sense of the word, can nowhere be traced beyond about 600-700 B.C. A book, as we understood the term, presupposes the existence of an alphabet, abundance of writing materials, paper, reeds and ink, and most of all, the presence of a reading public. Alphabets, consisting of consonants and vowels, existed, as is well known, at a much earlier time; but it is a long cry from alphabets used in inscriptions and even in treaties and other official documents, to books in alphabetic writing intended to be read by an educated public. If we call Babylonian cylinders or Egyptian hieratic papyri, books—and there is no harm in doing this—the age of books would have to be put back very considerably, possibly to the reign of Yâo, in the twenty-fourth century B.C. But if we retain its destination for a reading public as an essential feature of a book, I doubt whether we can prove the existence of such a thing in any part of the world previous to 600-700 B.C. But if that is so, it by no means follows that the earlier centuries were entirely illiterate. On the contrary, the more we become acquainted with ancient literature the clearer does it become that there was everywhere a period of oral literature, composed and handed down by memory only. It is difficult for us to realise this, because our memory has become something totally different from what it was in ancient times, when writing and reading were unknown, nay, from what it still is in countries such as India, where, though there exist MSS., the Veda can properly be learnt

from the mouth of a teacher only. That people may know the whole of the Veda by heart is a simple fact that can easily be verified by anybody inclined to doubt it, while the accuracy of oral tradition, as superior even to that of MSS., is equally attested in India at the present day. The possibility of composing long poems without paper, pen and ink, forms generally the greatest difficulty. It is absurd, we have been told again and again, to suppose that Homer could have composed the Iliad and the Odyssey without paper, pen, and ink. But on this point also we have now indisputable evidence to the contrary. The Kalevala may not be as great a poem as the Iliad, but it is certainly as large a poem, and it was within the memory of man that Lönnrot and others wrote it down for the first time from the mouth of the people, many of whom could neither read nor write, whether in Finnish or in Swedish. It must, therefore, have been composed by the aid of memory alone. I mention this in order to show that if Darmesteter had proved that the Avesta was not written down before the Arsacide or Sassanian rulers of Persia, he would not have proved thereby that it did not exist as oral literature at a much earlier time. His arguments against the early date of a written Avesta are so strong that it will be difficult altogether to upset them. To begin with, we have no MSS. of the Avesta before the thirteenth century A.D., nor is it likely that more ancient Zend MSS. will ever be discovered. There are, no doubt, the Pahlavi translations, which belong to the fourth century, and were still in existence at the time when the Dînkart was written, say 900 A.D. (*Sacred Books of the East*, Vol. V., p. lxiv.) But what is that compared with the Sassanian and the Achæmenian periods, with the date assigned to Vîshtâspa and Darius, to say nothing of the earlier dates ranging from 1200 to 1500 B.C.!

Taking his stand on the Dînkart as translated for the first time by West in the *Sacred Books of the East*, Vol. XXXVII., Darmesteter has made it clear that there is

trustworthy evidence of at least three anterior collections of the Avesta. The account given of the first composition can hardly claim to be called historical, except in so far as it records a belief current at the time. We read that the twenty-one Nasks of the Avesta were the work of Ahura Mazda, and that they were formed from the twenty-one words of the Ahura Vairya prayer. These twenty-one Nasks were supposed to have been presented by Zoroaster to King Vîshtâsp, who ordered two copies to be made, one to be deposited in the treasury of Shâpigân, the other in the National Library.

Approaching historical times, the Dînkart goes on to state that the copy in the National Library was burnt by Alexander's soldiers, while the other was carried off by the Greeks to be translated into their own language. This occurrence is more or less confirmed by Greek writers. We enter on really historical ground when we are told that one of the Parthian kings of Persia—Valkhash—was the first to order the fragments of the Avesta to be collected. This Valkhash has, with great plausibility, been identified by Darmesteter with Vologeses I., the contemporary of Nero, 37-68 A.D.

The next collector was the founder of the new Sassanian dynasty of Persia, Ardashir (211-241 A.D.). His chief assistant in the restoration of the old national religion was Tansar. A famous letter of his, translated from the original Pahlavi into Arabic by Ibn al Moqaffa, the well-known translator of Kalila va Dimnah (about 850 A.D.), and from Arabic into Persian by Muhammed bin ul Hassan (1210 A.D.), has lately been discovered by Darmesteter and published in the *Journal Asiatique*.

Next came Ardashir's son Shâhpûhr, who reigned from 241 to 272. He made great efforts to collect all that could still be recovered of ancient Avestic literature, not only in Persia, but, as we are told, in India and Greece also. He took particular interest in philosophical and scientific writings, such as were once comprised in the Avesta. Lastly,

Shâhpûhr II., the son of Auhrmazd (309-379), convoked a kind of ecclesiastical council in order to put an end to the division of religion into various sects. The orthodox party was represented by Adarbad, the son of Mahraspand, and an attempt was made to put an end to all forms of dissent, and, at the same time, to close the sacred canon.

Darmesteter argues very correctly that, accepting these statements as historical, there would have been every opportunity for adding portions to the Avesta as late as the time of the council under Shâhpûhr II., that is to say, about as late as the Council of Nicæa. He meets the objection that Zend was at that time a dead language by the statement that, though dead, Zend was still studied and written at that time. The spoken and official language during the Sassanian period was Pahlavi, as preserved in contemporary inscriptions, and in translations of the Avesta; but the sacred language, he thinks, continued to be understood by the priests. If that was so, it was of course possible that religious and philosophical ideas prevailing in neighbouring countries, whether India, Palestine, or Egypt, should have found their way into the Avesta. And here Darmesteter inverts, and at the same time strengthens, his argument by pointing out in the Avesta, even in that small portion which has come down to us, ideas which, as he thinks, could only have reached Persia either from a Jewish, from a Greek, or from an Indian source.

It is difficult to do full justice to the sagacity with which Darmesteter has searched for traces of these three influences, particularly if one does not oneself consider them as quite conclusive. Still, even without being convinced, one cannot help admiring the learned pleading of the great Zend scholar.

The fact that *deva*, or *daeva*, the name for gods in Sanskrit, is used in Zend as the name of evil spirits, was formerly explained as the result of a religious schism that took place at a very early time among Vedic Âryas, and

led to the establishment of the Masdayasnian faith in opposition to the ancient Polytheism of the Vedic worshippers. Darmesteter, on the contrary, would have us believe that the name *deva* was borrowed at a much later time to designate the false gods of India and of other neighbouring nations, and was then transferred to all the evil spirits of the Zoroastrian mythology. But shall we suppose that such names as *Indra*, *Saurva*, and *Naunghaithya* (in Sanskrit, Indra, Sarva, and Nâsatya) existed in Zend as names of evil spirits, but that they were not called by the general name of *daevas* till a much later time, when the Masdayasnians had learnt this name as that of the idols of their Indian neighbours?

Darmesteter takes *Buiti*, the name of a *daeva*, or evil spirit in the Avesta, who was to have killed Zarathushtra, as another name borrowed from India after the rise of Buddhism in that country. The name occurs once as *Buidhi*, which he identifies with the Sanskrit, *Bodhi*. Darmesteter would wish us to believe that the composer of the Nineteenth Fargard of the Vendidâd, where this name occurs, had been brought in contact with Indian Buddhism, and that, though he regarded it as a hostile religion, he yet borrowed from it the account of the temptation of Zarathushtra by Angra Mainyu, in imitation of Buddha's temptation by Mâra.

As this argument is hardly strong enough by itself, Darmesteter has tried to support it by the fact that in one of the Yashts *Gaotema* occurs represented as an impostor. *Gautama* is certainly one of the many names of Buddha, but as Gautama was the name of a large family in India, why should not *Gaotema* have been a common name in Persia also?

That Buddhism had reached Persia at the time of Ardashir (211-241 A.D.), and even earlier, may well be admitted, but that a contact of Zoroastrianism with Buddhism should have left no traces beyond those two names of *Buiti* and *Gaotema*, and that they should have become

the names of the adversaries of the half-mythical Zarathushtra, is more difficult to believe.

So much for the supposed Indian influences. The Jewish influence on the Avesta is admitted by Darmesteter himself to be less perceptible; but he points out traces of it in the general character of the Pentateuch and the Avesta. Both have the same object, he says, namely, to write the history of the Creation, and the history of the race, the Jewish on one side, the Iranian on the other; to inculcate the worship of a supreme deity, Jehovah or Ahura Mazda, and to teach a moral code, communicated by them to their prophets, whether Moses or Zarathushtra. All these features, however, might be traced in other religions also, and would scarcely suffice to prove a borrowing from the Pentateuch on the part of the author, or authors, of the Avesta. More special coincidences are the creation of the world in six days in the Pentateuch, and the creation of the world in six periods in the Avesta.[1] The succession of these six periods, however, is different in the two Bibles. Instead of light, heaven, sea, earth, plants, stars, animals, and man, we have in the Avesta heaven, water, earth, plants, animals, and mankind (*Bundahish*, i. 28) as the creation of the six periods.

The account of the Deluge also, no doubt, has many points of similarity; but likewise some important differences.

It is true that the division of the earth among the three sons of Noah is more or less closely matched by the division of the earth among the three sons of Thraêtaona Airya, Sairima, and Tura; but Thraêtaona is not Yima, and it is Yima in the Avesta who corresponds to the character of Noah in the Pentateuch, and not Thraêtaona. Again, that Moses was preceded by three patriarchs, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and Zarathushtra by three saints, Vivanghvat, Athwya, and Trita, is certainly curious, but hardly sufficient to support a conclusion such as Darmesteter tries to erect on it.

[1] Mentioned in an *Afrîn* only, and in *Yt*, 13, 86.

Admitting that there are certain similarities between the Pentateuch and the Avesta, it would not follow that they must be due to a direct exchange of thought between the Persians and the Jews dispersed in Asia during the first centuries before and after the Christian era. Several of the traditions mentioned by Darmesteter as transferred from Palestine to Persia, are now known to have formed part of the most ancient Semitic folklore, preserved to us in the cuneiform inscriptions of Chaldaea. Therefore, if borrowed at all from a Semitic source, the borrowing might have taken place very long before the first century B.C., and no argument could be derived from it as to the late date of our Avesta.

Far more powerful than his arguments in support of Indian and Jewish influences reaching the Avesta during the Parthian period, are, to my mind at least, Darmesteter's arguments in favour of Greek, and more particularly of Neo-Platonic thoughts having found admission into the Avesta about the beginning of the Christian era.

That the Zoroastrians believed in four great periods of the world, each lasting 3,000 years, is known from Theopompos, who may have seen the very MS. of the Avesta which was carried off by the soldiers of Alexander, and likewise from the Avesta. According to Theopompos, the Magi believed that the good and the evil spirits reign at first alternately, that during the third period they struggle, while during the fourth the good prevail. The Zoroastrians, while agreeing as to the four periods of 3,000 years each, and as to the struggle carried on between Ahura Mazda and Angra Mainyus during the third, begin the fourth period with the birth of Zoroaster, and end it with the final destruction of Ahriman and the resurrection to eternal life. They differ even more essentially from the account given by Theopompos with regard to the first and second periods. Thus the *Bundahish* (i. 8) declares that in the first period Ormazd produced a spiritual creation, and that for three thousand years his creatures remained in a spiritual state,

without corruption (amûîtâr), without motion, and intangible. It was in the second period only that the world became material, while Ahriman remained in confusion. This conception of a spiritual creation preceding the material creation is so clearly a repetition of the Neo-Platonic conception of a κόσμος νοητός preceding the κόσμος ὁρατός (in Zend the *sti gaîthya* and the *sti mainyava*), that Darmesteter took it confidently as a late importation from Greece or Alexandria. The objection that it occurs in the *Bundahish*, which could not have been written before the Mohammedan conquest of Persia (A.D. 650), and which for other reasons has been assigned to A.D. 881,[1] he meets by showing that, though the *Bundahish* is of recent date, its materials are probably taken from the *Dâmdât*, one of the twenty-one original Nasks, which, to judge from an analysis of it in the *Dînkart*, treated of the creation of the spiritual world and of its change into the material. He actually quotes from the Pahlavi version of the Vendidâd a fragment of the lost Zend original of that work, in which the question is asked, "How long did the creation of the good spirit last?" thus leaving no doubt that such a work existed in Zend, and what the chief subject of that lost Nask must have been.

All this shows how careful a pleader Darmesteter could be, and how conscientiously his case was prepared; but we must remember that the idea of a spiritual, followed by a material creation, strange as it may sound to some of us, is not so peculiar in itself that it could have occurred to one mind only, to that of Plato, and have been handed down in one school only, that of the Neo-Platonists of Alexandria. On the contrary, the rudiments of the theory of the Logos —that is, the Spiritual Creation—proceeding from the Supreme Spirit, are to be found in places which Greek influence could not possibly have reached. In a well-known hymn of the Rigveda, Vâk, or Speech, is represented as holding the same, or a very similar place, as the Logos in Philo;

[1] *Sacred Books of the East*, Vol. V., p. xliii.

and even among uncivilised races, such as the Klamaths and other Red Indian tribes, we meet with utterances which imply the recognition of a spiritual as well as a material creation, such as "Our Old Father created the world by thinking and willing."[1] If in the Avesta, or even in the *Bundahish*, we could point out a single Greek word such as *Logos*, we should be as ready to admit Neo-Platonic influences in the Avesta as in the Fourth Gospel; but without such evidence we ought, I think, to leave it an open question whether the theory of a spiritual and a material creation was of native growth in Persia, or borrowed from Greek philosophers.

In order to be quite fair, we ought still to mention what Darmesteter has to say about the Amshaspands. The Amshaspands, or Amesha Spentas, the Holy Immortals, are six in number, and form, as it were, the staff of Ahura Mazda. They are:—

1. *Vohu-Manô, i.e.*, Good Mind, the Guardian of flocks and of man.
2. *Asha-Vahista, i.e.*, Perfect Righteousness, the Guardian of fire.
3. *Khshathra-Vairya, i.e.*, Good Government, the Guardian of metals.
4. *Spenta-ârmaiti, i.e.*, Holy Piety or Humility, the Guardian of the earth.
5. *Haurvatât, i.e.*, Health, the Guardian of water.
6. *Ameretât, i.e.*, Immortality, the Guardian of plants.

These six Spirits were known to Plutarch in the first century A.D., though he may not always have understood their character quite accurately. He explains *Vohu-Manô* as *θεὸς εὐνοίας*, *Asha-vahista* as *θεὸς ἀληθείας*, *Khshathra-vairya* as *θεὸς εὐνομίας*, *Spenta-ârmaiti* as *θεὸς σοφίας*, *Haurvatât* as *θεὸς πλούτου*, *Ameretât* as *τὰ ἐπὶ τοῖς καλοῖς ἡδέα*.

It is quite clear that these divine beings are not, like

[1] *Gifford Lectures*, Vol. IV., p. 383.

the oldest Gods in the Avesta, of physical origin. The question is, Were they abstractions formed by the Mazdayasnians themselves, or were they borrowed from Greece? The names are certainly Persian, and in the case of *Haurvatât* and *Ameretât*, Darmesteter has himself in one of his earliest essays established their Vedic antecedents. He has also shown that all of them began with abstractions, not intuitions, and that it was by a natural after-growth that they became personal, and were at last connected with physical phenomena. Nevertheless, he now holds that these Amshaspands, and more particularly the first and most important of them, *Vohu-manô*, the Good Mind, represented a thought borrowed from Neo-Platonism, that he was, in fact, the representative of the Logos, as taught at Alexandria, as known to Philo, and as transferred to Palestine by Jews who had been living in Alexandria. No one could doubt that this doctrine of the Logos might have been carried from Alexandria to Persia, just as it might have been to Jerusalem by such men as Apollos, a Jew mighty in the Scriptures, who was born at Alexandria, or by the Synagogue of the Alexandrians, mentioned in the Acts, or by the author of the Fourth Gospel, who, whatever his name, was certainly no stranger to the doctrines of the Neo-Platonists. The manner in which this Second Person, or the Good Mind, is spoken of in the Avestic writings reminds one most forcibly of expressions used of the Logos by philosophers, and of the Son by the Christians of Alexandria, such as St. Clement and Origen. He is called[1] the first-born of all beings, through whom in the beginning Ahura created the world and the true religion. He is the type of the human race, and at last the intercessor between Ahura and man, to obtain forgiveness of sins.

It must be confessed that to a student fresh from Philo or from Origen, these coincidences sound startling; and

[1] Darmesteter, III., p. 53.

yet we must always remember that if the development of the Logos in the Neo-Platonic sense from the fundamental conceptions of Plato and Aristotle, was natural and intelligible, considering the necessity of having some kind of connecting link between the transcendent Deity and the phenomenal world, so would be the parallel development of the Vohu-Manô, as the instrument through which Ahura Mazda was able to create and to rule the world. This may seem a very lame argument, yet, though I am not satisfied by it, I cannot forget that the whole system of Angels and Archangels has always been supposed to have been borrowed by the Jews from the Zoroastrian, rather than by the Zoroastrians from the Jews. And while in the Avestic writings we find not a single foreign name borrowed from a Jewish source, we actually find one Zend name at least in the book of Tobit. One of the evil spirits created by Ahriman to oppose Ormazd and his six Amshaspands, was *Aeshma*, and this Aeshma, under the form of *Aeshmô daevô*, has been proved by Kohut and Windischmann, to have been the original of *Asmodeus*. This shows the direction of a stream of thought flowing from Persia to Judæa, but not from Judæa to Persia.

One more difficulty has to be mentioned which prevents us from accepting Darmesteter's theory of the late and Neo-Platonic origin of the Amshaspands. We saw that there were six Amshaspands, and Darmesteter himself admits that five of them were later developments of the original idea embodied in Vohu-Manô. The third of these Amshaspands is called in the Avesta *Khshathra-Vairya*, generally translated by Good Government, but meaning literally Strong Government. This is pure Zend, and very near to the corresponding Sanskrit words *Kshatra* and *Vîrya*. We have hitherto supposed that this name was gradually corrupted to *Khashtarvar*, *Shatrêvar*, *Shahrêvar*, and *Shehrîûr*. Fortunately, we can fix the date of one of these corruptions from coins which were

struck by Indo-Scythian rulers such as Kanishka (about 78 A.D.), and Huvishka (111-129 A.D.). On one of the coins of Huvishka we read the name *Raoreoro* or *Raoreoar*, which is as exact a rendering of *Shahrévar* as it was possible to give in the Indo-Scythian Greek alphabet.[1] We are now asked to believe that the Mazdayasnians knew nothing of their *Khshathra-Vairya* till about the first or second century after Christ, that is, till about the very time when this Persian Deity was borrowed by the Indo-Scythian rulers of India, under the corrupt form of *Shahrévar* or *Raoreoro*. This seems altogether impossible, while the former theory, that the old form *Khshathra-Vairya* became changed to *Shéhrevar* in the course of centuries and in obedience to the phonetic laws of Persian, and was adopted in that modern form by Huvishka, is simple, intelligible, and, as far as I can judge, indisputable. The ideas, too, which lie imbedded in *Khshathra-Vairya*, must surely have passed through a long process before they could dwindle down to the meaning conveyed by *Shahrévar*.

It may seem hardly fair in an obituary notice to enter upon a criticism of the opinions of a departed scholar. Still, as I said at the beginning, the true life of a scholar is written in his books, and they are of more interest than the small events which mark the stations of his pilgrimage on earth. Nor should I wish to be understood as if I undervalued Darmesteter's arguments in support of a late date of the Zend Avesta; all I wish to say is that I am not convinced, though I feel at the same time that the facts and arguments he has brought together on his side of the question, can never again be ignored, and deserve, if they are to be demolished at all, to be demolished by a better Zend scholar than I can claim to be. It is to be regretted that in discussing questions of scholarship, one is always supposed to be discussing persons rather than things. The

[1] See Stein, Zoroastrian Deities on Indo-Scythian coins, in *Oriental and Babylonian Record*, August, 1887, p. 161.

true scholar, however, cares not about *who* is right, but only about *what* is right. It happens, not unfrequently, that the man whose views in the end prove to be wrong, possesses and displays a far greater amount of sound knowledge than he who seems almost to divine the truth, and is able to unravel at once the most confused tangle of facts and arguments. Darmesteter possessed, certainly, a vast amount of positive knowledge, nor did he allow this burden to weigh down his critical faculty or his brilliant combination. His arguments are always to the point, his workmanship is always clean and sharp-cut. It seems the very consciousness of his strength that makes him attempt the most difficult tasks, which no one before him has ventured to approach. As I said in another article, his essay on the modern date of the Avesta, has fallen like a bomb into the peaceful camp of Zend scholars, and no one has yet succeeded in quenching it or carrying it away. I am the last person to undertake this dangerous task, but I could not, in giving an account of Darmesteter's literary achievements, suppress altogether the doubts which remain in my mind after a careful study of his work.

Darmesteter himself avoided, as much as possible, any literary feuds. He preferred to discuss opinions rather than men. He would often controvert certain views, and establish new facts, without once mentioning the names of those who were responsible for them. Still even he did not altogether escape from personal conflicts, and his controversy with Dr. de Harlez, now happily forgotten, is but another instance how two scholars of very high merit can say most painful things of each other, while all the time working, and working well, each in his own way, in the same noble cause, in the conquest of truth. There is no doubt that Darmesteter's last thesis will continue the subject of fierce controversy for years to come, but now that the author of it has been taken away from us, it will no doubt be carried on with the respect due to the dead, which is so often denied to the living.

My account of the literary labours of Darmesteter, which I was unexpectedly asked to write, is chiefly confined to the publications which had brought me in contact with him, and which were, therefore, quite familiar to me. Even if at Oxford I had been able to procure some of his other works, I should not have had time to read them, still less to judge them. But the following list of his publications, which I partly owe to the kindness of friends, will give an idea of his wide interests, and his comprehensive studies.

"Le Mahdi depuis les origines de l'Islam."

"Jemrud et la légende de Jemshid" (*Journ. Asiat.*, 8e série, tom. viii.).

"Points de contact entre le Mahabhârata et le Shâh-Nameh" (*ibid.* t. x. p. 6).

"Les inscriptions de Caboul" (*ibid.* t. xi., p. 491).

"L'apocalypse de Daniel" (*Mélanges Renier*, p. 405).

"Souvenirs bouddhistes sur l'Afghanistan" (*Journ. Asiat.*, 8e série, t. xv., p. 195).

"La grande inscription de Qandahar" (*Ibid.* t. xv., p. 195).

"Etudes Iraniennes," 2 vols., Paris, 1883.

"Essais orientaux," Paris, 1883.

"Les Prophètes d'Israël," Paris, 1892.

"L'apocryphe persan de Daniel" ("Bibl. des Hautes Études," fasc. 73.)

In the *Revue des Etudes Juives.*

"Les six feux dans le Talmud et dans le Bundahish" (tom. i., p. 186).

"David et Rama" (t. II., p. 300).

"Textes Pahlavis relatifs au Judaisme" (xviii. 1, xix. 41).

"Chants populaires des Afghans, précédés d'une introduction sur la langue, l'histoire et la littérature des Afghans," 1890.

This list may give an idea of his indefatigable industry. Darmesteter had for many years to support himself by his pen, and he did me the honour at that time to translate my Hibbert Lectures into French, *Origine et Développe-*

ment de la Religion, études à la lumière des Religions de l'Inde, 1879. His struggle for life must often have been very severe and very painful, but his last years were rendered bright and sunny by the tenderness of a devoted friend. Though he had accepted the editorship of a great French Review, a step which his colleagues and friends regretted, he did not become unfaithful to his Oriental studies. To the very last day of his life he worked hard at a new edition of his translation of the Avesta, for the *Sacred Books of the East*. Few only of the works constituting that large series, have as yet had the honour of a second edition, and it does great credit to the public in England and abroad that they should have discovered the exceptional value of the labour garnered in those two volumes. It will be no easy task to arrange the materials which he has left for publication, but the first volume is nearly printed, and the introduction, containing his latest views on the Avesta, is almost ready for press. Happy as he was in his birth, he was even happier in his death. After a cheerful conversation with his wife on some literary plans, he rested in his chair, while the bright sunlight streamed down upon him through the window of his library, a parting greeting from Mithra, the friend of light and truth, whom he had served so faithfully during his life on earth. He fell asleep unconsciously, and never opened his eyes again.

F. MAX MÜLLER.

SOME ASPECTS OF RABBINIC THEOLOGY.

III.

THE visible kingdom may be viewed from two aspects, national and universal. In the following pages I will try to give the outlines of this idea as they are to be traced in Rabbinic literature.

"Before God created the world," we read in the chapters of R. Eliezer, "there was none but God and his great name. 'The great name is the tetragrammaton,'" the name expressive of his being, the "I am." All other names, or rather attributes, such as Lord, Almighty, Judge, Merciful, indicative of his relation to the world and its government, had naturally no meaning before the world was created. The act of creation again is a manifestation of God's holy will and goodness; but it requires a responsive goodness on the part of those whom he intends to create. "When the holy one, blessed be he, consulted the Torah as to the creation of the world, she answered, 'Master of the (future) world, if there be no host, over whom will the King reign, and if there be no peoples praising him, where is the glory of the King?' The Lord of the world heard the answer, and it pleased him."[1]

To effectuate this object, the angels already in existence did not suffice. "When God had created the world," one of the later Midrashim records, "he produced on the second day the angels with their natural inclination to do good, and an absolute inability to commit sin. On the following days he created the beasts with their exclusively animal

[1] Chapter III. The thought of the world, and especially man, having been created for God's glory, is very common in Jewish literature. Cp. *Perek Kinyan Torah*, at the end; *Tanchuma Bereshit*, § 1.

desires. But he was pleased with neither of these extremes. If the angels follow my will, said God, it is only on account of their impotence to act in the opposite direction. I shall, therefore, create man who will be a combination of both angel and beast, so that he will be able to follow either the good or the evil inclination."[1] His evil deeds will place him below the level of the brutes, whilst his noble aspirations will raise him above the angels.

In short, it is not slaves, heaven-born though they may be, that can make the kingdom glorious. God wants to reign over free agents, and it is their obedience which he desires to obtain. Man becomes thus the centre of creation, for he is the only object in which the kingship could reveal itself in full manifestation. Hence it is, as it would seem, that on the sixth day, after God had finished all his work, that God became King over the world.[2]

Adam the first invites the whole creation over which he is master "to clothe God with majesty and strength," and to declare him King, and he and all beings join in the song, "The Lord reigneth, he is clothed with majesty," which forms now the substance of the 93rd Psalm.[3] God can now rejoice in his world. This is the world inhabited by man, and when he viewed it, as it appeared before him in all its innocence and beauty, he exclaimed: "My world, O that thou wouldst always look as graceful as thou lookest now."[4]

This state of gracefulness did not last long. The free agent abused his liberty, and sin came into the world, disfiguring both man and the scene of his activity. Rebellion against God was characteristic of the generations that follow. Their besetting sin, especially that of the generation of the Deluge, which had to be wiped out from the

---

[1] Quoted in the סמ"ק, § 53.

[2] See *Rosh Hashanah*, 31*a*, assuming, of course, that the words ומלך עליהן on the second day came into the text by a clerical error. Cp. ד"ם, a.l. *Aboth d'R. Nathan*, Appendix 76*b*, and the Mishnah, ed. Lowe, 191*a*.

[3] Chapters of R. Eliezer, XI.

[4] *Genesis R.*, IX.

face of the earth, was that they said: "There is no judge in the world."[1] They were the reverse of the faithful of later generations, who proclaimed God's government and kingship in the world every day.[2] They maintained that the world was forsaken by God, and said unto God, "Depart from us, for we desire not the knowledge of thy ways" (Job xxi. 14).[3] The name of God was profaned by transferring it to abominations (or idols), and violence and vice became the order of the day.[4] By these sins God was removed from the world in which he longed to fix his abode, and the reign of righteousness and justice ceased. The world was thus thrown into a chaotic state of darkness for twenty generations, from Adam to Abraham, all of them continuing to provoke God.[5] With Abraham the light returned,[6] for he was the first who called God master (אדון), a name which declares God to be the Ruler of the world, and concerned in the actions of men.[7] Abraham was also the first great missionary in the world, the friend of God, who makes him beloved by his creatures, and wins souls for him, bidding them, as he bade his children, to keep the way of the Lord, to do righteousness and judgment.[8] It was by this activity that Abraham brought God again nearer to the world;[9] or, as the Rabbis express it in another passage, which I have already had occasion to quote: Before Abraham made God known to his creatures he was only the God or the King of the heavens, but since Abraham came (and commenced his proselytising activity) he became also the God and the King of the earth;[10] Jacob is also supposed by the Rabbis to have

---

[1] *Aboth d'R. Nathan*, 47*b*, and parallels.

[2] See *Midrash Tillim*, *B.*, 11*b*.

[3] See *Synhedrin*, 108*a*.

[4] *Mechilta*, 67*b*. See also *Pseudo-Jonathan*, *Gen.* IV. 26.

[5] See *Aboth*, V. 1, and commentaries.

[6] *Genesis R.*, III., § 3.

[7] *Berachoth*, 7*b*. See מהר"שא to the passage.

[8] See *Siphre*, 73*b*, and parallels.

[9] *Pesikta B.*, 1*b*, and *Pesikta F.*, 18*b*.

[10] *Siphre*, 134*b*, where the word מלך occurs.

taught his children before his death the ways of God whereupon they received the yoke of the kingdom of heaven.[1] Hence the patriarchs (as models and propagators of righteousness) became, as I have mentioned above, the very throne of God, his kingdom being based upon mankind's knowledge of him, and their realisation of his nearness.[2]

But the throne of God is not secure as long as the recognition of the kingship is only the possession of a few individuals. At the very time when the patriarch was teaching righteousness, there were the entire communities of Sodom and Gomorrah committed to idolatry and the basest vices,[3] whilst in the age of Moses Pharaoh said: "Who is the Lord that I should obey his voice?"[4] The kingship is therefore uncertain until there exists a whole people "which knows God," sanctified unto his name, and devoted to the proclamation of his unity.[5] "If my people," God says to the angels, "decline to proclaim me as King upon earth, my kingdom ceases also in heaven." Hence Israel says unto God, "Though thou wast from eternity the same ere the world was created, and the same since the world has been created, yet thy throne was not established and thou wast not known; but in the hour when we stood by the Red Sea, and recited a song before thee, thy kingdom became firmly established and thy throne was firmly set."[6] The establishment of the kingdom is indicated in the eighteenth verse of the song, where it is said, "The Lord shall be King for ever and ever." But even more vital proofs of their readiness to enter into the kingdom Israel gave on the day of "the glorious meeting" on Mount Sinai, when they answered in one voice: "All that the

---

[1] *Numbers R.*, II., § 8. See also *Gen. R.*, and parallels.

[2] See JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, VI., p. 422.

[3] *Synhedrin*, 108*a*, and parallels.

[4] See Maimonides' M. T. ע"ז פ"א ה"ו הלכות עכום, etc., which seems to be a paraphrase of some Midrash.

[5] See *Exod. R.* xxiii.

[6] Midrash to Song of Songs MS.

Lord hath said we will do, and be obedient"[1] (Exod. xxiv. 7). This unconditional surrender to the will of God invested Israel, according to the Rabbis, with a special beauty and grace.[2] And by the manifestation of the knowledge of God through the act of the revelation the world resumes its native gracefulness, which makes it again heaven-like, whilst God finds more delight in men than in angels.[3]

There is a remarkable passage in the Mechilta, in which Israel is strongly censured because in the song at the Red Sea, instead of using the present tense, ה' מָלָךְ, "God *is* King," they said ה' ימלוך, "God *shall be* King," thus deferring the establishment of the kingdom to an indefinite future.[4] Israel had accordingly some sort of foreboding of the evil times to come, a foreboding which was amply justified by the course of history. Israel soon rebelled against the kingdom. There was the rebellious act of the Golden Calf, which took place on the very spot where the kingdom was proclaimed, and which was followed by other acts of rebellion against God.[5] The sons of Samuel were called *Bene Belial*—men who threw off the yoke of God[6] and denied the kingdom of heaven.[7] The

---

[1] *Pesikta B.*, 17*a*.

[2] See *Midrash Agadah*, ed. B., 171*a*. Cp. the Targum to Song of Songs, vii. 7.

[3] See *Exod. R.*, LI., § 8, and parallels.

[4] See *Mechilta*, 44*a*, in the name of R. Jose of Galilee. The text in the editions is corrupt. In the *Midrash Haggadol* it runs:—ה' ימלוך לעולם ועד · ר' יוסי אומ' אלו אמרו ישראל ה' מלך עולם ועד לא שלטה בהם אומה ומלכות אלא ה' ימלוך לעולם ועד לעתיד לבוא · מפני מה כי בא סוס פרעה מלמד שאף פרעה בכלל · וישב עליהם את מי הים · עליהם שב · אבל עמך וצאן מרעיתך ונחלתך בני אברהם אוהבך זרע יצחק ידידך משפחת יעקב בכורך · נפן שהסעת ממצרים וכנה שנטעה ימינך · ובני ישראל הלכו ביבשה בתוך הים. Cp. Targum Onkelos to this verse, who seems to have had the same difficulty as R. Jose, which Nachmanides did not apparently appreciate, unless he overlooked the passage from the *Mechilta*.

[5] See *Numb. R.*, VII., § 2.

[6] See *Siphre*, 93*b*.

[7] See *Yalkut Samuel*, § 86. The marginal reference to *Torath Kohanim*

division of the ten tribes under Jeroboam was also regarded as a rebellion against the kingdom of God. The Rabbis seem to have had a tradition that the original reading in 2 Samuel xx. 1 was איש לאלהיו ישראל, "Every man *to his gods*, O Israel."[1] Even the princes of Judah at a later time "broke the yoke of the Holy One, blessed be he, and took upon themselves the yoke of the King of Flesh and Blood." The phrase, "broke" or "removed" the yoke, is not uncommon in Rabbinic literature, and has a theological meaning. The passage just cited refers probably to some deification of Roman emperors by Jewish apostates, and not exactly to a political revolt.[2]

Yet, notwithstanding all these relapses, one great end was achieved, and this was, that there existed a whole people who did once select God as their King. Over the people as a whole, as already hinted, God asserts his right to maintain his kingdom. Thus the Rabbis interpret Ezekiel xx. 33, "Without your consent and against you will I (God) be King over you"; and when the elders of Israel remonstrate, "We are now among the Gentiles, and have therefore no reason for not throwing off the yoke of his kingdom," the Holy One answers, "This shall not come to pass, for I will send my prophets, who will lead you back under my wings."[3] The right of possession is thus enforced by an inner process, the prophets being a part of the people; and so there will always be among them a remnant which will remain true to their mission of preaching the kingdom. The remnant is naturally small in

---

(39*d*) refers only to the first lines of the passage, which Schöttgen (1149) confused. See *Koheleth Rabbah*, I., § 18.

[1] The rebellion of the Belial Sheba, the son of Bichri, is only a prelude to that effected by Jeroboam. See *Midrash Shemuel B.*, c. 14, § 4, and notes, and 39*a*.

[2] See *Aboth d'R. Nathan*, c. 20. See, however, Bacher's *Agada der Tannaiten*, I., 58, note 1, and the reference there to Weiss. Cp. the *Beth Talmud*, II. 333-34.

[3] See *Torath Kohanim*, 112*b*. Cp. *Synhedrin*, 105*a*, and parallels.

number, but is sufficient to keep the idea of the kingdom alive. "God saw," say the Rabbis, "that the righteous were sparse; he therefore planted them in (or distributed them over) all generations, as it is said in 1 Samuel i. 8, 'For the pillars of the earth are the Lord's, and he has set the world upon them.'" The pillars, according to the Rabbinical explanation, are the righteous, who, by the fact of their being devoted to the Lord, form the foundation of the spiritual world.[1]

I will now try to sum up in some clearer way the results to which the preceding sentences, mostly consisting of Rabbinical quotations, may lead us. We learn first that the kingdom of God is in *this world.* In the next world, if we understand by it the heavens, or any other sphere where angels and ethereal souls dwell, there is no object in the kingdom. The term, "Kingdom of Heaven," must therefore be taken in the sense in which heaven is equivalent to God, but not locally, as if the kingdom were located there. The term מלכות שדי in the Prayer-book,[2] the kingdom of the Almighty, may be safely regarded as a synonym of מלכות שמים.

This kingdom again is established on earth by man's consciousness that God is near to him, whilst nearness of God to man means the knowledge of God's ways to do righteousness and judgment, in other words, the sense of duty and responsibility to the heavenly King who is concerned in and superintends our actions. "The hill of the Lord," and "the tabernacle of God" in the Psalms, in which only the workers of righteousness and the pure-hearted shall abide, are kingdoms of God in miniature.

The idea of the kingdom is accordingly ethical, not eschatological, and it was in this sense that the Rabbis considered the patriarchs and the prophets as the preachers

---

[1] *Yoma*, 38*b*.

[2] Beginning על כן נקוה (p. 77 of Rev. S. Singer's Edition).

of the kingdom. It is not even identical with the law or the Torah. Why do we read, ask the Rabbis, first the *Shema* (*i.e.*, Deut. vi. 4-9), and afterwards the section Deut. xi. 13, commencing with the words: "And it shall come to pass if ye will hearken diligently unto my commandments." This is done, say the Rabbis, to the end that we may receive upon ourselves first the yoke of the kingdom and afterwards the yoke of the commandments.[1] The law is thus only a necessary consequence of the kingdom, but it is not identical with it. Another remarkable passage, in which the kingdom is distinguished from the Torah, is the following, alluding to Zech. ix. 9: "'Rejoice greatly, O daughter of Zion, ... behold thy King is coming unto thee. . . . .' God says to Israel: 'Ye righteous of the world, the words of the Torah are important for me; ye were attached to the Torah, but did not hope for my kingdom. I take an oath that with regard to those who hope for my kingdom I shall myself bear witness for their good. . . . . These are the mourners over Zion who are humble in spirit, who hear their offence and answer not, and never claim merit for themselves." Lector Friedmann, in his commentary on the Pesikta, perceives in this very obscure passage the emphatic expression of the importance of the kingdom, which is more universal than the words of the Torah; the latter having only the aim of preparing mankind for the kingdom.[2] But from another passage it would seem that Israel could derive the same lesson from the Torah itself, if they would only read it rightly. I refer to Siphre in Deut. xxxii. 29, where we read: "Had Israel looked properly into the words of the Torah which were revealed to them, no nation would have ever gained dominion over them. And

---

[1] *Berachoth*, 13*a*.

[2] See *Pesikta Rabbathi*, 159*a*, text and notes (especially note כב). There are, however, very grave doubts as to the age and character of all these *Messianic Pesiktoth*. See Friedmann's interesting note, *ibid.*, p. 164*a* and *b*, though he defends their genuineness.

what did she (the Torah) say unto them? Receive upon yourselves the yoke of the kingdom of my name; outweigh each other in the fear of heaven, and let your conduct be mutual loving-kindness."[1] The conditions of the kingdom are thus, mainly at least, ethical: The fear of God and the love of one's neighbour. Nor again is the kingdom of God political. The patriarchs in the mind of the Rabbis did not figure as worldly princes, but as teachers of the kingdom. The idea of theocracy in opposition to any other form of government was quite foreign to the Rabbis. There is not the slightest hint in the whole Rabbinic literature that the Rabbis gave any preference to a hierarchy with an ecclesiastical head who pretends to be the vice-regent of God, to a secular prince who derives his authority from the divine right of his dynasty. Every authority, according to the creed of the Rabbis, was appointed by heaven;[2] but they had also the sad experience that each in its turn rebelled against heaven. The high priests, Menelaus and Alcimus, were just as wicked and as ready to betray their nation and their God as the laymen, Herod and Archelaus, who owed their throne to Roman machinations.

If, then, the kingdom of God was thus originally intended to be in the midst of men and for men at large (as represented by Adam), if its first preachers were like Abraham ex-heathens, who addressed themselves to heathens, if again the essence of their preaching was righteousness and judgment, and if, lastly, the kingdom does not mean a hierarchy, but any form of government conducted on the principles of righteousness, judgment,

---

[1] *Siphre*, 138*a*. Perhaps we ought to read שמים instead of שמי. Cp. also תד"אר, c. 28: "And thus said the holy one, blessed be he, My beloved children, do I miss anything which you could give me? I want nothing from you but that you love each other, respect each other, and that no sin or ugly thing be found among you."

[2] See *Berachoth*, 58*a*. With regard to Rome in particular, see *Abodah Zarah*, 17*a*, שאומה זו המליכוה מן השמים.

and charitableness, then we may safely maintain that the kingdom of God, as taught by Judaism in one of its aspects, is universal in its aims.

But, on the other hand, it cannot be doubted that the idea of the kingdom is occasionally so strongly connected with the Israelites as to appear almost inseparable from them. This is its national aspect. The Israelites, as we have seen, are the people, who, by their glorious acts on the Red Sea, and especially by their readiness on Mount Sinai to receive the yoke of the kingdom, became the very pillars of the throne, with whom even the angels have to reckon. To add here another passage of the same nature, I will quote the saying of R. Simon, who expresses the idea in very bold language. Speaking of the supports of the world, and Israel's part in them, he says: "As long as Israel is united into one league (that is, making bold front against any heresy denying the unity or the supremacy of God), the kingdom in heaven is maintained by them; whilst Israel's falling off from God shakes the throne to its very foundation in heaven.[1]" Jerusalem, which the Prophet (Jer. iii. 17) called the throne of the Lord, becomes identified with it; and Amalek, who destroyed the holy city, becomes guilty of rebellion against God and his kingdom.[2] Therefore neither the throne of God nor his holy name is perfect (that is to say, not fully revealed) as long as the children of the Amalekites exist in the world.[3] And just as Israel are the bearers of the name of God, so the Amalekites are the representatives of idolatry and every base thing antagonistic to God, so that R. Eleazer of Modyim thinks that the existence of the one necessarily involves the destruction of the other. "When will the name of the Amalekites be wiped out? he exclaims. Not before both the idols and their worshippers cease to exist, when God will be alone in the world and his kingdom established

[1] See *Midrash Shemuel*, V., § 11, and references. Cp. Bacher, II. 140, note 1.

[2] *Pesikta B.*, 28*a*.

[3] *Pesikta F.*, 51*a*, and parallels.

for ever and ever."[1] These passages, to which many more of a similar nature might be added, are the more calculated to turn the kingdom of heaven into a kingdom of Israel, when we remember that Amalek is only another name for his ancestor Esau, who is the father of Edom, who is but a prototype for Rome. With this kingdom, represented in Jewish literature by the fourth beast of the vision of Daniel,[2] Israel according to the Rabbis is at deadly feud, a feud which began before its ancestors even perceived that the light of the world is perpetually carried on by their descendants, and will only be brought to an end with history itself.[3] The contest over the birthright is indicative of the struggle for supremacy between Israel and Rome. It would even seem as if Israel despairs of asserting the claims of his acquired birthright, and concedes this world to Esau. "'Two worlds there are,' Jacob says unto Esau, 'this world and the world to come. In this world there is eating and drinking, but in the next world there are the righteous, who with crowns on their heads revel in the glory of the divine presence. Choose as first-born the world which pleases thee.' Esau chose this world."[4] Jacob's promise to join his brother at Seir meant that meeting in the distant future, when the Messiah of Israel will appear and the Holy One will make his kingdom shine forth over Israel, as it is said (Obadiah i. 21): "And saviours shall come up on Mount Zion to judge the mount of Esau; and the kingdom shall be the Lord's."[5] Thus the kingdom of heaven stands in opposition to the kingdom of Rome, and becomes connected with the kingdom of Israel, and it is in conformity with this sentiment that a Rabbi, picturing the glorious spring, in which the budding of Israel's redemption will first be perceived, exclaims: "The time has arrived when the reign of the wicked will break down and Israel will be redeemed;

---

[1] *Mechilta*, 56*a* and *b*.
[2] See *Lev. R.*, XII., and parallels.
[3] *Genesis R.*, LXI., §§ 6, 7 and 9.
[4] Quoted from a Midrash in a Parma MS. Cp. XIX., ת"דבז
[5] *Genesis R.*, LXXVIII., and parallels.

the time is come for the extermination of the kingdom of wickedness; the time is come for revelation of the kingdom of heaven, and the voice of the Messiah is heard in our land."[1]

This is only a specimen of dozens of interpretations of the same nature, round which a whole world of myths and legend grew up, in which the chiliastic element, with all its excesses, was strongly emphasised. I cannot enter here into the details of those legends. They fluctuate and change with the great historical events and the varying influences by which they were suggested.[2] But there are also fixed elements in them which are to be found in the Rabbinic literature of almost every age and date. These fixed elements are:—

1. The faith that the Messiah will restore the Kingdom of Israel, which under his sceptre will extend over the whole world. 2. The notion that a last terrible battle will take place with the enemies of God (or of Israel), who will strive against the establishment of the kingdom, and who will finally be destroyed. 3. The conviction that it will be an age of both material as well as spiritual happiness for all those who are included in the kingdom.[3]

Now even Christianity, in which the Messianic element is so predominant, and in which, according to the best authorities, the chiliastic element is so early "that it may be questioned whether it ought not to be regarded as a Christian dogma," dispensed with it as early as the fourth

---

[1] See *Pesikta B.*, 50*a*, and *Pesikta F.*, 75*a*, text and notes.

[2] Principal Drummond's book, *The Jewish Messiah*, is still the best work on the subject. A thorough re-examination of all the materials as to their real Jewish character and their age would be the more desirable, as since the appearance of this work many MSS. and Midrashim have been discovered. See Güdemann, *Monatsschrift*, 1893, p. 351.

[3] Whether the Kingdom of the Messiah is identical with the Kingdom of God, or only a preparation for it, is not quite clear. In one of the versions of the well-known Midrash of the Ten Kings after the Messiah, the kingdom comes back to its first master, that is, God, who was the first King after the creation of the world. See Chapters of R. Eliezer, XI.

century. Judaism, which has never shown a great tendency to convert folklore into dogma, whilst, on the other hand, it has felt a strong reluctance to assume authority in matters falling within the province of prophecy, had neither the necessity nor the opportunity of disowning these chiliastic details. When the Church became triumphant, and "the profession of the Christian faith was attended with ease and honour," the doctors of Christianity could afford to spiritualise or to explain away the idea of the millennium, from which the early martyrs derived so much comfort and strength. But Judaism had then to enter on a new and terrible era of persecution and suffering, which gave a fresh impulse to the creation of new Messianic apocalypses or to the spinning out of the old ones.

The process of spiritualisation, as it was partly undertaken by Maimonides, and others, had therefore to be postponed to a later period. The theological consequences of this delay were that, in the meantime, the two ideas of the Kingdom of Heaven, over which God reigns, and the Kingdom of Israel, in which the Messiah holds the sceptre, became confused with each other.

But this delay was not quite an unmixed evil. To a certain extent I even feel grateful for it. The worst that can be said of this confusion is, that it has both narrowed, and to some extent even materialised, the notion of the kingdom. On the other hand, however, it also contributed towards investing it with that amount of substance and reality which are most necessary, if an idea is not to become meaningless and lifeless. It is just this danger to which ideas are exposed in the process of their spiritualisation. That "the letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life," is a truth of which Judaism, which did depart very often from the letter, was as conscious as any other religion. Zerachya ben Shealtiel, in his Commentary to Job ii. 14,[1]

[1] Published in the תקות אנוש, a collection of commentaries to Job.

goes even as far as to say, "Should I explain this chapter according to its letter I should be a heretic, because I would have to make such concessions to Satan's powers which are inconsistent with the belief in the Unity. I shall therefore interpret it according to the spirit of philosophy." But, unfortunately, there is also an evil spirit which sometimes possesses itself of an idea and reduces it to a mere phantasm. The history of theology is greatly haunted by these unclean spirits. The best guard against them is to provide the idea with some definiteness and reality before we permit ourselves to look out for the spirit.

This was the service rendered by the connection of the Kingdom of Israel with the Kingdom of God. In the first place, it fixed the kingdom *in this world.* It had of course to be deferred to some indefinite period, but still its *locale* remained our globe, not unknown regions in another world. It was extended from the individual to a whole nation, thus making the idea of the kingdom visible and tangible. The whole nation, with all its institutions, civil and ecclesiastical, becomes part and parcel of the Kingdom of God.

By this fact, it is true, the Kingdom of God becomes greatly nationalised. But even in this narrowed sense, Israel is only the depository of the kingdom, not the exclusive possessor of it. The idea of the kingdom is the palladium of the nation. According to some, it is the secret which has come down to them from the patriarchs;[1] according to others, the holy mystery of the angels overheard by Moses, which Israel continually proclaims.[2] It has to be emphasised in every prayer and benediction,[3] whilst the main distinction of the most solemn prayers of the year on the New Year's Day consists in a detailed proclamation of the Kingdom of God in all stages of

---

[1] See *Siphre*, 72*b*, and the very instructive notes by the editor.

[2] *Deut. R.*, II.

[3] See *Berachoth*, 12*a*.

history, past, present, and future. "Before we appeal to his mercy," teach the Rabbis, "and before we pray for redemption, we must first make him King over us."[1] We must also remember that Israel is not a nation in the common sense of the word. To the Rabbis, at least, it is not a nation by virtue of race or of certain peculiar political combinations. As R. Saadyah expressed it, כי אומתינו אינה האומה כי אם בתורותיה ("This nation is only a nation by reason of its Torah");[2] and if we could imagine for a moment Israel giving up its allegiance to God, the Rabbis would be the first to sign its death-warrant as a nation. The prophecy (Isaiah xliv. 5), "Another shall subscribe with his hands unto the Lord," means, according to the Rabbis, the sinners who return unto him from their evil ways, whilst the words, "And surname himself by the name of Israel," are explained to be proselytes who leave the heathen world and join Israel.[3] It is then by these means of penitence and proselytism that the Kingdom of Heaven, even in its connection with Israel, expands into the universal kingdom to which sinners and Gentiles are invited.

The antagonism between the Kingdom of God and the kingdom of Rome, which is brought about by the connection of the former with that of Israel, suggests also a most important truth: *Bad Government is incompatible with the Kingdom of God.* As I have already said, it is not the *form* of the Roman Government to which objection was taken, but its methods of administration and its oppressive rule. It is true that they tried "to render unto Cæsar the things that were Cæsar's and unto God the things that were God's." Thus they interpreted the words in Ecclesiastes vii. 2: "I counsel thee, keep the king's commandments and that in regard of the oath of God," in the following way: "I take an oath from you, not to rebel against the (Roman)

---

[1] See *Siphre*, 19*b*, and *Rosh Hashanah*, 16*a*.

[2] אמונות ודיעות, III.

[3] *Mechilta*, 95*b*, and parallels.

Government, even if its decrees against you should be most oppressive; for you have to keep the king's commands. But if you are bidden to deny God and give up the Torah, then obey no more." And they proceed to illustrate it by the example of Hananiah, Mishael, and Azariah, who are made to say to Nebuchadnezzar: "Thou art our king in matters concerning duties and taxes, but in things divine thy authority ceases, and therefore 'we will not serve thy gods, nor worship the golden image which thou hast put up.'"[1] But compromises forced upon them by the political circumstances of the time must not be regarded as desirable ideals or real doctrine. Apart from the question as to the exact definition of things falling within the respective provinces of Cæsar and of God—a question which, after eighteen hundred years' discussion, is still unsettled—there can be little doubt that the Rabbis looked with dismay upon a government which derived its authority from the deification of might, whereof the emperor was the incarnate principle. "Edom recognises no superior authority, saying, "Whom have I in heaven."[2] It represents the iron (we would say blood and iron), a metal which was excluded from the tabernacle, as the abode of the divine peace,[3] whilst their king of flesh and blood, whom they flatter in their ovations as being mighty, wise, powerful, merciful, just, and faithful, has not a single one of all these virtues, and is even the very reverse of what they imply."[4]

But besides these theological differences the Rabbis held the Roman Government to be thoroughly corrupt in its administration; Esau preaches justice and practises violence. Their judges commit the very crimes for which they condemn others. They pretend to punish crime, but are reconciled to it by bribery. Their motives are selfish,

---

[1] See *Tanchuma* נח, § 10, and *Lev. R.*, XXXIII.

[2] *Lev. R.*, XIII.

[3] See *Exod. R.*, XXXV. 7.

[4] *Mechilta*, 35*a*.

never drawing men near to them, except in their own interest and for their own advantage. As soon as they see a man in a state of prosperity, they devise means how to possess themselves of his goods. In a word, Esau is rapacious and violent, especially the procurators sent out to the provinces, where they rob and murder, and when they return to Rome pretend to feed the poor with the money they have collected.[1] Such a government was, according to the Rabbis, incompatible with the Kingdom of Heaven, and therefore the mission of Israel was to destroy it.[2]

The third essential addition made to the Kingdom of God by its connection with the Kingdom of Israel is, as I have said, the feature of material happiness. The Rabbis pictured it in gorgeous colours: The rivers will flow with wine and honey, the trees will grow bread and delicacies, whilst in certain districts springs will break forth which will prove cures for all sorts of diseases. Altogether, disease and suffering will cease, and those who come into the kingdom with bodily defects, such as blindness, deafness, and other blemishes, will be healed. Men will multiply in a way not at all agreeable to the laws of political economy, and will enjoy a very long life, if they will die at all. War will, of course, disappear, and warriors will look upon their weapons as a reproach and an offence. Even the rapacious beasts will lose their powers of doing injury, and will become peaceful and harmless.[3] Such are

[1] See *Lev. R.*, ibid.; *Aboth*, II. 3; *Exod. R.*, XXXI.; *Pesikta B.*, 95*b*. Interesting is a passage in Mommsen's *History of Rome*, IV., which shows that the Rabbis did not greatly exaggerate the cruelty of the Roman Government. "Any one who desires," says our greatest historian of Rome, "to fathom the depths to which men can sink in the criminal infliction, and in the no less criminal endurance of an inconceivable injustice, may gather together from the criminal records of this period the wrongs which Roman grandees could perpetrate, and Greeks, Syrians, and Phœnicians could suffer." Cp. Joel's *Blicke*, I., 109. How far matters improved under the emperors, at least with regard to the Jews, is still a question.

[2] *Berachoth*, 17*a*. See ד"ה, a.l.

[3] See, for instance, *Kethuboth*, 111*a*; *Shabboth*, 63*a*; *Gen. R.*, XII.; *Exod. R.*, XII.

the details in which the Rabbis indulge in their descriptions of the blissful times to come. I need not dwell upon them. There is much in them which is distasteful and childish. Still, when we look at the underlying idea, we shall find that this idea is not without its truth. The Kingdom of God *is* inconsistent with a state of social misery, engendered through poverty and want. Not that Judaism looked upon poverty, as some author has suggested, as a moral vice. Nothing can be a greater mistake. The Rabbis were themselves mostly recruited from the artisan and labouring classes, and of some we know that they lived in the greatest want. Certain Rabbis have even maintained that there is no quality becoming Israel more than poverty, for it is a means of spiritual purification.[1] Still, they did not hide from themselves the terrible fact that abject poverty has its great demoralising dangers. It is one of the three things which makes man transgress the law of his Maker.[2]

But even if poverty would not have this effect, it would be excluded from the Kingdom of Heaven, as involving pain and suffering. The poor man, they hold, is dead as an influence, and his whole life, depending upon his fellows, is a perpetual passing through the tortures of hell.[3] But it is a graceful world which God has created, and it must not be disfigured by misery and suffering. It must return to its perfect state when the visible kingdom is established. As we shall see in a future essay, Judaism was not wanting in theories, idealising suffering and trying to reconcile man with its existence. But, on the other hand, it did not recognise a chasm between flesh and spirit, the material and the spiritual world, so as to abandon the one for the sake of the other. They are both the creatures of God, the body as well as the soul, and hence both the objects of his salvation.

---

[1] *Chagiga*, 9*b*. [2] *Erubin*, 41*b*.
[3] *Nedarim*, 7*b*, and *Berachoth*, 6*b*.

In a remarkable book, containing the conversations of a Jewish Mystic of the present century, R. Nachman of Braslaw, there a question is put by one of his disciples to this effect: "Why did God, in whom everything originates, create the quality of scepticism?" The Master's answer was: "That thou mayest not let the poor starve, putting them off with the joys of the next world, instead of supplying them with food."

I too venture to maintain with the mystic that a good dose of materialism is necessary for religion that we may not starve the world. It was by this that Judaism was preserved from the mistake of crying inward peace, when actually there was no peace; of speaking of inward liberty, when in truth this spiritual but spurious liberty only served as a means for persuading man to renounce his liberty altogether, confining the Kingdom of God to a particular institution and handing over the world to the devil.

This is not the place to enter into the Charity-system of the Rabbis, or to enlarge upon the measures taken by them so as to make charity superfluous. But having touched upon the subject of poverty, a few general remarks will not be out of place. In that brilliant Gospel of the second half of the nineteenth century, which is known under the title of *Ecce Homo*, we meet the following statement: "The ideal of the economist, the ideal of the Old Testament writers, does not appear to be Christ's. He feeds the poor, but it is not his great object to bring about a state of things in which the poorest shall be sure of a meal." I am happy to say that this was included in the ideal of the Rabbis. They were not satisfied with feeding the poor. Not only did they make the authorities of every community responsible for the poor, and would even stigmatise them as murderers if their negligence should lead to starvation and death;[1] but their great ideal was not to allow man to be poor, not to allow him to come down into the depths of

[1] See *Sotah*, 38*b*, and *Jerushalmi*, ibid., 23*d*.

poverty. They say: "Try to prevent it by teaching him a trade, or by occupying him in your house as a servant, or make him work with you as your partner."[1] Try all methods before you permit him to become an object of charity, which must degrade him, tender as our dealings with him may be.

Hence their violent protests against any sort of money speculation which must result in increasing poverty. "Thou lendest him money on the security of his estate with the object of joining his field to thine, his house to thine, and thou flatterest thyself to become the heir of the land; be sure of a truth that many houses will be desolate."[2] Those again who increase the price of food by artificial means, who give false measure, who lend on usury, and keep back the corn from the market, are classed by the Rabbis with the blasphemers and hypocrites, and God will never forget their works.[3]

To the employers of workmen again they say: "This poor man ascends the highest scaffoldings, climbs the highest trees. For what does he expose himself to such dangers, if not for the purpose of earning his living? Be careful, therefore, not to oppress him in his wages, for it means his very life."[4] On the other hand, they relieved the workman from reciting certain prayers when they interfered with his duty to his master.[5]

From this consideration for the employer and the employed a whole set of laws emanate which try to regulate their mutual relations and duties. How far they would satisfy the modern economist I am unable to say. In general I should think that, excellent as they may have

---

[1] See *Torath Kohanim*, 109*b*, and Maimonides' *Mishnah Torah*, הלכות מתנות עניים פ"י ה"ז וה' י"ז. See also the older commentaries on *Aboth*, I., 5.

[2] *Pesichta of Lament. R.*, 22, on Is. v. 8.

[3] See *Aboth d'R. Nathan*, 43*b*; *Baba Bathra*, 90*a*.

[4] See *Siphre*, 123*b*, and *B. Mezia*, 123*b*, and *Berachoth*, 16*a*.

[5] *Berachoth*, 17*a*.

been for their own times, they would not quite answer to our altered conditions and ever varying problems. But this need not prevent us from perceiving, in any efforts to diminish poverty, a divine work to which they also contributed their share. For if the disappearance of poverty and suffering is a condition of the Kingdom of the Messiah, or in other words, of the Kingdom of God, all wise social legislation in this respect must help towards its advent.

S. SCHECHTER.

ON THE APOCALYPSE OF MOSES.

IT is almost certain that in this Apocalypse we have one of those Jewish apocryphs which, like the Book of Enoch, exercised a formative influence upon the earliest Christianity. For two ideas are prominent in it which have been perpetuated in the younger religion, namely, that of baptism by trine immersion after repentance and forgiveness of sins, and that of the resurrection in the flesh and restoration to the Garden of Eden of the descendants of Adam. The former of these two ideas is conveyed in ch. xxxvii., the latter in chs. xxviii., xxxvii., xxxix. and xliii.

The following text of the Apocryph is translated from the ancient Armenian Version, which in turn seems to have been made not from a Greek, but from a Syriac or Ethiopic, or even Arabic text. Thus in ch. xxix. the words "nard" and "cinnamon" are explained respectively as "phajlaseni" and "daraseni," and these synonyms are perhaps Arabic terms, though one of them occurs once in Ethiopic literature, probably as a transliteration. The frequent Syriacisms, however, strongly suggest a Syriac original. The date of the Armenian Version is not easy to assign with any precision, the MS. from which I copied it being as late as the year A.D. 1539. As regards language, however, it is old, and probably anterior to 1000 A.D.; it might even belong to the fifth or sixth century. There is a peculiar use observable in it of the dative for the genitive, which is not characteristic of Armenian in any age, and may, perhaps, reflect the idiom of the language from which the version was made.

The Greek Text was first published by Tischendorf in a volume of Apocrypha, under the title of *Apocalypse of Moses,* from four MSS., of which the earliest belongs to the

eleventh century, and is preserved in the library of Milan. This MS., which only contains the beginning and end of the piece, has been republished more critically by Ceriani Tischendorf's other three MSS. are equally fragmentary and much later. His Text is, therefore, an eclectic one, and comprises many readings which never stood together in any one Text. The Armenian, however, which I here translate, is both a real Text and an ancient one, as is clear from the way in which it cuts across the Greek codices, following now one and now another. It must, therefore, be taken account of by any one who wishes to get at the Text as it originally stood. I have printed in italics passages which are absent from all the Greek codices, and which may represent either additions due to the Armenian translator and to his archetype, or lacunae in the Greek tradition. Where the sense of the Armenian departs from all the Greek codices alike, or agrees with one of them and not with others, I have often appended a note explanatory of the same.

There is one remarkable variant in the Armenian. In ch. xxxvii. we read in it that Adam is thrice immersed in a sea *not made with hands*, as if the Greek original were ἀχειροποίητον λίμνην ; but the Greek MSS. have ἀχέρουσαν λίμνην. At first glance the Armenian reading seems the better one, for it recalls the temple not made with hands of Mark xiv. 58, and "the house not made with hands which is everlasting in the heavens" of Paul's II. Ep. to Cor. v. 1, and also the περιτομὴ ἀχειροποίητος of Ep. to Col. ii. 11. It is suitable to think of Adam, who has been caught up into the second heaven, as being baptised in a sea or laver not made with hands. On the other hand, the parallels which I have quoted from the *Visio Pauli* make it very likely that the Greek has here retained the original reading, and that the Armenian reflects the brilliant emendation of some Greek scribe who could not allow an Acherusian lake to figure in his conception of heaven.

In the Greek MSS. this piece is entitled "The History

of the life of Adam and Eve, revealed by God to Moses his servant, when he received the tablets of the Law of the Covenant from the Lord's hand, instructed by the archangel Michael." In the Armenian the Apocryph is entitled simply the "Book of Adam," and at the end of it is written in the MS., in the lower margin, this scholium: "Ye should know, brethren, that this history of the first created (πρωτοπλάστων) was revealed at the command of God by Michael, the archangel, to the first prophet, Moses. Glory to God." That this piece of information is relegated in the Armenian to a scholium, whereas in the Greek MSS. it is embodied in the title, makes it probable that it is a late addition in itself, and that the Armenian title, "The Book of Adam," is the true one. It also diminishes the force of Tischendorf's argument, based on the Greek title, that this Apocryph is part of a longer history. There is no internal reason for supposing this to be so, for the Apocryph is, as it stands, a self-contained whole, needing nothing to complete it.

There are several other "books of Adam" in the library of Etschmiadzin, but all of them of a late and trifling description: some of them were versifications of this Apocryph. One of them, contained in an enormous folio for reading in church, is entitled "A History of the Repentance of Adam and Eve, the First-created. How they Fared." This begins with a long and tedious lament uttered by Adam on being expelled from the garden. At the close of it, it is related that Adam and Eve's bodies were laid by Sem (Shem) in his portion, in a place *now* called Shamajtoun, *i.e.*, "the house of Shem." But afterwards they were moved, and Eve's was laid in a cave at Bethlehem, wherein Christ was born of the Virgin Mary, just over Eve's tomb; while Adam's was removed to Golgotha, where Jesus was crucified for our salvation directly over the head of Adam. This latter treatise is, therefore, a Christianised version of our Apocryph; and though I copied the greater portion of it, I do not think it merits to be published.

Prof. Marr, of the University of Petersburg, has printed some portions of the Adam book here translated in an article on Armenian apocryphs, contained in the Transactions (or Bulletin) of the Eastern Section of the Russian Imperial Archæological Society, 1890-91, Vols. V., VI., p. 228. I have made my translation from a photographic copy of the book which I made on the spot. The MS. is a small quarto, well written in double columns. It contains many other apocryphs of a similar nature to this one. Prof. Jajic has lately published an old Slavonic book of Adam, which I have not had an opportunity of comparing with the Greek and Armenian. It would no doubt prove a valuable aid towards the determination of the earliest form of the Text.

FRED. C. CONYBEARE.

From the MS. No. 1,631 (198*a*-212*a*) of the library of Etschmiadzin, written A.D. 1539 :—

(Ch. i.) A history[1] of the life of Adam and Eva, the first-created, after their expulsion from the garden of delight.

Adam took his wife Eva and went to a place which was in the region of the East, *full opposite the garden of delight.* And there he dwelt for eighteen years and two months ; and after that Adam approached his wife Eva, and she conceived and bore two sons, Anlojs[2] (*i.e.*, without light), who is called Cain, and Barekhooh[3] (*i.e.*, well-minded), who is called Habel. (Ch. ii.) But subsequently, while Adam and his wife were sleeping, Eva saw a dream. Then Eva awoke Adam, and told the dream to Adam, and said as follows :—"My lord, I saw in a dream by night, that blood of our son Abel was poured[4] into the mouth of Cain, his brother, and he drank the blood of his brother. But Habel prayed him to leave him a little of his blood. But he hearkened not unto him, but instantly drank

---

[1] The Greek Codices have not only the title as translated in the Arm., but also this previous one : *διήγησις καὶ πολιτεία Ἀδὰμ καὶ Εὔας τῶν πρωτοπλάστων ἀποκαλυφθεῖσα παρὰ θεοῦ Μωυσῇ τῷ θεράποντι αὐτοῦ ὅτε τὰς πλάκας τοῦ νόμου τῆς διαθήκης ἐκ χειρὸς κυρίου ἐδέξατο, διδαχθεὶς ὑπὸ τοῦ ἀρχαγγέλου Μιχαήλ.*

[2] Tisch. has *διάφωτον.* Ceriani, *ἀδιάφωτον,* which answers to the Arm.

[3] The Grk. has *Ἀμιλαβές.*

[4] "Filled." The Grk. has *βαλλόμενον εἰς τὸ στόμα.*

it all; and there remained no other blood in his stomach, but he vomited it all out." When Adam heard this he said unto her:— "Arise, and let us go to see our children and learn what hath happened unto them, lest the enemy be warring against them. (Ch. iii.) And they went and found that Habel had been slain by the hands of his brother Cain. And God said to the archangel Michael: "Go and say unto Adam: The mystery of the dream which thou didst see, tell it not to thy son Cain. For he is a son of destruction.[1] And say to Adam: 'But do thou not sorrow, for I will give to thee another son in his place, who shall tell unto thee all that thou art about to do.'" And all this the archangel Michael by the behest of God said to Adam. But Adam kept all that was said in his heart. Likewise also his wife. But Eva continually sorrowed in her soul for their son Habel.

(Ch. iv.) But after that Adam again approached his wife Eva and she conceived and bore Seth. And Adam said to Eva: "Lo, we have begotten a son in place of Habel, whom Cain slew. Let us then arise and give glory and praise to God." (Ch. v.) And there came to be sons of Adam in number thirty,[2] and the length of his life which he lived on the earth was 930 years. And after that it happened unto him to fall sick. And Adam called with a loud voice and said: "Let there be summoned all my sons together before me, that I may behold them before I die." And they were all gathered together, for they were living apart each by himself in his own place.[3] Then said Seth his son unto Adam: "O my father, what is thy sickness and injury?" And he made answer and said unto him:

"Woes many and inextricable hem me round, O my child." (Ch. vi.) Seth said unto him: "O my father, surely thou art bringing to mind *the delight and the enjoyment* of the garden of God, and the diverse variety of fruits of which thou didst daily eat? And because of that sorrow of thine is thy sickness. Should this be so? O my sire, tell me, and I will go and bring to thee of the fruit of the garden of life. For I will go and will place dust[4] on my head, and will lament *before it*, and will beseech the Lord God; and the Lord heareth the voice of the prayer of his servant, and sendeth his angels, and will fulfil my desire; and I will bring unto thee *of the fruit of the garden of life* (*to be*) *thy food*, that, *tasting of it*, thou mayest be made whole of thy sickness." Adam said unto him: "It cannot be so, my child Seth, but many sicknesses and woes *without escape* beset me."

---

[1] Grk.: ὀργῆς υἱός.

[2] Grk. adds "and daughters thirty."

[3] "And they . . . place"]. Grk. has ἦν γὰρ οἰκισθεῖσα ἡ γῆ εἰς τρία μέρη.

[4] In Grk.: "dung."

Said Seth unto him : " And how[1] came there to be woes unto thy sickness ? Tell me, father mine." (Ch. vii.) Adam saith unto him : " *Hear me, my child, with patience.* When God created me and thy mother Eva, because of whom I am dying, he also gave me a command to taste of and enjoy all the fruits of the garden, but of one tree he commanded me not to taste thereof. *And he saith to me: 'If ye eat of the same with death shall ye die'*[2] ; and that time was near when angels looked to your mother Eva for her to render homage before God. And when the angels had departed afar from her, then the enemy, *understanding that I am not near at hand, nor yet the angels,*[3] came *and conversed with her*, and gave her of the fruit, and she did eat of it, and came and gave unto me, and I did eat. (Ch. viii.) And[4] then God was angry with us, and at the same hour he came into the garden ; and the Lord spake to me with a terrible voice and said : ' Adam, where art thou ? Why hidest thou thyself from my face ? For a house cannot be hidden from its builder.[5] But forasmuch as ye have transgressed my command and have not kept my edict, so therefore will I bring upon thy flesh persecutions and many woes, as it were seventy in number.[6] And the first of ills which shall smite thee will be an affliction of the eyes. But the second blow will fall on thine ears ; and thus, one by one, there shall be woes and strokes that befall all thy members.'" (Ch. ix.) And when Adam had said all this to his sons, he drew a deep sigh, and said : " What shall I do, for (in) great sorrow is my soul ? "

But Eva wept bitterly, and said to Adam : " My lord, rise up, and the half of the woes of thy soul thou shalt give to me, and I will bear them. Because on my account did this come upon thee, and by reason of me wilt thou be in toil."[7] And Adam said unto her :

---

[1] This answers to πῶς σοι, read in Tisch. ; ποσοι is read by Ceriani's MS. D.

[2] In place of the words italicised, the Grk. has simply : δι' οὗ καὶ ἀποθνήσκωμεν, which, however, MS. C omits. Cp. Protevang., c. xiii., p. 25.

[3] In place of the words italicised, the Grk. has καὶ ηὗρεν αὐτὴν μόνον ; but adds equivalent words : ἐγνωκῶς ὅτι οὐκ εἰμὶ ἔγγιστα αὐτῆς οὔτε οἱ ἅγιοι ἄγγελοι later in the sentence after the clause : " She did eat of it."

[4] The Grk. codd., except D, prefix : ὅτε δὲ ἐφάγομεν ἀμφότεροι.

[5] D omits this clause : " For a house," etc., and adds instead these words : " Did I not tell thee not to eat of the tree ? And I said to the Lord : The woman, whom thou gavest me, she gave me from the tree, and I did eat. And the Lord said to me."

[6] Ceriani's MS. D reads, " seventy-two." The rest, " seventy."

[7] The Grk. MS. D adds : " Through me in the sweat of thy brow thou eatest thy bread ; through me thou sufferest all things." The other Grk. codd. omit.

"Do thou arise, and thy son Seth, and do ye go near to the garden and cast dust upon your heads and lament exceedingly with tears, and beseech God if he will perhaps have pity on me and send his angels into the garden of delight, and give unto me of the fruit from which proceedeth the anointing *of pity;*[1] and ye shall anoint my person therewith in order that I may, perhaps, be healed of my woes." (Ch. x.) But they arose and went opposite to the garden; and when they came into the road,[2] then Eva looked and beheld her son Seth, that a wild beast fought with him. And Eva wept bitterly, and cried: "Woe to me, woe to me, woe to me! For if it be unto me to come unto the day of resurrection, all sinners of my progeny will come to curse me, and will say: [*Cursed be Eva*, for] she has not kept safe the observance of the Lord her God, [*and because of this we shall all die with death.*" *And having looked*] she said to the beast: "O evil beast, art thou not afraid to wage war against the image of God?" (Ch. xi.) Then that wild beast called out and said: "O thou woman, 'tis not from us that there was a beginning of greed (πλεονεξία),[3] but from thee. For from thee was the beginning [*of the loosing*] of wild beasts. For when thy mouth was opened to eat of the fruit of the tree, of which God commanded you not to eat of the same, and thou didst eat and transgress the commandment of God, then our nature changed into disobedience to men. And now therefore [*bandy not words with me, but hold thy peace, for*] thou canst not bear it if I begin to chide thee." (Ch. xii.) But Seth said to the beast: "Shut thy mouth and be silent, and hold off from the image of God until the day of judgment." Then said that wild beast to Seth: "Behold, I stand aloof from the image of God, and I go to my dwelling place." (Ch. xiii.) But Seth and his mother Eva *having got quit of the wild beast*, came nigh to the garden of the Lord, and they wept and lamented, and prayed the Lord to send his angels and give unto them the anointing of pity.[4] And the Lord sent the archangel Michael and said to Seth: "Man of God, weary not thyself concerning this quest of thine, about the tree in which flows the oil of compassion, that thou mayest anoint with it thy father Adam. For in the present this shall not be; but going thou shalt behold thy father end his earthly (or temporal) life. And his time is at hand. For after three days he will pass away (lit. exchange), and

---

[1] So τοῦ ἐλέους has dropped out of all the Greek codd. after τὸ ἔλαιον (for which, however, B has ἔλεος). The sending of Seth for the oil of pity is also told in the Descensus Christi ad Inferos (*Evang. Apocryph.*, p. 303).

[2] MS. D omits this clause.

[3] The Grk. adds, "and of wailing."

[4] Ceriani's D has τὸ ἔλεος τοῦ ἐλαίου.

thou shalt behold his translation (lit. change to above), glorious and terrible."[1] When the angel of the Lord had said this, he ascended from them *into Heaven.* (Ch. xiv.) But Seth and his mother came and returned[2] to where Adam was placed and lay in sickness. And Adam said to Eva: "O Eva, what hast thou done unto me, because thou hast brought upon me wrath exceeding, which[3] also shall be inherited by all the race of my offspring." What answer doth she give and make to him? "Woe unto me, woe unto me, woe unto me, because I was deceived, obeying the deceitful words of the serpent." And when Eva had said this, they began to weep and lament bitterly. And when they ceased from their lamentation, an awful sorrow overcame[4] Adam. But his sons along with Eva sat around the bed of their father and wept exceedingly. (Ch. xv.) Said to them their mother Eva: "Children, so your father dies, and I with him; and now, my children, give ear unto me, and I will relate to you the envy . . . of the adversary, by what crafty means he robbed us *of the garden of delight and of eternal life.*" And she began to say as follows: "*God, who loveth man and is merciful, fashioned me and your father Adam; and placed us in the garden of delight, to govern and rule over all things which grew therein. But from one tree he commanded us to abstain from the same; the which Satan beheld, (to wit) our glory and honour; and having found the serpent the wisest animal of all which are on the whole earth,* (Ch. xvi.) *he approached him and said to him*[5]: 'I behold thee wiser than all animals, and I desire[6] to reveal

---

[1] The Greek has: "Do thou again go to thy father, since the measure of his life is fulfilled. And as his soul goes forth, thou art about to behold his ascent (*ἄνοδον*) all terrible." [2] Grk.: "returned to the tent where."

[3] The rest of this chapter is much briefer in the Greek, as follows: "which is death, dominating all our race. And he saith to her: 'Summon all our children and our children's children, and inform them of the mode of our transgression.'"

[4] The Armenian Text is not quite intelligible here.

[5] Instead of the passage in italics the Greek Texts read in the following sense: "And it happened, as we were guarding the paradise, each of us kept the portion assigned him by God. But I guarded in my portion the south and west. But the devil went into the portion of Adam, where were the male beasts. For God divided them for us, and apportioned the males to your father, but the females to me. And each of us watched. And the devil spake to the serpent and said: Rise up and come to me. And he arose and went to him. And the devil said to him."

[6] The Greek Text of Ceriani (D) has "And I associate with thee. Why dost thou eat of the tares of Adam and not of the garden? Arise, and we will cause him to be expelled from the garden, as we also were expelled through him. The serpent said," etc.

unto thee the thought which is in my heart and to unite (with) thee. Thou seest how much worth God has bestowed on the man. But we have been dishonoured; so hearken unto me and come, let us go and drive him out of the garden, out of which we have been driven because of him.' The serpent saith unto him: 'I fear to do this thing, lest the Lord be wrath with me.' Satan said to him: 'Fear not concerning this, but do thou only become a vessel unto me, and I will deceive them by thy mouth in order to ensnare them.' (Ch. xvii.) And instantly the serpent hung himself from and lay along the wall of the garden; and when the angels went forth to do homage, then Satan having taken the form of an angel, sang the songs of praise. And I looked and saw him there on the wall in the form of an angel. And he spake and said to me: 'Art thou Eva?' And I say to him, 'Yes, I may be.' And he saith to me, 'What mayest thou be doing in yonder garden of thine?' And I say to him, 'God placed me here.'[1] And he saith to me, 'And how (is it that) God commanded thee not to eat of all the trees which are in this garden of thine?' And I say to him, ''Tis not so; but we eat of all, except of a single tree which is in the middle of the garden, which God commanded us not to eat of the same; saying unto us: "If ye eat of the same, with death shall ye die."' (Ch. xviii.) Then saith the serpent unto me: 'As God is alive, my soul hath exceeding sorrow because of thee,[2] and I desire not thy ignorance. But take and eat of yonder fruit; and then forthwith shalt thou know the honour of that tree.' And I say unto him, 'I fear lest the Lord be wroth with me, even as he commanded us.' And he saith unto her (*sic*), 'Fear not, for when thou shalt eat of the same, thine eyes shall be opened unto a knowledge of good and evil.[3] For the Lord knew that whenever ye shall eat, ye shall become like God to know good and evil. And being jealous of you because thereof, he forbade you to eat of the same. And now do thou take and eat of the fruit, and thou shalt behold the highest glory.' (Ch. xix.) And when I heard these words spoken by him, I opened the door of the garden and entered into the garden of delight; for I was without when the serpent spake unto me. But he went in after me and said to me, 'Come after me, and I will give to thee of the fruit.' And he began

---

[1] The Grk. has: "God placed us here to guard and eat out of it. The devil answered by the mouth of the serpent: Ye do well, but ye do not eat of all that grows. And I said: We eat of all, save of one tree only, which is in the middle of the garden," etc.

[2] The Grk. adds: "because ye are as cattle."

[3] The Grk. has: "thine eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as gods knowing good and evil."

to walk before me, and I after him. And when we had gone a little way, he turned back and said to me craftily : 'I will not give thee of yonder fruit to eat, unless thou swear unto me, that when thou eatest it, thou wilt give also to thy husband to eat of the same.' And not understanding his crafty language of deceit, I further say to him, 'I know not how I may swear to thee, but whatsoever I know I will say. And now then I swear to thee on the throne of the Lord and on the Cherubin *which bear it up and hold it*, and on the tree of life, that when I shall have eaten, I will give also to my husband, even as thou tellest me to swear.' When he heard the oath which I sware unto him, he came instantly and drew nigh unto the tree, and took and gave to me of the fruit forthwith ; the offspring of his wickedness,[1] that is to say of desire. For desire is the leader in all sin. And he took hold of the bough of the tree of knowledge, and bent it down to the earth, and I took and eat of the fruit thereof. (Ch. xx.) And at once my eyes were opened, and I knew that I was naked of the righteousness with which I had clad myself. And I wept bitterly, and I said unto the serpent : 'Why hast thou done this thing, offspring of wickedness, and why hast thou deceived me and deprived me of my glory ?' I also wept much, because of the oath which I had sworn unto him. But he, when he heard this, at once went down from the tree and disappeared ! And I sought on my part for leaves in order to cover my shame, and I found them not. For there rested not upon my body the leaf of any of the trees[2] except of the fig-tree only. And I took thereof and girdled myself and hid the nakedness of my body. (Ch. xxi.) And I cry out to your father, and say : 'Adam, where art thou. Arise and come unto me, and I will shew thee wonderful things.'[3] And when your father cometh to me, I repeat to him the words of lawlessness, which drove us out of our glory. And I opened my lips, because Satan gave unto me to speak *the words of blasphemy and of contumacy*. And I say unto him : 'Come, my lord Adam, hearken unto my words, and eat of the fruit of the tree of which the Lord commanded us that we should not eat of the same, and thou shalt become God.'[4] Your father made answer unto me and said : 'I fear lest God be angry with me.' And I say unto him : 'Fear not, for when thou shalt eat it, it shall be thine to know good and evil.' And he hearkened to my words of temptation, and tasted of the fruit, and at once his eyes were

[1] The Grk. has : "the poison of his wickedness."

[2] The Grk. adds τοῦ ἐμοῦ μέρους.

[3] In the Grk. : "a great mystery."

[4] In the Grk. : "become as a god."

opened, and he knew the nakedness of his person. And he said to me: 'O thou woman, why hast thou done this thing unto me, and hast deprived me of the glory of God?' (Ch. xxii.) And in that hour we heard the voice of Michael the archangel, sounding his trumpet and saying to all the angels: 'Thus saith the Lord of Hosts: "Come ye all, and go down with me into the garden, and hear the judgment with which I shall *will to* judge Adam."' And when we heard the sound of the trumpet of the archangel Michael and the words which he spake, we say one to the other: 'Behold the Lord is about to come into this garden in order to judge us,' and we were afraid, and hid ourselves. And the Lord God came into the garden sitting upon a chariot of Cherubin, and all the angels gave praise before him. And when he entered into the garden all the plants which are in the garden instantly blossomed and burgeoned, all[1] which were around Adam; likewise, also, those which were around me. And the throne of the Godhead was set at the tree of life. (Ch. xxiii.) And the Lord God cried aloud to thy father Adam and said: 'Adam, where art thou hidden? Dost thou think thyself hidden from my all-seeing eyes, that I should not find thee? For the house is not hidden from him that builded it.' Then thy father made answer to him and said: 'My Lord, 'tis not that we hide from thee,[2] but we are naked, and we thought thou wouldst not find us. But we fear thee, for we are naked.' And God said unto him: 'And who taught thee that thou wast naked (except) that thou hast transgressed my commandment which I gave thee and hast not kept it?' Then thy father pondered my word which I said unto him,[3] that I will preserve thee without fear before God. He turned to me and said: 'Why hast thou done this thing?' And[4] I say unto him: 'Lord, the serpent deceived me.' (Ch. xxiv.) Then the Lord God said to thy father Adam: 'Forasmuch as thou hast done this, and hast not kept my commandment, but hast listened to the voice of thy wife, the earth shall be cursed in thy works. For thou shalt work it, and it shall not give thee its strength; but thorns and thistles shall it bring forth for thee, and by the sweat of thy brows thou shalt eat thy bread.'[5] And turning to

---

[1] The Grk. has: "both those of the portion of Adam and of my portion also."

[2] The Grk. has: "We hide as thinking that we are not found by thee, but we fear, because we are naked," etc.

[3] The Grk. adds: "when I wished to deceive him."

[4] In the Grk.: "And I remembered the word of the serpent, and said that the serpent deceived me."

[5] The Grk. adds a long gloss here, which is not in the Armenian, as follows: "and shalt be in many sorts of labour; thou shalt weary and not win

the serpent, he said unto him : 'Forasmuch as thou hast done this thing, and hast become the vessel of shame, and hast deceived the upright[1] in heart, cursed shalt thou be among all brutes and dumb animals, and thou shalt be deprived of thy food, whence thou didst eat, and shalt eat dust all the days of thy life. Upon thy navel and thy belly shalt thou go, and shalt be deprived of thy hands and thy feet ; and there shall not be left to thee an ear, nor wings, nor any of thy other members for thee to have,[2] forasmuch as by thine evil devices thou hast worsted and deceived these beings, and hast caused them to be expelled from the garden of delight. And I will place enmity between thee and this woman, between thy seed and hers ; they shall serve thy head, and thou shalt serve the sole of their foot until the day of judgment.' (Ch. xxv.) And the Lord turned and said to me[3]: 'Forasmuch as thou hast listened to this serpent, despising my commandment, thou shalt be in empty pains and pangs that cannot be alleviated. Thou shalt bear many children in sorrow, and[4] in thy labours thou shalt be straitened, and in thy life and in thy distress thou shalt make confession, and shalt say : "O Lord God, save me in this present, and henceforth I will not turn me to the same sinning in my flesh."[5]

(Two lines undecipherable) . . . . . Concerning the enmities which the enemy hath sown in thee. And there thy turning shall be to thy husband, and he shall rule over thee.' (Ch. xxvii.) And thereafter the Lord gave a command to his holy angels to drive us out of the garden of delight. And when they had driven and led us out, we lamented much and wept bitterly. And your father Adam saith to me : 'Grant me a little respite, that I may pray to God who loveth man, in order that he may perhaps have compassion on me, for I

---

rest, be pressed hard by bitterness and not taste of sweetness, be oppressed by heat and straitened by cold. And thou shalt weary much, and not be rich, and shalt grow fat, but not reach thine end, and those beasts which thou ruledst shall rise up against thee and rebel, because thou hast not kept my commandment."

[1] τοὺς παρειμένους. [2] In the Grk. : ἐν ⌐τῇ κακίᾳ σου.

[3] The Greek Text puts this address to Eve before that made to the serpent, transposing chs. xxv. and xxvi.

[4] The Grk. continues : "and in one hour thou shalt come and destroy thy life because of thy great necessity and pains. And thou shalt confess," etc.

[5] Two lines are illegible in the Armenian. The Grk. continues : "And therefore I will judge thee by thy words, because of the hatred which the enemy put in thee," etc.

alone sinned.' And the angels granted him a little respite from driving us out; and Adam called out with a loud voice, and said, lamenting: 'Remit unto me, Lord, my transgressions, whatsoever I have done.' Then said the Lord to his angels: 'Wherefore have ye given them respite, and expel them not from the garden? Did I not of myself make (them)?[1] or have I judged them unjustly?' But the angels fell on their faces, and said: 'Just art thou, Lord; and righteous are thy judgments.' (Ch. xxviii.) And the Lord turned to Adam and said to him: 'I will not permit thee now and henceforth to be there in the garden.' And Adam made answer and said to the Lord: 'O my Lord and my God, I pray thee bestow on me of the tree of life, that I may eat thereof before I go forth from the garden of life.' God again spake with Adam, and said: 'In this present thou shalt not receive of the same, for we have enjoined on the cherubim with the flaming sword to guard the path, unto the end that thou mayest not taste thereof and abide deathless for ever. But there shall be unto thee[2] thy war, which the enemy has sown for thee. But when thou shalt remove thyself from the garden and keep thyself from all wickedness, and bear in mind death;[3] after thine ending, in the coming of the resurrection, I will raise thee up, and then I will give to thee of the fruit of life and thou shalt abide deathless for ever.' (Ch. xxix.) And the Lord, having said this, commanded the angels to drive us out of the garden. And then your father Adam wept bitterly in the garden before the angels. And the angels say unto him: 'What wilt thou that we do to thee, Adam?' Adam made answer to the angels: 'I know that ye now drive me forth, but suffer me to take some fragrant thing from the garden, in order that when I shall be outside it, and am offering oblations to God, the Lord may listen unto my prayers.' (Ch. xxx.) But the angels approached the Lord, and said: 'Hojili Hojil,'[4] *which is translated* King eternal. And he bade be given to Adam incense of sweet odour (εὐωδίας) from the garden. And the Lord God bade that Adam be brought before him, that he might receive the incense of sweet odour and the seeds of his food, giving leave unto his angels. And Adam came before the Lord. And the Lord God bade there be given to him four things, which are the following: crocus, which is saffron; and nard, which is phajla-

---

[1] The Grk.="Surely the transgression is not mine?"

[2] "Thou shalt have the war," etc.

[3] In Grk.: "As wishing to die [but Codex C 'as about to die'], then when the resurrection again comes I will raise thee up, and then shall be given thee of the tree of life," etc.

[4] In the Grk.: "Ἰαὴλ *αἰώνιε βασιλεῦ*."

seni;[1] and calamus, which is a reed; and cinnamon, which is daraseni;[1] and many other seeds among those things which we eat. And when he had received all these, we went forth from the garden, and we beheld ourselves placed in this earth. (Ch. xxxi.) And now, my children, I have discoursed to you about everything, and concerning the chicanery of the enemy (*and how, that by his deceit, he . . . . us*). But do ye forthwith be on your guard, lest ye also forfeit the glory of God." (Ch. xxxii.) And all this did Eva relate to her sons; and Adam lay before them much afflicted in his sickness.[2] *But Eva and her sons began to weep and lament.*

And when they were silent there arose Adam from his sleep. And Eva said unto him: "Wherefore dost *thou* die and I remain alive, my lord? Or for how long a time do I (wait to) come after thine ending? Acquaint me *with the truth.*" Said Adam unto Eve: "It is not any concern of thine (lit. for thee) to ask concerning this, because thou wilt (? not) delay to follow after me, but alike we shall die together, and they will place thee near to me in the same spot. But when I shall die cover me[3]; and suffer not any one of thy sons to behold[4] me, until the angel shall ordain what is to be done concerning me. For God neglects me not, but seeks out the vessels which he fashioned. Now, therefore, arise and remain in prayer until there shall pass forth my spirit from my body this day into the hand *of my Lord* who gave it unto me. *Oh*, for I know not, how I[5] shall meet my Creator, lest haply he be wroth concerning me, or on the contrary he may have pity on me in his compassion." Then Eva arose and went without, and fell on her face on the earth, and wept and lamented bitterly, and spake as follows: "I have sinned against thee, O God; I have sinned against thee, Father of all; I have sinned against thee, O Lord; I have sinned also against thy angels![6] *I have sinned against thee, Lover of mankind*; I have sinned against thee and thy cherubim; I have sinned against thee, Lord, and against thy immoveable throne; I have sinned against thee, Lord; *I have sinned against the holiness of thy saints*; I have sinned against thee, Lord, I have sinned unto heaven and before thee, O Lord. For sin and transgressions have from me originated in the world." And as she offered up this prayer, the angel of the Lord came unto her in a human shape

---

[1] The homonyms added are, perhaps, Arabic. The Greek Text has not them.

[2] The Grk. adds: "but he had one more day before he quitted his body."

[3] The Cod. A has καλύψετε, but B C καταλίψετε.

[4] In the Grk.: "to touch me."

[5] In the Grk.: "how *we*."

[6] In Grk.: "Thy chosen angels."

(εἶδος),[1] and having aroused her *from sleep*, said to her: "Stand strong, thou woman, in thy adoration.[2] For behold Adam, thy husband, has passed away from his flesh. And do thou look and behold his spirit ascending unto heaven to his Maker to be before him." (Ch. xxxiii.) But Eva having arisen cleansed with her hands her face[3] *from her excessive tears; for her eyes were swollen with weeping.* And having raised her eyes to heaven, she beholds a fiery chariot raised aloft by four fiery beasts,[4] and the tongue of man is too weak to tell forth the sheen of their glory. And they bore his spirit to the place wherein (?) is Adam in the flesh. And angels went before the chariot. But when they came nigh to that place, the chariot stopped along with the cherubin and Adam upon it; she beheld also censers of gold and three canopies, and angels went with fragrant incense taking the censers, and came in haste into the holy tabernacle, and kindling fire they cast the incense into the censers, and the smoke of the incense so went forth as to overshadow the firmament of heaven. And the angels prostrated themselves in adoration before God, crying all of them aloud and saying: "Eliájil, *which is being translated Lord, king of eternity*, vouchsafe remission to Adam, for he is thine image and the work of thy spotless hands." (Ch. xxxiv.) Eva beheld yet other[5] marvels before God. And Eva wept bitterly. And Eva turned and spake, and said to Seth her son: "My child, stand firm over the body[6] of thy father, and come to me and see what no one hath seen with his eyes. And behold how all the angels beseech the Lord concerning thy father Adam." (Ch. xxxv.) But Seth arose and went to his mother, and said unto her: "Why weepest thou, mother mine?" His mother made answer to him and said to him: "Do thou look up and see with thine eyes the firmament of heaven opened,[7] and the

---

[1] In the Grk.: "Lo there came to her the angel of humanity (τῆς ἀνθρωπότητος)." [2] In the Grk.: "Rise up from thy repentance."

[3] In Grk. simply: "laid her hand on her face."

[4] The Grk. has: "A chariot of light moved on by four bright eagles, of which no one born of the womb could tell the glory nor behold their countenance, and angels preceding the chariot. When they came to the place where lay your father Adam, the chariot halted, and the seraphim were between your father and the chariot. And I saw gold censers and three cups; and lo, all the angels with frankincense and with censers and the cups (or vials) came to the altar and blew them, and the vapour of the incense hid the firmaments," etc.

[5] In Grk.: "yet two other mysteries before God."

[6] In Grk.: "rise up from the body."

[7] In Grk.: "behold the seven firmaments opened, and see with thine eyes how the body of thy father lies on its face, and all the holy angels with it, praying for it and saying."

soul of thy father, how he falls down before God on his face, and all the angels beseech the Lord in his behalf, thus saying: 'Vouchsafe, O Lord, remission unto Adam, *thou who art God long-suffering and art Lord of all.* For he is thine image.' Therefore, O my child Seth, what[1] shall come unto me, when I shall stand before the unseen God. And who then may be yonder two men, the Ethiops, who stand before God, beseeching the Lord for thy father Adam?" (Ch. xxxvi.) Seth said unto her: "O my mother, yonder two men whom thou beholdest are the sun and the moon, who stand and beseech God, falling upon their faces, concerning my father Adam." And Eva saith unto him: "And where may be their light? How darkened do they appear!" Seth made answer and said: "'Tis not because their light is laid aside from them, but their light appeareth not before the father of light.[2] *Because their sheen is clouded over by glory and by the mighty sheen of the face of the father of light.*" (Ch. xxxvii.) And as Seth spake this word unto his mother Eva, on a sudden one of the archangels blew his trumpet, and instantly all the angels arose, who were fallen on their faces before God. And they called out with a loud uproar and with terrible voice: "Blessed is the glory of the Lord by his creatures. For that he hath taken pity on those that were fashioned by his hands, upon Adam." And when the angels had cried out this aloud, there came one of the six-winged cherubin and caught up Adam and bore him into a sea not made with hands, and washed him three times.[3]

---

[1] In Grk.: "What shall be this? and when shall it be given over into the hands of the unseen father and of our God? But who are the two Ethiops," etc.

[2] In Grk.: "before the light of the whole, the father of lights, and therefore is their light hidden and lost."

[3] In Grk.: "ἥρπασεν τὸν Ἀδάμ, καὶ ἀπήγαγεν αὐτον εἰς τὴν ἀχερουσίαν λίμνην καὶ ἀπέλουσεν αὐτὸν τρίτον." So Ceriani's codex D; but Tischendorf reads: ἥρπασεν τὸν Ἀδὰμ εἰς τὴν ἀχέρουσαν λίμνην καὶ ἀπέπλυνεν αὐτὸν ἐνώπιον θεοῦ, and on ἀχέρουσαν he has this note: Ita coniecimus scribendum esse pro γερουσίας, quod in codice esse dicitur. Poterat enim scribi ἀχερουσιάδα. Illud vero similiter in Apocalypsi Pauli legitur, ubi sect. 22 est: ὅταν δὲ μετανοήσῃ καὶ μεταστάθῃ τοῦ βίου, παραδίδοται τῷ Μιχαήλ, καὶ βάλλουσιν αὐτὸν εἰς τὴν Ἀχέρουσαν λίμνην. In the same section of the *Apoc. Pauli* we read that ἡ ἀχέρουσα λίμνη was in the land of the gentle ones who inherit the earth, in a region where the souls of the just are kept. Its waters were brighter than gold and silver, and none might enter it, except after repentance of their sins. The Syriac version of the *Apoc. Pauli* renders it "the sea of Eucharista." In § 31 of the same Apocryph the phrase recurs ἔξω τῆς πόλεως καὶ τῆς ἀχερούσης λίμνης καὶ τῆς γῆς τῆς ἀγαθῆς

And again he brought and placed him before God ; and he spent three hours, fallen on his face on the earth. But after this he stretched forth his hand, who is lord of all, he that sat on his throne. And having taken Adam, he gave him into the hand of Michael the archangel, saying to him : "Bear him unto the second heaven[1] and let him repose until the day of the great renewal, which I will bring (as) salvation in the midst of the earth, *because of Adam and all his children.*" Then Michael the archangel took Adam and they bore him and gave him repose in the place where the Lord commanded him. And all the angels sang a strain of praise and the songs of angels. They marvelled at God's love of man, and at the acceptable pardon of Adam. But after so much rejoicing, which there was concerning Adam, Michael the archangel spake unto the father *of light concerning Adam*, and said to him : " Lord, let all the angels be gathered together before God, each according to his order." And they were all gathered together, some having censers in their hands and others harps and trumpets.[2] And behold the Lord ascended in glory upon the four winds, and the cherubim took hold of and held the winds. And angels came down from heaven and went before him, all of them, and descended unto the earth, at the spot in which was lying the body of Adam. And having come thither, the Lord entered into the garden with the heavenly hosts. Then the plants and fruit-bearing trees all blossomed forth together, and there breathed forth a sweet odour, so that all who were born of Adam, were stupefied and fell into a deep sleep, from the odour wafted to them from the bloom and blossom of the garden. But Seth alone was not stupefied : *for the Lord wished to shew unto him the wonders which he was about to work.* But the Lord God[3] having looked, beheld the body of Adam lying just as it was on the earth. He was much distressed *in his love of man*, and he said : " O Adam, wherefore hast thou done this, for if thou hadst kept my commandment, which I gave to thee, they would not be rejoicing who have brought thee into yonder place of thine ? But now I say to thee, *that when my salvation shall be manifested to the world*, I will turn their rejoicing into sorrow ; but thy sorrow I will turn into rejoicing. For I will restore thee unto thy primal glory,[4] and seat thee on a throne of thy

---

[1] In the Grk. : "Lift him up into the paradise as far as the third heaven, and leave him there till that great day and terrible of my economy, which I will bring about in the world."

[2] In the Grk. : " and others trumpets and vials."

[3] According to Tischendorf's Text *Seth* was " distressed." In all the Grk. MSS., however, there is some flaw here.

[4] In Grk. : " will restore thee to thine empire."

deceiver. And he shall come to that place, wherein thou art now lying, and he shall behold thee become higher than himself. And then he himself shall be judged and all his worshippers. *And I send him into the gehenna of fire.* And he shall be much affrighted and will sorrow, beholding thee sitting on his throne." (Ch. xl.) And when God had spoken these words to Adam, the archangel Michael again said[1] : " Come to the kingdom, which is in the second heaven, and thou shalt take there three linen robes, white and purple, and shalt bring them hither." And he went and fulfilled that which was commanded of the Lord. And God commanded Michael the archangel to envelop the body of Adam, saying thus : " Spread ye out those fine linen cloths of yours and envelop him, and bring ye of the oil of anointing, of fragrant smell, and scatter it over him." And the archangels Michael and Uriel did as the Lord commanded them. And when they had enfolded the body of Adam, God commanded them to bring the body of Abel the just. And they bore and laid it before God. And God commanded them to bear in like manner linen cloths, and envelop the body of Abel the just ; because his body was not wrapped up by anyone, from the day on upon which Cain slew his brother. For Cain himself was desirous to keep it,[2] but was not able ; for that the earth would not receive his body.

But there was a voice of summoning from the earth to Cain saying : " I am not willing to receive the body of the first-formed, which they received from me." And the angel having taken the body of Abel, they placed it on a stone, until they had buried the body of Adam. But the Lord God commanded the angels to lift up his body and carry it into the region of the garden unto that place in which the Lord had taken clay (or dust) and fashioned Adam. And he commanded that they should cleave the earth asunder and bury them together. And the Lord gave command to seven holy archangels to come and bring forth from the kingdom many odours. And the archangels came and brought them, even as the Lord commanded. And they laid the fragrant (spices) in the place in which he commanded them

---

[1] According to the Grk. ch. xl. begins thus : " After this God said to the archangel Michael : Strew linen clothes and cover the body of Adam ; and bring ye oil of the oil of fragrance and pour it out on it. And the three great angels tended him. And when they had finished tending Adam, God bade the body of Abel also to be brought."

[2] In the Grk. : " Cain often wished to hide it, but could not. For his body would leap up from the ground and a voice issued from the earth, saying, A second creation shall not be hidden in the earth, until there be given up to me the first creation which was taken from me, the dust (of me) from whom it was taken."

to set down their bodies. And then they took the body of the twain and laid them in the place in which they had cloven asunder the sepulchre; and they covered it over with clay (or dust). (Ch. xli.) And the Lord God cried out to the body of Adam and said: "Adam, Adam." But he uttered a cry, saying[1]: "Lo, here am I, Lord." And the Lord said: "Aforetime I said unto thee that dust thou wast and to dust shouldst thou return. But mightily[2] do I give thee good tidings of my power and unto all nations of the sons of men, who are of thy children." (Ch. xlii.) When he said this, the Lord God made a sign (or monument)[3], triangular, and with it sealed their sepulchre; that no one might come nigh thereunto for six days, until the dust return whence it was taken. And when he had completed all this our Lord ascended into heaven in glory. But Eva did not comprehend where was laid his body. She was filled with great sorrow and wept bitterly because of his death, and again because of not knowing his body, what it was become. For as we said before, all were stupefied together with Eva, in that time in which the Lord descended into the garden of delight concerning the body of Adam. And so all these marvels took place; but no one of them knew, but only Seth, their son. But after this, when the time of Eva's end came, she arose even of herself, and fell to praying with tears and said: "Lord God of all natures, Creator of creation, separate me not from the body of thy servant Adam. For thou didst even make me out of the body of Adam, and from his bones didst thou even fashion me; and I pray thee, make me worthy, who am unworthy, (and make worthy) the sinful body of thy hand-maid; that it be not separated from the body of Adam, even as aforetime I was together with him in yon garden. For though we had transgressed thy command, we were not divided from one another." And when she had finished this prayer, she looked up to heaven and smote her breast, and said: "O my Lord, and God of all, receive my spirit *in peace.*" *And having said this, she slept, committing her spirit into the hands of angels.* (Ch. xliii.) But thereafter Michael the archangel along with three archangels lifted up the body of Eva, and took and buried it in the place in

---

[1] In the Grk.: "the body answered from the earth and said."

[2] In the Grk.: "Again I announce to thee the resurrection. I will raise thee in the resurrection with every race of men sprung from thy seed."

[3] In the Grk.: "God made a seal and sealed the tomb, that no one might do aught to it in the six days, until his rib revert to him. Then the Lord and his angels proceeded unto their place. But Eve also after the fulfilling of six days fell asleep. But while she still lived, she wept bitterly because of the falling asleep of Adam."

which lay the body of Adam and of Abel the just. And thereafter Michael the archangel cried aloud to Seth and said: "Thus[1] shalt thou bury every man who shall die until the day *of the coming again* and of the resurrection." And having thus laid down the law, he saith to him: "On the seventh day thou shalt rest and rejoice in it. For on this day the Lord and all his angels (? said): 'Let us rejoice with all the spirits of the just ones who may be upon the earth.'" And when Michael the archangel had said this to Seth, forthwith he ascended into heaven along with the three archangels, giving thanks unto and glorifying God. And they sang songs, saying: "Allelouiah, Allelouiah, *Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord of Hosts*, glory to God Almighty for ever and ever."[2]

Lord God of thy holy archangels and angels, and of all the powers of heaven, and of the first-created ones Adam and Eva, through their intercession have pity on the owner of this book, Mahdas Gregory, and his wife Selene (*lou-sin*), and his sons Thôrwand and Parsam, and on all the blood of his neighbours, and on the writer of the same, and on those who shall read and give ear to it and who say the Amen. Amen.

---

[1] In the Grk. Michael says: "Thus bury every man who dies until the day of resurrection." And after giving him this law he said to him: "Beyond six days ye shall not mourn; but on the seventh day rest and be joyful on it, because in it (we) God and the angels rejoice with the just soul which has passed away (τῆς μεταστάσης) from earth."

[2] The Greek ends here. The rest is an addition of the Armenian translator or scribe.

THE EXPULSION OF THE JEWS FROM ENGLAND IN 1290.

(*Continued from p.* 100.)

VI.—The Prohibition of Usury.

Very soon after the passing of the Statute of 1270, Edward left England to join the second Crusade of St. Louis, and did not return till 1274, two years after he had been proclaimed king. At once he took up with characteristic vigour, and with the help and advice of a band of statesmen and lawyers, the work of administrative reform that he had already begun as heir-apparent. He recognised that the state of affairs established in 1270 could not endure, since, under it, the Jews, while practically prevented from lending money at interest, now that the law forbade them to take in pledge real property, the only possible security for large loans, were nevertheless still nothing but usurers, allowed by ancient custom and royal recognition to carry on that one pursuit as best they could, and prevented by the same forces from carrying on any other. Edward, with his usual love for "the definition of duties and the spheres of duty,"[1] felt that it was necessary to define for the Jews a new position, which should not, as did their present position, condemn them to hopeless struggles, nor demand from him acquiescence in what he believed to be a sin.

For the Church had never ceased to maintain the doctrine of the sinfulness of usury which Ambrose and Clement, Jerome and Tertullian, had taught in strict conformity with the communistic ideas of primitive Christianity. It is true that till the eleventh century

[1] Stubbs, *Constitutional History*, II., 116.

usury and speculative trading generally had not been active enough to call for repression, nor would the Church have been strong enough to enforce on the Christian world the observance of its doctrine. It could not follow up the attempt made by the Capitularies of Charles the Great to prevent laymen from practising usury, and it had to rest content with enforcing the prohibition on clerics.[1] But the growth under Hildebrand of the power of the Church over every-day life, and the elevation of the moral tone of its teaching that resulted from its struggles with the temporal power, enabled it to adopt with increasing effect measures of greater severity. Hildebrand, in 1083, decreed that usurers should, like perjurers, thieves, and wife-deserters, be punished with excommunication;[2] and the Lateran General Council of 1139, when exhorted by Innocent II. to shrink from no legislation as demanding too high and rigorous a morality, decreed that usurers were to be excluded from the consolations of the Church, to be infamous all their lives long, and to be deprived of Christian burial.[3] The religious feeling aroused by the Crusades still further strengthened the hold on the Christian world of characteristically Christian theory, while the prospect of the economic results that they threatened to bring about in Europe, awoke the Church to the advisability of putting forth all its power to protect the estates of Crusaders against the money-lenders. Many Popes of the twelfth century ordained, and St. Bernard approved of the ordinance[4] that those who took up the Cross should be freed from all engagements to pay usury into which they might have entered. Innocent III. absolved Crusaders even from obligations of the kind that they had incurred under oath, and subsequently ordered that Jews should be forced, under penalty of

---

[1] Ashley, *Economic History and Theory*, I., 126-32, 148-50.

[2] Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*, V., 175.

[3] *Ibid.*, 438-441. [4] Jacobs, *The Jews of Angevin England*, 23.

exclusion from the society of Christians, to return to their crusading debtors any interest that they had already received from them.[1]

Stronger even than the influence of the Crusades was that of the Mendicant Orders. The Dominicans, who preached, and the Franciscans, who "taught and wrought" among all classes of people throughout Europe, carried with them, as their most cherished lesson, the doctrine of poverty. It was by the teaching of this doctrine, and by the practice of the simple unworldly life of the primitive Church, that the founders of the two orders had been able to give new strength to the ecclesiastical institutions of the thirteenth century. And their teaching, if not their practice, made its way from the Casiuncula to the Vatican. Cardinal Ugolino, the dear friend of S. Francis, became Gregory IX.; Petrus de Tarentagio, of the order of the Dominicans, became Innocent IV.; and Girolamo di Ascoli, the "sun" of the Franciscans, was soon to become Nicholas IV. Moreover, the work of formulating and publishing to the world the official doctrines of the Church was in the hands of the Mendicants. A Dominican, Raymundus de Peñaforte, was entrusted by Gregory IX. with the preparation of the Decretals, which formed the chief part of the canon law of the Church.[2] And friars of both orders codified with indefatigable labour the moral law of Christianity, and set it forth in hand-books, or *Summæ*, which were universally accepted as guides for the confessional, and which all agreed in condemning usury.[3] Hence, the doctrine of its sinfulness was taught throughout Christian Europe, by priests and monks, by Dominican preachers and Franciscan confessors, who could enforce their lesson by the use of their power of granting

---

[1] *Corpus Juris Canonici* (Leipzig, 1839), II., 786.

[2] Raumer, *Geschichte der Hohenstaufen und ihrer Zeit*, III., 581.

[3] Endemann, *Studien in der Romanisch-Kanonistischen Wirthschafts- und Rechtslehre*, I., 16-18. Stintzing, *Geschichte der Populären Literatur des Römisch-Canonischen Rechts.*

or refusing absolution. How strong and violent a public opinion was thus created is best shown in the lines in which Dante, the contemporary of Edward I., tells with what companions he thought it fit that the Caursine usurers should dwell in hell.[1]

There was every reason why the hatred of usury should be as strong in England as anywhere. The Franciscan movement had spread throughout the country, and had found among Englishmen many of its chief literary champions.[2] And the Englishman's pious dislike of usury had been strengthened by many years of bitter experience. Italian usurers had in the previous reign gone up and down the country collecting money on behalf of the Pope, and lending money on their own account at exorbitant rates of interest.[3] From some of the magnates they obtained protection (for which they are said to have paid with a share of their profits),[4] but to the great body of the Baronage, to the Church and the trading classes, their very name had become hateful. One of them, the brother of the Pope's Legate, had been killed at Oxford.[5] In London Bishop Roger had solemnly excommunicated them all, and excluded them from his diocese.[6]

No English king who wished to follow the teachings of Christianity could willingly countenance any of his subjects in carrying on a traffic which was thus hated by the people and condemned by all the doctors of Christendom. Even Henry III. was once so far moved by indignation and religious feeling as to expel the Caursines from his kingdom,[7] and had religious scruples about the retention of the Jews.[8] But, as has been shown, he could not do with-

[1] E pero lo minor giron suggella,
Del segno suo e Sodoma e Caorsa.
Inferno, XI. 49, 50.

[2] *Monumenta Franciscana* (Rolls Series), XLV., L., 10, 38-9, 61.

[3] Macpherson, *Annals of Commerce*, I., 399-400.

[4] M. Paris, *Chronica Majora*, V., 245.

[5] *Ibid.*, III., 482-3.

[6] *Ibid.*, III., 332-3.

[7] *Ibid.*, IV., 8.

[8] M. Paris, *Historia Anglorum*, III., 104.

out the Jewish revenue. Edward was not only free from dependence on that source of income, but he was also a far more religious king than his father. He was a man to obey the behests of the Church, instead of setting them at naught with an easy conscience, as his father had done. In the second year of his reign the Church, by a decree passed at the Council of Lyons, demanded from the Christian world far greater efforts against usury than ever before.[1] Till this time, though Popes and Councils had declared the practice accursed, churches and monasteries had had usurers as tenants on their estates, or had even possessed whole ghettos as their property.[2] Now this was to be ended, and it was ordained by Gregory X. that no community, corporation, or individual should permit foreign usurers to hire their houses, or indeed to dwell at all upon their lands, but should expel them within three months. Edward, in obedience to this decree, ordered an inquisition to be made into the usury of the Florentine bankers in his kingdom with a view to its suppression, and allowed proceedings to be taken at the same time and with the same object against a citizen of London.[3] And the events of the last reign enabled him to proceed to what at first seems the far more serious task of bringing to an end the trade that the Jews had carried on under the patronage, and for the benefit, of the Royal Exchequer.

For the Jews could no longer support the Crown in times of financial difficulty as they had been able to do in previous reigns. The contraction of their business that

---

[1] Ashley, *Economic History and Theory*, I. 150 ; Labbeus, *Sacrosancta Concilia*, xi. 991, 2.

[2] Depping, *Les Juifs dans le Moyen Age*, 202, 207 ; Muratori, *Antiquitates Italicæ Medii Aevi*, I. 899, 900 ; *Ninth Report of the Historical Manuscripts Commission*, p. 14 (No. 264).

[3] *Forty-fourth Report of Deputy-Keeper of Public Records*, pp. 8, 9, 72 ; *The Question whether a Jew*, etc., by a Gentleman of Lincoln's Inn, London, 1753 ; Appendix, § 18.

was the result of their exclusion from many towns, and the losses that they had suffered through the extortions of Henry III. and the plundering attacks of the barons, had very greatly diminished their revenue-paying capacities, and the legislation of 1270 must have affected them still more deeply. At the end of the twelfth century they had probably paid to the Treasury about £3,000 a year, or one-twelfth of the whole royal income,[1] and for some parts of the thirteenth century the average collection of tallage has been estimated at £5,000;[2] but in 1271—by which time the royal income had probably grown to something like the £65,000 a year which the Edwards are said to have enjoyed in time of peace[3]—Henry III., when pledging to Richard of Cornwall the revenue from the Jewry, estimated its annual value, apart from what was yielded by escheats and other special claims, at no more than 2,000 marks.[4] And while the resources of the Jews had fallen off, the needs of the Crown had increased. Not only must Edward have conducted his foreign enterprises at a much greater cost than did his predecessors, under whom the English knighthood had been accustomed to serve without serious opposition, but, in addition, he had to make the best of a vast heritage of debt that his father had left him.[5] He had to seek richer supporters than the Jews, and such were not wanting.

The Italian banking companies were the only organisations in Europe that could supply him with such sums of money as he needed. From all the greatest cities of Italy—from Florence, Rome, Milan, Pisa, Lucca, Siena, and Asti—they had spread to many of the chief countries of Europe,

---

[1] Jacobs, 328. [2] *Papers Anglo-Jewish Hist. Exhibition*, 195.

[3] Stubbs' *Constitutional History* II., 601.

[4] Rymer, *Foedera*, I. 489. Cf. Public Record Office, *Q. R. Miscellanea.*

[5] *Chronicles Ed. I. and II.* (ed. Stubbs), Vol. I., p. c. Cf. *Forty-second Report of Deputy-Keeper of Public Records*, p. 479 (At the beginning of his reign Edward says, in his writs to the sheriffs, "Pecuniæ plurimum indigemus"). *Forty-third Report*, 419.

to France, England, Brabant, Switzerland, and Ireland.[1] They were merchants, money-lenders, money-changers, and international bankers, and in this last occupation their supremacy over all rivals was secured by the great advantage which the wide extent of their dealings enabled them to enjoy, of being able to save, by the use of letters of credit on their colleagues and countrymen, the cost of the transport of money from country to country.[2] They were thus the greatest financial agents of the time. They transacted the business of the Pope. At the Court of Rome ambassadors had to borrow from them.[3] In France their position was established by a regular diplomatic agreement between the head of their corporation and Philip III.[4] In England they had in their hands the greater part of the trade in corn and wool ;[5] and the protection and favour of English kings was often besought by the Popes on their behalf in special bulls.[6]

Edward began his reign in financial dependence on the Italians. His father had in the earliest period of his personal government incurred obligations to them which he himself, as heir apparent, had to increase considerably at the time of his Crusade.[7] When in later years he needed money to pay his army, he borrowed it from them ; when he diverted to his own use the tenth that was voted for his intended second Crusade, they gave security for repayment.[8] So great were the amounts that they advanced to him, that between 1298 and 1308 the Friscobaldi

---

[1] Muratori, *Antiquitates Italicæ Medii Aevi* (Dissertatio XVI) ; Depping, *Les Juifs dans le Moyen Age*, 213-6 ; Rymer, *Foedera*, I., 644.

[2] Macpherson, *Annals of Commerce*, I. 405, 6 ; and see Peruzzi, *Storia del Commercio e dei Banchieri di Firenze*, 170.

[3] Peruzzi, 169 ; *Archaeologia*, xxviii. 218, 219.

[4] Muratori, *Antiquitates Italicae Medii Aevi*, I. 889.

[5] *Archaeologia*, xxviii. 221 ; Cunningham, *Growth of English Industry and Commerce, Early and Middle Ages*, Appendix D ; Peruzzi, *Storia del Commercio*, 70.

[6] Rymer, *Foedera*, I. 660, 823, 905.

[7] *Archaeologia*, xxviii. 261-272.

[8] Rymer, *Foedera*, I. 644, 788.

Bianchi alone, one of the thirty-four companies that he employed,[1] received in repayment nearly £100,000.[2] He was compelled to favour them, although he attempted to stop their usury. He gave them a charter of privileges.[3] He presented them with large sums of money. He bestowed on the head of one of their firms high office in Gascony. At various times he placed under their charge the collection of the Customs in many of the chief ports in England.[4]

Edward's close connection with a body of financiers so rich and powerful made the Jews unnecessary to him. If he was not to disobey the decree of the Council of Lyons, he must either withdraw his protection from them or else forbid them any longer to be usurers. To withdraw his protection from them would be to expose them to the popular hatred, the danger from which had been the justification of the relations that had been established between Crown and Jewry after 1190, and still existed. He chose the second alternative. In 1275 he issued a statute, in which he absolutely forbade the Jews, as he had just forbidden Christians,[5] to practise usury in the future. He gave warning that usurious contracts would no longer be enforced by the king's officers, and he declared the making of them to be an offence for which henceforth both parties were liable to punishment. To ensure that all those contracts already existing should come to an end as quickly as possible, he ordered that all movables that were in pledge on account of loans were to be redeemed before the coming Easter.[6]

VII.—Edward's Policy: The Jews and Trade.

Thus the Jews, already shut out from the feudal and municipal organisation of the country, were forbidden by

---

[1] Peruzzi, 174.

[2] *Archaeologia*, xxviii. 244-5.

[3] *Ibid*, 231, Note l.

[4] Peruzzi, 172-5.

[5] *The Question whether a Jew*, etc. Appendix, §18. Prynne, *A Short Demurrer*, 58.

[6] Blunt, *Establishment and Residence*, etc., 139-144.

one act of legislation to follow the pursuit in which the kings of England had encouraged them for two hundred years.

However, for the hardships imposed by the Christian Church there was an approved Christian remedy. Thomas Aquinas, the greatest authority on morals in Europe in the thirteenth century, had written: "If rulers think they harm their souls by taking money from usurers, let them remember that they are themselves to blame. They ought to see that the Jews are compelled to labour as they do in some parts of Italy."[1] A Christian king, and one whom Edward revered as his old leader in arms and as a model of piety, had already acted in accordance with the teaching of Thomas Aquinas. In 1253 St. Louis sent from the Holy Land an order that all Jews should leave France for ever, except those who should become traders and workers with their hands.[2] And now, when Edward was forbidding the Jews of England to practise usury, he naturally dealt with them in the fashion recommended by the great teacher of his time and adopted by the saintly king. "The King also grants," said the Statute of 1275, "that the Jews may practise merchandise, or live by their labour, and for those purposes freely converse with Christians. Excepting that, upon any pretence whatever, they shall not be levant or couchant amongst them; nor on account of their merchandise be in scots, lots, or talliage with the other inhabitants of those cities or boroughs where they remain; seeing they are talliable to the King as his own serfs, and not otherwise. . . . And further the King grants, that such as are unskilful in merchandise, and cannot labour, may take lands to farm, for any term not exceeding ten years, provided no homage, fealty, or any such kind of service, or advowson to Holy Church, be belonging to them. Provided also that this power to farm

[1] Thomas Aquinas, *Opusculum*, XXI. (*Ad Ducissam Brabantiae* in Vol. XIX. of the Venice edition, 1775-88.)

[2] M. Paris, *Chronica Majora*, V. 361, 2.

lands, shall continue in force for ten years from the making of this Act, and no longer." [1]

The 16,000[2] Jews of England were thus called upon to change at once their old occupation for a new one, and the task was imposed upon them under conditions which made it all but impossible of fulfilment. They were forbidden to become burgesses of towns; and the effect of the prohibition was to make it impossible for them, in most parts of England, to become traders, for it practically excluded them from the Gild Merchant. It is true that some towns professed that their Gild was open to all the inhabitants, whether burgesses or not, so long as they took the oath to preserve the liberties of the town and the king's peace.[3] But most of the Gilds were exclusive bodies, to which all non-burgesses would find it hard to gain admission,[4] and Jewish non-burgesses, though not as a rule kept out by a disqualifying religious formula,[5] would on account of the unpopularity of their race and religion, find it trebly hard.[6] As non-Gildsmen, they would be at a disadvantage both in buying goods and in selling them. They would find it hard to buy, because, in some towns at any rate, the Gildsmen were accustomed to "oppress the people coming to the town with vendible wares, so that no man could sell his wares to anyone except to a member of the society." [7] They would find it in all towns hard to sell, in some impossible. In some towns non-Gildsmen were forbidden to deal in certain articles of common use,

---

[1] Blunt, *Establishment and Residence*, etc., 141.

[2] This is the number of those who left the country in 1290. *Flores Historiarum* (Rolls Series), iii. 70. Probably the number of those in the country in 1275 was about the same.

[3] Gross, *The Gild Merchant*, I. 38.

[4] *Ibid.*, I. 39-40.

[5] *Ibid.* II., 68, 138, 214, 243, 257.

[6] One Jew alone is known to have become a member of a Gild during the residence of the Jews in England before 1290. He became a citizen at the same time. His election took place in 1268 (Kitchin's *Winchester—Historic Towns Series*, p. 108), After 1275 it would have been illegal.

[7] Gross, *The Gild Merchant*, I. 41.

such as wool, hides, grain, untanned leather, and unfulled cloth ; in others, as in Southampton, they might not buy anything in the town to sell again there, or keep a wine tavern, or sell cloth by retail except on market day and fair day, or keep more than five quarters of corn in a granary to sell by retail. There were even towns where the municipal statutes altogether forbade non-Gildsmen to keep shops or to sell by retail.[1]

It was almost as difficult for Jews to become agriculturists or artisans, as to become traders. They were allowed by the statute to farm land, but for ten years only, and they were far too ignorant of agriculture to be able to take advantage of the permission. They could not work on the land of others as villeins, because, even if a Christian lord had been willing to receive them, they would have been prevented by their religion from taking the oath of fealty.[2]

Only under exceptional conditions could they work at handicrafts. A Jew who possessed manual dexterity might, as was sometimes done in the thirteenth century, have worked for himself at a cottage industry, and might, though the task would have been a hard one, have gained a connection among Christians, and induced them to trust him with materials.[3] But many crafts were at the time coming under the regulations of craft-gilds. Certainly as early as the beginning of the fourteenth century, there were in London fully-organised gilds of Lorimers, Weavers, Tapicers, Cap-makers, Saddlers, Joiners, Girdlers, and Cutlers.[4] In Hereford there were Gilds for nearly thirty trades.[5] It was probably very often the case, as it was with the Weavers' Gild in London, that a craft-gild existing

---

[1] Gross, *The Gild Merchant*, I. 45, 46, 47.

[2] *Liber Custumarum* (Rolls Series), 215.

[3] Ochenkowski, *Englands Wirthschaftliche Entwickelung im Ausgange des Mittelalters*, 51-4.

[4] *Liber Custumarum* (Rolls Series) 80-81, 101-2, 121 ; *Liber Albus* (Rolls Series), 726, 734. Riley, *Memorials of London*, 179.

[5] Johnson, *Customs of Hereford*, 115-6.

in any town could forbid the practice of the craft in the town to all who had not been elected to membership, or earned it by serving the apprenticeship that the Gild's statute required.[1] The period required by the Lorimers' statute was ten years, by the Weavers', seven, and in some cases certainly, and probably in all, the apprenticeship had to be served under a freeman of the city.[2] The apprentice who had served his time, was still, in some towns and industries, unable to practise his craft, unless he became a citizen and entered the frank pledge.[3] It was difficult for a Jewish boy to become an apprentice, for the Church threatened to excommunicate any Christian who received into his house, as an apprentice would naturally be received, a Jew or Jewess; it was impossible for a Jewish man to become a citizen, for the king forbade his Jewish "serfs" to be in scot and lot with the other inhabitants of the cities in which they lived.

Excluded from the trades and handicrafts of the towns, the Jew might try other means of earning a livelihood. He might attempt to travel with wares or with produce, from one part of England to another, or he might be an importer or an exporter. But wholesale trade of this kind would be open to those alone who had command of a large capital. And this was not the only difficulty in the way. If the Jew went about the country with his goods from fair to fair, or from city to city, he would do so at very great risk. He would have to travel over the high roads, the perils of which made necessary the Statute of Winchester, and are recounted in the words of its preamble, *de jour en jour roberies, homicides, arsons, plus sovenerement sont fetes que avaunt ne soleyent.*[4] If he survived the dangers of the road and reached a fair, he would find

---

[1] *Liber Custumarum*, 418-425.

[2] *Liber Custumarum*, 78, 81, 124. Riley, *Memorials of London*, 179, 216.

[3] *Liber Custumarum*, 79, Ochenkowski, *Op. Cit.*, 64.

[4] Stubbs, *Select Charters*, 470.

there an assemblage made up in part of "daring persons," such as those, who, in spite of the orderly traders and citizens, had caused the massacre at Lynn, in 1190,[1] or those who, at Boston killed the merchants and plundered their goods, until "the streets ran with silver and gold,"[2] or those citizens of Winchester who, in the reign of Henry III., carried on for a time a successful conspiracy to rob all itinerant merchants who passed through the country.[3] With his foreign face and striking badge, he would be the first mark for the hatred of the riotous crowd. And if he escaped violence and robbery, he had still to fear the officials of the lord of the fair, who exercised for the time unlimited and irresponsible power, and who, according to the regulations of some fairs, could destroy the goods of any trader if their quality did not please them.[4] When he had managed to escape from the mob and the officials, his difficulties were not over. He might make his bargains, but there was no court of justice to which he could appeal to enforce the completion of any transaction that required a longer time than that of the duration of the fair. Redress for any injustice committed at a fair, or for the failure to carry out an agreement made there, could be obtained only through application made by the municipality of the complainant to that of the wrong-doer.[5] The Jew had no municipality to present his claims. If those with whom he had transactions deceived him or refused to pay him, he was helpless. There was no power to which he could appeal.

If instead of going to a fair he tried to sell, in a town, produce from another country or a different part of England, he was in a position of even greater difficulty.

---

[1] Jacobs, 116.

[2] Walsingham, *Historia Anglicana* (Rolls Series), I. 30.

[3] M. Paris, *Chronica Majora*, v. 56-8.

[4] Ochenkowski, *Englands wirthschaftliche Entwickelung*, 157.

[5] Cunningham, *Growth of English Industry and Commerce, Early and Middle Ages*, 175.

In a strange town he was as much an alien as in a strange country, and there was scarcely any limit to the vexations and sufferings that on that account he would have to endure. In London, for example, alien merchants were forbidden to remain in the city for more than forty consecutive days. While they were there they might not sell anything by retail, nor have any business dealings at all with any but citizens. There was a long list of articles that they were altogether forbidden to buy. They might not stow their goods in houses or cellars; they had to sell within forty days all that they had brought with them; they were allowed neither to sell anything after that time, nor to take anything back with them. They were continually annoyed by the officers of the city.[1] All these disadvantages the Jew would have to endure to the full while competing with many powerful organisations which were engaged in foreign trade, and had, after long struggles, secured from the king special charters of privilege. Such were the companies of the merchants of Germany, who had their steelyard in London and their settlements at Boston and Lynn; the Flemings, who had their Hanse in London; the Gascons who enjoyed a charter; the Spaniards and Portuguese; the Florentines, most powerful of all, and the Venetians, whose enterprise was, at the beginning of the fourteenth century at any rate, carried on under the auspices of the Republic.[2]

The last opportunity for the Jews was to take part in the export of English produce. English wool was the most important article of international trade in Western Europe. It was brought from monasteries and landholders chiefly by the rich and powerful companies of Flemish

[1] *Liber Custumarum* (Rolls Series), xxxiv.-xlviii., 61-72; *Liber Albus*, xcv., xcvi., 287; Macpherson, *Annals of Commerce*, I. 388-9.

[2] *Liber Custumarum* and *Liber Albus*, as referred to in preceding note: Cunningham, *Growth of English Industry and Commerce, Early and Middle Ages*, 181-6; Ochenkowski, *Englands wirthschaftliche Entwickelung*, 180; *Calendar of State Papers* (*Venetian*), lx.-lxix.; Peruzzi, *Storia dei Banchieri e del Commercio di Firenze*, 70.

and Italian merchants, and sent to Flanders and Italy to be woven and dyed.[1] The Jews had, apparently, long taken some slight part in wholesale trade,[2] but the amount of capital that it required, and the power of the rivals who held the field, made it impossible for many of them to take to it immediately as a substitute for money-lending. Still it was the only form of enterprise in which they would not be at a hopeless disadvantage, and some Jews, those probably who had a large capital and were able to recall it from the borrowers, followed the example of the Italians, and made to landholders advances of money to be repaid in corn and wool.[3]

VIII.—The Temptations of the Jews.

But even for those Jews who were rich enough to take part in wholesale trade, there was still a great temptation to transgress the prohibition against usury. All the legal machinery that was necessary for the due execution and validity of agreements between Jews and Christians—the chest in which the deeds were deposited, and the staffs of officers by whom they were registered and supervised —were still maintained in some towns, since they were necessary alike for the recovery, by the ordinary process, of the old debts (many of which, in spite of the order for summary repayment in the Statute of 1275, still remained outstanding)[4] and for the registration of any new agree-

---

[1] Cunningham, *Growth*, etc., 185 ; Macpherson, *Annals of Commerce*, pp. 415, 481 ; *Calendar of State Papers* (*Venetian*), lxvi.-lxvii.

[2] Jacobs, 66-7 ; *Archæological Journal*, xxxviii. 179.

[3] This was the procedure adopted by the Italians : They paid down a sum as earnest-money, and then took a bond (Peruzzi, 70). Cf. Tovey, 207.

[4] For pledges still unredeemed, land still in the hands of the Jews and old debts still unpaid long after the Statutes of 1270-1275 had been passed, see MSS. in Public Record Office (*Queen's Remembrancer's Miscellanea*, 557, 13-23) ; Rymer, I. 570 ; John of Peckham, I. 937 ; *Calendar of Patent Rolls*, 1281-1292, p. 81 ; Prynne, *Second Demurrer*, pp. 74 and 80 (=154).

ments that might be made for the delivery of corn and wool, or for the repayment of money lent ostensibly without interest. There was no lack of would-be borrowers to co-operate with the Jews in using this machinery in order to make agreements on which, in spite of the prohibition of usury, money might profitably be lent. The demand for loans was great, far too great to be satisfied, as the Church thought it reasonable to expect,[1] by money advanced without interest; and owing to the progress of the change from payment of rents in kind or service to payment in cash,[2] it was steadily growing. It had been met by the money of the Italian bankers, of the Jews, of English citizens, and, as is freely hinted by writers of the time, of great English barons, who secretly shared in the transactions and the profits of the Jewish and foreign usurers.[3] The supply had suddenly been checked by the simultaneous prohibition of all usury whether of Jews or of Christians. Now a Jew who wished, by collusion with a borrower, to evade the law against usury, had only to study the methods that had been followed by the Caursines, and those that were still followed by the Italians and acquiesced in by the heads of the religious houses with whom they had dealings. The Caursines, for example, sometimes avoided the appearance of usury by lending 100 marks and receiving in return a bond, acknowledging a loan of £100.[4] Sometimes they lent money for a definite period, on an agreement that they were to get a "gift," in return for their kindness in making the loan, and "compensation" in case it were not repaid in time.[5] Sometimes by a still more elaborate device, the Italians combined their two

---

[1] Labbeus, *Sacrosancta Concilia*, XI. 649-50.

[2] Vinogradoff, *Villeinage in England*, 179, 307.

[3] M. Paris, V. 245; Wilkins, *Conc.*, I. 675; *De Antiq. Legibus*, 234 sq. (Archbishop of York's remarks on the corruption of the Great Council and on the *fautores* of Jews.)

[4] M. Paris, *Chronica Majora*, V. 404-5.

[5] Muratori, *Antiquitates Italicæ Medii Aevi*, I., 893.

professions of money-lenders and merchants, by inducing a monastery which had borrowed money, to acknowledge the receipt, not only of the money, but also of the price of certain sacks of wool which it bound itself in due time to supply.[1] The Jews, no doubt, followed the example of the Caursines and of the Italians. In official registers, which are still extant, there are mentioned bonds which secured to Jewish creditors a large payment in money together with a small payment in kind, and which doubtless represent collusive transactions, in which the offence of usury was to be avoided by the substitution of a recompense in kind for interest in money. Other bonds for repayment of money alone are mentioned in the same registers as having been executed after 1275, and every one of the kind that was executed between that date and the date of the amendment of the Statute against usury may be safely considered to represent a transaction which was an offence, either veiled or open, against the prohibition.

The temptation to transgress the Statute of 1275 could appeal only to Jews with capital, but on the poorer Jews other temptations acted with even more strength and even worse results.

The only reputable careers known to have been open to the poorer Jews were to become servants in the houses of their rich co-religionists,[2] or else to imitate in a humble way their financial transactions, either by keeping pawnshops,[3] or by carrying on, in towns where there was no recognised Jewry, business of the same kind as that of the rich money-lenders in the larger Jewish settlements. To follow these pursuits was now impossible, in consequence, not only of the prohibition of usury, but also of the strictness with which Edward enforced the old legislation

---

Rotuli Parliamentorum, I. 1, 2.

[2] *Royal Letters* (Rolls Series), II. 24.

[3] *Leet Jurisdiction of Norwich* (Selden Society), p. 10; Cf. *Ancren Riwle* (Camden Society), 395. "Do not men account him a good friend who layeth his pledge in *Jewry* to redeem his companion?"

against the residence of Jews in towns where there did no exist a chest for the deposit of Jewish debts, and a staff of clerks to witness and register them.[1] There was thus nothing to which the poorer Jews could turn. Crowded as unwelcome intruders into a small and decreasing number of towns, without legal standing or industrial skill, hated by the people and declared accursed by the Church, they were bidden to support themselves under conditions which made the task impossible unless they could take by storm the citadel of municipal privilege which bade defiance to the "greatest of the Plantagenets" throughout his reign.

Under such conditions degeneration was inevitable. Some of the Jews are said to have taken to highway robbery and burglary;[2] some went into the House of Converts, where they got 1½d. a day and free lodging.[3] But to the dishonest there was open a far more profitable form of dishonesty than either of those already mentioned, viz., clipping the coin.

The offence had long been prevalent. In 1248 such mischief had been done that, according to Matthew Paris "no foreigner, let alone an Englishman, could look on an English coin with dry eyes and unbroken heart."[4] It was in vain that Henry III. issued a new coinage, so stamped that the device and the lettering extended to the edge of the piece,[5] and caused it to be proclaimed in every town, village, market-place, and fair that none but the new pieces with their shapes unaltered should be given or taken in exchange.[6] The opportunity for dishonesty was too tempting. The coins that actually circulated in the country

---

[1] Rymer, *Foedera*, I. 503, 634; *Papers of the Anglo-Jewish Historical Exhibition*, 187-190.

[2] *Calendar of Patent Rolls*, 1281-1292, p. 98; *Papers Anglo-Jewish Hist. Ex.* 167.

[3] See *Dictionary of Political Economy*, Article JEWS, (House for Converted).

[4] *Chronica Majora*, V. 15.

[5] *Annales Monastici* (Rolls Series), II. 339.

[6] M. Paris, *Chronica Majora*, V. 15, 16.

were of many different issues,[1] they were not milled at the edges,[2] they were so liable to damage and mutilation of all kinds that their deficiency of weight had to be recognised and allowed for.[3] Hence anyone who had many coins passing through his hands could secure an easy profit by clipping off a piece from each one before he passed it again into circulation. In the early part of the reign of Edward I., such was the deficiency in the weight of genuine coins (an annalist of the period estimates it at 50 per cent.),[4] and such the amount of false coin in circulation, that the price of commodities rose to an alarming height, foreign merchants were driven away, trade became completely disorganised, shopkeepers refused the money tendered to them, and the necessities of life were withdrawn from the markets.[5] The King had to promise to issue a new coinage, but the announcement of his intention only increased the general disturbance. The Archbishop of Canterbury complained that in consequence of the disturbance of circulation, he could not find anyone, except the professional usurers, from whom he could borrow money on which to live during the interval before the revenues of his see began to come in.[6] When the King at this period of his reign went to a priory to ask for money, the first and most cogent of the excuses that he heard was that "the House was impoverished by the change in the coinage of the realm."[7] Public opinion ascribed to the Jews the greatest share in the injuries to the coinage. "They are notoriously forgers and clippers of the coin," says Matthew Paris.[8] And that the suspicion was not absolutely without justification is shown by the fact, that early in Henry III.'s reign, the

---

[1] Ruding, *Annals of the Coinage*, I. 179.
[2] Ashley, *Economic Hist., Theory*, I. 169.
[3] Ashley, I., 215, n. 95 ; cf. Jacobs, 73 and 225.
[4] *Annales Monastici* (Rolls Series), IV. 278.
[5] *Annales Monastici*, IV. 278 ; *Liber Custumarum*, 189.
[6] John of Peckham, *Registrum Epistolarum* (Rolls Series), I. 22.
[7] *Annales Monastici* III. 295. [8] *Historia Anglorum*, III. 76.

community made a payment to the King in order to secure as a concession the expulsion from England of such of its members as might be convicted of the crime.[1] When inquiries were ordered into the causes of the debasement, in 1248, it was generally considered that the guilt would be found to rest with the Jews.[2] The official verdict included them with the Caursines and the Flemish wool-merchants in its condemnation.[3]

It was not unnatural that Edward, when the evil reappeared in his reign, should share the general suspicion against the Jews, seeing that they had only recently begun to give up dealing in money, while many of the poorer among them must have become, since 1275, desperate enough to be ready to take to any tempting form of dishonesty. The King's indignation at the suffering that had been caused by the injury done to the old coinage, and at the expense that was involved in the preparation of the new issue which had become necessary, prompted him to act on his suspicions, and to take a measure of terrible severity in order to make sure of the apprehension of the most probable culprits. When, in 1278, he was making preparations for an inquiry into the whole subject of the coinage, he caused all the Jews of England to be imprisoned in one night, their property to be seized, and their houses to be searched. At the same time the goldsmiths, and many others against whom information was given by the Jews, were treated in the same way.[4]

The prisoners were tried before a bench of judges and royal officers. There can be no doubt that many innocent men were accused, even if they were not condemned. At a time when all the Jews in England were imprisoned, there was a great temptation for Christians to bring false accusations against those among them whom they disliked on personal or religious grounds, especially as there

[1] Tovey, 109 ; Madox, *History of the Exchequer* I. 245, z.

[2] M. Paris, *Chronica Majora*, IV. 608.

[3] *Ibid.*, V. 16. [4] *Annales Monastici*, IV. 278.

was a good chance of extorting hush-money from the accused, or, in case of condemnation, of concealing from the escheators some of their property.[1] The Jews and the King recognised the danger. One Manser of London, for example, was wise enough to sue that an investigation might be held into the ownership of tools for clipping that were found on the roof of his house.[2] The King, anxious that punishment should fall only on the guilty, issued a general writ, in which the various motives for false accusation were recited, and it was ordered that any Jew against whom no charge had been brought by a certain date might secure himself altogether by paying a fine.[3] Nevertheless, a large number both of Jews and Christians were found guilty. Of the Christians only three were condemned to death, though many others were heavily fined. For the Jews, however, there was no mercy. Two hundred and ninety-three of them were hanged and drawn in London, and all their property escheated to the King. A few more had been condemned, but saved their lives by conversion to Christianity.[4]

The activity with which Jews took part, or were supposed to take part, in the debasement of the coinage, and in the prohibited practice of usury,[5] must have aroused in the mind of the King some misgivings on the subject of his new policy. Nevertheless, he did not as yet despair of its ultimate

---

[1] *Calendar of Patent Rolls from* 1281 *to* 1292, 128, 147, 173, 176, 213, 291, 451 ; *Chron. Ed. I.*, I. 93 ; *Rotuli Parliamentorum*, I. 51a ; Rymer, *Fœdera*, I., 570.

[2] *Papers Anglo-Jewish Historical Exhibition*, 42-3.

[3] Tovey, 211-13.

[4] *Chronicles of Edward I. and Edward II.* (Rolls Series), I., 88 ; *Chronicon Petroburgense* (Camden Society), 29.

[5] "Whereas in the time of our ancestors, kings of England, loans at interest were wont and were allowed to be made by Jews of our kingdom, and much of such profits fell into the hands of those our ancestors, as the issues of our Jewry; and we, led on by the love of God, and wishing to follow more devoutly in the path of the Holy Church, did forbid unto all the Jews of our kingdom who had viciously lived from such loans, that none of them henceforth in any manner be guilty of resorting to loans at interest, but that they seek their living and sustain themselves by other legitimate

success. The crimes of the Jews were no greater than those of the Christians around them, though they called forth heavier punishment. Christians clipped and coined; Christians still lent money on usury.[1] And a certain amount of crime among Jews could not but be looked for as a natural result of the terrible difficulties in the way of the social revolution that had been demanded of them. Edward saw that he had been trying to do too much at once. The Jews could not change their occupation as suddenly as he had wished. The country could not do without money-lenders. By making the lending of money at interest a penal offence, and thus encouraging debtors and creditors to keep their transactions secret, Edward had weakened the supervision that had been exercised by the Treasury, since 1194, over the business and property of the Jews, and thus he had increased the chance of fraud in the collection of tallages, and in the apportionment of the share of each estate that had long been claimed by the Crown as the succession due on Jewish property.[2] But he had not stamped out usury, though the Statute of 1275 had forbidden it. He had not even secured the redemption of all pledges of Christians from the hands of the Jews, though the Statute of 1275 had demanded it. And, therefore, in order that he might not keep on the Statute Book a law of which the effective administration was impossible,

---

work and merchandise, especially since by the favour of Holy Church they are suffered to sell and live among Christians. Nevertheless, afterwards, in a blind and evil spirit, turning to evil, under colour of merchandise and good contracts and covenants, what we established by rational thought, premeditating mischief anew, they do it with Christians by means of bonds and divers instruments, which remain with the Jews, and in which, on a given debt or contract, they put double, treble, or quadruple more than they lend to the Christians [this reads like an exaggeration], penally abusing the name of usury. . . ." (*Papers Anglo-Jewish Historical Exhibition*, 225-6).

[1] For Coining, see Ruding, *Annals of the Coinage* I. 197; *Calendar of Patent Rolls from* 1281 *to* 1292, 97; *Abbreviatio Rotulorum Originalium* (Record Commission), 49; Peckham, *Registrum Epistolarum*, I. 146. For Usury, *Forty-fourth Report of the Deputy-Keeper of the Public Records*, pp. 8 and 9; *Archæologia*, XXVIII., 227-9; Peckham, II., 542; and for a later period, *Rotuli Parliamentorum*, II. 332*a*, (VII.) 350*b*.

[2] *Papers of Anglo-Jewish Historical Exhibition*, p. 192 (note 54), and p. 222.

he mitigated the severity of the provisions of 1275, and issued, probably a few years later, a new Statute, in which he prescribed certain conditions under which usury was to be permitted. He allowed loans to be made under contract for the payment of interest at the rate of half a mark in the pound yearly, but for three years only; and, in order to reduce the temptation to conclude secret transactions, restored legal recognition to all debts of the value of £20 or upwards that were made under the prescribed conditions, and were registered before the chirographer and clerk, and threatened heavy penalties against all who should lend up to that amount without registration.[1]

Edward was wise in thus substituting for his earlier, harassing measure, one that allowed for gradual change, and that attempted to control the evil of which the immediate suppression was impossible. But the few years' experience that he had already had ought to have made him go farther still. It ought to have shown him that it was hopeless to expect the Jews to give up usury so long as the greater part of them were practically excluded from all other pursuits, and that, if ever he was to bring to a successful issue the policy that he had inaugurated, he would have to find some means of enabling them to work side by side with Christians, and to compete with them on equal conditions.

Such a task would have been full of difficulties, the greatest of which resulted from the active hostility with which the rulers and teachers of the Christian Church in the thirteenth century, unlike their predecessors, regarded the Jews. The growth and nature of this hostility must now be considered.

B. Lionel Abrahams.

(*To be continued.*)

---

[1] *Papers of Anglo-Jewish Historical Exhibition*, pp. 224-9.

BELIEFS, RITES, AND CUSTOMS OF THE JEWS, CONNECTED WITH DEATH, BURIAL, AND MOURNING.

(As illustrated by the Bible and later Jewish literature.)

V.

The next step preliminary to burial is to prepare the corpse by a process of purification for its journey to its eternal home. This sacred task is usually fulfilled by the members of a religious confraternity known as חֶבְרָא קַדִּישָׁא, who have voluntarily taken upon themselves to discharge all the rites connected with death and burial. Their varied duties are covered by the word *συγκομίζειν*, occurring in Acts viii. 2.

The water required for the cleansing of the dead has to be warmed. The ceremonial of washing the corpse must not be performed by one person alone, not even in the case of a child. The dead must likewise not be moved from one position to another by fewer than two persons. The corpse is first laid on a deal board, with its feet turned towards the door, and covered with a clean sheet. The body is undressed as far as the inner shirt, which is then rent through from the breast downward in such a manner that the corpse shall remain covered throughout. The corpse is now washed from head to foot in lukewarm water, during which process the mouth is covered, so that no water should trickle down it.

First, the dead lies with face lifted upward; it is next inclined upon the right side while the left side and part of the back are being washed, and is then turned on to the

left side while the right side and the remaining portion of the back are being subjected to the same treatment, the corpse being afterwards laid on its back. In some cases the nails are cut, but generally they are simply cleaned with a special kind of pin, while the hair is often arranged in the manner in which it was worn in life. In ancient times the hair was cut (T. B. *Moed. Kat.*, 8*b*), but it is now only washed, and nine measures of cold water are subsequently poured over the corpse (during which, in some places, the dead is settled in an upright position), and this constitutes the actual religious purification technically known as טַהֲרָה.

While this ceremonial is being carried out, some verses are recited by those who officiate, concluding with the words: "And I will sprinkle clean water upon you, and you shall be clean" (Ezekiel xxxvi. 25).

The corpse is, of course, thoroughly dried, care being taken not to leave it uncovered the while. Women have to undergo the same process of purification at the hands of their own sex. In Acts ix. 37 we have an instance of a woman being washed before burial in New Testament times.

The board on which the corpse lay is cleansed, and all the water that may have been spilt around about is cleared up, so that no one should pass over it. The overturning of the board is fraught with danger, and any one might die in consequence within three days afterwards (*Testament of R. Jehuda Chasid.* VI.).

It was formerly the custom also to anoint the corpse, after cleansing, with various kinds of aromatic spices, בְּשָׂמִים שֶׁל מֵתִים. It will be remembered that when Mary was reproached with an unnecessary waste of ointment, Jesus exclaimed, "Suffer her to keep it against the day of my burial" (John xii. 7). And we find it recorded that a mixture of myrrh and aloes, about 100 lbs. weight, was subsequently brought for the body of Jesus (*Ibid.* xix. 39). The custom of actual embalming, as understood

by the Egyptians, does not seem to have found favour with the Jews, as instances of the practice are extremely rare in the history of Israel.

The legendary character of stories such as that Herod preserved the corpse of a girl in honey for seven years, and that the corpse of Eleazer bar Simeon was confined in a garret for twenty-two years is, as Perles truly remarks, self-apparent.

For examples of swathing the corpse in spices, cf. Matt. xxvi. 12; Mark xiv. 8; xvi 1; Luke xxiii. 56; xxiv. 1; John xix. 39 f.

After the rite of purification has been carried out in the customary manner, the corpse is clothed in grave-vestments, commonly called תכריכין (*Mish. Sanhed.* vi. 5), or metaphorically זודתא, provision for a journey (T.B. *Erub.* 41*a*). They are identical with the *σινδών* of the New Testament (cf. Matt. xxvii. 59, etc.), being made of white linen (סדין) without the slightest ornament, and must be stainless. They are usually the work of women, and are simply pieced together, no knots being permitted, according to some, in token that the mind of the dead is disentangled of the cares of this life, but in the opinion of others, as representing the expression of a wish that the bones of the dead may be speedily dissolved into their primitive dust (*Rokêach*, 316).

The outfit of the dead usually comprises מצנפת, a cap or mitre, מכנסיים, breeches, כתונת, shirt, סרגנס, a garment resembling a surplice, and חגרה, girdle. No corpse, male or female, must be clothed in less than three garments. Over these is placed the prayer cloak טלית, usually worn by the Jews during divine worship, with one of the fringes torn off the corner to which it is attached. In the case of women, an apron, סינור, is supplied instead of מכנסיים. Women also dispense with the טלית, as it is not worn by members of the female sex in life. Very frequently the white shroud used by strict Jews on New Year's Day, the Day of Atonement, and the Passover "night of observance,"

forms part of their grave apparel. "It is the custom in some countries that the bride presents the bridegroom with this article on the wedding day" (*The Jewish Religion*, Friedlander, p. 492, Note 2). The cerements correspond to the garments worn by the High Priest in days of old. The regulations (set forth above) with regard to the טַהֲרָה and the mode of dressing the dead are post-Talmudic; see the ספר החיים, a work compiled early in the last century, by Rabbi Simeon Frankfurter, and edited with an English translation and notes, under the title of *Book of Life*, by the Rev. B. H. Ascher.

The making of the several vestments to be worn by the departed is esteemed as a מִצְוָה and we are told (*Ruth Rab.*, I. 8) that the kindness which Naomi's daughter-in-law showed to the dead (Ruth i. 8) consisted in her having prepared grave-clothes for them. *Apropos* of this, the Targ. Jerus. has a remarkable rendering of Deut. xxvi. 14: לֹא אָכַלְתִּי בְאֹנִי מִמֶּנּוּ……וְלֹא נָתַתִּי מִמֶּנּוּ לְמֵת: "I have not defrayed therefrom the expense of grave-vestments." (For a note on this interpretation, see Geiger's *Urschrift*, p. 479.)

It is strange that שַׁעַטְנֵז, "a mingled stuff, wool and linen together," prohibited for ordinary garments in Levit. xix. 19 and Deut. xxii. 11, may be used for the purpose of cerements (*Mish. Kilaim* ix. 4).

The garments worn by the dead are referred to in the following passages of the New Testament: Matth. xxvii. 59; Mark xv. 46; Luke xxiii. 53; John xi. 44; xx. 7; xix. 40; Acts v. 6.

The cerements were not invariably composed of the simplest material, nor were they "always white." Until about fifty years after the destruction of the Jewish State, gross extravagance was practised in the dressing of the dead. (Cf. Josephus, *Ant.*, XV. iii. 4; XVI. vii. 1; XVII. ix. 3; *Wars of Jews*, I. xxxiii. 9.)

Thus we are told (T. B. *Moed Kat.* 27*b*) that formerly the outlay concurrent on a death in a household was so great, that the suffering of the mourners was thereby

intensified, and the anxiety of having to provide the necessary expenses was often a greater source of sorrow to the bereaved than the actual loss they had sustained. Hence Rabban Gamliel left an injunction that he was not to be buried in many grave-vestments, and it is reported that he was interred in a simple linen shroud (see *Tosafoth, i. l.*).

We also find in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs that Judah's last command to his family, which he joined with the injunction to lay him in Hebron, was a protest against their enwrapping him in costly robes (*Testamenta* XII. *Patriarchum*, Ed. Sinker, p. 79. Cf. Chrysostom, *Homil.*, 84). The *Kolbo* enjoins (§ 114) that the dead should not be attired in splendid vestments, so as not to put to shame those who may not have the means to provide them. Thus in process of time a garment costing a sus became popular (T.B. *Moed Kat.* 27*b*), and the Jews have since been interred in the simplest and most inexpensive raiment (cf. *Josephus c. Apion*, ii. § 27). Up to the age of the Rabbis, the cerements used to be of different colours, such as red, white, green and variegated (Cf. T. J. *Kilaim*, ix. 14). Afterwards white predominated, and has since prevailed, doubtless because it is emblematical of purity and simplicity. Rabbi Jochanan requested to be buried in garments that were neither entirely white nor entirely black, so that should he come hereafter among the righteous he should feel no shame, and should his lines fall among the impious, he should have no reason to blush. (*Ibid.*) Rabbi Joshia wished to be buried in white garments, because he did not feel ashamed of his deeds. (*Beresh. Rab.* xcvi. 5). Rabbi Jannai is reported to have addressed his children before death: "Bury me not in black garments, nor in white; not in black, because I might be found righteous, and I should then be as a mourner among bridegrooms; not in white, in case I should be approved in the sight of God, and I should then be as a bridegroom among mourners. Bury me rather in vestments that are

saturated with fine oil and have come from a maritime town." (T.B. *Shabb.* 114*a*.)

In T. B. *Megilla*, 26*b*, it is stated that antiquated scrolls of the Law, which were no longer fit for use in the synagogue, were employed for clothing the dead.

Interment in a simple reed-mat, מחצלת של קנים, was considered as a token of disrespect to the dead, and suggested in the eyes of the people that the departed had been placed under ban, and could not be united with the bands of spirits pervading the world. Thus, in the course of a conversation between two departed spirits, overheard by a Rabbi who was passing the night in the burying-place, one of the spirits remarked that she was buried in a mat of reeds, and could not therefore leave the grave (T. B. *Berach*, 18*b*).

The Rabbis seem to have been much exercised as to whether in the time of the resurrection the dead would come forth from their tombs naked or clothed. Rabbi Ibo (or, according to some, Rabbi Nathan) deduced from Job xxxviii. 14, that a man will arise from the grave in the same garments which he wore when he entered it (*Kohel. Rab.* v. 10). Rabbi Meir argued, *a minore ad majorem*, that if a mere grain of wheat, which is deposited in the ground in all its nakedness, comes forth at a later date with an abundance of vesture, how much more should the righteous, who are interred in grave garments (T. B. *Sanhed.* 90*b*, and cf. 1 Cor. xv. 37f). We also find a similar opinion expressed in T. B. *Kethub* 111*b*, עתידין צדיקים שיעמדו בלבושיהן "Likewise Aischa asked the Messenger of God (Mohammed), Will no one awake clothed on the day of the resurrection? No one, he replied, but the prophets, their families (the martyrs), and those who fasted regularly in Ragab, Schabân, and Ramadân" (*Muhamm. Eschat.* ch. xxviii.).

The Jews were not the only nation of antiquity who bestowed such care upon the purification of their dead prior to interment. The Syrians (according to Bar Hebræus, *Book of Conduct*, 36*v*.) likewise washed their dead,

and afterwards clothed them in linen vestments. Jacob of Edessa, however, explains that the washing of the dead, which the Nestorians regarded as an ordinance of the Church, was nowhere commanded; it only became a recognised custom because at first those who died from severe ulcers were washed and anointed with fragrant oil of consecration, and the practice was afterwards extended to all alike. The laity and inferior clergy had their whole bodies washed; monks, nuns, anchorites, and the superior clergy had only the head, hands, and feet cleansed (*Die Canones Jacob's von Edessa*, p. 152.) With reference to the Nestorian ritual of the washing of the dead, see an interesting article by Isaac H. Hall in *Hebraica*, IV. 82. The learned author states that the dead is apparelled in white garments as in the days of his wedding. The Samaritans are likewise prepared for burial by their own friends; the whole body is washed, but especially the head (thrice), mouth, nose, face, ears, both inside and out (all this Mohammedan fashion), and lastly the feet (*Fragments of a Samaritan Targum*, etc., John W. Nutt). The Mandaeans also have a sacrament of the dying, referred to by Siouffi, 120 *seq.* They pour first hot and then cold water over the head of the dying man, and subsequently array him in the rastâ, in which he is to be interred. Dying without this ablution and attire causes the soul to remain up to the last day among the Matartâ's (*Die Mandaische Religion*, A. J. Wilhelm Brandt, 82). When one of the Anseyreeyah dies, the body is well soaked, and is washed with warm water. The corpse is then wrapped in a white shroud. Likewise among the Abyssinians, the body is wrapped in a white cotton shroud (*Social Races of Mankind*, Featherman, Div. V., 495f., 619). It was the custom in Greece that the women should wash and anoint the body, and then clothe it in clean white garments (Lucian, *De Luctu*, § 11; Sophocles, *Œdip. Colon.* 1602 f.; Homer, *Iliad*, XVIII. 350; XXIV. 582; *Odyss.*, XXIV. 4). It was also a rule with the Romans for the body to be bathed in hot

water and then anointed (Seyffert's *Dict. of Class. Antiqs.*). Among the Assyrians and Babylonians, "the corpse was wrapped in mats of reed and covered with asphalt; it was clothed in the dress and ornaments that had been worn during life—the woman with her earrings in her ears, her spindle-whorl and thread in her hands; the man with his seal and weapons of bronze or stone; the child with his necklace of shells" (*Social Life among the Assyrians and Babylonians*, A. H. Sayce, Chap. IV.).

The Jews in ancient times had also a number of valuable articles deposited with them in the grave (*Semach.* VIII.). Thus, when Hyrcanus opened the sepulchre of David he took out of it three thousand talents (Josephus, *Ant.* XIII. viii. 4; XVI. vii. 1). In like manner, Aristobulus was buried with many ornaments (Idem, *Ant.* XV. iii. 4). With regard to the Syrians the Patriarch John complains that costly garments and all kinds of finery were buried with the dead (*Ebed-Jesu in Mai-a-a-O*, 258, quoted by Kayser). In Greece, too, many tombs have been found to contain various articles that had been dear or useful to the living (Max Müller, *Anthropological Religion*, p. 264). Among the Polynesians it was customary to bury with the dead some article of value; a female would have a cloth mallet laid by her side, whilst her husband would enjoin his friends to bury with him a favourite stone adze, or a beautiful white shell worn by him in the dance (*Ibid*, p. 277). Among various South African tribes, "the ornaments, rings, armlets, tobacco pipes, and articles of apparel worn by the departed are placed in the grave, as well as his broken spear, walking-stick, and other small personal effects" (Rev. J. Macdonald, in *Journ. of Anthrop. Inst.* XIX.). In the case of the Jews, symbols and souvenirs of the calling of the deceased were sometimes suspended from the coffin (*Semach.* VIII.), modern Jews often deposited in the grave a bag filled with earth (by preference, dust of the Holy Land) which is placed under the head of the corpse.

When the dead has been thoroughly prepared for burial

he is placed in a coffin in a sleeping posture, the hands and feet being stretched out to their fullest length. The corpse must on no account be left in the attitude known as קמצוץ, *i.e.*, squeezed together as fish are sometimes packed, the head of one being pressed against the feet of another, and so on (T. J. *Nasir*, ix. 3). The corner of the prayer cloak, of which a fringe was torn off, is left hanging out of the coffin.

There is some uncertainty as to whether the dead were buried in ancient times with or without a coffin.

In early Biblical times there is certainly no mention of a coffin being used for the corpse, with the solitary exception of the case of Joseph (Gen. l. 26), and his interment in a coffin was no doubt owing to the fact that the Egyptians employed a kind of wooden case called אָרוֹן, to contain the embalmed dead. In the passages in the New Testament bearing upon the subject there is also no trace of such a practice.

In the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, however, it is remarked that they were placed in a coffin prior to burial. With regard to Simeon (p. 8; cf. *Book of Jubilees*, ch. xlvi.), it is added that the coffin was of wood which did not decay. But this is, of course, only fanciful.

At the same time the Talmud contains several names for coffins, and the precise instructions which it gives with regard to the manner of interring persons of different status unquestionably points to the fact that a coffin was generally employed to contain the mortal remains in Rabbinic times. (Cf. T. B. *Moed Kat.* 24*b* גלוסקמא or דלוסקמא, = γλωσσοκομεῖον (also *Semach* III., and *Targ. Jon. on Gen.* l. 26); T. J. *Moed Kat.* I. 1, ארון של אבן; T. J. *Moed Kat.* I. 5, ארון של עץ; T. J. *Kilaim*, IX. 3, ארון; T. B. *Moed Kat.* 8*b*, ארון מנסרים.)

From these titles it would seem that coffins were made either of wood or of stone. For further particulars with regard to the material of the coffin, see T. B. *Moed Kat.* 8*b*; T. J. *Moed Kat.* l. 5.

The lid of the coffin (according to Rashi on *Shabb.* 152*b*) was called גולל, and each of the side-walls דופק. R. Jacob Tam (on *Kethub.* 4*b*) and R. Chananel (on *Chull.* 72*b*), on the contrary, take גולל to be the stone used to confine the coffin in the grave, and דופק the stone set at each side for the purpose of strengthening the stone above in its place.

A one-day old child (as among the modern Egyptians) is not borne to the grave in a coffin, but in one's arms. A child of thirty days has a miniature coffin that is easily portable גלוסקמא ובאגפיים. The same rule applies to children under twelve months. A child aged from twelve months to three years is placed in a coffin that can be carried on one's shoulders גלוסקמא ובכתף. A child that has completed the age of three, or advanced beyond it, is regarded as an adult, and conveyed to the grave on a bier (*Semach.* III.).

In modern times poor and rich Jews alike are interred in a plain coffin, and conveyed to the grave in a hearse without trappings.

It appears that a stone used to be placed on the coffin of persons excommunicated by the Ecclesiastical Authorities of the Jews (T. B. *Berach.* 19*a*; *Moed Kat.* 15*a*). Thus we are told (*Mish. Ediyoth*, v. 6) that Akabya ben Mahalallel died under ban, and the Beth-Din cast stones upon his coffin. R. Jehuda says, however, that it was Eliezer ben Chanoch who was "banned." When he died a stone was laid on his coffin by order of the Beth-Din. Hence it is to be inferred that one throws stones upon the coffin of one who has been excommunicated and died under ban. In *Semach.* V. it states that when an excommunicated person (מנודה = ἀποσυνάγωγος, John ix. 22) dies, a representative of the community should place a stone on his coffin as a symbol of the fulfilment of the punishment of סקילה. The custom was, however, abolished by the Rabbis of the Middle Ages. It was possibly based on the case of Achan, who, having been as it were excommuni-

cated for having taken of a devoted thing (חֵרֶם), had a great heap of stones raised over him (Josh. vii. 26). Cf. also 2 Sam. xviii. 17, where the same is related of Absalom. But it appears that a similar custom prevails among the Arabs. (See Waldemar Sonntag, *Die Todtenbestallung*, p. 197.)

A. P. BENDER.

(*To be continued.*)

DOMNINUS, A JEWISH PHILOSOPHER OF ANTIQUITY.

THIS essay will deal with a personage whose name has been kept in darkness for 1500 years, and concerning whom there is a risk that he might sink in oblivion. Many know him not; those who know him do not appreciate him; those who appreciate him, appreciate him not as a Jew.

I have undertaken to make him known and appreciated according to his worth, but specially to reclaim him and give him a place in Jewish history and science.

1. *Life of Domninus.*—He is mentioned by Hesychius and Suidas in the article *Δομνῖνος*, by the former briefly, by the latter more fully. We get some little information concerning him from Marinus in the biography of Proclus.[1] We have, therefore, but three sources for our information, of which Suidas is the most important.

Suidas (ed. Bernhardy, I., 1432) begins as follows:—"Domninus, by race a Syrian, of Laodicea, or Larissa, a town in Syria, a disciple of Syrian, a cotemporary of Proclus. Thus it is stated by Damascius."[2]

The same account is given by Hesychius (ed. Flach, p. 60), who, however, puts immediately after the name the words *φιλόσοφος Σύρος*. Marinus (ed. Boissonade), cap. 26, also states that Syrian was the teacher of Domninus, who

---

[1] Marinus was a native of Flavia Neapolis, in Palestine, disciple of Proclus, and his successor to the Chair of Philosophy at Athens in 485 A.D. One of his pupils was Agapius.

[2] *Δομνῖνος, Σύρος τὸ γένος, ἀπὸ τε Λαοδικείας καὶ Λαρίσσης πόλεως Συρίας, μαθητὴς Συριανοῦ καὶ τοῦ Πρόκλου συμφοιτητής, ὡς φησι Δαμάσκιος.* Damascius was a pupil of Marinus and his successor at Athens; *vide* Photius, *Myriobiblion* (ed. Rotomagi, 1653), p. 411.

hailed from Syria.[1] Hesychius states, in addition, that the philosopher Gesius was a pupil of Domninus.[2]

These data are sufficient to determine the age in which Domninus lived. Syrian died in 450 A.D., Proclus was born in 412 and died in 485. Marinus, the disciple of Proclus, flourished about 480;[3] but Marinus speaks of Domninus as though deceased, and consequently he could not have been alive about 480. We know, further, that Domninus attained a high age (Suidas styles him γηραιος), and his birth could, accordingly, not be fixed later than 400.

Domninus lived, therefore, between 400 and 480 A.D. We know very little about his life. We shall find, later on, that he once stayed at Athens, in company with Plutarch the philosopher, and that he was there seized with a violent illness. Whether he was the head of the Neo-Platonic school at Athens, it is impossible to decide; Marinus speaks of him as though he succeeded Syrian in the direction of this school,[4] but there are cogent reasons for doubting the accuracy of that statement.[5] It is nevertheless certain that he was surrounded by pupils. Suidas mentions the fact that he rejected a certain pupil named Asklepiodotos.[6] Proclus calls Domninus his companion.[7]

2. *The Religion of Domninus.*—Suidas forms no favourable opinion of him. "In his mode of life," he says, "he was not so remarkable as to deserve the title of philosopher,"[8] and in justification of his opinion he narrates the following anecdote: "It happened in Athens that Æsculapius proposed

---

[1] Cf. Zeller, *Philosophie der Griechen*, 2nd edit., Leipzig, 1868. Vol. III. Pl. 2, p. 691.

[2] *Sub voce* Γέσιος, p. 40 ed. Flach; *vide* below.

[3] *Vide* E. Munk, *Geschichte d. griechischen Prosa* (2nd ed., Berlin, 1863). Vol. II., pp. 477 and 485.

[4] Proclus, Cp. 26, ... ἐκ τῆς Συρίας φιλοσόφῳ καὶ διαδόχῳ Δομνίνῳ.

[5] Zeller, as above.

[6] At the end of the article. I do not know why Zeller makes no mention of this fact.

[7] Proclus in Tim. 34 B. ἑταῖρος. Cf. Zeller, *loco lecto*, note 3.

[8] ἦν δὲ οὐδὲ τὴν ζωὴν ἄκρος, οἷον ἀληθῶς φιλόσοφον εἰπεῖν.

one and the same cure to Plutarch, the Athenian, and to Domninus, the Syrian; the latter was subject to frequent attacks of spitting of blood, so much so that he was named after this disease (?). I am unacquainted with the former's malady; the cure consisted in their eating much pork. While Plutarch did not keep to this prescription, though there was nothing in his religion to forbid it.... Domninus, on the other hand, following the dream in contradiction to his law (which is in vogue among the Syrians), and caring nothing for Plutarch's example, ate of this flesh both on this occasion and subsequently. It is said that if he omitted to partake of it for but a single day, he had a fresh attack of his illness, until he again stuffed himself with it." [1]

It is not difficult at first sight to understand that a *Syrian*, to whom the prohibition not to eat pork was a *national* one, could only have been a *Jew*. It is well known that Jews are often styled Syrians by both Greek and Latin authors. The refusal to eat pork is in itself no clear evidence that the person must have been a Jew, for we have reliable accounts which state that other races, besides the Jewish, abstained from pork; [2] but Suidas speaks of a *national* law which prohibits the eating of swine's flesh, and such a law is known to Judaism alone, whilst among other people it is but a voluntary act of self-denial.

Plutarch, being a heathen, could have partaken of swine's flesh, but he did not do so, while Domninus the Jew

---

[1] ὁ γὰρ Ἀθήνησιν Ἀσκληπιὸς τὴν αὐτὴν ἴασιν ἐχρημῴδει Πλουτάρχῳ τε τῷ Ἀθηναίῳ καὶ τῷ Σύρῳ Δομνίνῳ. τούτῳ μὲν αἷμ' ἀποπτύοντι πολλάκις καὶ τοῦτο φέροντι τῆς νόσου τὸ ὄνομα, ἐκείνῳ δὲ οὐκ οἶδα ὁ, τι νενοσηκότι. ἡ δὲ ἴασις ἦν ἐμπίπλασθαι χοιρείων κρέων. Ὁ μὲν δὲ Πλούταρχος οὐκ ἠν ἔσχετο τῆς τοιαύτης ὑγιείας καίτοι οὐκ οὔσης αὐτῷ παρανόμον κατὰ τὰ πάτρια . . . Δομνῖνος δὲ οὐ κατὰ θέμιν πεισθεὶς τῷ ὀνείρῳ, θέμιν τοῖς Σύροις πάτριον, οὐδὲ παραδείγματι τῷ Πλουτάρχῳ χρησάμενος, ἔφαγε τότε καὶ ἤσθιεν ἀεὶ τῶν κρεών. λέγεται που, μίαν εἰ διέλειπεν ἡμέραν ἄγευστος, ἐπιτίθεσθαι τὸ πάθημα πάντως, ἕως ἀνεπλήσθη.

[2] *Midrash Koheleth Rabbah* on I. 8 (p. 8*a*, ed. Wilna) לעתיד לבא, etc. Vide Blau in the Hungarian periodical *Magyar-Zsidó-Szemle*, XI., 286.

followed the advice of Æsculapius in preference to the dictates of his religion. Suidas, therefore, lays stress upon this weakness of his as sufficient reason to deny him the title of philosopher, whilst society ridiculed him and invented the story about him that he had ever after to feed himself with the flesh of swine. But, further, Plutarch himself refers in unmistakable language to the Jewish faith of Domninus, inasmuch as he enquires of the god Æsculapius whether he would prescribe for the *Jew* also as medicine the flesh of swine.[1] But there is really no necessity for inferring indirectly what was the faith professed by Domninus, for Hesychius states clearly that Domninus was a Jew.[2]

In the course of this article we shall touch upon a few further details, which only become intelligible upon the supposition that they have reference to Judaism.

3. *The Works of Domninus.*—Suidas entertains no high opinion of the scientific labours of Domninus: "In mathematics he was well grounded; in other branches of learning all too superficial. Hence the cause of his having perverted many of Plato's teachings.[3] We thus learn incidentally what Hesychius clearly states, that Domninus adhered to the

---

[1] ὦ δέσποτα ἔφη, τί δὲ ἂν προσέταξας Ἰουδαίῳ νοσοῦντι ταύτην τὴν νόσον.

[2] S. v. Γέσιος (p. 40, ed. Flach). The passage is as follows (Domnus and Domninus are, of course, one and the same) :—Γέσιος, ἰατροσοφιστής, Πετραῖος τὸ γένος, ἐπὶ Ζήνωνος. Καθελὼν δὲ Δόμνον τὸν ἑαυτοῦ διδάσκαλον, Ἰουδαῖον ὄντα καὶ τοὺς ἑταίρους εἰς ἑαυτὸν μέταστησάμενος ὀλίγου πάντας, πανταχῇ ἐγνωρίζετο καὶ μέγα κλέος εἶχεν. οὗτος καθώρθωσε τέχνην ἰατρῶν καθ' ἑαυτὸν πάντων. As from these words it appears that this Gesius played an important part in the life of Domninus, we will add here another characteristic of this person according to Photius, *Bibliotheca*, p. 325: Magnum honorem Gesius consecutus est, non solum quod arte medica valeret et docendo et operando, sed etiam ob omnem aliam eruditionem, Dialecticis sese instruens.

[3] Ἐν μὲν τοῖς μαθήμασιν ἱκανὸς ἀνήρ, ἐν δὲ τοῖς ἄλλοις φιλοσοφήμασιν ἐπιπολαιότερος (the text is not quite correct in this place), διὸ καὶ πολλὰ τῶν Πλάτωνος οἰκείοις δοξάσμασιν διέτρεψε. We must observe that from οἰκειον δόξασμα may be deduced that by birth and education Domninus belonged to quite a different circle, *i.e.*, he was a Jew.

philosophy of Plato.[1] On account of his perversion of the Platonic philosophy, he was attacked by Proclus in a special work, whereupon Domninus published his views in a collected form in the work *Καθαρτικὴ τῶν δογμάτων Πλάτωνος* (*The Teachings of Plato purified*).[2] This work is lost.

A *Manual of Mathematics* (*ἐγχείριδιον*), with Domninus, or Domnius of Larissa, a philosopher, as author, is occasionally quoted, and is still extant in MS. As regards name, place and tendency, our Domninus might have been the author; but this book is generally ascribed to the renowned Heliodorus, who also came from Larissa.[3]

Marinus relates that shortly before his death, Syrian commissioned his pupils, Proclus and Domninus, to write a commentary upon the Orphic hymns or the oracles (*λογία*). Domninus chose the former, Proclus the latter, but nothing came of the project.[4] We therefore possess not a single work written by Domninus.

4. *Theurgic Science in the Neo-Platonic School.*—The Orient was always the classic ground for crass superstition and witchcraft, and it appears that this craft of ancient Babylon and Chaldæa was continued by the Neo-Platonic school under the cloak of a branch of science. These philosophers, whom we meet in the immediate company of Domninus, were all much occupied with such theurgic sciences. It is positively asserted of Plutarch, for instance, that he was quite a master in the science; that, in fact, in his case it was a sort of heritage.[5] The same we find in the instance, too, of Proclus, the fellow-student of Domninus. Proclus sets about his work with Chaldaic formulæ of prayer (*συστάσως*), *i.e.*, with prayers, the object of which is to propitiate the Godhead on man's behalf; with Formulæ of Oaths (*ἐντυχίαι*), and *with ineffable magic wheels* (*ἄφεγκτοι*

---

[1] S. v. Domninus, *ἔγραψε κατὰ τῶν τοῦ Πλάτωνος δοξασμάτων.*

[2] Suidas, in the passage quoted.

[3] *Vide* Pauly's *Real Encyclop.*, II., p. 1223.

[4] *Procl.*, cp. 26. Zeller, III., pt. 2, p. 691, note 2.

[5] Zeller, p. 677, note 1.

στρόφαλοι).[1] Proclus had adopted these things while in the house of Plutarch. Both the pronunciation (ἐκφώνησις) and the mode of application (of those magic wheels) he had acquired from Asklepigeneia, the daughter of Plutarch; she was, in fact, the only one who had received these things by tradition from the great Nestor, in addition to all kinds of theurgic arts which she acquired from her father.[2]

Who does not perceive in all this a relation to Judaism? A reference to the mystic prayers and the secret theory of the chariot (מעשה מרכבה)? And an Ineffable Name! Can this be aught else but the Tetragrammaton, the ineffable name of God in Hebrew? Even the term "Chaldaic," as applied to prayers, probably means "Hebrew," or such as were composed for and by Jews. It is true that the Greeks also had their mysteries, and the whole might, if pressed, refer to Greek conditions; but the personages included in this environment are so imbued with the Jewish spirit,[3] that we feel constrained to judge their mode and aspects of life from the Jewish point of view.

But this is certain beyond doubt, that in Domninus' circle theurgic arts were practised. And although Domninus is not directly mentioned as having practised such arts, yet his *Syrian* descent leaves no doubt in our mind that he must have been addicted to them even more than his *Greek* friends; as a proof, his very cure, as we saw above, was the result of a *dream*. Domninus must, therefore, be regarded as the type of a Greek Jew towards the end of the fifth century, and his life has, accordingly, a real historical significance.

5. *A Speaking-Machine in Ancient Times.*—To understand aright the life of Domninus and his circle, we must have a

---

[1] Marinus, *Proclus*, cp. 28. Zeller, p. 678, note 1.

[2] Marinus, *Proclus*, cp. 28.

[3] Domninus was a Jew, his pupil Gesius came from Petra, in Idumæa. Marinus, the biographer, came from Flavia Neapolis, in Palestine; the name of *Syrian* may not be accidental. Plutarch resided with Domninus the Jew, and Proclus resided at the house of Plutarch.

knowledge of a marvellous arrangement which existed in olden times, viz., the speaking-machine. It sounds strange, but it is nevertheless true, that a sort of telephone or phonograph dates from antiquity.

The work of a Syrian philosopher, Oinomaos,[1] *Περὶ κυνισμοῦ*, is also cited by the title *Κυνὸς αὐτοφωνία*.[2] What does this mean? "The very voice of the dog."

Crusius has set it down that in ancient times there existed an apparatus which, at the request of its owner, began to speak automatically. According to Lucian, in specially important cases, a scientific apparatus was set in motion in the oracle of Æsculapius, presided over by the false prophet Alexander. Such oracles (*αὐτοφώνως μαντεύεσθαι*) were quite current. This matter becomes as clear as we could wish it when we take into account what Suidas relates under the head of *Domninus*. After he, accordingly, relates that Plutarch had refused to eat the flesh of swine, as had been ordered him by Æsculapius for the cure of his sickness, he continues as follows: "He (Plutarch) arose from his slumbers, supported himself on his bed with his fists and stared at the figure of Æsculapius (for it happened that he slept in the court of the temple), and exclaimed: 'O Lord! what would thou prescribe for a *Jew* if he had such an illness? Wouldst thou bid him to gorge himself with *pork*?' Whereupon the figure spoke, and, lo, Æsculapius furthermore suffered another most sonorous expression to proceed from it, giving a remedy for the disease."[3]

Considering that this speaking-machine is first mentioned by Oinomaos, the Palestinian, and was employed by persons in Athens who formed, as it were, a Jewish circle, we may infer that the speaking-machine was well known to, perhaps even invented by, Jews. At least Cumont (*Alexandre*

---

[1] Also in the Talmud אבנימום.

[2] All these details are collected by Crusius in the *Rheinisches Museum*, New Series, vol. XLIV., p. 309.

[3] *ταῦτα εἶπεν ὁ δὲ Ἀσκληπιὸς αὐτίκα ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀγάλματος ἐμμελέστατον δή τινα φθόγγον ἑτέραν ὑπεγράψατο θεραπείαν τῷ πάθει.*

d'Abonotichos, p. 27) is of opinion that it was no Greek invention, but Oriental (Syrian or Egyptian).

To the lover of history the sketch which is here presented of the life of Domninus, drawn as it is from ancient sources, will not be less pleasing because even when pieced together from materials of varied style and sources, the result is but a fragment.

SAMUEL KRAUSS.

LAZARUS DE VITERBO'S EPISTLE TO CARDINAL SIRLETO CONCERNING THE INTEGRITY OF THE TEXT OF THE HEBREW BIBLE.

THE history of the "humanistic" movement among the Jews of Italy has yet to be written. Though the knowledge of Latin possessed by Jews in other countries was not as low as is generally considered to be the case, we have still to note that it was owing to the culture of Italy, and specially to the influence of the humanists, that the knowledge of Latin literature first spread among the Jews. We have evidence of this not alone in the translation of several pieces of ancient classical literature into Hebrew, but also in the employment of Latin for purposes of scientific expression.

But with the language were introduced into the tents of Jacob also the scientific spirit, the comparative study and appreciation of the national literature, æsthetics and criticism. It is by no accident that the founder of modern Jewish science, Azarya di Rossi, came from Italy.

The following small contribution to the history of Jewish *belles-lettres* in Italy I now submit as an instance on the philological side of a Latin treatise by a Jew, the subject-matter serving as an example from the Jewish point of view of a modern scientific diatribe. I am indebted to the kindness of Prof. Dr. Walter Friedensburg and the Royal Prussian Historical Institute in Rome for having given me the opportunity of rescuing it from concealment among the archives of the Vatican and bringing it to the light of day.

Lazarus de Viterbo acts as the defender of his co-religionists before his patron, the learned Cardinal

Gulielmo Sirleto, inasmuch as he repels the absurd reproach, that the Jews had falsified those portions of the text of Holy Writ which seemed to contain proofs of the truth of Christianity.

The charge was not a new one; it was ever raised against the Jews afresh without intermission, in spite of hundredfold refutations, by both Mohammedans and Christians alike. In Rome, the accusation that the Jews had, out of hatred of the Christians, tampered with the text of their sacred records, was first again levelled at the Jews in 1555 with terrible fury by the fanatic Franciscus Torensis, in his work: *De sola lectione legis et prophetarum Judæis cum Mosaico ritu, et cultu permittenda.*

It did not suffice him that the towns of Italy were smoking with the stakes upon which the Talmud was burnt at the bidding of the Pope and his Inquisitors; he would fain have sacrificed at the same time the entire Jewish writings, the commentators of Holy Writ who had escaped death by fire. The Inquisition had already arrogated to itself the right to watch the printing of Jewish books; the text of Jewish books had to a certain extent to receive its impress from Rome; all that was wanting to complete the matter was that it be prescribed to the Jews how the text of Holy Writ had to be read—that text which they had saved out of the storms of ages, the purity of which they had guarded as never any other work had been guarded.

It was not by accident that Cardinal Sirleto was the man before whom the question as to the integrity of the Hebrew text was to be heard.

Not only his study of the Hebrew language, evidenced by his *Adnotationes in Psalmos* in the Antwerp Polyglot of 1569, but also his official position, rendered this question one of deep interest to him. Cardinal from the 12th March, 1565, Protector and Judge of all Catechumens and Neophytes from the end of 1567, the Oracle of the Tridentine Council, which he advised from Rome with the

fulness of his world-wide scholarship—it was Sirleto's task to occupy himself uninterruptedly with Jewish questions social and literary, so much so that according to Dejob's investigations[1] his papers remain even for the present time a valuable source of information, and an unearthed treasure for modern Jewish history. Filled rather with the spirit of Marcello Cervini, afterwards Pope Marcello II., whose memory is blessed in Jewish history[2] in spite of the short duration of his office as Pope—filled rather with his spirit than with that of the dark intolerance of Pope Paul IV., Sirleto possessed the kindness and forbearance to lend an ear to reasonable arguments, though they came from the Jewish side. It was his special knowledge of the subject that made Hebrew as dear to him as the classical languages.

Lazarus de Viterbo is on this account confident at the outset of finding in this influential Cardinal an advocate of his righteous cause. He proceeds from the view that the Holy language, the instrument of the world's creation and of Revelation, also produced the crown of all literatures, namely the Bible. With liberal and cultured mind and critical eye, Lazarus praises the fervour of the Psalms, the flights of Isaiah and the inimitable sweetness and tenderness of the Song of Songs.

How could the Jews, the depositaries of these treasures, have dared to lay hands upon such sacred possessions, seeing that their entire history is a proof that they believed with all confidence that they possessed in these writings God's own word. For what else, he adds with clever irony, than this conviction could have kept them steadfast in their faith, unless it was the fortune and peace, the protection and security of which they could boast in the profession of that faith ?

Nay, a glance at the condition of these documents as now extant proves with how great a fidelity and

---

[1] *Revue des Études Juives*, IX., 77, *sq.* [2] Kaufmann, *ib.*, IV., 88, *sq.*

devotion they guarded the integrity of their texts. For unless it had been so, how would it have been possible that, despite their dispersion over the earth and all the vicissitudes of their career, such a uniformity could have existed in the text of the Sacred Scriptures, that the Bible of an Italian Jew differs in no wise from one found in the other countries of the inhabited globe!

That which was accomplished by straining all the powers of industry and memory till the time of Ezra, in whom, in spite of Elias Levita, our author with rash faith sees the founder of the system of Hebrew vocalisation and accentuation, this marvellous coincidence in the tradition and reading of the sacred texts, this was the work, after Ezra, of the Massora. On the alert for every characteristic of the text, it established out of affectionate consideration, by counting every striking grammatical and orthographical peculiarity, a fence round about the Sacred Scriptures which guarded them against the intrusion of errors and corruptions. Looking at the Massora alone, which has been able to accomplish the most marvellous results by means of the labours, incomparable as they are in point of devotion and self-sacrifice, of those responsible for the counting and classification of verses, words, and even letters, one would have thought that the mere idea would have been silenced and not suffered to be expressed, that a people which had demonstrated to the world such marvellous industry and self-denial could have wilfully and wickedly tampered with the text of these records. But the very examples which are brought forward to substantiate the charge, show on closer investigation that they are without foundation, for internal evidence as well as the older translations bear testimony to the truth of Jewish tradition. And though the audacious charge was proclaimed even from the pulpits of Rome, possibly by Jewish converts of the type of Andrea de Monti,[1] and appeared before the tribunal of the judge on

[1] *Revue*, IX., 87, *sq.*

scientific and learned questions—a position which in the opinion of Lazarus de Viterbo Cardinal Sirleto held at the time—yet the accusation that the Jews had altered the text of the Old Testament had to fall to the ground.

Lazarus de Viterbo is not unknown in the history of Jewish literature. He is the one who as Eliezer Mazliach b. Abraham Cohen, published about the year 1585 at Venice, through Juan di Gara, his Italian translation of Moses Riete's ethical poems מעון השואלים[1] under the title: *I tempio di oratori.* It is in the familiar reflective style of the Hebrew; names of places which occur frequently are reproduced in Hebrew or Aramaic equivalents, as *e.g.*, Posen is rendered פז נאה, Cracow כרכא, and he gives Viterbo the origin of the family name, as בי תרבא, to remind one of the Talmudic בי תרבו (*Joma*, 77 *a*; *Baba K.*, 23 *b*).

There is no necessity for us to conjecture that Isaac b. Abraham Cohen de Viterbo, whose acquaintance we make as Rabbi of Siena in 1573, was his brother, for David de Pomis clearly tells us so in the Introduction to his Lexicon Zemach David. He mentions the fact with pride that through his wife, whom he lost early in life, he became the brother-in-law of these excellent brothers, Eliezer, the learned and pre-eminent physician, and Isaac, a renowned authority, both as Talmudist and philosopher.[2]

When Joseph of Foligno was about to marry, in 1573, at Pesaro, Julia, the widow of his brother David who had died without issue, and who at the same time was the sister of his deceased wife, Sulpicia—when, in other words, he wished to avail himself of the right of marrying his deceased brother's wife, and he obtained the sanction of all the important Rabbis of Italy, we find that R. Isaac b. Abraham Cohen de Viterbo of Siena was among those who

[1] Cf. Dukes in *Orient*, IV., 486, n. 30.

[2] אשת נעורי שהיתה אחות של אנשי חסד ואמונה היושבים ראשונה במלכות הדעת והתבונה כמהר"ר אליעזר חכם ורופא מובהק וכמהר"ר יצחק אחיו הגאון והפילוסוף הגדול שניהם ראשי הגדולה ממלכת כהנים אשר יצאו מויטירבו :

were foremost in giving their opinion in favour of the permission.[1] If I rightly understand the words in which Isaac cites a similar case which occurred in his youth, it would seem that Rome was the native place of these two brothers, and that in that city permission was given by the Rabbinate to a man named Ephraim, who was equally anxious to avail himself of the law of the Levirate.

Besides being renowned for their Rabbinic scholarship, these two brothers were famous in the medical profession. Isaac, whom his brother-in-law David de Pomis (himself distinguished as physician and lexicographer) does not style as such, is yet called in his decision upon the question regarding the Levirate, not only Gaon, but also President of the Physicians, while Eliezer is singled out by David himself as a renowned physician. It is not unlikely that, on this account, he stood in the relation of physician in ordinary to Cardinal Sirleto, and that it was this close relationship to the Prince of the Church that impelled him to write his Epistle concerning the integrity of the text of the Hebrew Bible.

DAVID KAUFMANN.

LAZARUS OF VITERBO'S LETTER TO CARDINAL SIRLETO.

(*Rome* : *Vat. Arch. Var. Pol.* 47, *fol.* 101^{b}.)

Ill^{mo} et R^{mo} D^{no} S. R. E. Cardinali Sirleto domino meo osservandissimo.

Inter eximias præclarasque animi tui dotes R^{me} ac Ill^{me} Presul ac virtutes prope divinas, quibus cæteris omnibus tuæ ætatis hominibus antecelles, veritatis, amor, maxime in te relucet, cum apertam unam dumtaxat aurem dicenti inclines, alteram vero clausam contradicenti apertam serves, adeo quod inclinatio tua ad utramque partem semper equalis permanet, cum ergo multi arbitrantur hebreos ipsos ut Christianorum intentiones aufugerent sacras scripturas pluribus in locis depravasse proptereaque ajunt, illis correctione

[1] פחד יצחק, III. 24*c*. Carmoly, *Histoire des médecins Juifs*, p. 153, and Mortara, מזכרת חכמי איטאליא, p. 69.

opus esse, cum hoc semper ægre passus sim an hoc sit verum nec ne, enitar paucis. D. T. Ill^{mae} demonstrare, que tanquam judex non iniquus, æqua lancia vel eosdem nefando crimine accusabis, vel sacris canonibus favebis eosdemque a calumniatoribus defendes, reliquum est ut D[eum] O[ptimum] M[aximum] deprecer ut Te tanquam ornamentum atque ætatis nostræ decus, incolumem et superstitem conservet et ad vota exaltet.

D. T. Ill^{mae} atque R^{mae}

Humillimus servus

Lazarus hebreus Viterbiensis.

fol. 102^{a}—108^{a}.

Non sine optima ratione Ill^{mae} et R^{mae} D^{nae}, linguam hebream ab omnibus dici linguam sanctitatis, cum ille gloriosus Deus sanctissimus, non dedignatus est, cum hominibus se ipsum communicare, et hac lingua alloqui, cum qua etiam ipzum universum creavit, ut ostendunt, ac demonstrant derivationes nominum nostrorum primorum parentum, et omnium qui ante linguarum confusionem vixerunt, cum Adam ab Adama, hoc est a terra, derivetur, ut affirmat textus dum dicit.[1] Et formavit Deus hominem e pulvere terræ ; et paulo inferius :[2] et misit eum Dominus Deus de horto delitii ad colendam terram ex qua sumptus fuerat. Ipse etiam Adam, dixit in primo intuitu mulieris[3] Iscia ab Isc, hoc est mulier, a viro, dicendo huic vocabitur mulier quia ex viro sumpta est, eamque proprio nomine hava, a Cai, idest a vivente, dicit enim textus,[4] et vocavit Adam nomen uxoris sui ava quia ipsa fuit mater omnis viventis, ipsa etiam dixit[5] Cain, a verbo acquiro, et Sced,[6] a verbo pono. Lemec etiam vaticinando derivavit Noac a verbo consolor, dum dixit,[7] et vocavit nomen eius Noac dicendo iste consolabitur nos ab opere nostro et a dolore manuum nostrarum et Heber (a quo dicti sunt hebrei) vaticinando etiam ipse dixit.[8] Peleg a verbo divido, quia in diebus eius divisa est terra. Locus etiam confusionis linguarum dictus fuit Babel,[9] a verbo confundo, quia ibi confundit Deus labium omnis terræ. Que derivationes omnes in alia quacunque lingua, (hebrea excepta) minime derivari sive deduci possunt. Quamquidem linguam cum nomen duxit ab Heber Noe pronepote. Liquide probatur remansisse in linea, et successione sanctorum patriarcharum unde pater ipse Abraam, ex illis primus. Licet patrie esset Caldeus, Caldaicoque

---

[1] Gen. ii. 7. [2] Ib. iii. 23,

[3] Ib. ii. 23. Comp. Mendelssohn's Introduction to his Translation of the Pentateuch.

[4] Ib. iii. 20. [5] Ib. iv. 1. [6] Ib. iv. 25. [7] Ib. v. 29.

[8] Ib. x. 25. [9] Ib. xi. 9.

idiomate (quod non multum ab hebreo distat) pro vernacula, et materna lingua usus fuerat, hebream tamen pro sibi propriam retinuit. Unde Abram Hebreus[1] sed non Caldeus a patria sua dictus fuit. Unde liquide colligi potest hoc sanctissimum Idioma, omnibus suis successoribus tanquam hereditarium relictum fuisse, ut etiam derivationes nominum filiorum nepotum ac omnium tribuum demonstrant ut inspicienti apparere potest.

Additur etiam ad hoc, quod quando ille summus Legislator, sibi ipsi complacuit ut populo suo dilecto de sua sanctissima lege gratificaretur, non Ægiptiaco, non Greco, sive alio quovis idiomate, illam legem interpretatus est, sed solum musaica lingua, qua tot, tantaque sanctissima prophetica verba, tot tantique sanctissimi Davidis psalmi, ac denique universa sacra historia, exposita sunt, cui certe tanquam omnium perfectissime nec copia, nec ornamentum unquam defecit. Licet hodie anxietate populi sui diminuta reperiatur, fuit tamen alias plena et integerrima, ut ostendit tractatus ille tabernaculi divi Moysi, ac templi Regis Salomonis quibus nec instrumentorum, nec materierum, nec lapidum nec preciosarum gemmarum nomina de quibus opus fuerat defecerunt, sicut in aliis occasionibus animalium, volucrum plantarumque nomina, ut aliarum rerum de quibus non fuit occasio indigebant,[2] sic tunc temporis minime desiderabantur, nam quando poma illa colloquintide in ollam Elisei fuerunt apposita statim nomen illorum pomorum inventum fuit. Ait enim et invenit vitem agrestem et collegit ex ea Paccuhod,[3] hoc est coloquintidos.

Quod autem attinet ad eius ornamentum, certe hoc mirabile ac stupendum existit. Sed ne quid dicam de eiusdem lingue subtilitatibus, dicam tantum quod minime satis exploratum est mihi, que oratio gravior, nec quod eroicum poema, secum deferat altius ornamentum, sive suaviorem dulcedinem quam Sacrosancti Davidis psalmi, unde merito a sancto spiritu dictus fuit,[4] dulcis carminibus Israel. Hec qualis copia maior nec doctior eloquentia, sive maiestate ac varietate gravior, que vel superet, vel quidem pari passu ambulet cum oratione divinissimi vatis Iesaie. Unde ipse furore solito profetico gloriando aiebat.[5] Dominus Deus dedit mihi linguam eruditorum ut sciam dicere tempore suo sitibundo verbum. In aliis enim oratoribus maior dicendi facundia minime invenitur, nec

---

[1] Gen. xiv. 13.

[2] The author used here certainly Jehuda Halewi's arguments for the wealth of the holy language in his Cusari, ii. 68; see Cassel's remarks in his second edition of this work, p. 169, n. 3, and Kaufmann, *Jehuda Halewi*, p. 28, n. 3.

[3] 2 Reg. iv. 39. [4] 2 Sam. xxiii. 1. [5] Jes. l. 4.

alius quidem fuit acrior vel acerbior in reprehensione, nec dulcior atque suavior in consolatione nec efficacior in proferendo, ommitto magnum pelagum ornamenti et copie aliorum ne tedio sim legenti.

Si sic est ergo quod sanctissimo sanctorum placuit hoc idiomate alloqui, si hac orbem ipsum creavit, si hoc sanctis patribus in confusione linguarum, et successive tanquam hereditarium populo dilecto remansit, hac exposita ac tractata sunt omnia sancta, lex sancta, sancta vaticinia omnia, ac sancti Davidis psalmi ac universa sancta historia, iure quidem optimo linguam sanctitatis dici ac ab omnibus sic (discrepante nemine) recipi necesse est.

Sed si hec sanctitatis dicta est, quia sanctas scripturas omnes exposuit tanto magis ille sanctissime reputari debent, dicitur enim propter quod unum quodque et illud magis nam si præceptorem amamus propter discipulum, discipulum ergo magis amamus.

Quale ergo delictum aut facinus gravius vel atrocius excogitari sive imaginari poterimus, quod acerbiori pæna sive supplicio feriori, dignius reputaretur quam illius qui mala mente excogitaret, vel in malo animo conaretur maculare sive corrumpere (animæ suæ pernitiæ, totiusque orbis detrimento) minimum quidam de illis sacrosanctis canonibus, opus summi Dei gloriosi, quod toti universo pro sua universali perpetuaque salute, gratificatus est, nescio quidem excogitare quod sacrilegium magis impium quod Deo maximo magis displicere posset ?

Immo facile credo, quod Deus ipse gloriosus, pro sua maxima charitate et summa pietate, suum opus versus, nunquam permitteret tale scelus suum consequi finem sicut etiam firmiter teneo, quod mirifice actum sit (habita ratione tantarum aerumnarum et calamitatum per tot discrimina rerum que musaicus populus passus est), illos sanctissimos canones in suo candore et perfectione permansisse.

Sed quoniam nunquam defecerunt ut nunc non deficiunt ; qui hebreos antiquos vel modernos aperte oppugnando calumniantur asserentes ipsos hebreos depravasse et lacerasse scripturas sacras, ideo dicunt et affirmant dictis sacris literis opus esse correctione cum semper hoc egre tuli cum mea quidem sententia, sit alienum, et minime rationi consentaneum, omni conatu [...] evitare vivis rationibus demonstrare. Tuæ Ill^{mae} ac R^{mae} Dominationi (cui semper veritas fuit amica) quod hoc sit impossibile sed potius manifestissima calumnia pace ac venia aliter credentium.

Et primo dicimus presupponendum esse quod ipsi hebrei vel credunt (prout firmiter certe tenent) eorum leges et canones esse divinum opus, eis a Deo optimo maximo pro eorum æterna salute gratificatum, vel aliter credunt et tenent, quod sint tantum opus ab

hominibus excogitatum et fabricatum. Si tenent illos divinos esse, secum eorum salutem deferentes, quorsum ego maxima suarum animarum iactura proprias leges corrumpere voluerunt? hoc esset potius diabolicum non humanum opus.

Sed si aliter tenent et credunt, quorsum sic pertinaciter per tot secula in errore sibi notissimo permansissent? forsan ne propter quamplurimas felicitates, plurimasque divitias, magnosque honores, regna et status, quibus sub hoc cœlo maxime gaudent? que cum deserere et derelinquere non patiantur perseverant in hac vita mundana adeo felici quod propter ipsam altera perennis minime ipsis cordi est?

An hoc verum sit nec ne, tanquam manifestissimum aliorum iudicio relinquo. Secundo dico quod licet Hebrei hoc facere voluissent numquam fuisset sibi integrum, propter eorum dissipationem, dispersationemque, nam et si universus hebreorum cætus simul unico loco convenissent adhuc longe eis dificillimum umaniter [*l.* unanimiter] convenisse ut proprias leges corrupissent sæpissime enim magna copia discrepat in sententia.

Sed si hebrei per universum orbem dispersi sunt, nec quidem historia vetusta vel nova legitur, quod ipsi hebrei ab annis 1540 aliquando convenissent quomodo ergo itali iudei, galli, hispani, alemani, greci, africani, et tandem qui trans Eufratem habitant. Indiani etiam et Etiopes poterant in unicam sententiam convenire, ut unum vel duo, vel tria vel centum loca sacræ paginæ alterarent, seu mutarent? Ego firmiter teneo minime unquam integrum esse cuivis maximo Imperatori etiam totius mundi Monarche eum consensum suum sortiri effectum, tanto minus hoc possunt ipsi hebrei qui eorum delicto vel infortunio, ubique locorum opprimuntur, nec unquam aliquis inter ipsos defuisset, qui toti cœlo hoc notum fecisset, tamen textus scripturarum Italorum maxime conveniunt (sine aliqua minima discrepantia) cum aliis cuiusvis regionis etiam remotissimæ sive quantumvis occultæ.[1]

Hec autem (mea quidem sententia) adeo efficax apparet, ut sola sit sufficiens veritatem huius facti luce clariorem demonstrare.

Sed ut omnino calumniantium omnium os claudatur, ex dicendis

---

[1] It is the same argument derived from the harmony and unanimity of all the manuscripts of the sacred rolls in the Jewish communities from the frontiers of India to the border of Spain, which we find already in the Spanish-Arabic literature against the assertions of Islam, that the Jews have changed and falsified the texts of their holy books. Comp. Abraham Ibn Daûd *Emuna rama*, ed. Weil, p. 80, and Maimûni's letter to Yemen in קובץ תשובות הרמב"ם, II. 36, and in Holub's edition of Ibn Tibbon's translation of this Letter, p. 28.

toti cœlo manifestissime demonstrabitur. An hebreorum intentio fuit unquam tueri, defendereque sacras scripturas vel easdem corrumpere vel devastare.

Sed imprimis sciendum esse censeo, quod secundum opinionem doctiorum hebreorum doctorum, ante ætatem Esræ hebrei in scripturis minime unquam usi fuere, nec accentibus nec punctis, quibus hodie pro vocalibus utuntur [,] sed loco vocalium tribus literis utebantur scilicet literis אהו que literarum matres a nostris grammaticis dicuntur : nam Alef pro A ; Vau pro o vel u ; Iod vero pro I vel E officio fungebantur. Sed non ubicunque fuerat opus ipsius a, ponebant א alef, nec ubi erat opus v, vel o, ponebant ו vau, quemadmodum loco i vel e, scribebatur [י] Iod [,] sed tantum opponebantur ubi maior urgebat necessitas, alia vero loca omittebant Juditio peritieque legentis qui usu et experientia a suo unusquisque preceptore doctus sine errore absque litteris vocalibus scripturas legebat, adeo quod principalissimus Moyses profetarum omnium, legis lator, interpresque divini oraculi, docuit modum recte legendi (ut isti aiunt) totam hebreorum turbam et imprimis Jesuen eius successorem ac universum eiusdem gimnasium, istique successive alios profetas et illi alios usquam ad babilonicam transmigrationem, adeo quod professi perseverantibus usquam ad hoc tempus, sacra pagina inculpabilti incorruptaque semper permansit.

Sed in universali babillonica hebreorum pernicie atque ruina, deficientibus sanctis hominibus facile pati potera(n)t, sacra scriptura iacturam non minimam, nisi etiam profete ipsi, eorumque successio perseverassent usque ad secundi templi ædificationem, ut fuerunt Zaccarias, Ageus at alii, inter quos fuit Esra diligentissimus scriba sacræ legis ut plenam fidem de ipso reddit textus dum ait,[1] ipse Esra ascendit e Babel et erat scriba velox in lege Moysi quam dedit Dominus Deus Israel.

Cum autem cognovisset ipse Esra quanta iactura in plebe iam facta ac quanta poterat fieri in dies etiam in viris patritiis, voluit viam et modum invenire ut unicuique liceret, sacram paginam sine errore perlegere, atque incorrupta omnino conservaretur.[2] Unde ultra quamplurima volumina que propria manu scripta reliquit, de quibus aliqua hodie etiam vivunt ipse Esra cum sua magna academia, in qua aderant imprimis : Necamias, Zaccarias, Ageus, Malachias, Zerubabel, Jesues maximus sacerdos et alii probi viri usque ad numerum 120, adinvenit puncta pro vocalibus, et accentus non sine

[1] Esra vii. 6.

[2] For the history of that opinion see G. Schnedermann, *Die Controverse des Ludovicus Capellus mit den Buxtorfen über das Alter der hebräischen Punctation*, Leipzig, 1878, p. 25.

maxima consideratione et altis misteriis, ut facile eligitur ex illo textu dum ait,[1] et legerunt in libro in Lege Dei expositi, et positus est intellectus et intellexerunt scripturam, unde veteres nostri expositores[2] intelligunt ex dictis verbis, inventionem punctorum, vocalium et accentuum ac pausas sententiarum, ac alia altiora, et aliqui ex dictis intellexerunt[3] etiam מָסוֹרָה hoc est librum traditionis de quo inferius, fuerunt etiam qui dicentes huiusmodi puncta, et accentus traditos fuisse a divino oraculo ipsi Moysi, ut reliquam scripturam non tamen in scriptis, sed tamen oretenus,[4] ut etiam oretenus aiunt expositio legis universe tradita fuit ab Esra deinde et sua magna academia fuerunt omnia sic disposita ut hodie ordinata sunt. Sed quia hæc opinio aliqua instantia patitur aliqui sibi assentiri noluerunt, sed cum linga hebrea et sacra scriptura tot minutiis, tot punctis, totque accentibus, repleta sit cognovit illa magna accademia ac Esra[5] eiusdem primus, quam facile evenire posset propter mundana accidentia ut in aliqua particula depravaretur, excogitarunt modum invenire ut quavis occasione integerrima conservaretur, vel si hoc acciderit, facile ad pristinam integritatem et claritatem reduci valeret, et sic inceperunt illi boni viri componere monumentum quoddam, quod ex eo quia ab uno ad alterum tradendum erat מְסֹרָה,[6] hoc est tradictionem vocabant in quo scripta reliquerunt omnia signa, omnesque regulas, quibus sacra pagina in sua sinceritate et candore custodiretur.[7] At quoniam error cadere poterat in illis

---

[1] Neh. viii. 8.

[2] Nedarim f. 37[b].

[3] Ib., ואמרו לה אלו המסורות. Comp. Jehuda Halewi, *Cusari*, iii. 31: ואחר כן במסורות. My manuscript of Jehuda Ibn Tibbon's translation of the Cusari reads: ואחר כן במסורת, but see for our reading: במסורות Steinschneider, *Catalog der Berliner hebräischen Handschriften*, p. 77.

[4] For this opinion comp. Jehuda Halewi *Cusari*, iii. 31, and the expositions of Buxtorf (the son) in his *Tractatus de punctorum origine*, p. 312 et seq. (Schnedermann, l. c., p. 22 n. 7).

[5] Comp. Profiat Duran Efodi in his grammar מעשה אפד, and Schnedermann, p. 25.

[6] For the form מסורה see Bacher in the JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, III. 785, and Edward König, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, (Bonn, 1893) pp. 38, 39. The pronunciation of מְסֹרָה, which we find there in our text, is also mentioned by Buxtorf.

[7] Our author seems as if he had not yet any knowledge of the post-talmudical date which Elia Levita assigned to the Hebrew vowels and accents in the first and third introduction of his *Massoreth Hammassoreth*, though this book had already been issued many years before this memoir has been written, the editio princeps dating from 1538. Comp. Isidore Harris in the JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, I. 228-230. But his silence

dictionibus que nunc in unum, nunc in alium modum scribi solent, modo cum una ex dictis matribus modo sine illa, modo cum uno ex dictis punctis seu vocalibus modo cum altero, incepit illa magna academia in his rebus extrema diligentia uti, quequidem academia per multos annorum centinarios in his elaborando perduravit, adeo quod hæc diligentia eo usque pervenit, quod, ne in numero versuum eorum caperetur, numerum versuum totius sacræ scripturæ supputaverunt, at ne talis error cadere in dictionibus valeret, eius dictiones omnes numeraverunt, sed ne in litteris hic error accidere posset, etiam literas, et characteres omnes per numeros collegerunt, et tanto ulterius progressus est hic labor, quoad invenerunt versiculum illum octavi Levitici qui dicit et posuit super eum pectorale, esse totius pentateuci versuum medietatem,[1] alium vero in decimo eiusdem qui dicit, querendo quesivit Moyses, esse eiusdem pentateuci dictionum medietatem querendo ex uno, quesivit ex altero latere.[2] Invenerunt etiam litteram Vau illius dictionis נָחוֹן, hoc est omne ambulans super pectus[3] esse medietatem literarum eiusdem.[4]

Nec propria illi viri[z] fuit satisfactum, nisi etiam numerassent versus, dictiones ac literas singulorum capitulorum, ne uni aufferretur et daretur alteri, ponendo pro signo infallibili unius cuiusque numeri nomen alicuius viri ut gratia exempli primum capitulum genesis quod ab hebreis dicitur Berescid invenerunt habere versus 146 et pro signo istius numeri posuerunt אַמְצִיָה nomen illius regis, nam calculus literarum illius nominis ad numerum 146 ascendit.

Nam sciendum est, omnes hebreorum litteras in tres ordines divisas esse et unamquamque ipsarum numerum aliquem significare.

Primus ordo est unitatum ab alef prima litera que unum significat usque ad ted nonam literam, que novem resultat.

2us ordo est denariorum a litera Iod que X. refert usque ad zadi que 90, importat.

Tertius vero est centinariorum a cof que centum dicit usque ad zadi finalem, que noningentenus numerus est. Alef vero que in

---

cannot be an argument for the assertion that Lazarus of Viterbo did not yet know Elias's book ; he used it in other places, but he ignored his view on these points designedly.

[1] Lev. viii. 7. Comp. Joel Müller, *Masecheth Soferim*, c. IX. Hal. 3 ; pp. 134, 135.

[2] Lev. x. 16, according to the expression of the Massora דרש מכא דרש מכא. Müller, *ib.*, and Isidore Harris in the JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, I. 139, n. 5.

[3] Lev. xi. 42.

[4] Kidduschin f. 30a.

primo ordine, unitatem referebat, in ultimo tota ditio mille significat.[1]

Atque ne additamentum vel defectus posset (ut dictum est) accidere in caratheribus vel litteris alterius capituli ad aliud numerarunt etiam literas singulorum capitulorum adeo quod invenerunt literas dicti primi capitis esse 1915 et pro signo huius numeri ponebant אין טו que litere ad illum numerum ascendunt, adeo quod dictum primum caput duo signa retinuit alterum versuum, alterum vero literarum. Secundi capituli dicti Noac, habentis 153, versus signum fuit בְּצַלְאֵל nomen illius boni viri, cuius literæ eundem numerum referunt, et sic de singulis factum fuit.[2]

Nec ardenti desiderio illorum satis fuit factum, quoniam numeraverunt etiam versus omnes singulorum librorum ipsius pentateuci, ne ab uno libro ad alterum error committeretur, inveneruntque numerum versuum primi libri quem dicunt Genesis esse 1634 [l. 1534] talis numeri signum fuit אך דל cuius medietas invenerunt esse versum illum super gladio tuo vives[3] at quia hic liber habuit 12 magna capitula, signum fuit אַחְאַב nomen illius Regis eiusdem capitula minora fuerunt 43. Signum eorum fuit יְדִידְיָה nomen Regis Salomonis. Literæ omnes ipsius Genesis fuerunt 4395, et sic de singulis. Versus omnes totius pentateuci fuerunt 5045 [l. 5845] omnes autem eius literæ fuerunt 60045.

Nec etiam illi boni viri in hoc acquieverunt, quoniam numeraverunt etiam singulas literas totius sacri voluminis, inveneruntque alef 42377. Bed 38218. Ghimel 29637 [l. 29537] et sic de singulis literis fuit calculatum, quarum numerum, ne tedio sim legenti, libenter omitto.[4]

---

[1] Comp. the third introduction to Elia Levita's Massoreth Ha-Massoreth: וחלק השלישי חלק המאיו' והוא קרשתך ם ן ף ץ ולמנין אלף חוזר הדין לראש האלפא ביתא וכותבין אֶלֶף ב מ ל ו א ה [=tota dictio].

[2] From a comparison between this digression and Elia Levita's words, *l. c.*, it will be clear, that Lazarus of Viterbo used already his Massoreth Ha-Massoreth, and that he did not share his opinion about the date of accents and vowels when he pronounces a different view.

[3] Gen. xxvii. 40.

[4] The poem from which these dates are derived, is assigned in some manuscripts and by Shemtob Ibn Gaon in his בדי הארון to Saadja Gaon (*see* Dukes, נחל קדומים, p. 2), and has several times been edited. Different numbers are communicated by Shapira in the "Athenæum" No. 2626 (1878, Febr. 23). R. Jaïr Bacharach f. 272[a] doubts already the correctness of these numbers: כאלו רוח ה' דבר בו יי אבל מה נעשה והחוש מכחיש

Nec hucusque videntes huius desiderii relaxati fuerunt donec altera exquisitissima diligentia uterentur, nam cum quamplurime dictiones hebree sint que aliquando scribantur cum aliqua ex tribus matribus literarum, quam dictionem tunc plenam vocant, aliquando vero eademmet dictio sine illa litera scribatur, quam dictionem tunc temporis mancam appellant, ut gratia exempli futura prime coniugationis modo scribuntur cum vau in ultima ut אֶפְקוֹד, נִפְקוֹד, תִּפְקוֹד, יִפְקוֹד, modo sine ipsa ut יִפְקֹד, אֶפְקֹד, נִפְקֹד, et sic fere de infinitis aliis dictionibus dicendum est.

Isti vero ne error accidat in scribendo plenam pro manca, et mancam pro plena, numeraverunt ex ipsis, eas ditiones que in minori sunt numero, sin enim plene sunt in minori numero numerant plenas, si vero in maiori numero, numerant mancas, adeo quod que pauciores sunt, semper numerantur, assignando loca et signa ponendo ut קָדוֹשׁ idest sanctus scribitur cum Vau in ultima et dictio est plena, sed numerantur in toto sacro canone 13 vicibus inveniri mancam sine dicta litera Vau in ultima ut קָדֹשׁ sic etiam אָרוֹן idest arca dicunt tribus vicibus inveniri mancam, et sic de singulis assignando loca et capitula et signa ponendo.[1]

Quod autem dictum est de Vau dicitur etiam de Iod ut נְשִׁיאִים, hoc est patriarchæ invenerunt dictionem hanc quater in ultima tantum plenam,[2] et quater plenissimam puta in ultima et penultima sic etiam numerando dicunt de hac dictione נְבִיאִים hoc est profete et sic de singulis.

Eamdemmet considerationem habuerunt de alef nam inveniuntur quamplurime dictiones plene de alef et aliquando inveniuntur eadem sine dicta alef sic etiam de he que in ultimo dictionis venire solet dicendum est nam aliquando plene aliquando manche inveniuntur ut רֵאשִׁית,[3] רֵשִׁית, נער, נערה et sic de singulis.

Nec solum plenitudinem vel defectum dictionum numerantur sed etiam mutationes vocalium, nam cum hebrei habeant pro qualibet vocali duo puncta ut loco A. habent hanc virgulam sub litera videlicet ַ que padac dicitur, et virgulam cum puncto videlicet ֵ que ר dicitur camez quarum una longa altera vero brevis est. Si ergo dictiones ille que regulariter punctari deberent padac punctarentur

---

פרטי המספרים. Since Josef del Medigo, נובלות חכמה, ed. Basel, 1629, II. 196, the poem is assigned to Saadia b. Josef Bechor Schor, see Zunz, *Zur Geschichte*, p. 75.

[1] Comp. Elia Levita *l. c.*, c. II.

[2] Ib. c. 5 ; cf. *The Massorah*, ed. Ginsburg, II. 290.

[3] Cf. *The Massorah*, II. 272.

camez vel e contra, numerant etiam et assignant illas dictiones que irregulariter punctantur, ut etiam numerant et assignant dictiones quarum accentus regulariter esse deberet in ultima et irregulariter erit in penultima vel contra.

Sic etiam assignant et numerant subtilitates et minuties multo minores.

Preterea usi sunt etiam alia extrema diligentia in numerando quasdam sententias que sepe numero uno modo, et sepenumero in alio modo inveniuntur, ut causa exempli hec que dicit ה' [אלהי] ישראל hoc est Deus Deus Israel et aliquando dicit יה' צבאות אלהי ישראל[1] hoc est Deus exercituum Deus Israel sic etiam hec alia sententia que dicit יְבָרֶכְךָ ה' hoc est benedicat tibi Deus et aliquando dicit יְבָרֶכְךָ אלהיך [ה"][2] hoc est benedicat tibi Deus Deus tuus quia hæ sententiæ et similes in utroque modo sepe inveniuntur ne accidat error de una ad aliam numerant sententias ne mutarentur et assignant loca et capitula.

Numerant etiam omnes dictiones in quibus loco Iod ponitur Vau vel e contra ut nihil intactum relictum sit.

Dantur etiam quedam particule replicate et triplicate et quadruplicate quarum alique describuntur cum copula et alique sine ipsa ut אֶת אֶת וְאֶת[3] et has etiam numerant et assignant ut distincte inotescat que cum copula et que sine ipsa scribi debent et sic de similibus ab illis observatum fuit.

Si huiusmodi labores et observantie in aliis libris quam in sacris fuissent observate puderet me certe tot minuties enumerasse, sed in sacris nunquam fuit satis superque observatum quam magis non deberet observari.

Nec censendum est casu et fortuna huiuscemodi dictiones aliquando plenas aliquando mancas accidisse, ut fortasse multi arbitrari poterant cum propter eam superabundantiam vel defectum literarum sensus sive significatum dictionis nequaquam varietur, sacra enim scriptura cum perfecta sit tanquam divinum opus nec superflua nec diminuta esse poterat sed necessario sic vel sic describi debent, sed in his rebus fundantur profundissima misteria ac sacra archana Theologiæ cum doctores ipsi unicuique minutie reddant rationem.

Unde ex omnibus dictis nullus unquam locus calumniæ relinquitur ac luce clarius poterit unusquisque cognoscere, an antiqui hebrei habuerunt in animo depravare scripturas an easdem integer-

---

[1] Cf. *The Massora*, II. 567. [2] Cf. *The Massorah*, I. 710.

[3] *Ochlah W'ochlah*, ed. S. Frensdorff, N. 79, 230-1.

rimas conservare etsi hodierni vel novi licet voluissent si hoc facere potuissent.

Unde meo quidem iudicio ille divus Thomas de Aquino rationi consentaneum dixit, hebreos esse scripturarum sacrarum armarium.

His non obstantibus multi arbitrantur ac etiam diebus paucis elapsis cum quidam bonus vir concitatus est publice dixit hebreos ipsos depravasse versiculum Ieremie dicentis cap. 23,[1] et hoc est nomen suum quod vocabit eum Deus iustus noster dixit enim ille quod loco יִקְרָאוֹ hoc est vocabit cum debet legi יִקְרְאוּ hoc est vocabunt inferendo quod hebrei ut aufugerent ne messias vocaretur Deus iustus noster corruperunt textum et loco יִקְרְאוּ hoc est vocabunt adaptarunt ut legatur יִקְרָאוֹ hoc est vocabit eum quasi dicat quod Deus iustus noster vocabit eum messiam etc., sed cum in utraque lectura idem sensus habeatur quod hebreis attribuitur manifestissima est calumnia, nam legant Christiani vocabunt, legant hebrei vocabit eum, semper nomen ipsius messie, erit Deus Deus iustus noster. Nam secundum Christianorum lecturam que dicit vocabunt, sensus est quod Israel sive Juda sive omnes gentes vocabunt messiam Deus iustus noster, secundum vero hebreorum lecturam que dicit vocabit eum, idem est sensus, nam dicit textus in diebus suis salvabitur Juda, et Israel habitabit confidenter, et hoc est nomen eius quod vocabit eum Deus iustus noster, quod ad Judam vel ad Israel vel ad totum universum refertur. Scilicet quod unusquisque eorum vocabit nomen messie Deus iustus noster, adeo quod in utraque lectura semper messias vocabitur iustus noster, aliter hebreorum lectura imperfecta esset, si vocabit eum referretur ad Deum iustum nostrum, qui vocaret nomen messie, cum nullum aliud nomen, quo Messias vocaretur referat textus ille.

Nec apud hebreos hoc est inconveniens, cum Idem Hieremias cap. 33, dicat in diebus illis salvabitur Juda et Hierusalem habitabit confidenter et hoc est quod vocabit eum Deus iustus noster adeo quod ex his verbis apparet quod etiam civitas ipsa Hierusalem vocabitur Deus iustus noster et Ezachiel dixit ultimo capitulo et nomen civitatis ex hodie Deus ibidem.[2]

Et Moyses dixit ad altare נִסִּי יְ׳, hoc est Deus elevatio mea[3] idem dixit Jacob ad altare Deus Deus Israel.[4]

Et parafrasis caldea, et illi antiquissimi viri qui librum illum tradictionis inceperunt, legunt vocabit eum, et non vocabunt, adeo quod nulla relinquitur ratio nec authoritas hebreos hunc locum depravasse.

---

[1] Jer. xxiii. 6.
[2] Ezech. xlviii. 35.
[3] Exod. xvii. 15.
[4] Gen. xxxiii. 20.

Dixit etiam ille bonus vir hebreos etiam corrupisse illum [1] textum psalmi 22, et loco כָּרוּ, hoc est foderunt secundum Christianorum lecturam legunt ipsi hebrei כָּאֲרִי, hoc est sicut leo.[2]

Certum est quod parum refert ad hebreos qualis sit hæc lectura sed si ipsi hebrei scripturas corrumpere voluissent, ut aufugerent Christianorum intentiones, quid fuit in causa quod reliquerunt intactum capitulum 52 Isaie in quo Christiani fundant omnem intentionem? quare etiam intactum reliquerunt textum illum Zaccariæ in cap. 12, et aspicient ad me quem confixerunt? [3] quare etiam in libro illo dicto traditio parva [4] reliquerunt כָּאֲרִי בחרי לִשְׁנֵי, hoc est sicut leo bis inveniri in sacris in duo significato? et quare reliquerunt, in libro dicto traditio magna [5] כארי ד' ב' קמצין וב' פתחין hoc est sicut leo quater, inveniri bis cum caf punctata padac et bis cum caf punctata camez? ne Christianis relinqueretur anza fundandi suas intentiones.

Sed quod etiam hoc sit calumnia, liquide demonstrat antiquissima parafrasis Caldea nam cum vidisset secundum lecturam hebreorum sententiam diminutam sive imperfectam, addidit verbum נכתין hoc est nacti(m)[n] quod mordentes seu ferientes significat quasi dicat congregatio malignantium circumdavit me mordentes sicut leo manus meas et pedes meos adeo quod hoc modo etiam Christiani possunt habere suam intentionem, legat quisque ut placuerit.

Unde ille R. P. D. Augustinus Iustinianus Episcopus Nebiensis in scoliis sui psalterii quinque linguarum [6] in hoc passu dixit sicut leo manus meæ et pedes mei, sive manus meas et pedes meos constructio defectiva subaudiendumque impii tanquam leo foderunt perforaverunt male habuerunt fixerunt aut male tractaverunt etc., nec assensio dicentibus hebreos hunc locum corrupisse quod ex nostris arbitrantur multi qui dicunt legendum esse apud hebreos carù deducta voce a verbo carà quod fodio sive figo sive vincio significat et verum quod hic verborum structus defectivus habeatur, liquide ex caldeo textu qui defectui occurrens addidit verbum Nactin quod mordentes sive vulnerantes seu ferientes significat hec ille.

---

[1] Cf. Franciscus Torrensis, *De sola lectione legis . . . Judæis . . . permittenda*, p. 27.

[2] Cf. Graetz, *Kritischer Commentar zu den Psalmen*, I. p. 228.

[3] Zach. xii. 10. [4] מסורה קטנה. [5] מסורה גדולה.

[6] Augustinus Giustinianus, bishop of Nebbio in Corsica, author of the *Psalterium Nebiense* (Genua 1517); comp. Perles, die in einer Münchener Handschrift aufgefundene erste lateinische Uebersetzung des Maimonidischen "Führers," p. 3 *sq.*

Unde apparet homines probos qui veritatem diligunt sine suo preiudicio vel detrimento iusto tantum accommodatos esse.

Hæc pauca, R^me^ et Ill^me^ D. Dominationi tuæ volui dixisse ut si vera esse censeas reprimas, reprehendasque audaces qui contra etiam sacros canones absque ulla ratione os aperiunt postergata ratione tante sanctitatis atque operis summi Dei gloriosi, qui charitate sua atque clementia conservet exaltetque ad vota Dominationem tuam Ill^mam^ et R^mam^ cui humiliter genuflexus me ipsum et omnia mea commendo.

A NEW TRANSLATION OF THE BOOK OF JUBILEES.[1] (*Concluded.*)

Part III.

XXXII.—And he abode that night at Bethel, and Levi dreamed that they had ordained and made him the priest of the Most High God, him and his sons for ever; and he awoke from his sleep and blessed the Lord. 2. And Jacob rose early in the morning, on the fourteenth of this month, and he gave a tithe of all that came with him, both of men and cattle, both of gold and every vessel and garment, and he gave tithes of all. 3. And in those days Rachel became pregnant with her son Benjamin. And Jacob counted his sons from him upwards and Levi fell to the portion of the Lord, and his father clothed him in the garments of the priesthood and filled his hands. 4. And on the fifteenth of this month he brought to the altar fourteen oxen from amongst the cattle, and twenty-eight rams, and forty-nine sheep, and seven[2] lambs, and twenty-one[2] kids of the goats as a burnt-offering on the altar of sacrifice, well pleasing for a sweet savour before God. 5. This was his offering, in consequence of the vow which he had vowed that he would give a tenth, with their fruit-offerings and their drink-offerings. 6. And when the fire had consumed it, he burnt incense on the fire over it, and for a thank-offering two oxen and four rams and four sheep, four he-goats, and two sheep of a year old, and two kids of the goats; and thus he did daily for seven days. 7. And he and all his sons and his men were eating (this) with joy there during seven days and blessing and thanking the Lord, who had delivered him out of all his tribulation and had given him his vow. 8. And he took a tenth of all the clean animals, and made a burnt sacrifice, but the unclean animals he gave (not)[3] to Levi his son, and he gave him all the souls of the men. 9. And Levi discharged the priestly office at Bethel before Jacob his father in preference to his ten brothers, and he was a priest there, and

---

[1] For an account of the MSS. upon which this translation is founded, see JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, Vol. V. pp. 703-708.

[2] Emended from B.

[3] I have added the negative.

Jacob gave his vow: thus he gave a second tenth to the Lord and sanctified him, and he became holy unto him. 10. And for this reason it is ordained in the heavenly tables as a law for the giving of a second tenth to eat before the Lord in the place where it is chosen that his name should dwell from year to year, and to this law there is no limit of days for ever. 11. This ordinance is written that it may be fulfilled from year to year in eating the second tenth before the Lord in the place where it has been chosen, and nothing shall remain over from it from this year to the year following. 12. For in its year shall the seed be eaten until the days of the gathering[1] of the seed of the year, and the wine till the days of the wine, and the oil till the days of its season. 13. And all that is left thereof and becomes old, let it be regarded as polluted: burn it with fire, for it is unclean. 14. And thus let them eat it together in the sanctuary, and let them not suffer it to become old. 15. And all the tithes of the oxen and sheep shall be holy unto the Lord, and shall belong to his priests, which they will eat before him from year to year; for thus is it ordained and engraven regarding the tithe in the heavenly tables. 16. And on the following night, on the twenty-second day of this month, Jacob resolved to build that place, and to surround the ground with a wall, and to sanctify it and make it holy for ever, for himself and his children after him. 17. And the Lord appeared to him by night and blessed him and said unto him: "Thy name shall not be called Jacob, but Israel shall they name thy name." 18. And he said unto him again: "I am the Lord thy God who created the heaven and the earth, and I will increase thee and multiply thee exceedingly, and kings shall come forth from thee, and they shall rule everywhere wherever the foot of the sons of men have trodden. 19. And I will give to thy seed all the earth which is under heaven, and they shall rule over all the nations according to their desires, and after that they shall get possession of the whole earth and inherit it for ever." 20. And he finished speaking with him, and he went up from him, and Jacob looked till he had ascended into heaven. 21. And he saw in a vision of the night, and behold an angel descended from heaven with seven tablets in his hands, and he gave them to Jacob, and he read them and knew all that was written therein which would befall him and his sons throughout all the years. 22. And he showed him all that was written on the tablets, and said unto him: "Do not build this place, and do not make it an eternal sanctuary, and do not dwell here; for it is not this place. Go to the house of Abraham thy father and dwell with Isaac thy father until the day of the death of thy father. 23. For in Egypt thou shalt die

[1] Emended from B.

in peace, and in this land thou shalt be buried with honour in the sepulchre of thy fathers, with Abraham and Isaac. 24. Fear not, for as thou hast seen and read it, thus will it all be ; and do thou write down everything as thou hast seen and read." 25. And Jacob said : "Lord, how can I remember all that I have read and seen?" And he said unto him : "I will bring everything to thy remembrance." 26. And he went up from him, and he awoke from his sleep, and he remembered everything which he had read and seen, and he wrote down all the words which he had read and seen. 27. And he stayed there yet another day, and he sacrificed thereon according to all that he had sacrificed on the former days, and called its name "Addition," for this day was added, and the former days he called "The Feast." 28. And thus it was manifested that it should be, and it is written on the heavenly tables : wherefore it was revealed to him that he should celebrate it, and add it to the seven days of the feast. 29. And its name was called the days of "Addition," because that it is recorded amongst the days[1] of the feast, according to the number of the days of the year. 30. And in the night, on the twenty-third of this month, Deborah Rebecca's nurse died, and they buried her beneath the city under the oak of the river, and he called the name of this river, The river of Deborah, and the oak, The oak of the mourning of Deborah. 31. And Rebecca went and returned to her house to his father Isaac, and Jacob sent by her hand rams and sheep and he-goats that she should prepare a meal for his father such as he desired. 32. And he went after his mother till he came to the land of Kabrâtân, and he dwelt there. 33. And Rachel bare a son in the night, and called his name "Son of my Sorrow" ; for she suffered in giving him birth : but his father called his name Benjamin, on the eleventh of the eighth month in the first of the sixth week of this jubilee. 34. And Rachel died there and she was buried in the land of Ephratha, the same is Bethlehem, and Jacob built a pillar on the grave of Rachel, on the road above her grave.

XXXIII.—And Jacob went and dwelt to the south of Magdalâdrâêf.[2] And he went to his father Isaac, he and Leah his wife, on the new moon of the tenth month. 2. And Reuben saw Bilhah, Rachel's maid, the concubine of his father, bathing in the water in a secret place, and he loved her. 3. And he hid himself at night, and he entered the house of Bilhah at night, and he found her sleeping alone on a bed in her house. 4. And he lay with her, and she awoke

---

[1] Emended with Latin.

[2] A translation of מִגְדַּל-עֵדֶר אֶפְרָת.

and saw, and behold Reuben was lying with her in the bed,[1] and she uncovered the border of her covering and seized him, and cried out, and discovered that it was Reuben. 5. And she was ashamed because of him, and released her hand from him, and he fled. 6. And she lamented because of this thing exceedingly, and did not tell it to any one. 7. And when Jacob returned and sought her, she said unto him : "I am not clean for thee, for I have been defiled (so as to be separate) from thee ; for Reuben has defiled me, and has lain with me in the night, and I was asleep, and did not discover until he uncovered my skirt and slept with me." 8. And Jacob was exceedingly wroth with Reuben because he had lain with Bilhah, because he had uncovered his father's skirt. 9. And Jacob did not approach (her) again because Reuben had defiled her; and as for every man who uncovers his father's skirt his deed is wicked exceedingly, for he is abominable before the Lord. 10. For this reason it is written and ordained on the heavenly tables that a man should not lie with his father's wife, and should not uncover his father's skirt, for this is unclean : they shall surely die together, the man who has lain with his father's wife and the woman, for they have wrought uncleanness on the earth. 11. And there shall be nothing unclean before our God in the nation which he has chosen for himself as a possession. 12. And again, it is written a second time : " Cursed be he who lieth with the wife of his father, for he hath uncovered his father's shame " ; and all the holy ones of the Lord will say, " So be it ; so be it." 13. And do thou, Moses, command the children of Israel that they observe this word ; for the punishment is death ; and it is unclean, and there is no atonement for ever to atone for the man who has committed this, except by executing and slaying, and stoning him with stones, and rooting him from the midst of the people of our God. 14. For no man who has done so in Israel shall remain alive a single day on the earth, for he is abominable and unclean. 15. And let them not say that to Reuben was granted life and forgiveness after he had lain with his father's concubine, and to her also, though she had a husband, her husband Jacob, his father, being still alive. 16. For until that time there had not been revealed the ordinance and judgment and law in its completeness for all, but in thy days (it has been recorded) as a law of seasons and of days,[2] and a law that is everlasting for the everlasting generations. 17. And for this law there is no consummation of days, and no atonement for it, except that they should both be rooted out in the midst of the nation : on the day whereon they committed it

---

[1] I have omitted " and sleeping " after " bed " with Lat.

[2] Passage is corrupt ; for " in days " (A.) I have read " and of days."

they shall slay them. 18. And do thou, Moses, write it down for Israel that they may observe it, and do according to these words, and not commit a mortal sin ; for the Lord our God is judge, who respects not persons and accepts not gifts. 19. And tell them these words of the covenant, that they may hear and observe, and be on their guard with respect to them, and not be destroyed and rooted out of the land ; for an uncleanness, and an abomination, and a contamination,[1] and a pollution are all they who commit this on the earth before our God. 20. And there is no greater sin than the fornication which they commit on earth ; for Israel is a holy nation unto the Lord its God, and a nation of inheritance, and a nation of priests, and a nation for a kingdom and a possession ; and there shall no such uncleanness appear in the midst of the holy nation. 21. And in the third year of this sixth week Jacob and all his sons went and dwelt in the house of Abraham, near Isaac his father and Rebecca his mother. 22. And these were the names of the sons of Jacob : the first-born Reuben, Simeon, Levi, Judah, Issachar, Zebulon, the sons of Leah ; and the sons of Rachel, Joseph and Benjamin ; and the sons of Bilhah, Dan and Naphtali ; and the sons of Zilpah, Gad and Asher ; and Dinah, the only daughter of Leah, the daughter of Jacob. 23. And they came and bowed themselves to Isaac and Rebecca, and when they saw them they blessed Jacob and all his sons, and Isaac rejoiced exceedingly, for he saw the sons of Jacob, his younger son, and he blessed them.

XXXIV.—And in the sixth year of this week after this, in the forty-fourth jubilee Jacob sent his sons to pasture their sheep, and their servants with them to the pastures of Shechem. 2. And the seven kings of the Amorites assembled themselves together against them, to slay them, hiding themselves under the trees, and to take their cattle as a prey. 3. And Jacob and Levi and Judah and Joseph were in the house with Isaac their father ; for his spirit was sorrowful,[2] and they could not leave him : and Benjamin was the youngest, and for this reason remained with his father. 4. And the kings of Tâphû, and the kings of Arêsa, and the kings of Sêrâgân, and the kings of Sêlô, and the kings of Gâas, and the king of Bêthôrôn, and the king of Maanîsâkîr, and all those who dwell in those mountains (and) who dwell in the woods in the land of Canaan. 5. And they announced this to Jacob saying : " Behold, the kings of the Amorites have surrounded thy sons, and plundered their herds." 6. And he arose from his house, he and his three sons and all the servants of his father, and

[1] Emended by Dillmann.

[2] Better translated " timorous " with Lat.

his own servants, and went against them with six thousand[1] men, who carried swords. 7. And he slew them in the pastures of Shechem, and pursued those who fled, and he slew them with the edge of the sword, and he slew Arêsa and Thâphû and Sarâgân and Sêlô and Amânîsakîr and Gâgâas. 8. And he brought together his herds, and was powerful over them, and he imposed tribute on them that they should pay him tribute, five fruit products of their land, and he built Reuben and Tamnâtârês. 9. And he returned in peace, and made peace with them, and they became his servants until the day that he and his sons went down into Egypt. 10. And in the seventh year of this week he sent Joseph to learn about the welfare of his brothers from his house to the land of Shechem, and he found them in the land of Dothan. 11. And they dealt treacherously with him, and formed a plot against him to slay him, but changing their minds, they sold him to Ishmaelite merchants, and they brought him down into Egypt, and they sold him to Potiphar, the eunuch of Pharaoh, captain of the guard,[2] priest of the city of Elêw. 12. And the sons of Jacob slaughtered a kid, and dipped the coat of Joseph in the blood, and sent (it) to Jacob their father on the tenth of the seventh month. 13. And he mourned all that night, for they had brought it to him in the evening, and he became feverish with mourning for his death, and he said : "An evil beast hath devoured Joseph" ; and all the members of his house mourned with him that day, and they were grieving and mourning with him all that day. 14. And his sons and his daughter rose up to comfort him, but he refused to be comforted for his son. 15. And on that day Bilhah heard that Joseph had perished, and she died mourning him, and she was living in Qafrâtêl, and Dinah also, his daughter, died after Joseph had perished. Thus three mournings came upon Israel in one month. 16. And they buried Bilhah over against the tomb of Rachel, and Dinah also, his daughter, they buried there. 17. And he mourned for Joseph one year, and did not cease, for he said : "Let me go down to the grave mourning for my son." 18. For this reason it is ordained for the children of Israel that they should mourn on the tenth of the seventh month—on the day that the news which made him weep for Joseph came to Jacob his father—that they should make atonement for themselves thereon with a young goat on the tenth of the seventh month, once a year, for their sins ; for they had grieved the affection of their father regarding Joseph his son. 19. And this day has been ordained that they should grieve thereon for their sins, and for all their trans-

[1] So A,B,D. C gives "eight hundred."

[2] MSS. give "the chief cook," owing to the Greek translator adopting the meaning of שַׂר הַטַּבָּחִים, inappropriate to this context.

gressions and for all their errors, so that they might cleanse themselves on that day once a year. 20. And after Joseph was destroyed, the sons of Jacob took unto themselves wives. The name of Reuben's wife is Adâ ; and the name of Simeon's wife is Adebâa, a Canaanite ; and the name of Levi's wife is Mêlkâ, of the daughters of Arâm, of the seed of the sons of Târân ; and the name of Judah's wife, Bêtasûêl, a Canaanite ; and the name of Issachar's wife, Hêzaqâ ; and the name of Zabulon's wife, Adni[1] ; and the name of Dan's wife, Eglâ ; and the name of Naphtali's wife, Rasûû, of Mesopotamia ; and the name of Gad's wife, Mâka ; and the name of Asher's wife, Îjônâ ; and the name of Joseph's wife, Asnêth, the Egyptian ; and the name of Benjamin's wife, Ijasaka. 21. And Simeon repented, and took a second wife from Mesopotamia as his brothers.

XXXV.—And in the first year of the first week of the forty-fifth jubilee Rebecca called Jacob, her son, and commanded him regarding his father and regarding his brother, that he should honour them all the days of Jacob's life. 2. And Jacob said : "I will do all that thou hast commanded me ; for this thing will be honour and greatness to me, and righteousness before the Lord, that I should honour them. 3. And thou too, my mother, knowest from the time I was born until this day, all my deeds and all that is in my heart, that I always think good concerning all. 4. And how should I not do this thing which thou hast commanded me, that I should honour my father and my brother ! 5. Tell me, mother, what perversity hast thou seen in me and I shall turn away from it, and mercy of the Lord[2] will be upon me." 6. And she said unto him : "My son, I have not seen in thee all my days any perverse but (only) upright deeds. And yet I will tell thee the truth, my son, I shall die this year, and I shall not survive this year in my life ; for I have seen in a dream the day of my death, that I should not live beyond a hundred and fifty-five years : and behold I have completed all the days of my life which I was to live." 7. And Jacob laughed at the words of his mother, because his mother had said unto him that she should die ; and she was sitting opposite to him in possession of her strength, and she was not infirm in her strength ; for she went in and out and saw, and her teeth were strong, and no ailment had touched her all the days of her life. 8. And Jacob said unto her : "Blessed am I, mother, if my days approach the days of thy life, and my strength remain with me thus as thy strength : and thou wilt not die, for thou hast jested idly to me regarding thy death." 9. And she went in to Isaac and said unto him : "One petition I make unto thee : make Esau swear

[1] So Syr. Frag. A,B, omit.

[2] Restored from Lat. ; Eth. omits.

that he will not injure Jacob, nor pursue him with enmity ; for thou knowest Esau's thoughts that they are perverse from his youth, and there is no goodness in him ; for he desires after thy death to kill him. 10. And thou knowest all that he has done since the day Jacob his brother went to Haran until this day ; how he has forsaken us with his whole heart, and has done evil to us ; how he has taken to himself thy flocks, and carried off before thy face all thy possessions. 11. And when we implored and besought him for what was our own, he did as a man who was taking pity on us. 12. And he is bitter against thee because thou didst bless Jacob thy perfect and upright son ; for there is no evil but only goodness in him, and since he came from Haran unto this day he has not robbed us of aught, for he brings us everything in its season always, and rejoices with all his heart when we take at his hands, and he blesses us, and has not parted from us since he came from Haran until this day, and he has remained with us continually at home honouring us." 13. And Isaac said unto her : "I, too, know and see the deeds of Jacob who is with us, how that with all his heart he honours us ; but I loved Esau formerly more than Jacob, because he was the firstborn ; but now I love Jacob more than Esau, for he has done manifold evil deeds, and there is no righteousness in him, for all his ways are unrighteousness and violence, and there is no righteousness around him. 14. And now my heart is troubled because of all his deeds, and neither he nor his seed shall prosper, for they are those[1] who shall be destroyed from the earth, and who shall be rooted out from under heaven, for he has forsaken the God of Abraham and gone[2] after his wives and after their uncleanness and after their error, he and his children. 15. And thou dost bid me make him swear that he will not slay Jacob, his brother ; even if he swear he will not abide by his oath, and he will not do good but evil only. 16. But if he desires to slay Jacob, his brother, into Jacob's hands will he be given, and he will not escape from his hands, for he will fall into his hands. 17. And fear thou not on account of Jacob ; for the guardian of Jacob is great and powerful and honoured, and praised more than the guardian of Esau." 18. And Rebecca sent and called Esau, and he came to her, and she said unto him : "I have a petition, my son, to make unto thee, and do thou promise to do it, my son." 19. And he said : "I will do everything that thou sayest unto me, and I will not refuse thy petition." 20. And she said unto him : "I ask you that the day I die, thou wilt take me in and bury me near Sarah, thy father's mother, and that thou and Jacob will love each other, and that neither will desire evil against the other, but love just him, and ye

[1] Construction doubtful. [2] Emended.

will prosper, my sons, and be honoured in the midst of the land, and no enemy will rejoice over you, and ye will be a blessing and a mercy in the eyes of all those that love you." 21. And he said : "I will do all that thou hast told me, and I will bury thee on the day thou diest near Sarah, my father's mother, as thou lovest that her bones may be near thy bones. 22. And Jacob, my brother, also, I will love above all flesh ; for I have not a brother in all the earth but him only : and this is no great merit for me if I love him ; for he is my brother, and we were sown together in thy womb, and together came we forth from thy loins, and if I do not love my brother, whom shall I love? 23. And I, myself, beg thee to exhort Jacob concerning me and concerning my children, for I know that he will assuredly be king over me and my children, for on the day my father blessed him he made him the higher and me the lower. 24. And I swear unto thee that I will love him, and not desire evil against him all the days of my life but good only." And he swear unto her regarding all this matter. 25. And she called Jacob before the eyes of Esau, and gave him commandment according to the words which she had spoken to Esau. 26. And he said : "I will do thy pleasure ; believe me that no evil will proceed from me or from my sons against Esau, and I shall be first in naught save in love only." 27. And they eat and drank, she and her sons that night, and she died, three jubilees and one week and one year old, on that night, and her two sons, Esau and Jacob, buried her in the double cave near Sarah, their father's mother.

XXXVI.—And in the sixth year of this week Isaac called his two sons, Esau and Jacob, and they came to him, and he said unto them : "My sons, I am going the way of my fathers, into the eternal house where my fathers are. 2. Wherefore bury me near Abraham my father, in the double cave in the field of Ephron the Hittite, where Abraham purchased a sepulchre to bury in ; in the sepulchre which I digged for myself, there bury me. 3. And this I command you, my sons, that ye practise righteousness and uprightness on the earth, so that the Lord may bring upon you all that the Lord said that he would do to Abraham and to his seed. 4. And love one another, my sons (even) your brother as a man loves his own soul, and let each seek in what he may benefit his brother, and act together on the earth ; and let them love each other as their own souls. 5. And concerning the question of idols, I have commanded and admonished you to reject them and hate them, and love them not ; for they are full of deception for those that worship them and for those that bow down to them. 6. Remember ye, my sons, the Lord God of Abraham your father, and afterwards[1] I too worshipped him and served him

[1] We should perhaps emend and read "how."

in righteousness and in joy, that he might multiply you and increase your seed as the stars of heaven in multitude, and establish you on the earth as the plant of righteousness which shall not be rooted out unto all the generations for ever. 7. And now I will make you swear a great oath, for there is no oath which is greater than it by the name glorious and honoured and great and splendid and wonderful and mighty, which created the heavens and the earth and all things together, that ye will fear him and worship him. 8. And that each will love his brother with affection and righteousness, and that neither will desire evil against his brother from henceforth for ever all the days of your life, so that ye may prosper in all your deeds and may not be destroyed. 9. And if either of you devises evil against his brother, know that from henceforth everyone that devises evil against his brother will fall into his hand, and will be rooted out of the land of the living, and his seed shall be destroyed from under heaven. 10. But on the day of turbulence and execration and wrath and anger, and as with flaming devouring fire he burnt Sodom, so likewise will he burn his land and his city and all that is his, and he will be blotted out of the book of the discipline of the children of men, and not be recorded in the book of life, but in that which shall be destroyed, and he will depart into eternal execration; so that their condemnation may be always renewed in hate and in execration and in wrath and in torment and in indignation and in plagues and in disease for ever. 11. I say and testify to you, my sons, according to the judgment which will come upon the man who wishes to injure his his brother. 12. And he divided all his possessions between the two on that day, and he gave the larger portion to him that was the firstborn, and the tower and all that was about it, and all that Abraham possessed at the well of the oath. 13. And he said, "This larger portion I will give[1] to my firstborn." 14. And Esau said, "I have sold to Jacob and given my right of primogeniture to Jacob; to him it has been given, and I have not a single word to say regarding it, for it is his." 15. And Isaac said, "May a blessing rest upon you, my sons, and upon your seed this day, for ye have given me rest, and my heart is not pained concerning the primogeniture, lest thou shouldest work wickedness on account of it. 16. May the Most High Lord bless the man that worketh righteousness, him and his seed for ever." 17. And he ended commanding them and blessing them, and they eat and drank together before him, and he rejoiced because there was a reconciliation between them, and they went forth from him and rested that day and slept. 18. And Isaac slept on his bed that day rejoicing; and he slept the eternal sleep, and died one hundred and eighty years old. He

[1] Emended.

completed twenty-five weeks and five years ; and his two sons Esau and Jacob buried him. 19. And Esau went to the land of Edom, to the mountains of Seir, and he dwelt there. 20. And Jacob dwelt in the mountains of Hebron, in the tower of the land of the sojournings of his father Abraham, and he worshipped the Lord with all his heart and according to the visible command according to the division of the days of his generation. 21. And Leah his wife died in the fourth year of the second week of the forty-fifth jubilee, and he buried her in the double cave near Rebecca his mother, to the left of the grave of Sarah, his father's mother. 22. And all her sons and his sons came to mourn over Leah his wife with him, and to comfort him regarding her, for he was lamenting her. 23. For he loved her exceedingly after Rachel her sister died ; for she was perfect and upright in all her ways and honoured Jacob, and all the days that she lived with him he did not hear from her mouth a harsh word, for she was gentle and peaceable and upright and honourable. 24. And he remembered all her deeds which she had done during her life, and he lamented her exceedingly ; for he loved her with all his heart and with all his soul.

XXXVII.—And on the day that Isaac the father of Jacob and Esau died, the sons of Esau heard that Isaac had given the portion of the elder to his younger son Jacob they were very angry. 2. And they strove with their father, saying : "Why has thy father given Jacob the portion of the elder and put thee after him, although thou art the elder and Jacob the younger ?" 3. And he said unto them "Because I sold my birthright to Jacob for a small mess of lentils ; and on the day my father sent me to hunt venison[1] and bring him something that he should eat and bless me, he came with guile and brought my father food and drink, and my father blessed him and put me under his hand. 4. And now our father has caused us to swear, me and him, that we shall not mutually devise evil, either against his brother, and that we shall continue in love and in peace each with his brother and not make our ways corrupt." 5. And they said unto him, "We will not hearken unto thee to make peace with him ; for our strength is greater than his strength, and we are more powerful than he ; we will go against him and slay him, and destroy him and his children.[2] And if thou wilt not go with us, we will do hurt to thee also. 6. And now hearken unto us : We will send to Aram and Philistia and Moab and Ammon, and let us choose for ourselves chosen men who are ardent for battle, and let us go against him and do battle with him, and let us exterminate him from the

[1] Emended.

[2] Emended from A, with Latin.

earth before he grows strong." 7. And their father said unto them, "Do not go and do not make war with him lest ye fall before him." 8. And they said unto him, "This too, is exactly thy mode of action from thy youth until this day, and thou hast brought thy neck under his yoke. We will not hearken to these words." 9. And they sent to Aram, and to Adûrâm to the friend of their father, and they hired along with them one thousand fighting men, chosen men of war. 10. And there came to them from Moab and from the children of Ammon, those who were hired, one thousand chosen men, and from Philistia, one thousand chosen men of war, and from Edom and from the Horites one thousand fighting men, and from the Hittites one thousand chosen and mighty men, men of war. 11. And they said unto their father: "Go forth with them and lead them, else we will slay thee." 12. And he was filled with wrath and indignation on seeing that his sons were forcing him to go before (them) to lead them against Jacob his brother. 13. But afterward he remembered all the evil which lay hidden in his heart against Jacob his brother; and he remembered not the oath which he swear to his father and to his mother that he would devise no evil all his days against Jacob his brother. 14. And notwithstanding all this, Jacob knew not that they were coming against him to battle, and he was mourning for Leah, his wife, until they approached very near to the tower with four thousand warriors and chosen men of war. 15. And the men of Hebron sent to him saying, "Behold thy brother has come against thee, to fight thee, with four thousand girt with the sword, and they carry shields and weapons;" for they loved Jacob more than Esau. So they told him; for Jacob was a more liberal and merciful man than Esau. 16. But Jacob would uot believe until they came very near to the tower. 17. And he closed the gates of the tower; and he stood on the battlements and spake to his brother Esau and said, "Noble is the comfort wherewith thou has come to comfort me because of my wife who has died. Is this the oath that thou didst swear to thy father and again to thy mother before they died? Thou hast broken thy oath, and on the moment that thou didst swear to thy father wast thou condemned." 18. And then Esau answered and said unto him, "Neither the children of men nor the beasts of the earth have any oath of righteousness which they swear when they would swear (an oath valid) for ever; but every day they devise evil one against another, so that each may slay his adversary and foe. 19. And thou too dost hate me and my children for ever. And there is no observing the tie of brotherhood with thee. 20. Hear these words which I declare unto thee, If the boar can change its skin and make its bristles as soft as wool, or if it can cause horns to sprout forth on its head like the horns of a stag or

of a sheep, then I will observe the tie of brotherhood with thee. And yet since the (twin) male offspring were separated from their mother, thou hast not shown thyself a brother to me. 21. And if the wolves make peace with the lambs so as not to devour and rob them, and if their hearts turn towards them to do good (unto them), then there will be peace in my heart towards thee. 22. And if the lion becomes the friend of the ox and if he is bound under one yoke with him and ploughs with him and makes peace with him, then I will make peace with thee. 23. And when the raven becomes white as the râzâ,[1] then know that I have loved thee and will make peace with thee. Thou shalt be rooted out and thy sons shall be rooted out, and there shall be no peace for thee." 24. And when Jacob saw that he was working evil against him from his heart, and that with his whole soul he would slay him, and that he had come springing like the wild boar which comes upon the spear that pierces and kills it, and it recoils not from it; 25. Then he spake to his own and to his servants that they should attack him and all his companions.

XXXVIII.—And after that Judah spake to Jacob, his father, and said unto him: "Bend thy bow, father, and send forth thy arrows and cast down the adversary and slay the enemy; and mayst thou have the power, for we will not slay thy brother, for he was with thee, and he is like thee, so that we should give him[2] (this) honour. 2. Then Jacob bent his bow and sent forth the arrow and struck Esau, his brother, on his right breast,[3] and slew him. 3. And again he sent forth an arrow and struck Adôrân, the Aramaean, on the left breast, and drove him backward and slew him. 4. And then went forth the sons of Jacob, they and their servants, dividing themselves into companies on the four sides of the tower. 5. And Judah went forth in front, and Naphtali and Gad with him and fifty servants with him on the south side of the tower, and they slew all they found before them, and not one individual escaped from them. 6. And Levi and Dan and Asher went forth on the east side of the tower, and fifty (men) with them, and they slew the fighting men of Moab and Ammon. 7. And Reuben and Issachar and Zebulon went forth on the north side of the tower, and fifty men with them, and they slew the fighting men of the Philistines. 8. And Simeon and Benjamin and Enoch, Reuben's son, went forth on the west side of the tower, and fifty men with them, and they slew of Edom and of the Horites four hundred stout warriors; and six hundred escaped,

---

[1] The Râzâ is a large white bird which eats grasshoppers.

[2] Emended with Lat.

[3] Restored from Lat. and the Midrash *Wajjissan.*

and four of the sons of Esau fled with them, and left their father lying slain, as he had fallen on the hill which is in Adûrâm. 9. And the sons of Jacob pursued after them to the mountains of Seir. And Jacob buried his brother on the hill which is in Adûrâm, and he returned to his house. 10. And the sons of Jacob surrounded [1] the sons of Esau in the mountains of Seir, and (the sons of Esau) humbled themselves so as to become servants of the sons of Jacob. 11. And they sent to their father to inquire whether they should make peace with them or slay them. 12. And Jacob sent word to his sons that they should make peace, and they made peace with them, and placed the yoke of servitude upon them, so that they paid tribute to Jacob and to his sons always. 13. And they continued to pay tribute to Jacob until the day that he went down into Egypt. 14. And the sons of Edom did not get quit of the yoke of servitude which the twelve sons of Joseph had imposed on them until that day. 15. And these are the kings that reigned in Edom before there reigned any king over the children of Israel until this day in the land of Edom. 16. And Bâlâq, the son of Bêôr, reigned in Edom, and the name of his city was Danâbâ. 17. And Bâlâq died, and Jôbâb, the son of Zârâ of Bôsêr, reigned in his stead. 18. And Jôbâb died, and Asâm, of the land of Têmân, reigned in his stead. 19. And Asâm died, and Adâth, the son of Barad, who slew Median in the field of Moab, reigned in his stead, and the name of his city was Awût. 20. And Adâth died, and Salman, from Amâsêqâ, reigned in his stead. 21. And Salman died, and Sâûl, of Râabôth (by the) river, reigned in his stead. 22. And Sâûl died, and Baêlûnân, the son of Akbûr, reigned in his stead. 23. And Baêlûnân, the son of Akbûr, died, and Adâth reigned in his stead, and the name of his wife was Maitabît, the daughter of Mâtarat, the daughter of Mêtabêd Zâab. 24. These are the kings who reigned in the land of Edom.

XXXIX.—And Jacob dwelt in the land of his father's sojournings in the land of Canaan. 2. These are the generations of Jacob. Joseph was seventeen years old when they took him down into the land of Egypt, and Potiphar, an eunuch of Pharaoh, captain of the guard, [2] bought him. 3. And he set Joseph over all his house, and the blessing of the Lord came upon the house of the Egyptian on account of Joseph, and the Lord prospered him in all that he did. 4. And the Egyptian left everything in Joseph's hands ; [3] for he saw that the Lord was with him, and that the Lord prospered him in all that he did. 5. And Joseph was comely and very well favoured,[4] and the wife of his

[1] Emended with Lat.
[2] Emended, as in xxxiv. 11.
[3] Emended.
[4] Slightly emended from A, B.

master lifted up her eyes and saw Joseph, and she loved him, and besought him to lie with her. 6. But he did not surrender his soul, and he remembered the Lord and the words which Jacob, his father, had read (to him) from amongst the words of Abraham, that no man should commit fornication with a woman who has a husband ; that for him the punishment of death has been ordained in the heavens before the Most High Lord, and the sin will be recorded against him in the eternal books continually before the Lord. 7. And Joseph remembered these words and refused to lie with her. 8. And she besought him for a year, but he refused and would not listen. 9. But she embraced him and held him fast in the house in order to force him to lie with her, and closed the doors of the house and held him fast ; but he left his garment in her hands and broke through the door and fled without from her presence. 10. And the woman saw that he would not lie with her, and she calumniated him in the presence of his lord, saying : " Thy Hebrew servant, whom thou lovest, sought to force me to lie with him ; and it came to pass when I lifted up my voice that he fled and left his garment in my hands when I held him, and he brake through the door." 11. And the Egyptian saw the garment of Joseph and the broken door, and heard the words of his wife, and cast Joseph into prison into the place where the prisoners were kept whom the king imprisoned. 12. And he was there in the prison ; and the Lord gave Joseph favour in the sight of the chief of the guards of the prison and compassion before him, for he saw that the Lord was with him, and made all that he did to prosper. 13. And he committed all things into his hands,[1] and the chief of the guards looked to nothing that was in his keeping, for Joseph did every thing, and the Lord perfected it.[2] 14. And he remained there two years. And in those days Pharaoh, king of Egypt, was wroth against his two eunuchs, against the chief of the butlers, and against the chief of the bakers, and he put them in ward in the house of the captain of the guard,[3] in the prison where Joseph was kept. 15. And the captain of the guard appointed Joseph to serve them ; and he served before them. 16. And they both dreamed a dream, the chief butler and the chief baker, and they told it to Joseph. 17. And as he interpreted to them so it befell them, and Pharaoh restored the chief butler to his office, and the chief baker [4] he slew, as Joseph had in-

---

[1] Emended with Lat. and Gen. xxxix. 22.

[2] Better emended with Latin and read " made it to prosper."

[3] Eth. and Lat. versions read " chief of the cooks," which, though a possible rendering of שַׂר־הַטַּבָּחִים, is manifestly wrong here.

[4] Emended with Lat.

terpreted to them. 18. But the chief butler forgot Joseph in the prison, although he had informed him what should befall him, and did not remember to inform Pharaoh how Joseph had told him, for he forgot.

XL.—And in those days Pharaoh dreamed two dreams in one night concerning a famine which should be in all the land, and he awoke from his sleep and called all the interpreters of dreams that were in Egypt, and magicians, and told them his two dreams, and they were not able to declare (them). 2. And then the chief butler remembered Joseph and spake of him to the king, and he brought him forth from the prison, and he told his two dreams before him. 3. And he said before Pharaoh that his two dreams were one, and he said unto him : "Seven years will come (in which there will be) plenty over all the land of Egypt, and after that seven years of famine, such a famine as has not been in all the earth. 4. And now let Pharaoh appoint overseers in all the land of Egypt, and let them store up food in every city throughout the days of the years of plenty, and there will be food for the seven years of famine, and the land will not perish through the famine, for it will be very severe." 5. And the Lord gave Joseph favour and mercy in the eyes of Pharaoh, and Pharaoh said unto his servants : "We shall not find such a wise and intelligent man as this man, for the spirit of the Lord is with him." 6. And he appointed him the second in all his kingdom and gave him authority over all Egypt, and caused him to ride in the second chariot of Pharaoh. 7. And he clothed him with byssus garments, and he put a gold chain upon his neck, and they proclaimed [1] before him [2] "El El Wa Abîrer,[3] and placed a ring on his hand and made him ruler over all his house, and magnified him, and said unto him : "Only on the throne shall I be greater than thou." 8. And Joseph ruled over all the land of Egypt, and all the princes of Pharaoh, and all his servants, and all who did the king's business loved him, for he walked in uprightness, for he was without pride and arrogance, and he had no respect of persons, and did not accept gifts, but he judged in uprightness all the people of the land. 9. And the land of Egypt was at peace before Pharaoh because of Joseph, for the Lord was with him, and gave him favour and mercy for all his generations before all those who knew him and heard concerning him, and Pharaoh's kingdom was well ordered, and there was no adversary and no evil person (therein). 10. And the king called Joseph's name Sephântîphâns, and gave Joseph to wife

---

[1] Emended with Lat.

[2] Eth. MSS. add "and he said" against Latin and Gen. xli. 43.

[3] "God, God, the mighty one of God," אֵל אֵל וַאֲבִיר אֵל.

the daughter of Potiphar, the daughter of the priest of Heliopolis, captain of the guard.[1] 11. And on the day that Joseph stood before Pharaoh he was thirty years old when he stood before Pharaoh. 12. And in that year Isaac died. And it came to pass as Joseph had said in the interpretation of his two dreams, according as he had said it, there were seven years of plenty over all the land of Egypt, and in the land of Egypt one measure brought forth abundantly eighteen hundred measures. 13. And Joseph gathered food into every city until they were full of corn until they could no longer count and measure it for multitude.

XLI.—And in the forty-fifth jubilee, in the second week, (and) in the second year, Judah took for his first-born, Er, a wife from the daughters of Aram, named Tamar. 2. But he hated, and did not lie with her, because his mother was of the daughters of Canaan, and he wished to take him a wife of the kinsfolk of his mother, but Judah, his father, would not permit him. 3. And this Er, the first-born of Judah, was wicked, and the Lord slew him. 4. And Judah said unto Onan, his brother: "Go in unto thy brother's wife and perform the duty of a husband's brother unto her,[2] and raise up seed unto thy brother." 5. And Onan knew that the seed would not be his, (but) his brother's only, and he went into the house of his brother's wife, and spilt the seed on the ground, and he was wicked in the eyes of the Lord, and he slew him. 6. And Judah said unto Tamar, his daughter-in-law: "Remain in thy father's house as a widow till Shelah my son be grown up, and I will give thee to him to wife." 7. And he grew up; but Bêdsûêl, the wife of Judah, did not permit her son Shelah to marry. And Bêdsûêl, the wife of Judah, died in the fifth year of this week. 8. And in the sixth year Judah went up to shear his sheep at Timnah. And they told Tamar: "Behold thy father-in-law goeth up to Timnah to shear his sheep." 9. And she put off her widow's clothes, and put on a veil, and adorned herself, and sat in the gate which faces the way to Timnah. 10. And as Judah was going along he found her, and thought her to be an harlot, and he said unto her: "Let me come in unto thee"; and she said unto him: "Come in," and he went in. 11. And she said unto him: "Give me my hire"; and he said unto her: "I have nothing in my hand save my ring that is on my finger, and my necklace, and my staff which is in my hand." 12. And she said unto him: "Give them to me until thou dost send me my wage"; and he said unto her: "I will send unto thee a kid of the goats"; and he

[1] MSS. read "cooks." See xxxix. 14 (note).

[2] The phrase is obscure.

gave them to her, and he went in unto her,[1] and she conceived by him. 13. And Judah went unto his sheep, and she went to her father's house. 14. And Judah sent a kid of the goats by the hand of his shepherd, an Adullamite, and he found her not; and he asked the people of the place, saying: "Where is the harlot who was here?" And they said unto him: "There is no harlot here with us." 15. And he returned and informed him, and said: "I have not found her,[2] and I asked the people of the place, and they said unto me: 'There is no harlot here.'" And he said: "Let her take[3] (them) lest we become a cause of derision." 16. And when she had completed three months, it was manifest that she was with child, and they told Judah, saying: "Behold Tamar, thy daughter-in-law, is with child by whoredom." 17. And Judah went to the house of her father, and said unto her father and her brothers: "Bring her forth, and let them burn her, for she hath wrought uncleanness in Israel." 18. And it came to pass when they brought her forth to burn her that she sent to her father-in-law the ring and the necklace, and the staff, saying: "Discern whose are these, for by him am I with child." 19. And Judah acknowledged, and said: "Tamar is more righteous than I am." And therefore they burnt her not. 20. And for that reason she was not given to Shelah, and he did not again approach her. 21. And after that she bare two sons, Perez and Zerah, in the seventh year of this second week. 22. And thereupon the seven years of fruitfulness had been accomplished, of which Joseph spake to Pharaoh. 23. And Judah acknowledged that the deed which he had done was evil, for he had lain with his daughter-in-law, and he declared that it was hateful in his eyes, and he acknowledged that he had transgressed and gone astray, for he had uncovered the skirt of his son, and he began to lament and to supplicate before the Lord because of his transgression. 24. And we told him in a dream that it was forgiven him because he supplicated earnestly, and lamented, and did not again commit it. 25. And he received forgiveness because he turned from his sin and from his ignorance, for he transgressed greatly before our God; and every one that acts thus, every one who lies with his mother-in-law, let them burn him with fire that he may burn therein, for there is uncleanness and pollution upon them; with fire let them burn them. 26. And do thou command the children of Israel that there be no uncleanness amongst them, for every one who lies with his daughter-in-law or with his mother-in-law hath wrought uncleanness; with fire let them

---

[1] Restored from emended Lat. text.

[2] Emended with Lat. and Gen. xxxviii. 22.

[3] Emended with Lat. and Gen. xxxviii. 23.

burn the man who has lain with her, and likewise the woman, that he may turn away wrath and punishment from Israel. 27. And unto Judah we said that his two sons had not lain with her, and for this reason his seed was established for a second generation, and should not be rooted out. 28. For in singleness of eye he had gone and sought for punishment, namely, according to the judgment of Abraham, which he had commanded his sons, Judah had sought to burn her with fire.

XLII.—And in the first year of the third week of the forty-fifth jubilee the famine began to come into the land, and the rain refused to be given to the earth, for none whatever fell. 2. And the earth grew barren, but in the land of Egypt there was food, for Joseph had gathered the seed of the land in the seven years of plenty and had preserved it. 3. And the Egyptians came to Joseph that he might give them food, and he opened the storehouses where was the grain of the first year, and he sold it to the people of the land for gold. 4. Now the famine was very sore in the land of Canaan,[1] and Jacob heard that there was food in Egypt, and he sent his ten sons that they should procure food for him in Egypt; but Benjamin he did not send, and the ten sons of Jacob[2] arrived in Egypt among those that went (there). 5. And Joseph recognised them, but they did not recognise him, and he spake roughly[3] unto them, and he said unto them: "Are ye not spies, and have ye not come to explore the approaches of the land"? And he put them in ward. 6. And after that he set them free again, and detained Simeon alone and sent off his nine brothers. 7. And he filled their sacks with corn, and he put their gold in their sacks, and they did not know. 8. And he commanded them to bring their younger brother, for they had told him their father was living and their younger brother. 9. And they went up from the land of Egypt and they came to the land of Canaan; they told their father all that had befallen them, and how the lord of the country had spoken roughly to them, and had seized Simeon till they should bring Benjamin. 10. And Jacob said: "Me have ye bereaved of my children! Joseph is not and Simeon is not, and ye will take Benjamin away. Against me is your wickedness." 11. And he said: "My son will not go down with you lest perchance he fall sick; for their mother gave birth to two sons, and one has perished, and this one also ye would take from me. If perchance he took a fever on the road, ye would bring down my old age with sorrow unto death." 12. For he saw that their money had been

[1] Found only in Lat. [2] Restored from Lat. and Gen. xlii. 5.
[3] Corrected from Lat. and Gen. xlii. 7.

returned to every man in his sack, and for this reason he feared to send him. 13. And the famine increased and became sore in the land of Canaan, and in all lands save in the land of Egypt, for many of the children of the Egyptians had stored up their seed for food from the time when they saw Joseph gathering seed together and putting it in storehouses and preserving it for the years of famine. 14. And the people of Egypt fed themselves thereon during the first year of their famine. 15. But when Israel saw that the famine was very sore in the land, and that there was no deliverance, he said unto his sons : "Go, return, and procure food for us that we die not." 16. And they said : " We will not go ; unless our youngest brother go with us, we will not go." 17. And Israel saw that if he did not send him with them, they should all perish by reason of the famine. 18. And Reuben said : "Give him into my hand, and if I do not bring him back to thee, slay my two sons instead of his soul." And he said unto him : " He shall not go with thee." 19. And Judah came near and said : "Send him with us, and if I do not bring him back to thee, let me bear the blame before thee all the days of my life." 20. And he sent him with them in the second year of this week on the first day of the month, and they came to the land of Egypt with all those who went, and (they had) presents in their hands, stacte and almonds and terebinth nuts and pure honey. 21. And they went and stood before Joseph, and he saw Benjamin his brother, and he knew him, and said unto them : "Is this your youngest brother ?" And they said unto him : "It is he." And he said : "The Lord be gracious to thee my son !" 22. And he sent him into his house and he brought forth Simeon unto them and he made a feast for them, and they presented the gift which they had brought in their hands. 23. And they eat before him and he gave them all a portion, but he made the portion of Benjamin seven times larger than that of any of theirs. 24. And they eat and drank and arose and remained with their asses. 25. And Joseph devised a plan whereby he might learn their thoughts as to whether thoughts of peace prevailed amongst them, and he said to the steward who was over his house : "Fill all their sacks with food, and return their money unto them into their vessels, and my cup, the silver cup out of which I drink, put it in the sack of the youngest, and send them away."

XLIII.—And he did as Joseph had told him, and filled all their sacks for them with food and put their money in their sacks, and put the cup in Benjamin's sack. 2. And early in the morning they departed, and it came to pass that when they had gone from thence, Joseph said unto the steward of his house : "Pursue them, run

and seize them, saying, 'For good ye have requited me with evil; you have stolen from me the silver cup out of which my lord drinks.' And bring back to me their youngest brother, and fetch him quickly before I go forth to my seat of judgment." 3. And he ran after them and said unto them according to these words. 4. And they said unto him: "God forbid that thy servants should do this thing, and steal from the house of thy lord any utensil, and the money also which we found in our sacks the first time, we thy servants brought back from the land of Canaan. 5. How then should we steal any utensil? Behold here are we and our sacks; search, and wherever thou findest the cup in the sack of any man amongst us, let him be slain, and we and our asses will serve thy lord." And he said unto them: "Not so, the man with whom I find, him only will I take as a servant, and ye shall return in peace unto your house." 7. And as he was searching in their vessels, beginning with the eldest and ending with the youngest, it was found in Benjamin's sack. 8. And they rent their garments, and laded their asses, and returned to the city and came to the house of Joseph, and they all bowed themselves on their faces to the ground before him. 9. And Joseph said unto them: "Ye have done evil." And (Judah) said unto him[1]: "What shall we say and how shall we dispute the transgression of thy servants which our lord has discovered; behold we are the servants of our lord, and our asses also." 10. And Joseph said unto them: "I too fear the Lord; as for you, go ye to your homes and let your brother be my servant, for ye have done evil. Know ye not that a man divines with[2] his cup as I (do) with this cup? And yet ye have stolen it from me." 11. And Judah said: "O my lord, let thy servant, I pray thee,[3] speak a word in my lord's ear; two brothers did thy servant's mother bear to our father; one went away and was lost, and hath not been found, and he alone is left of his mother, and thy servant our father loves him, and his life also is bound up with the life of this (lad). 12. And it will come to pass, when we go to thy servant our father, and the lad is not with us, that he will die, and we shall bring down our father with sorrow to the grave (lit. "death"). 13. Now rather let me, thy servant, abide instead of the lad as a bondman unto my lord, and let the youth go with his brethren, for I became surety for him at the hand of thy servant our father, and if I do not bring him back, thy servant shall bear the blame to our father for ever." 14. And Joseph saw that they were all accordant in goodness one with another, and he could not refrain himself, and he told them that he was Joseph. 15. And he conversed with them in the Hebrew tongue and fell on

[1] B "they said"; CD "they said unto him."

[2] Emended with Gen. xliv. 5, 15. [3] Emended with Gen. xliv. 18.

their neck and wept. But they knew him not and they began to weep. 16. And he said unto them : "Weep not over me, but hasten and bring my father to me ; and ye see that it is my mouth that speaketh, and the eyes of my brother Benjamin see.[1] 17. For behold this is the second year of the famine, and there are still five years without harvest or fruit of trees or ploughing. 18. Come down quickly ye and your households, so that ye perish not through the famine, and do not be grieved for your possessions, for the Lord sent me before you to set things in order that many people might live. 19. And tell my father that I am still alive, and ye, behold, ye see that the Lord has made me as a father to Pharaoh, and ruler over his house and over the land of Egypt. 20. And tell my father of all my glory, and all the riches and glory that the Lord hath given me." 21. And by the command of the mouth of Pharaoh he gave them chariots and provisions for the way, and he gave them all many-coloured raiment and silver. 22. And to their father he sent raiment and silver and ten asses which carried corn, and he sent them away. 23. And they went up and told their father that Joseph was alive, and was measuring out corn to all the nations of the earth, and that he was ruler over all the land of Egypt. 24. And their father did not believe it, for he was beside himself in his mind ; but when he saw the wagons which Joseph had sent, the life of his spirit revived, and he said : "It is a great thing for me if Joseph lives ; I will go down and see him before I die."

XLIV.—And Israel took his journey from Haran from his house on the new moon of the third month, and he went on the way of the well of the oath, and he offered a sacrifice to the God of his father Isaac on the seventh of this month. 2. And Jacob remembered the dream that he had seen at Bethel, and he feared to go down into Egypt. 3. And while he was thinking of sending word to Joseph to come to him, and that he would not go down, he remained there seven days, if perchance he should see a vision as to whether he should remain or go down. 4. And he celebrated the harvest festival of the first-fruits with old grain, for in all the land of Canaan there was not a handful of seed in the land, for the famine was over the beasts and cattle and birds, and also over man. 5. And on the sixteenth the Lord appeared unto him, and said unto him, "Jacob, Jacob" ; and he said, "Here am I." And he said unto him : "I am the God of thy fathers, the God of Abraham and Isaac; fear not to go down into Egypt, for I will there make of thee a great nation.

[1] Emended with Gen. xlv. 12, by a slight change from an unmeaning text.

6. I will go down with thee, and I will bring thee back (again), and in this land shalt thou be buried, and Joseph will put his hands upon thy eyes. Fear not; go down into Egypt." 7. And his sons rose up, and his sons' sons, and they placed their father and their possessions upon wagons. 8. And Israel rose up from the well of the oath on the sixteenth of this third month, and he went to the land of Egypt. 9. And Israel sent Judah before him to his son Joseph to examine the Land of Goshen, for Joseph had told his brothers that they should come to dwell there that they might be near him. 10. And this was the goodliest (land) in the land of Egypt, and near to him, for all of them and for their cattle. 11. And these are the names of the sons of Jacob who went into Egypt with Jacob their father. 12. Reuben, the first-born of Israel; and these are the names of his sons: Enoch, and Phâllus, and Esrôm and Karâmî, five. 13. Simeon and his sons; and these are the names of his sons: Ijâmûêl, and Ijamên, and Avôt, and Ijakîm, and Saar, and Saul, the son of the Canaanitish woman,[1] seven. 14. Levi and his sons; and these are the names of his sons: Gêdson, and Qaâth, and Mêrârî, four. 15. Judah and his sons; and these are the names of his sons: Shela, and Phares, and Zarah, four. 16. Issachar and his sons; and these are the names of his sons: Tôlâ, and Phûa, and Ijâsûb, and Sâmarôm, five. 17. Zebulon and his sons; and these are the names of his sons: Saar, and Elôn, and Ijâlêl, four. 18. These are the sons of Jacob, and their sons whom Leah bore to Jacob in Mesopotamia, six, and their one sister, Dinah, and all the souls which were sons of Leah, and their sons, who went with Jacob their father into Egypt, were twenty-nine, and Jacob their father being with them, they were thirty. 19. And the sons of Zilpah, Leah's handmaid, the wife of Jacob who bore unto Jacob Gad and Asher: 21. And these are the names of their sons who went with them into Egypt: The sons of Gad: Sêphjôn, and Agâtî, and Sûnî, and Asîbôn. . . . and Arôlî, and Arôdî, eight. 21. And the sons of Asher: Ijômnâ, and Jesûa, . . . and Barîa, and Sârâ, their one sister, six. 22. And all the souls were fourteen, and all those of Leah were forty-four. 23. And the sons of Rachel, the wife of Jacob: Joseph and Benjamin. 24. And there were born to Joseph in Egypt before his father came into Egypt, those whom Asenath bare unto him daughter of Potiphar priest of Heliopolis, Manasseh, and Ephraim, three. 25. And the sons of Benjamin: Bâlâ, and Bakar, and Asbêl, Gûâdâ, and Neêmên, and Abdjô, and Râê, and Sanânîm, and Aphîm, and Gâam, eleven. 26. And all the souls of Rachel were fourteen. 27. And the sons of Bilhah, the handmaid of Rachel, the wife of Jacob, whom she bare to Jacob, were Dan

[1] Emended.

and Naphtali. 28. And these are the names of their sons who went with them into Egypt. And the sons of Dan were Kûsîm, and Sâmôn, and Asûdi, and Ijâka, and Salômôn, six. 29. And they died the year in which they entered into Egypt, and there was left to Dan Kûsîm alone. 30. And these are the names of the sons of Naphtali: Ijâsîêl, and Gâhânî, and Esaar, and Sallûm, and Iv. 31. And Iv, who was born after the years of famine, died in Egypt. 32. And all the souls of Rachel were twenty-six. 33. And all the souls of Jacob which went into Egypt were seventy souls. These are his children and his children's children, in all seventy; but five died in Egypt before Joseph, and had no children. 34. And in the land of Canaan two sons of Judah died, Er and Onan, and they had no children, and the children of Israel buried those who perished, and they were reckoned among the seventy Gentile nations.

XLV.—And Israel went into the country of Egypt, into the land of Goshen, on the new moon of the fourth month, in the second year of the third week of the forty-fifth jubilee. 2. And Joseph went to meet his father Jacob, to the land of Goshen, and he fell on his father's neck and wept. 3. And Israel said unto Joseph: "Now let me die since I have seen thee, and now may the Lord God of Israel be blessed, the God of Abraham and the God of Isaac who hath not withheld his mercy and his grace from his servant Jacob." 4. It is a great thing for me that I have seen thy face whilst still living; yea, true is the vision which I saw at Bethel, blessed be the Lord my God for ever and ever, and blessed be his name. 5. And Joseph and his brothers ate bread before their father and drank wine, and Jacob rejoiced with exceeding great joy because he saw Joseph eating with his brothers and drinking before him, and he blessed the Creator of all things who had preserved him, and had preserved for him his twelve sons. 6. And Joseph had given to his father and to his brothers as a gift the right of dwelling in the land of Goshen and in Râmêsênâ and all the region round about, which he ruled over before Pharaoh. And Israel and his sons dwelt in the land of Goshen, the best part of the land of Egypt; and Israel was one hundred and thirty years old when he came into Egypt. 7. And Joseph nourished his father and his brethren and their possessions with bread as much as sufficed them[1] for the seven years of the famine. 8. And the land of Egypt suffered by reason of the famine, and Joseph acquired all the land of Egypt for Pharaoh in return for food, and he got

[1] "As much as sufficed them," seems corrupt for "according to their persons," cf. Gen. xlvii. (LXX.).

possession of the people and their cattle and every thing for Pharaoh.[1] 9. And the years of the famine were accomplished, and Joseph gave to the people in the land seed and food that they might sow (the land)[2] in the eighth year, for the river had overflowed all the land of Egypt. 10. For in the seven years of the famine it had not overflowed[3] and had irrigated only a few places on the banks of the river, but now it overflowed and the Egyptians sowed the land, and they gathered[4] much corn that year. 11. And this was the first year of the fourth week of the forty-fifth jubilee. 12. And Joseph took of all that which was produced[5] the fifth part for the king and left four parts for them for food and for seed, and Joseph made it an ordinance for the land of Egypt until this day. 13. And Israel lived in the land of Egypt seventeen years, and all the days which he lived were three jubilees, one hundred and forty-seven years, and he died in the fourth year of the fifth week of the forty-fifth jubilee. 14. And Israel blessed his sons before he died and told them everything that would befall them in the land of Egypt; and he made known to them what would come upon them in the last days, and blessed them and gave to Joseph two portions in the land. 16. And he slept with his fathers, and he was buried in the double cave in the land of Canaan, near Abraham his father in the grave which he dug for himself in the double cave in the land of Hebron. 17. And he gave all his books and the books of his fathers to Levi his son that he might preserve them and renew them for his children until this day.

XLVI.—And it came to pass that after Jacob died the children of Israel multiplied in the land of Egypt, and they became a great nation, and they were of one accord in heart, so that brother loved brother and every man helped his brother, and they increased abundantly and multiplied exceedingly, ten[6] weeks of years, all the (remaining) days of the life of Joseph. 2. And there was no enemy (lit. Satan) nor any evil all the days of the life of Joseph which he lived after his father Jacob, for all the Egyptians honoured the children of Israel all the days of the life of Joseph. 3. And Joseph died being a hundred and ten years old; seventeen years he lived in the land of Canaan, and ten years he was a servant, and three in prison, and eighty years he was under the king, ruling all the land of Egypt. 4. So he died and all his brethren and all that generation. 5. And he commanded the children of Israel before he died that they should carry his bones with them when they went forth from the land of Egypt.

---

[1] Emended with Lat. from B.
[2] Added with Lat. and Gen. xlvii. 23.
[3] Emended with Lat. from D.
[4] Emended with Lat.
[5] Emended with Lat.
[6] Slightly emended.

6. And he made them swear regarding his bones, for he knew that the Egyptians would not again bring forth and bury him in the land of Canaan, for Mâkamârôn, king of Canaan, while dwelling in the land of Assyria, fought in the valley with the king of Egypt and slew him there, and pursued after the Egyptians to the gates of Ermôn. 7. But he was not able to enter, for another, a new king, was ruling over Egypt, and he was stronger than he, and he returned to the land of Canaan, and the gates of Egypt were closed, and none went out and none came into Egypt. 8. And Joseph died in this forty-sixth jubilee, in the sixth week, in the second year, and they buried him in the land of Egypt, and all his brethren died after him. 9. And the king of Egypt went forth to war with the king of Canaan in the forty-seventh jubilee, in the second week in the second year, and the children of Israel brought forth all the bones of the children of Jacob save the bones of Joseph, and they buried them in the field in the double cave in the mountain. 10. And the most of them returned to Egypt, but a few of them remained in the mountains of Hêbrôn, and Abrâm thy father remained with them. 11. And the king of Canaan was victorious over the king of Egypt, and he closed the gates of Egypt. 12. And he devised an evil device against the children of Israel of afflicting them, and he said unto the people of Egypt: 13. "Behold the people of the children of Israel have increased and multiplied more than we. Come and let us deal wisely with them before they become too many, and let us afflict them with slavery before war come upon us and before they too fight against us; and they join themselves unto our[1] enemies and get them up out of our land, for their hearts and faces are towards the land of Canaan." 14. And he set over them taskmasters to afflict them with slavery; and they built strong cities for Pharaoh, Pîthô, and Râmsê,[2] and they built all the walls and all the fortifications which had fallen in the cities of Egypt. 15. And they made them serve with rigour, and the more they dealt evilly with them, the more they increased and multiplied. 16. And the people of Egypt abominated the children of Israel.

XLVII.—And in the seventh week, in the seventh year, in the forty-seventh jubilee, thy father went forth from the land of Canaan, and thou wast born in the fourth week, in the sixth year thereof, in the forty-eighth jubilee; this was the time of tribulation on the children of Israel. 2. And Pharaoh, king of Egypt, issued a command regarding them that they should cast all their male children which were born into the river. 3. And they cast them in for seven months until the day that thou wast born. And thy mother hid thee

[1] Restored from Lat.

[2] Lat. adds "and On."

for three months, and they told regarding her. 4. And she made an ark for thee, and covered it with pitch and asphalt, and placed it in the flags on the bank of the river, and she placed thee in it seven days, and thy mother came by night and suckled thee, and by day Miriam, thy sister, guarded thee from the birds. 5. And in those days Tharmuth, the daughter of Pharaoh, came to bathe in the river, and she heard thy voice crying, and she told her maidens[1] to bring thee forth, and they brought thee unto her. 6. And she took thee out of the ark, and she had compassion on thee. 7. And thy sister said unto her: "Shall I go and call unto thee one of the Hebrew women to nurse and suckle this babe for thee?" And she said unto her[2]: "Go." 8. And she went and called thy mother Jockabed, and she gave her wages, and she nursed thee. 9. And afterwards, when thou wast grown up, they brought thee unto the daughter[3] of Pharaoh, and thou didst become her son, and Ebrân thy father taught thee writing, and after thou hadst completed three weeks they brought thee into the royal court. 10. And thou wast three weeks of years in the court until the time when thou didst go forth from the royal court and didst see an Egyptian smiting thy friend who was of the children of Israel, and thou didst slay him and hide him in the sand. 11. And on the second day thou didst find two of the children of Israel striving together, and thou didst say to him who did the wrong: "Why dost thou smite thy brother?" 12. And he was angry and indignant, and said: "Who made thee a prince and a judge over us? Thinkest thou to kill me as thou killedst the Egyptian yesterday?" And thou didst fear and flee on account of these words.

XLVIII.—And in the sixth year of the third week of the forty-ninth jubilee thou didst depart and dwell in the land of Midian[4] five weeks and one year. And thou didst return into Egypt in the second week in the second year of the fiftieth jubilee. 2. And thou thyself knowest what he spake unto thee on Mount Sinai, and what Prince Mastema desired to do with thee when thou wast returning into Egypt on the way when thou didst meet him at the lodging-place.[5] 3. Did he not with all his power seek to slay thee and deliver the Egyptians out of thy hand when he saw that thou wast sent to execute judgment and vengeance on the Egyptians?" 4. And I delivered thee out of his hand, and thou didst perform the signs and wonders which thou wast sent to perform in Egypt against Pharaoh,

---

[1] Emended by Dillmann.
[2] Restored from Lat.
[3] Emended from Exod. ii. 13.
[4] Restored from Lat. and Exod. ii. 15.
[5] Emended by comparison of Lat. and Exod. iv. 24.

and against all his house, and against his servants and his people. 5. And the Lord executed a great vengeance on them for Israel's sake, and smote them[1] through (the plagues of) blood and frogs, lice and dogflies, and malignant boils breaking forth in blains; and their cattle by death; and by hail-stones, thereby he destroyed everything that grew for them; and by locusts which devoured everything which had been left by the hail, and by darkness; and by the death of[2] the first-born of men and animals, and on all their idols the Lord took vengeance and burned them with fire. 6. And everything was sent through thy hand, that thou shouldest do (these things) before they were done, and thou didst tell it to the king of Egypt before all his servants and before his people. 7. And everything took place according to thy words; ten great and terrible judgments came on the land of Egypt that thou mightest execute vengeance on it for Israel. 8. And the Lord did everything for Israel's sake, and according to his covenant, which he had ordained with Abraham that he would take vengeance on them as they had brought them by force into bondage. 9. And Prince Mastema set himself against thee, and sought to cast thee into the hands of Pharaoh, and he helped the Egyptian sorcerers, and they set themselves against (thee), and they wrought before thee. 10. The evils indeed we permitted them to work, but the remedies we did not allow to be wrought by their hands. 11. And the Lord smote them with malignant ulcers, and they were not able to stand, for we destroyed them so that they could not perform a single sign. 12. And by all (these) signs and wonders Prince Mastema was put to shame[3] until he became powerful,[4] and cried to the Egyptians to pursue after thee with all the powers of the Egyptians, with their chariots, and with their horses, and with all multitudes of the peoples of Egypt. 13. And I stood between the Egyptians and Israel, and we delivered Israel out of his hand, and out of the hand of his people, and the Lord brought them through the midst of the sea as if it were dry land. 14. And all the peoples whom he brought to pursue after Israel, the Lord our God cast them into the midst of the sea, into the depths of the abyss beneath them, for the sake of the children of Israel; even as the people of Egypt had cast their children into the river, he took vengeance on 1,000,000 of them, and one thousand strong and energetic men were destroyed on account of one suckling of the children of thy people which they had cast into the river. 15. And on the fourteenth day and on the fifteenth and on the sixteenth and on the seventeenth and on the eighteenth Prince

---

[1] MSS. add "and slew them" against Lat.

[2] Text restored.

[3] MSS. insert a negative.

[4] Or "devised a plan," A.

Mastema was bound and imprisoned behind the children of Israel that he might not accuse them. 16. And on the nineteenth we let them loose that they might help the Egyptians and pursue the children of Israel. 17. And he hardened their hearts and made them stiffnecked, and the device was devised by the Lord our God that he might smite the Egyptians and cast them into the sea. 18. And on the seventeenth we bound him that he might not accuse the children of Israel on that day when they asked the Egyptians for vessels and garments, vessels of silver, and vessels of gold, and vessels of bronze, in order to despoil the Egyptians in return for the bondage in which they had forced them to serve. 19. And we did not cause the children of Israel to go forth from Egypt empty handed.

XLIX.—Remember the commandment which the Lord commanded thee concerning the passover, that thou shouldst celebrate it in its season on the fourteenth of the first month, that thou shouldst kill it before evening, and that they should eat it by night on the evening of the fifteenth from the time of the setting of the sun. 2. For on that night it was the beginning of the festival and the beginning of the joy—ye were eating the passover in Egypt, when all the powers of Mastema had been let loose to slay all the first-born in the land of Egypt, from the first-born of Pharaoh to the first-born of the captive maid-servant in the mill, and to the cattle. 3. And this is the sign which the Lord gave them : Into every house on the lintels of which they saw the blood of a lamb of the first year, into that house they should not enter to slay, but should pass (by it), that all those should be saved that were in the house because the sign of the blood was on its lintels. 4. And the powers of the Lord did everything according as the Lord commanded them, and they passed by all the children of Israel, and no plague came upon them to destroy from amongst them the soul of either cattle, or man, or dog. 5. And the plague was very grievous in Egypt, and there was no house in Egypt where there was not one dead, and weeping and lamentation. 6. And all Israel was eating the flesh of the paschal lamb, and drinking the wine, and they lauded and blessed, and gave thanks to the Lord God of their fathers, and were ready to go forth from under the yoke of Egypt, and from the evil bondage. 7. And remember thou this day all the days of thy life, and observe it from year to year all the days of thy life, once a year, on its day, according to all the law thereof, and do not change the day from (its) day, or from month to month. 8. For it is an eternal ordinance, and engraven on the heavenly tables regarding the children of Israel that they should observe it every year on its day once a year, throughout all their generations ; and there is no limit of days, for

this is ordained for ever. 9. And the man who is free from uncleanness, and does not come to observe it on occasion of its day, so as to bring an acceptable offering before the Lord, and to eat and to drink before the Lord on the day of that festival, that man who is clean and close at hand shall be cut off, because he offered not the oblation of the Lord in its appointed season, he shall bear his own sin. 10. Let the children of Israel come and observe the passover on the day of its fixed time, on the fourteenth day of the first month, between the evenings from the third part of the day to the third part of the night, for two portions of the day are given to the light, and a third part to the evening. 11. This is that which the Lord commanded thee that thou shouldst observe it between the evenings. 12. And it is not permissible to slay it at any hour of the light, but on the hour bordering on the evening, and let them eat it at the time of the evening until the third part of the night, and whatever is left over of all its flesh on the third part of the night and onwards, let them burn it with fire. 13. And they shall not cook it with water, nor shall they eat it raw, but roast on the fire : They shall eat it [1] with haste,[2] its head with the inwards thereof and its legs [3] they shall roast with fire, and not break any bone thereof ; for there will be no tribulation among the children of Israel on that day.[4] 14. For this reason the Lord commanded the children of Israel to observe the passover on the day of its fixed time, and they shall not break a bone thereof ; for it is a festival day, and a day commanded, and there may be no change from it day to day, and month to month, but on the day of its festival let it be observed. 15. And do thou command the children of Israel to observe the passover throughout their days, every year, once a year on the day of its fixed time, and it will come for a memorial well pleasing before the Lord, and no plague will come upon them to slay or to smite in that year in which they celebrate the passover in its season in every respect according to his command. 16. And they shall not eat it outside the sanctuary of the Lord, but before the sanctuary of the Lord, and all the people of the congregation of Israel shall celebrate it in its appointed season. 17. Every man who has come upon its day shall eat it in the sanctuary of your God before the Lord from twenty years old and upward ; for thus is

---

[1] Emended with Lat.

[2] Eth. renders "with care," and Lat., "*diligenter*" ; but as they are both renderings of בְּחִפָּזוֹן, Exod. xii. 11, I have translated accordingly.

[3] Eth. Lat. LXX., Exod. xii. 9, and Vulg., render "feet," but I have rendered "legs," as more truly representing כְּרָעָיו.

[4] Corrected from Lat. Eth. MSS. give, for "no bone of the children of Israel shall be broken."

it written and ordained that they should eat it in the sanctuary of the Lord. 18. And when the children of Israel come into the land which they are to possess, into the land of Canaan, and have set up the tabernacle of the Lord in the midst of the land in one of their tribes until the sanctuary of the Lord has been built in the land, let them come and celebrate the passover in the midst of the tabernacle of the Lord, and let them slay it before the Lord from year to year. 19. And in the days when the house has been built in the name of the Lord in the land of their inheritance, they shall go there and slay the passover lamb in the evening, at sunset, at the third part of the day. 20. And they shall offer its blood on the threshold of the altar, and place its fat on the fire which is upon the altar, and they shall eat its flesh roasted with fire in the court of the house which has been sanctified in the name of the Lord. 21. And they will not be able to celebrate the passover in their cities, or in any place save before the tabernacle of the Lord, or before his house where his name dwells ; they will not go astray from the Lord. 22. And do thou, Moses, command the children of Israel to observe the ordinances of the passover, as it was commanded unto thee ; declare thou unto them every year, and the day of its days, and the festival of unleavened bread, that they should eat unleavened bread seven days, (and) that they should observe its festival, and that they bring an oblation every day during those seven days of joy before the Lord on the altar of your God. 23. For ye celebrated this festival with haste when ye went forth from Egypt till ye entered into the wilderness of Sûr ; for on the shore of the sea ye completed it.

L.—And after this law I made known to thee the days of the Sabbaths in the desert of Sinai, which is between Elam and Sinai. 2. And I told thee of the Sabbaths of the earth on Mount Sinai, and I told thee of the years of Jubilee in the Sabbaths of years : but the year thereof I did not tell thee till ye entered the land which ye were to possess. 3. And the land also shall keep its Sabbaths while they dwell upon it, and these shall know the year of Jubilee. 4. Wherefore I have ordained for thee the year-weeks and the years and the jubilees : there are forty-nine jubilees from the days of Adam until this day, and one week and two years : and there are yet forty years to come (lit. "distant") for learning the commandments of the Lord, until they pass over into the land of Canaan, crossing the Jordan to the west. 5. And the jubilees will pass by, until Israel is cleansed from all guilt of fornication, and uncleanness, and pollution, and sin, and error, and dwells safely in all the land, and there will be no more an adversary (lit. a Satan) or any evil one, and the land will be clean from

that time for evermore. 6. And behold the commandment regarding the Sabbaths I have written down for thee, and all the judgments of its laws. 7. Six days shalt thou labour, but on the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord your God. In it ye shall do no manner of work, ye and your sons, and your men-servants and your maid-servants, and all your cattle, and the sojourner also who is with you. 8. And the man that does any work on it shall die: whoever desecrates that day, whoever lies with a wife, or whoever says he will do something on it, so as to set out on a journey thereon [1] regarding [2] any buying or selling: and whoever draws water which he had not prepared on the sixth day, and whoever takes a burden to carry it out of his tent or out of his house shall die. 9. Ye shall do no work whatever on the Sabbath day save what ye have prepared for yourselves on the sixth day, so as to eat, and drink, and rest, and keep Sabbath from all work on that day, and to bless the Lord your God, who has given you a day of festival, and a holy day, and a day of the holy kingdom for all Israel: such is that day among their days for all days. 10. For great is the honour which the Lord has given to Israel that they should eat and drink and be satisfied on that festival day, and rest thereon from all labour which belongs to the labour of the children of men, save burning frankincense and bringing oblations and sacrifices before the Lord for [3] days and for [3] Sabbaths. 11. This work alone shall be done on the Sabbath-days in the sanctuary of the Lord your God; that they may atone for Israel with sacrifice continually from day to day for a memorial well-pleasing before the Lord, and that he may receive them always from day to day according as thou hast been commanded. 12. And every man who does any work thereon or goes a journey or tills (his) land, whether in his house or any other place, and whoever lights a fire, or rides on any beast, or travels by ship on the sea, and whoever strikes or kills anything, or slaughters a beast or a bird, or whoever catches an animal or a bird or a fish, or whoever fasts or makes war on the Sabbaths: 13. The man who does any of these things on the Sabbath shall die, so that the children of Israel shall observe the Sabbaths according to the commandments regarding the Sabbaths of the land, as it is written in the tables, which he gave into my hands that I should write out for thee the laws of the seasons, and the seasons according to the division of their days.

Herewith is completed the account of the division of the days.

R. H. Charles.

---

[1] Or "say thereon regarding to some work that he will do it early thereon." (B.)

[2] MSS. "and regarding."

[3] Or "of."

CRITICAL NOTICES.

Eduard König's "Introduction to the Old Testament."

(*Collection of Theological Manuals.* Part II., 1st Section. Bonn, 1893.)

THE above-named work has been added to the various manuals containing introductions to the Old Testament. The reasons which induced the author to work up afresh the materials contained in the many excellent treatises which have appeared until now are briefly stated in the Preface. The author's intention is to give the "casting vote" to the evidence afforded by the History of Language "in determining the problems connected with the History of Literature in the Old Testament." The author says further that "he had to offer the results of recent investigations with regard to many points in connection with the History of the Text, the Canon, and the Rules for the Exegesis of the Old Testament."

As a matter of fact, the chief stress has been placed upon these latter points, which have been treated in much more detail than in those works which have hitherto appeared upon the subject. It can only be determined after mature investigation, a task which would require much time, how far our author has succeeded in finding a solution for the problems connected with the History of Biblical Literature by bringing to bear upon these problems new observations with regard to the historical development of the Hebrew language within the range of the Old Testament. We shall, therefore, pass over this portion of the book. We shall also omit to notice those parts in which the author does not promise anything new upon the question, and simply confine ourselves to those divisions which treat of the "Sources and Adventures of the Text," "the History of the Collection and the Canon of the Old Testament, and the History of the rules and methods of Exegesis."

We are pleased to be able to state that the author has treated the History of the Text as well as that of the Exegesis of the Old Testament upon a much broader basis than has been the case in former Introductions. He has, in a comprehensive and scholarly manner, laid under contribution the literature of the 17th and 18th centuries devoted to the subject, and with exemplary industry made himself

acquainted with the later Jewish literature. We can easily convince ourselves of the results of such labours, on comparing the striking portions of the Introduction under review with the corresponding portions of preceding works. But, as it generally happens with attempts in a new field, misconceptions and errors are not wanting, even in this instance. A mistake may be easily made when travelling along untrodden paths, and it is no reproach to an author to say that he has not always hit on the right thing. In order, therefore, to anticipate the danger which might threaten such as are little acquainted with this branch, and likely to be misled by relying on the reputation of the author, I herewith submit the following corrections :—

On p. 18 the author quotes from the *Mischna Shabbath*, IX. 6, לְגוֹנָן. This form, which is apparently a noun, does not occur at all. There occurs in the *Editio princeps* of Surrenhusius' edition of the Mishna and in all the editions of which I have availed myself, שמצניעין אותן לְגַוְנָן. The Waw is *mater lectionis* for a short kametz. In the same part we find תלמיד חכם, translated "a wise Talmudist," instead of "a scholar." On p. 20 there is the question concerning תם כתב and וועלש כתב. The first expression is correctly brought by Hävernick in connection with כתיבה תמה (*Shabbath*, 103*b*; cf. *Sifre*, II. 36). König rejects this explanation and says, "As regards determining the age of scrolls written in Tam-character, the character would simply offer a *terminus a quo*, if we say that this style of writing received its form from a grandson of Rashi, named Tam, viz., in the 12th century, which would seem more natural in the case of Tam-Tephillin and Rashe-Ksaf (Tychsen, *Tent.*, 267), than, *e.g.*, to assume, with Havernick, § 50, that Tam-Ksaf is derived from כתיבה תמה (*Shabbath*, 103*b*) *i.e.*, faultless style of writing." Such a statement dare not be repeated. Tam Tephillin (correctly Tephillin of Rabbi Jacob = Tam, according to Gen. xxv. 27) has no reference to the art of writing, but to the contents of the capsules (phylacteries), in which point R. Jacob differed from his grandfather; but here is not the place to discuss the point. Rashi-kethab is the name, at the present day, of the character in which the commentaries are printed in the Bible editions. I am unable to assert how old this expression may be.

On p. 29 we read, in inverted commas, thus:— "A book which is not corrected (מוגה), R. Ame adds, within thirty days, may be (מוּתָּר) destroyed" (*Kethuboth*, 19*b*). In the passage referred to we read:— אתמר ספר שאינו מוגה אמר רבי אמי עד שלשים יום מותר לשהותו מכאן ואילך אסור לשהותו שנאמר אל תשכן באהליך עולה, which means that one may keep a book uncorrected for thirty days (according to Job xi. 14), after which time it has to be corrected. König read instead

of לשחותו, לשחֲותו, which could not have happened had he read the continuation of the verse quoted.

Ib., line 2:—"The Scroll of the Law 'dare not be placed on its face, *i.e.*, so that the beginning lies underneath,'" etc. The reference is to *Sopherim*, III. 14 (no source is given), and should be translated: "The Scroll of the Law dare not be placed upon the written side" (cf. *Erubin*, 98*a*).

Page 30 deals with the various versions of the account concerning the three Scrolls of the Law found in the Temple court. In treating (p. 35, n. 2) of the oldest source, our author should not have omitted *Sifre* II. 3, 5, 6. Furthermore, we must bear in mind that the account in *Sopherim* 6, 4, cannot possibly be the most ancient, for the simple reason that it is adduced in the name of Simon ben Lakish, an Amora living in the third century, and is consequently later than the account given in *Sifre* and the Jerusalem Talmud (*Tuanith*, 68*a*), in which it is given anonymously as a Baraitha. From internal evidence also the text in *Sopherim* appears a derivative one, for a copy can surely not be called "Book with היא," if the היא does not once appear in the Kethib of the same. This would certainly be, according to Prof. König's conception, a *lucus a non lucendo*. The missing eleventh היא in *Aboth de R. Nathan*, c. 34, which is left out by Müller, Schechter (in his edition, 1887) and König, might be contained in the verse quoted from Genesis xx. 5, if we presuppose that not alone והיא but also the expression immediately preceding, אחותי הוא, has, contrary to the Massora, to be written with Yod.

On p. 31 we find לְגַנַּאי instead of לְגִנַּאי. The word is derived from the Aramaic, and there is no reason for punctuating it otherwise than as Aramaic, which, by the way, corresponds to the traditional pronunciation.

On pp. 32, 33, the author tacitly assumes my explanation of the dot over the Yod in וביניך (Gen. xvi. 5) [*Masoretische Untersuchungen*, pp. 17, etc.]. I cannot understand why in place of the classical passage in *Sifre* (on Numbers ix. 10) the derivative later source, *Numeri Rabba* (on III. 39) is quoted. Regarding the controversy (*ib.* Note), I will only state that I did say in my work, p. 7, that the dots called for a settlement, but not that the reading proposed through them was the "only correct one." It follows beyond doubt from the explanation concerning these dots in *Sifre* and other passages, that (as I have proved) in place of the elements of the text which were dotted, others had to be put. Why, König himself assumes this. But this does not imply that the text proposed, which perchance rested upon some MS. as a basis, was the better one, or had more evidence in its favour. Were this the case, it would undoubtedly have been admitted into

the text, and the reading which we have now in the text would have been marked by dots. The objection that no other reading is expressly proposed has no force, if we consider that the dots point back to the time in which no marginal notes were thought of. In support of this assertion, we may instance what has already been said concerning מעון (Deut. xxxiii. 27), where the better reading was simply admitted into the text without attention being called, by means of a marginal note, to the other reading. König might just as well have offered the objection against his own view, inasmuch as he assumes that, by means of the dots, another reading is suggested. Why is the other reading not noted in the margin ?

Page 35 (§ 11) deals with "the old Jewish practical labours with regard to the text of the Old Testament which are not mentioned in the Talmud." The author's intention is to bring forward such data bearing upon the history of the text as were not yet known in Talmudic times; and yet he adduces in the first instance the "Emendations of the Sopherim," of which eleven already appear in the *Mechilta*. This is the more surprising as our author himself mentions the *Mechilta*. One error occasions another, for, from the circumstance that the *Tiqqûn Sopherim* are not mentioned in the Talmud, he draws a chronological deduction. He remarks, namely, on p. 41:—"It is unsafe to refer the *Tiqqûn Sopherim* back to Ezra (§ 11, etc.), if only on account of the consideration that this questionable correction was not mentioned in the Talmud."

Page 36. סבירין does not mean "to propose a marginal reading," at least it is not the sense in which those instances have to be taken which occur in large number in our present Massora. The said expression denotes, "one might think," "one might wrongly opine." Originally סבירין might perhaps have had something of a polemical character, designed against the current reading (Geiger), but the greater part of those instances occurring in the present Massora are simply intended to prevent a possible error. Our author's statement is peculiar, when he says:—"The view of Capellus (3, 15, 19), that Qarjan and Sebirin simply imply the difference between older and later proposals, does not receive strong confirmation, but he might have brought forward in their favour that the name of the first generation of the post-Talmudic doctors was Saboreans, *i.e.*, authors of a mere סברה 'opinion.'" What is meant to be proved by this reference? That סבר=to opine? Or is König of opinion that the Saboreans were already styled thus by their contemporaries? Or are the Saboreans the authors of the סבירין? (Cf. also pp. 48 and 131.)

Page 40. "Jerome has, it is true, described the dotting in Gen. xix. 33 as one clearly shown in the text ('Adpungunt de super, etc.'), while, in reality, he adopts some of the Qeres by preference."

The dots are perhaps 500 years earlier than Jerome, as is proved by the sources themselves. It will, therefore, not do to mislead the reader by means of such quotations as to the age of these dots.

On p. 47, line 16, read (instead of דומי) רומי = Rome.

Of p. 84, n. 1, it should be observed that I have not contested the hanging Nun in מנשה (Judges xviii. 30), since I stated clearly (*Massoretische Untersuchungen*, 49), that it probably arose about 300. I only made the remark, which is of secondary importance, that "that no mention is made," in *Baba Bathra*, "that the Nun is a hanging one."

It is to be regretted that our author, who admits the results of my investigations, in spite of his objections against subordinate points, which, however, need scarcely be taken into account, yet again elects to throw a dangerous obscurity about the proper understanding of the Talmudic-Massoretic quotations by means of such expressions as the following (p. 84):—"The declaration of the Talmud on Judges xviii. 30 is a support of the opinion that also other peculiarities in the traditional Hebrew Old Testament were introduced, in order that meanings might be attached to them, *e.g.*, in the case of the broken Waw in שלום, which might hint at the idea that the peace of God made with Phineas, the son of Eliezer, has suffered a break, etc." No, this was not the case. The Doctors of the Talmud neither added to nor altered the sacred text by one iota for the sake of making it a peg on which to hang some lesson; they might as well have altered every letter, for some meaning attaches itself to every tittle. All that can be established is this: that, whenever anything abnormal existed in the text, some meaning was given to it, or that through an explanation based upon a misconception, an alteration of the text crept in; but never did it occur in the historical period of the history of the Text that an opportunity was taken to alter the text with the object of making it serve mnemonic purposes. It is time that such an antiquated view be dismissed once and for all.

According to this explanation we shall also have to reject the statement made on page 87, to the effect that "there is some basis for the opinion that the abnormal appearances in the M. T. were, at least partially, brought out for the express purpose of hinting at theories." Not a single passage can be adduced from Jewish Traditional Literature in support of such an opinion.

On p. 90 there is an endeavour to prove "that even in the editing of the Talmud there was not the most scrupulous care exercised as regards quotations . . . . For, as an instance, corresponding to לא תשוב (Deut. xxiv. 19), we have בל תשוב, *Mischna Pea*, 6, 4. There can be no doubt that the לא was changed into the בל which in

the Old Testament has the character rather of the dialectic and later Hebrew."

There can be no doubt that the לא and בל did not interchange, for both Mishna and Talmud quote the prohibitions mostly with בל and not with לא. For this kind of interchange one could instance hundreds of examples (*e.g.*, בל תסיף בל תגרע, Deut. iv. 2, in *Rosh Hashana*, 28*b*; בכל יראה ובכל ימצא, Exod. xii. 19; xiii. 7 in *Mishna Pesachim*, iii. 3, and ix. 3, etc.). In such and similar examples, it is not *a passage from the Text* that is quoted, but *the command itself* that is quoted, and this escaped the notice of König.

Notice to p. 98, n. 1, that the השם of the Samaritans is a periphrasis of the Tetragrammaton.

On p. 106, n. 4, the following passage (*Megilla*, 9*a*), ונכנס אצל כל אחד ואחד=(King Ptolemy) went unto each individual (scholar), is translated thus: "And each one was collected apart." How can an *individual* be collected? The author confounded נכנם with כנס.

On p. 108, וקילסו אותו (J. *Megilla*, i. 11 [71*c*, l. 12]), which means "they praised him" (the translator, Aquila), is translated, "And they considered him beautiful." Really one should not allow himself to be deceived by such questionable etymology (קלס and καλως).

We shall refrain from further observations touching individual statements contained in this first sub-division, as these will be treated elsewhere; and we pass over to the third and fourth sub-divisions which are devoted to the History of the Collection and Canon of the Old Testament and History of its Exegesis.

Page 446. The Baraitha *Baba Bathra*, 14*b*, concerning the order and editing of the several books of the Old Testament is put three centuries too late. Some Baraithas only received their final form in the first half of the third century, *i.e.*, after that time no more of them were composed; but it cannot on that account be said that every Baraitha originates from the same period. By far the greater portion of these traditions may be traced at least one century further back, and specially the one Baraitha referred to bears the impress of its age on the face of it, because, in the first place, no author is mentioned therein; and secondly there is no mention of any controversy, both of which circumstances point infallibly to an earlier period. On the same page we meet with the peculiar statement, that the first mention that is made of the prophets Haggai and Zechariah having belonged to the Great Synagogue is to be found in the passage of the *Dikd. Hat.*, 57, referring to Moses ben Asher (c. 900). Why, the Talmud already presupposes the fact that they did belong to it. Compare the passages of the Talmud which Fürst has collected in his *Kanon des A.T.*, p. 47, n. 8.

Page 447, n. 2. This is not clear to me.

We need not criticise what our author on pp. 452-3 has to say with reference to the idea contained in גנז, inasmuch as it would carry us too far. We would but remark that שהיו דבריו סותרים זה את זה (*Shabbath*. 30*b*) cannot be rendered, "because his words *obscured* one the other." It is correctly given in parenthesis as "contradict." The literal meaning of סתר here is "pulling down," and not "obscuring."

Page 457. "Or when Solomon is called a prophet in the Æthiopic Church." Why does our author not mention the Talmud also, considering that he cites *Sota*, 48*b*, and translates this passage (447, n. 2)?

Pages 458 and 144. In the latter passage we read: "Perhaps we should not overlook this point, that Christ many a time omits all mention of the name of Moses in those cases in which he refers to the Laws of the Pentateuch. Cf. the passive 'It is said' with the active, 'But I say unto you' (Matt. v. 21, 27, 31, 33, 38, 43). It can consequently not be insisted upon that the sayings of Christ were bound to be reproductions with literary historical accuracy." How incorrect this whole method of proving things is may be realised when we call to mind that, in Jewish tradition, the passages of the text are usually quoted with the expression שנאמר—"it is said." This minor point proves once again that, in questions of this sort, it is unsafe to take a single step without an exact knowledge of Jewish literature.

Page 466. "Zunz, 7, cites *Sabbath*, 116*b*. There it states, "In [Bab.] Nehardea they took as the Perikope a section of the Kethubim at the meat-offering of the Sabbath." What offerings were brought in Bab. Nehardea in the third century? The meat-offering has been derived from the slavish rendering of the two words במנחתא דשבתא =at the *Afternoon Service* of the Sabbath.

Page 477, line 15 from below. It should have been stated that it ought to have read, ויברך את טוביה ואת אשתו.

Page 514. To be brief, הלכה comes from the Aramaic; משפט (judgment), being translated by הֲלָכְתָא (*e.g.*, Ex. xxi. 7; xxvi. 30). Schürer, 2, 270, hits upon the right rendering when he says 'was gang und gabe ist." Etymologically הלכה is identical with מנהג. (Cf. J. *Shebiith*, iv. 1; 35*a*, line 24), as מְנַהֵג is also used for מְהַלֵּךְ (cf. Mech. xix. 4=62*b*, line 15, ed. Friedmann).

הַגָּדָה is originally, as Dr. Bacher has shown, nothing else than exegesis. König quotes Bacher's article, JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, 1892, but, strange to say, does not refer to this conclusion, and keeps to the erroneous translation "Verkündigen."

The inexperienced reader might easily contract wrong ideas from the following remarks regarding the inference *a majori ad minorem*

and *a minori ad majorem* : "I myself have found examples in Jerus. *Sanhedrin*, xii. 7, and in Rashi to Exod. xxii. 31 (p. 515)." The question turns upon an inference which occurs numberless times in the Talmuds and Midrashim ; how then can we refer to Rashi ? By the way, I cannot make out to what passage in Rashi reference is made, since Exod. xxii. has but 30 verses.

Page 516. The example for בנין אב is incorrect. The source is not added ; one is referred to Wähner (380, 402, 483), which, however, is inaccessible to me at present ; but Bechoroth 7*a* is meant. Upon closer investigation and comparison with Sifra to 11, 2 (ed. Weiss, 48*a*), we easily find that the passage of the Talmud under discussion has been misinterpreted, for it is not right to say that שה can only be one of the smaller cattle, the offspring of either two sheep or two goats.

"These seven rules which the well-known Hillel the Elder investigated (*Pirqê Aboth de R. Nathan* 35 *a* β), formed the foundation of the thirteen rules of Ishmael. To these were added 'the Rules of the Sages of the Gemara,' and the 'thirty-two Rules of R. Jose, the Galilean,' according to which the Haggada is investigated."

What is meant by the "Rules of the Sages of the Gemara," I really do not understand. We only know of the seven Rules of Hillel, the thirteen of Ishmael, and the thirty-two of Elieser ben Jose, the Galilean ; others are not known.

Ib. and p. 102. Concerning the use of letters for numerals (=Gematria) in Onkelos, the author cites (102) Numbers xii. 1, where האשה הכשית is rendered by אתתא שפירתא. Now Prof. König thinks that this rendering is only intelligible by reason of Rashi's remark כושית בגמטריא יפת מראה. This is undoubtedly incorrect, for the Targum, as far as I know, has not rendered one single passage upon the strength of a Gematria. The rendering in question springs from the explanation given in the *Sifre* i. 6 (Friedmann, 27*a*) ; מה כושי משונה בעורו כן צפורה משונה בנויה יותר מכל הנשים=Just as the Ethiopian differs in (the colour of) his skin, so was Zipporah different by virtue of her beauty from all other women. Cf. also 525, n. 2.

We should have liked more preciseness in settling the time of the composition of the Mishna. König states generally, "*c.* 180 A.D." (*e.g.*, 514) ; while on p. 522, *Mishna c.* 200" ; and 516, "*Doctors of the Mishna*, 30 B.C.—200 A.D." One and the same writer dare not admit now the date given by one scholar, now that given by another. I consider 220 to be the probable date of its redaction, but within the narrow limits of this notice it is impossible to enter into details. It is beyond doubt incorrect to place the date of the redaction of the Tosephta at "*c.* 400" (although this date has found its adherents), as it appears on p. 522 in the following statement which, in other

respects, is also erroneous: "The Palestinian Gemara (Completion, *c.* 350), and the Babylonian Gemara (*c.* 450), as also the additional [additional to what?] collected Tosephta (Addendum, *c.* 400)."

We should no longer use the term "Gemara," for the ancients knew only of the expression "Talmud"; besides, the translation "Completion" is incorrect, for גמר (from which the word גמרא is formed) also signifies in the Talmud "to learn," specially "to learn by heart," so that Gemara secondarily=Talmud.

We have to observe further, that it would be much nearer the mark to give *c.* 400 for the Jer. Talmud, and *c.* 500—550 for the Babylonian Talmud. This, too, is the place to remark upon the translation "investigations" for "Midrashim," which might lead to misconception, inasmuch as in the said works there are no "investigations." It is best to render the expression by "Commentaries," just as on the same page the author renders Mechilta "Sifre" and "Sifra," or "Agadic Commentaries," if one wishes to be particularly precise.

It is also incorrect to define the Pesikta as a Commentary, "giving reflections upon the Sabbath portions." In the first place it does not contain, as one would imagine from König's words, reflections upon all the Sabbath portions; and, secondly, it contains reflections also upon the Festival portions. (Cf. Zunz, *Gottesdien. Vorträge*, p. 190, etc., and Buber's Ed., 1868, III.)

The statement regarding the Midrash Rabba (*ib.*) is also very strange: "Somewhat later are the Rabboth, *i.e.*, the large Editions [with explanations] of the said Books, viz., the Pentateuch and the five Megilloth: Bereshith, Shemoth Rabba," etc. Such a description would be more appropriate for the large Rabbinic editing of the Bible מקראות גדולות, but not for the Midrash Rabba. The Rabboth are not large editions, with explanations, of the said Books, but agadic remarks upon them, of various lengths, and dating from different times.

The concluding words of the author of this work, which evidences so much scholarship and great industry, are devoted to the task of verifying passages from the Talmud. He says: "Many a time a '*sic*' or '!' is added to passages cited from the Talmud, as a sign that the respective quotations have been verified in accordance with past and modern information." Prof. König thus attaches, and rightly so, great importance to the correct interpretation and precise rendering of the texts quoted; I, therefore, cherish the pleasant hope that my remarks, aiming as they do for the most part at the same object, will be welcome to the esteemed author.

LUDWIG BLAU.

Budapest.

Introduction to the Talmud, by DR. HERMANN L. STRACK. Second edition; partly rewritten. Leipzig, 1894. viii. and 136 pp.

IT is most gratifying to see a second edition of the *Introduction to the Talmud;* it shows the interest which the study of the Talmud excites. To maintain and satisfy this interest the present volume has doubtless contributed to no small degree, and the second edition will intensify it.

The work contains everything which has reference to the study of the Talmud :—i. Prefatory Remarks (transcriptions, explanations of words, method of quotation) ; ii. Introduction to the Mishna (the Talmuds) and its parts ; iii. Contents of the Sixty-three Treatises of the Mishna ; iv. Treatises not belonging to the Canon ; v. History of the Talmud ; vi. Chronological Table of the Doctors of the Law ; vii. Characteristics of the Talmud ; viii. Literature. We only miss an estimate of the Talmud in its relation to the general literature of the human race, specially to that of Judaism, and as to what place it has taken, and does take, among the Jewish people. We think, too, that it might have been advisable to have said something of the elements of the Methodology of the Talmud.

As regards matters of detail, we would call the author's attention to the following :—In speaking, on p. 2, of משניות גדולות, which occurs in J. *Horajoth*, 48*c*., he translates the expression "large collections of Mishna." But the passage in question does not at all refer to the Mishna in our sense of the word, but to Baraitha ; this is evident from a comparison of parallel passages in *Cant. Rabba* on viii. 2, in which is added :—זה התלמוד שמפוטם במשנית כרקח, and in *Threni Rabba*, Introduction No. 23. It would have been better had the author adduced the more complete passage in *Koheleth Rabba* on xiii. 3, which is also supplemented by the words : זה התלמוד שבלול בהן, "the Baraithas are scattered throughout the Talmud."

On p. 3*c*. the expression ומה תלמוד לומר is wanting, meaning "What is the inference ?" *e.g*., *Aboth* V. 1.

On p. 4 the author defines Halacha "A mode of life regulated by the Law." This is never the meaning of the word. According to its etymology it would mean "an ordinance universally current." In speaking of הלכה למשה מסיני reference should have been made to Weiss' דור דור ודרשיו, I. 71.

At the top of p. 7 a few older names are given of several treatises of the Talmud ; the full names should have been given side by side with the shorter, *e.g*., שחיטת חולין next to חולין.

The author devotes, on p. 14, a somewhat lengthy note to the much-discussed word דמאי. My opinion is that it is derived from the Aramaic דמי=conjecture, *e.g.*, the well-known Talmudic expression בדמי, "to assert something upon the strength of conjecture," hence דמאי=corn, which, upon the strength of a supposition, has to be tithed.

P. 17. Note to דמע; reference should be made to the Biblical דמע, Exod. xxii. 28.

P. 22 to 7 add:—In the *Tosephta* the treatise *Beza* is always called *Jom Tob.* The Tosephists do not supplement Rashi (p. 115), but the Talmud; *vide* Güdemann, *Geschichte des Erziehungswesens in der Cultur der Juden in Frankreich und Deutschland* (p. 42).

The marginal notes occurring in the Talmud under the name of אין משפט refer not only to the corrections of the Halacha by Moses ben Maimon, Moses of Coucy, and Jacob ben Asher (p. 116), but also to the latest Ritual Code, viz., that of Joseph Karo.

The chapter on Literature requires a good deal of supplementing, although, considering the dimensions of modern Jewish literature, it would be difficult to attain completeness in this respect, nor would the attempt be of much avail. But under no circumstances should the following works be omitted:—Hirschfeld's *Halachische Exegese*, Derenbourg's *Histoire de la Palestine*, and Butt's *Mnemotechnik des Talmud.*

We would also call attention to these minor points:—P. 9, note 2, for עֲרָבִי read עַרְבִי; p. 6, etc., for טָהָרוֹת read טְהָרוֹת; the name of אבהו, one of the Amoraim, should be Abahu, not Abuha (p. 6, note); p. 18, רשות הרבים and not רשות; p. 52, חִשָּׁק שְׁלֹמֹה and not חִשָּׁק; p. 102, the Dagesh in שְׁהוּקַּשׁ is wrong, alter to שְׁהֻקַּשׁ, etc.; p. 103, § 3, has no heading, it should be headed "Specimen of Translation."

Printer's errors:—P. 16, שְׁנִי; p. 19, עִירוּבִין; p. 45, גרים; p. 66, סְבָרָה; p. 75, אֹמֶר instead of עוֹמֶר; p. 77, מרפון instead of טרפון; p. 101, אָבָל, etc.

These errors and differences which have here been pointed out can naturally not detract from the merit of the author's work; they have only been referred to with one object, and that is, that they may be corrected, should a third edition of this volume appear.

SAMUEL KRAUSS.

Gesammelte Abhandlungen zur Biblischen Wissenschaft, von DR. ABRAHAM KUENEN; *aus dem Holländischen übersetzt von* K. BUDDE. *Freiburg i. B. und Leipzig*, 1894, J. C. B. Mohr.

THE treatises collected in this volume have long since taken their place among standard authorities. Most Old Testament students are familiar with their titles, few probably with their contents. Buried in learned periodicals and written in Dutch, they have hitherto been inaccessible to the average reader. In the *Theol. Literaturzeitung*, of July 22nd, 1893, Prof. Budde, after paying an eloquent tribute to the life and labours of Dr. Kuenen, drew special attention to his articles in the *Theol. Tijdschrift* as the finest specimens of the critical method, and lamented the fact that no translation of them was to be had. A few days after the appearance of his article Prof. Budde received from the publishers a request to collect and translate this series of studies. The present volume is the result. It exhibits, we need hardly say, all the well-known characteristics of Kuenen's work, lucidity, directness, uncompromising honesty. The critical weapon is passionless cold steel of the finest temper, and it is wielded by the hands of a master.

Prof. Budde, in his interesting introduction, written with the enthusiasm of a disciple and the warmth of a personal friend, dwells upon the moral qualities of Kuenen's work. Spiritual interests are kept under studious reserve; they find expression in the manner, rather than in the matter of his treatment, the moral impression is conveyed in an intellectual form. There is something exhaustively satisfying in the whole process of the induction; we gird ourselves to new efforts as we follow him; his mastery takes hold of us; we are invigorated through and through. Hence this volume will serve the student as a drill-book in critical method. Robertson Smith once said that these studies are, perhaps, the finest things which modern criticism has to show; and Wellhausen has declared that the article on the Composition of the Sanhedrin would have been epoch-making if any one had read it.[1] Now, at last, it has been republished in a form which will enable it to produce on the many the effect which has, so far, been limited to the few.

The contents of this volume cover a wide range of subjects. An article on "Critical Method," which originally appeared in English in the *Modern Review*, 1880, comes first. It is important, as introducing

[1] *See* Prof. Wicksteed's appreciative article on Kuenen in Vol. IV., pp. 571-605 of this REVIEW.

us to the principles and point of view of the author. Next we have studies in post-biblical history, which discuss the composition of the Sanhedrin, the genealogy of the Massoretic text, and the men of the Great Synagogue. Then we are carried down to the Protestant Reformation in a review of Hugo Grotius' position as an interpreter of the Old Testament; then comes a discussion on the "Melecheth of heaven" in Jeremiah, and then a long investigation of the chronology of the Persian age. Thus far all these studies were first communicated in the form of academic lectures, and afterwards published in the Transactions of the Royal Academy of Sciences, Amsterdam. The articles which remain are collected, with one exception, from the *Theol. Tijdschrift* between 1880 and 1890. Most of them deal with the criticism of the Hexateuch and the history of Israel. They are, primarily, reviews of the works of Dillmann, Baudissin, Renan, Kittel, Baethgen, and others, as they appeared from time to time. New Testament criticism finds a place in a discussion on an extravagant theory of the origin of the Greek text. It must be confessed that these reviews are not so interesting, and do not possess the same quality of permanence, as the more directly constructive studies. Incidentally, of course, Kuenen takes occasion to state his own views while criticising those of others; but, as his own views are generally accompanied by a reference to the *Onderzoek* or the *Godsdienst*, they may be more conveniently consulted there. But it is highly instructive to observe the way in which Kuenen treats his authors, he is always so respectful and fair-minded, so ready with a word of approval whenever it can be given. Even the extravagancies of M. Vernes are dissected with the most patient care. There is not wanting, too, a certain amount of judicious banter; but what strikes us most is the clear thinking and firm statement by which all these reviews are marked.

The student will probably gain most from the studies which deal directly with obscure problems of criticism and history. Among these may be mentioned especially the article on Gen. xxxiv. (the avenging of Dinah)[1]; and on Ex. xvi. (manna and quails), where it is

[1] In Gen. xxxiv. 13 *all* the sons of Jacob form the treacherous plan to slay Shechem and his father; why, then, was it carried out by Simeon and Levi *alone*? Kuenen, p. 275, replies that Simeon and Levi, according to the earliest tradition (Gen. xlix. 5-7) must remain the principal actors; they were first in the field. But is this a sufficient explanation? According to another early tradition they and Dinah alone were the children of the same mother, Leah (Gen. xxix. 33 f. J; xxx. 21E). The two brothers would naturally be foremost in avenging the outrage upon their own sister.

noticeable that Kuenen parts company with Wellhausen and others, and refuses to assign any part of the chapter to J. It belongs, as a whole, he maintains, to the Priestly Document, the sections usually assigned to earlier narratives being due to interpolation or redaction (verses 4, 5, 25-30) influenced by a desire to lay additional emphasis upon the law of the Sabbath. Thus Ex. xvi. is to be regarded as the post-exilic counterpart to Num. xi. JE, which presents the ancient form of the manna and quails tradition.

It is beyond the scope of the present notice to give anything like an analysis of the different studies in this volume ; but it may not be out of place to introduce readers to what is, perhaps, the most generally interesting study of them all, and a characteristic specimen of Kuenen's treatment, the article on the Composition of the Sanhedrin (pp. 49-81). Without going into the details of his thorough-going discussion, we may briefly sum up the main results.

After noticing the great diversity of opinion among scholars on the subject of the Sanhedrin, some, as Zunz and Graetz, holding that it was a fundamental and regular part of the Jewish constitution from B.C. 142 to A.D. 70, with the "deliverers of tradition" as its presidents, others, as Jost, contending that it existed more in theory than in fact, its powers being usurped by the High-priesthood, Kuenen proceeds to examine the three authorities of highest rank — the Talmud, the New Testament, and Josephus.

a. The Sanhedrin of the Talmud is composed of seventy-one members,[1] under a Nasi, or president. The qualifications for membership are not clearly stated. "All have a voice in matters of taxation and finance (*i.e.*, can become members of the lesser Sanhedrins), but in matters of life and limb only priests, Levites, and those related to priestly families, can deliver judgment" (*i.e.*, are eligible for the Great Sanhedrin).[2] On the question of the appointment of members and of qualifications for the presidency no direct information is to be had. We infer that a reputation for wisdom, skill in the law, humility and obedience, would mark out a man as a suitable candidate for admission ; and we are told that a vacancy might be filled from the ranks of the "disciples of the wise" (תלמידי חכמים), the "disciple" being received into the Sanhedrin with a "laying-on of hands" (סמיכה). This Supreme Council was the ultimate court of appeal in all legal matters ; to transgress its decision was a graver offence than to transgress the law itself. The relations between the High Priest and the Sanhedrin are not defined ; but it is implied that he is not exempt from its jurisdiction. "The High Priest delivers judgment, but may himself be judged.[3] There is no trace in the Mishna that he

[1] *See* Num. xi. 4-34. [2] Mishna, *Sanh.* cap. iv. § 2. [3] *Sanh.* cap. ii. § 1.

was the regular president in virtue of his office. The "successors of the men of the Great Synagogue," Simon the Just, Antigonus of Socho, and the five "Pairs" (זוגות) who followed, down to Gamaliel and Simon II., that is from about B.C. 300 to A.D. 70, were regarded as the chief men in the Sanhedrin. These are described in the well-known passage in *Abôth* as the organs of tradition. In the case of the "Pairs," the first was the Nasi, the second the Ab-beth-dîn. Therefore we may conclude that the Sanhedrin, according to the Talmudic conception, was in the main *an assembly of Soferîm*, of those whose chief interest and experience was in the law in all its bearings. And yet it could not have been altogether occupied with the technicalities which chiefly concerned the Soferîm; as the constitutional embodiment of the Jewish State it had political and social functions to perform. Hence, it is probable that the strictly "legal" constituent was supplemented by another which was devoted to affairs.

b. From the Talmud we turn to the New Testament. The whole complexion of the case changes. The Sanhedrin is composed of "*chief priests, elders, and scribes.*" The "chief priests" are those who belong to eminent priestly families, related to the High Priest; the "elders" are probably laymen; the "scribes," of course, correspond to the Soferîm. It is further obvious that the High Priest (ὁ ἀρχιερεύς) is Nasi or President; it does not, however, follow that the Nasi, whether he were High Priest or some one else, would be called ὁ ἀρχιερεύς, such an every-day word could not have been used in more than one sense. In the New Testament, then, the High Priest is President of the Sanhedrin. It follows that the statements of the Mishna with regard to the succession of Nasis are untrustworthy. A further proof of this is the account in Acts v. 34-40 of Gamaliel. He is none other than the grandson of Hillel, and according to the Talmud a Nasi of the Sanhedrin; but in the narrative of S. Luke he is merely "a Pharisee, a doctor of the law, had in honour of all the people." He stands up and speaks in the Council, and delivers his opinion; but it is as an ordinary member, not as president.

c. It is clear that the New Testament does not agree with the Talmud on this subject, nor does Josephus. In the account which he gives[1] of the summoning of Herod before the Sanhedrin in the reign of Hyrcanus II. (B.C. 47) we find that the High Priest, who is also the Prince, is the President of the Sanhedrin, and that Sameas,[2] who

---

[1] *Ant.* xiv. 9, §§ 3-5.

[2] It is uncertain whether Σαμέας is שמעון בן שטח or שמעיה. In either case the argument above holds good; for שמעון would be Ab-beth-dîn and שמעיה Nasi; neither of them, therefore, ordinary members. See Strack, *Die Sprüche der Väter*, p. 12, note *h*.

according to the Talmud was a Nasi, is only an ordinary member. Again, in two later passages[1] Josephus tells us that the High Priest Hanan II. summoned a *συνέδριον κριτῶν* on his own authority, and that Agrippa was petitioned by Levites to call a meeting of the Sanhedrin to obtain a change of law in their favour, and with the consent of the Council their appeal was allowed by the King. Once more Josephus, in the account of his dealings with the Sanhedrin, expressly distinguishes Simon, the son of Gamaliel, from Ananus (Hanan II.), the High Priest[2]; the former is "of the city of Jerusalem, and of a very noble family, of the sect of the Pharisees," certainly not the Nasi as represented in the Talmud.

Thus we see that Josephus agrees with the New Testament as against the Talmud, and the evidence of the two former is all the more impressive from the very fact that it is obtained only from incidental references. In fact, the *name* of the Supreme Council is almost the only point common to the three authorities. Having discussed the constitutional question, the historical naturally comes next. Does the history of the Jews in the centuries immediately before and after the Christian era admit of the existence of such a body as the Talmud describes? Passing over the details which Kuenen gives in support of his answer, we will notice only the leading conclusions. They are these :—

a. The form of government under which the Jews lived after the time of Alexander the Great was practically an aristocracy, or, as as Josephus puts it, a *πολιτεία ἀριστοκρατικὴ μετ' ὀλιγαρχίας*. The High Priest was the head of the State; he was associated in authority with the chief priests (*οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς*), *i.e.*, members of the great priestly families who had a seat and voice in the council, supported the policy of their chief, and set the tone of the government. Class rule was the order of the day, and the class-rulers were the priests—*ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς καὶ ἡ γερουσία*. The Sanhedrin represented the aristocratic form of government. This exactly tallies with the accounts in the New Testament and Josephus.

b. The Sanhedrin must have existed from at least the third century B.C. The first mention of it by name occurs in Josephus' account of Hyrcanus II. (above), but a royal edict shows that a *γερουσία* existed in the time of Antiochus the Great (203 B.C.), while the Books of Maccabees imply that the High Priest was at the head of it. This council was distinct from the *δῆμος*, and closely connected with "elders and priests." It is difficult to date the origin of the national senate earlier than the beginning of the Greek age (330 B.C.). It may have been suggested by the national reforms

[1] *Ant.* xx. 9, § 1 and § 6. [2] *Life*, § 38.

inaugurated by Ezra and Nehemiah, but as an institution it is unknown at that early period. The Talmud refers its foundation to Moses, but this, of course, cannot be supported any more than the view that it existed in the days of Ezra, which can only be true if we suppose, as some have done, that "the Great Synagogue" was the older name of the Sanhedrin. Now in *Abôth*, "the Great Synagogue" precedes the "Pairs," *i.e.*, the Presidents. But we have seen that the latter are unhistorical, that, in fact, the Sanhedrin was not composed as the Talmud describes it. The entire conception of this piece of ancient history is therefore seriously discounted, in fact, it is impossible to accept it. "The Great Synagogue" may correspond to the Sanhedrin of the Talmud, but it has little or nothing in common with the Sanhedrin of history.

c. We are now in a position to account for the development which the Sanhedrin underwent in the course of its existence. That changes, due partly to political necessity, partly to religious feeling, were gradually introduced into its constitution is only what we should expect. From Josephus, and from the New Testament, it is evident that at least as early as Hyrcanus II., and down to the destruction of Jerusalem, the Soferîm or law-men had a place in the assembly. Was this the case from the first? If not, when did the change come about? We have seen that the government of the State was in the hands of the priests and their families. Their first concern was religion, but they were bound also to pay attention to politics. Another party, however, was rising into power and influence, the party of men whose sole interest was the Law and the national traditions. They were "the men of the people," uncompromising champions of the national faith, exclusive in their view of what the relations should be between Israel and other peoples. By degrees they forced their way into prominence; it became impossible to exclude them from the national senate, and in time the democracy of the Law became established in opposition to the aristocracy of the Priesthood. The rebellion against Antiochus Epiphanes was the turning-point in the accession of this democratic party to power; they claimed to be the guardians of the inheritance of Israel; they were ready to fight and to die for the faith of their fathers; in the eye of the nation they were the true Israelites.[1] As they gained predominance in the State the old aristocracy died out, although the traditions of the priestly party survived, and from time to time recovered their supremacy. But henceforth the party of the Law became a determining factor in the government. The Talmud itself preserves the tradition of the accession of this party to a share in the counsels of the nation. It says that John

[1] Dan. xi. 33, 35; xii. 3.

Hyrcanus established the "Pairs." However unhistorical this may be, it probably contains an element of fact, namely, that the Hasmonean High Priests sanctioned the entry of the Soferîm into the Sanhedrin.

The question remains, how did the Talmudic conception of the Sanhedrin arise? It is hardly necessary to say that the Mishna and Gemara were committed to writing long after the aristocracy had lost their power by the break-up of the Jewish State. By that time the party of the Law was supreme; and the doctors of the Talmud held that the constitution which they were familiar with was the constitution which had existed from the first. At the same time, their view contained some details of fact. It is an interesting point to work out the unmistakable connection between the Talmudic view and Num. xi. Either the Jews conceived their Sanhedrin on the model of Num. xi., or the latter must be a post-exilic interpolation. But this is impossible; for Num. xi. is an early and independent document. Therefore, we conclude that the Talmudic doctors fashioned a more or less ideal constitution on the basis of the Mosaic ordinance, and at the same time connected it, according to their lights, with what they knew of the history of their national senate.

It only remains to be said that the translation which Prof. Budde has given us reads extremely well, and bears clear traces of the scholar-like and vigorous hand from which it comes. It is a matter for congratulation that Prof. Budde has found time in the midst of his own multifarious labours to confer this boon upon all students of the Old Testament, who, as they use it, will realise afresh how much they owe to the master-mind of Kuenen.

Magdalen College, Oxford. G. A. Cooke.

Maimonides' Arabic Commentary on the Mishnah.

It was the merit of Pocock, the great collector of Hebrew and Arabic MSS. in the East—a collection which is the pride of the Bodleian Library—to have begun to edit parts of Maimonides' *Arabic Commentary on the Mishnah* in his *Porta Mosis* (Oxford, 1655, and re-edited in London, 1740). It contains, not as Pocock wrongly says, the introduction to the tractate of *Zeraim*, but the general introduction to the Mishnah, followed by the commentary on *Helek* —the tenth chapter of the tractate of *Sanhedrin* (re-edited critically

by Dr. Wolff, Rabbi at Gothenburg, Sweden, under the title of "The Eight Chapters," Leipzig, 1863). There follows in the *Porta Mosis*, lastly, the introductions to the *Sedarim* of Qodashim, Tohorot, and, in an appendix, of Menahot. Since Pocock, the Arabic commentaries of Maimonides had been used only fragmentarily, by some scholars who had access to the libraries which contain such MSS., until Professsor Barth, of Berlin, continued Pocock's tradition by publishing the *Arabic Commentary*, with an emended Hebrew translation of the tractate of *Makkoth* (Berlin, 1879 and 1880). The veteran Semitic scholar, M. J. Derenbourg, member of the French Institute, undertook a gigantic labour, viz., the *Arabic Commentary*, with a correct Hebrew translation, which was published by the society called מקיצי נרדמים, 1886 to 1892. Indeed the Hebrew translation, as printed in some editions of the Mishnah, and in nearly all editions of the Babylonian Talmud, is scarcely intelligible, for the translator was in fact less than a mediocre Arabic scholar, and did not understand Maimonides. These editions are besides full of typographical mistakes. We should have expected that a literary society for the publication of Maimonides' *Commentary on the Mishnah* would have been formed under the direction of the Paris savant, as is the case for the publication of Saadiah Gaon's works, in print and in MSS. Alas! such was not the case, for the rich Jews do not care for the glory of past Judaism, and no means were forthcoming for the honour of Maimonides. Maimonides now has to rely upon candidates for the doctor's degree in German universities, some of whom take up small parts of his *Commentary* as their thesis, and some fragments have been published in volumes of collected essays. We are afraid that their best efforts are not equal to the difficult task. The candidates are, in the first instance, too young for such a critical edition, and, on the other hand, they have no material means for bringing out the *Commentary* on whole tractates. Thus we get from them only fragments, for which they had no means for consulting the best MSS. Of these fragmentary editions we may mention up to date the following:—The commentaries on *Aboth* I. and on *Rosh Hashanah* I. 3 and III. 1 (Berlin, 1890, in the *Jubelsschrift*, dedicated to Dr. J. Hildesheimer on the occasion of his seventieth year). In dissertations were treated, from 1891 to 1894, the Arabic commentaries, with the corrected Hebrew translations, on the tractates *Berakhot*, *Kilayim Demai*, and *Sanhedrin* (I. to III.).

We have now before us the edition of the *Arabic Commentary* of the tractate *Peah*, with the corrected Hebrew translation, edited by Dr. David Herzog, which is again the subject of a dissertation, with instructive notes, on the orthography of the MSS. he used, as

well as on lexicographical points. We may expect soon the edition of the tractates *Betsa* and *Hulin*, as far as we know also in a dissertation. It will be seen that these authors do not try to complete one *Seder* of the Mishnah, neither agree about the uniformity of the size. Thus we may say that of Maimonides' *Arabic Commentary on the Mishnah* only Seder Tohorot (*or* Toharot) is published.

A. NEUBAUER.

Introduction to the Chronicle called סדר עולם רבה (in Hebrew), by Bär Ratner. Part I. Wilna, 1894.

THE author has undertaken a most difficult task with relation to the composition of the Chronicle, usually attributed to R. Yose ben Halafta. The real title of it, as will be seen from the edition in *Mediæval Chronicles* II., which will appear soon, is סדר עולם, as it is stated in the Egyptian fragments of it; the epithet, רבה, "the great," sprang up when another Chronicle was composed, most likely in the ninth century A.D., which is called סדר עולם זוטא (*The Minor Chronicle of the World*). After a short preface about the method of this introduction, M. Ratner gives his minute studies and results in twenty-two chapters, which we shall indicate only, for it is impossible to go into details of the thousand quotations from Talmudic and casuistic literature. First, naturally comes the investigation concerning the author of our Chronicle, the result of which is that, according to quotations in the Talmudic literature, R. Yose cannot be the author of it. Here comes a chapter about the date of the work, which, according to M. Ratner, was composed before the Mishnah was settled, since quotations in the Mishnah are excerpted anonymously from our Chronicle, and the Babylonian Talmud mentions it. The third chapter states the use of Palestinian Midrashim. The Jerusalem Talmud seems not to quote our Chronicle distinctly, but many quotations are certainly derived from it. Next, it is stated that R. Johanan is the compiler of our Chronicle as it lies before us. The sixth chapter shows that the *Seder Olam* was not always at the disposal of the Rabbis of the Talmuds and the Midrashim. Next come proofs that the Geonim, down to the Tosaphists, had not always the *Seder Olam* at their disposal. Our author follows up with an important chapter, where it is stated that the quotations of the Mishnah and the Talmud from our Chronicle are different from the printed text. The tenth chapter

has for its object the variations of passages of the Bible with those quoted in our Chronicle, and also in the Babylonian Talmud. The next chapter treats of the sources of which the compiler of the Chronicle made use ; they are the older Midrashim, then the books mentioned in the Bible now lost, Josephus, Sirach, the Book of Jubilees, and non-Jewish historical books. Here our author shows very little sense of criticism. If the compiler of our Chronicle made use of Josephus, he could not have had at his disposal the lost books mentioned in the Bible. Next follow chapters concerning the history of Edom, Aram, Philistia, Assyria, and Persia. The following chapter refers chiefly to the history of the text of the *Seder Olam*, where also some MSS. are described, chiefly the one in the Bodleian, and another in the Royal Library of Munich, and many which the Yalqut Shimoni had at his disposal, and, finally, commentaries on the *Seder Olam* now lost, which existed in the eleventh century. The twentieth chapter is a criticism upon Zunz concerning the *Seder Olam*. Next comes the question of the commentary by the famous R. Elia Wilna. In all these chapters a great knowledge of Talmud, Midrash, and of later literature is displayed ; indeed, the verification of M. Ratner's quotations would take months. We hope that he will publish soon the second part of his work, viz., *The Text of the Two Versions of Seder Olam*.

A. NEUBAUER.

Studien zum Buche Tobit. Von Dr. M. ROSENMANN, Berlin, 1894.

THE enigmatic apocryphal book of Tobit has been left untouched by critics since 1879, when Professor Nöldeke wrote an exhaustive article in *Monatsberichte* of the Academy of Berlin, on the occasion of the publication of the Aramaic text of it. It appeared that the last word had been said concerning this charming apocryphon. But it seems that this is not the case, for a young student points out in his monograph as above (apparently a doctor's dissertation) facts in this book not noticed by predecessors. After a short introduction, dealing chiefly with the bibliography concerning Tobit, our author treats, 1, of the marriage of agnates which occurs in Tobit, known from Num. xxxvi. 6, and one which is also the object of the book of Ruth. Dr. Rosenmann concludes that, since the Pharisees never, even in theory, mention this custom in the Talmud, and, in addition to this, that the *Megillat Taanit* mentions the abolition of it, and since the Pharisees

arose in the time of John Hyrcanus (136 to 105), the book of Tobit could not have been written earlier than the first century B.C. 2. Next it is pointed out that Noah is called a prophet, just as in the book of the Jubilees, and that he did not marry a foreign woman; her name is not given, but is mentioned in the Jubilees as Enzareh. No conclusion as to the date of Tobit's parallel passages (iv. 13-15) is given. 3, treats of the destruction of Nineveh; 4, deals with Tobit's view of Leviticus xix. 13^{b}, 17, 18. 5. The next part is instructive concerning the formalities of betrothal, from which the conclusion is drawn that Tobit must have been written between the post-biblical epoch and the Talmudic period. What was the approximative time for the former and the latter? The sixth part treats of iv. 17, viz., the putting meals on the tombs, the opinions of most interpreters are discussed. 7. Next comes a chapter on the eschatology in Tobit, from which our author finds that Tobit knows only of one destruction of the Temple, that of Nebuchadnezzar; he mentions the ten tribes, who will return without a Messiah, and makes no allusion to a resurrection, which excludes the possibility that the book is a product of the schools of the Talmud, more especially since Aqiba says that the ten tribes are lost for ever. The concluding chapter is devoted to the Greek recensions A and B, of which A is the older, while B is a paraphrasis composed in the second century B.C. Our author has forgotten to give the date of the book of the Jubilees, which the author of Tobit seemed to know, and also whether the original of Tobit was Hebrew or Greek, for in the latter case the refutation from Talmudic sources would vanish.

A. NEUBAUER.

"*Light of Shade and Lamp of Wisdom*," being Hebrew-Arabic Homilies, composed by NATHANEL IBN YESHÂYA (1327). Described, annotated, and abstracted by Rev. ALEXANDER KOHUT, Ph.D. New York, 1894, etc.

THE description of this interesting work of a Yemen Rabbi forms the second part of the "Studies in Yemen-Hebrew Literature," published as the Fourth Biennial Report of the Jewish Theological Seminary Association in New York. This institution deserves all praise for having followed the example of the Rabbinical schools of Breslau, Berlin, Budapest, Vienna, and Ramsgate, in adding to the annual reports an essay on Jewish literature. Paris and London, we hope,

will soon follow in the same way. If we are not mistaken, it was on my lamented friend, Alexander Kohut's, instigation that one Rabbinical seminary in New York gave a sign of literary life, which he himself began when very young ; and we may say he sacrificed his life to Jewish studies, for alas ! he died in the prime of his years. Deep sorrow prevents us from giving a picture of Dr. Kohut's life and activity ; and his son, George Alexander, has appended to the present report a memoir of his father's literary work. Moreover, my personal acquaintance with A. Kohut began only in December, 1874, when I met him in London, where he came to collect subscribers for the publication of his life-work, *i.e.*, the *Aruch Completum;* risking his health, for he was brought up in a dry climate, he came to England in the depth of fogs and rains. His success was very small, and he found no Mæcenas either in London or in Paris. Indeed, had he not been called to a Rabbinate at New York, where he found the Mæcenas in J. H. Schiff, Esq., his life-work would have died in its infancy. I call it " his life-work," in spite of what critics said of his *Aruch ;* they have indeed judged the work without considering the difficulties which my lamented friend had to overcome. It is, and will remain, a standard work. If Kohut has explained many foreign words in the Talmudic literature from the old Persian instead of the Greek, the critic ought to have remembered that the editor worked in the mines of Persian literature and lexicography so long—it must not be forgotten that Alexander Kohut was the first to explain Persian influence as to religious and mystic ideas in the Talmud—as to become so fond of this language that he found the foreign words in the Talmud nearer to it than to Greek. Was the severe critic (who is one of my dearest friends) always sure of his explanation from the Greek ? Perhaps not ; we are indeed far from the time when we shall stand on firm ground concerning a definite solution of the foreign words in the Talmud. That the editor of the *Aruch Completum* has intentionally borrowed from Levi's Talmudic Dictionary without acknowledging it we cannot believe ; it must have been by pure chance when he quoted the same passages as Levi did, since both lexicographers were acquainted with the same Talmud.

But let us forget all these quibbles, and let us say a few words on the new path of literature on which my lamented friend entered during the last years of his painful life. He took a fancy to the Jewish Yemen literature, which turned up suddenly in America, through the indefatigable Mr. Deinard, of Odessa, who had to leave Russia suddenly. The Libraries of Europe, public as well as private, were already provided with Yemen MSS., brought from Yemen by various travellers, when Mr. Deinard visited the East and brought consequently many duplicates. They had thence to wander to

America, together with many belonging to the late Mr. Shapira, some to New York, and more to the Sutro Library in San Francisco. A. Kohut got restless, and was eager to continue his activity by publishing Yemen MSS. In 1892, he brought out exhaustive notes extracted from Dhamari's Commentary on the Pentateuch (see JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, V., page 338); this was followed by the publication of Saadyah Gaon's הושענות, of which the last part appeared after his death (in the *Monatsschrift* of Breslau, vol. xxxvii.), as well as the poetical pieces which precede each Sidrâ in the Midrash Haggadol (*ibid.*, vol. xxxviii.), and finally the present essay, which I shall notice only very shortly.

Nethanel, son of Isaiah, wrote in 1327 A.D., a homiletical commentary on the Pentateuch, MSS. of which are to be found in the British Museum, in the Bodleian Library, in the Berlin Royal Library, and some in private possession. Our lamented friend rightly identifies the Ibn Yeshayah quoted in an anonymous Yemen Midrash with our author; I have overlooked this in my Catalogue, and the dates mentioned by our Nethanel are better given by Alexander Kohut than in other descriptions of this Midrash; indeed, the date given in Kohut's monograph, p. 16, is to be found in the Bodleian copy also; on the other hand, the New York MS. has more introductory passages in verse than that in the Bodleian. The figures and diagrams are the same as in the Bodleian Library, but they are so fanciful that it was not worth while mentioning them in my catalogue. These observations concern the first chapter. In the second A. Kohut gives the sources of Ibn Yeshayah, Hebrew as well as Arabic, with the passages where they occur. These authorities are not unknown. The third chapter is headed "Characteristic Features," where the part on the geographical names is instructive; so are also the polemical passages *pro* and *contra* Islam and Christianity, and the philological notes. The monograph concludes with an Appendix containing selections. Considering the state of health the deceased was in for some years, it is astonishing how well the monograph was carried through the press; still there are slips besides those given amongst the *errata* on the last page.

If I mention that my lamented friend intended to continue his Yemen publications by editing the text of the Midrashim, of which two are so fully described in the two reports, scholars will understand what we have lost by the premature death of the editor of the *Aruch Completum.* תנצבה

A. NEUBAUER.

Geschichte der Juden in Rom von der ältesten Zeit bis zur Gegenwart (2,050 Jahre). Von Dr. A. BERLINER. Frankfurt am Main, 1893. Two vols. (History of the Jews at Rome from the earliest time to the present, comprising 2,050 years.)

NOBODY could have been better prepared for writing the later history of the Jews at Rome than Dr. Berliner, who has paid so many visits to Rome, not only to investigate the Hebrew MSS. in the Vatican Library, but also the Municipal documents concerning the Jews. As forerunners he has already published two important pamphlets, viz., *Aus den letzten Tagen des römischen Ghetto* (1886), and *Censur und Confiscation hebräischer Bücher im Kirchenstaate* (1891), as well as articles which appeared in his *Magazin für die Wissenschaft des Judenthums*, and elsewhere.

The work is divided into two volumes. Vol. I. has for its object the history of the Jews in heathen Rome, viz., from 160 B.C. to 315 A.D. Here we cannot expect many new facts, after Mommsen's *History of Rome*, and P. Manfrin's *Gli Ebrei sotto la dominazione romana*. Still, the complete *aperçu* of this epoch is useful, and more especially the translation of the inscriptions in the catacombs.

The second volume has for its object the history of the Jews in Christian Rome (viz., from 315 A.D. to 1885), which is divided into two parts: (1) From the beginning of the Christian domination (315) to the exile into the Ghetto (1555); (2) From 1555 to 1885. The first mention of a Jewish community at Rome is under Pope Gregory the Great; but it is most likely that the Jews had remained in Rome through all vicissitudes. Dr. Berliner discusses the synagogues which are reported at Rome, of which he mentions the Portaleone, Bozecco, and Gallichi; others remain doubtful.

Here follows a chapter which will be new for those who read, for instance, M. Rodocanachi's book on the Ghetto; it treats of the literary occupation of the Jews at Rome. The first place is given to the famous liturgist, Eleazar Qalir, who, according to an hypothesis, lived in the eighth century at Portus, near Rome. It is not the place here to discuss this hypothesis. Dr. Harkavy, who believes, and perhaps rightly, that Qalir lived in Palestine (Tiberias), promises to bring forward his arguments, which we await with curiosity. The first literary Jew who may be said to belong to Rome with certainty was Meshullam ben Qalonymos, of Lucca. The Talmud scholars at Rome were, according to Haya Gaon (1032), not very important. Dr. Berliner mentions family names in Hebrew which were found at Rome, such as האדומים (*de Rossi*), התפוחים (*de Pomis*), הנערים (*Giovani*), and others. There were many physicians and artisans. The pride of

Jewish learning at Rome was the famous Nathan, son of Jehiel, author of the *Aruch*. The father, as well as the two brothers, Abraham and Daniel, are also known; they are quoted as the גאוני בית ר' יחיאל. The words of Benjamin of Tudela concerning his visit to Rome are then given (in German translation). The classical epoch finishes with the poet Immanuel ben Solomon, the friend of Dante, and the sons of Abraham, צעיר, Benjamin, and the more celebrated Zedekia.

Next comes a chapter on the last Pope at Rome before the transfer to Avignon. It was Bonifacius VIII., one who could not bear opposition, and naturally the Jews were the first to feel his hand. Still, he favoured the Jewish physician, Angelo Manuel, whom he styled "familiaris." In a following chapter we find the names of Isaac Zarphati, Bonet de Lates, Jacob Mantino, Obadja Sforno, Elia Bachur, and others, concluding with the famous David Reubeni and Solomon Molkho. This carries us on to the sixteenth century, when we find at Rome seven synagogues, used by the Jews who immigrated from various countries, such as Italy, Catalonia, Castile, Sicily, besides the German and French Jewish colony, who had no special synagogue. Many of these synagogues had to be given up when the Jews were relegated to the Ghetto. This chapter is full of interest for the interior history of the Jews at Rome, being taken from documents in the Jewish archives. In these portions Dr. Berliner's book is original, and very instructive. And with this ends Part I. of the second volume, which is followed by learned notes concerning the literary names mentioned.

We come now to the second part, which begins with Cardinal Carraffa, later on Pope Paul IV. (1555), who cut all the threads of life of the Jews by forbidding them to exist except in the Ghetto. This part is indeed, on the whole, the most interesting of Dr. Berliner's book, and here are original documents in abundance. In the fourth chapter is given still more of the interior history of the Jews in Rome. The indexes which follow each volume greatly facilitate the finding of facts and literary matters. The last is completely ignored in M. Rodocanachi's excellent book on the Ghetto. This second part does not lack notes concerning the documents used by the author.

Dr. Berliner has done well to dedicate the first volume to F. D. Mocatta, Esq., an English Mæcenas for Jewish literature, and the second to the memory of Samuel Alatri and Isidore Loeb. He also acknowledges his thanks to the keepers of various archives at Rome, and more especially to Signor Tranquillo Ascarelli, and his colleague, Signor Crescenzo Alatri, who put their knowledge of the Jewish archives at Dr. Berliner's disposal.

A. NEUBAUER.

Remarks of the Qaraite Abu-Yusuf Yaqub al-Qirqisani by DR. A. HARKAVY. Extract from the Russian "Archæological Journal," t. VIII., pages 247 to 321, with the title in Russian: *Isvestia Karaima Abu-Jusufa Jakuba al-Kirkisani ove Yevreiskich Sektach.*

AMONGST the Karaitic treasures in the Imperial Library of St. Petersburg is to be found the theological work in Arabic of Jacob of Kirqisi (the old town of Circesium on the Euphrates), written in 937 A.D., with the title, "Book of Lights and Observations," divided into thirteen parts, of which the first contains an extended introduction, where the author, amongst other subjects, gives an account of the Jewish sects according to his knowledge. Of this interesting part Dr. Harkavy published the text *in extenso*, after having furnished some details of our author as well as an enumeration of his extant works and of those only known by quotations. The beginning of the first chapter is unfortunately missing; it seems to have contained the history of the origin of Qaraism, in Persia chiefly, but also elsewhere. We know most of these facts from later Qaraitic writers, who no doubt made use of Qirqisani's treatise. In the second chapter, our author gives the history of the various Jewish sects, with the dates of their appearance. They are the following: (*a*) the Samaritans; (*b*) the Rabbanites, during the Second Temple, beginning with Simon the Just; (*c*) the Sadducees, beginning with Zadoc and Boëtos; (*d*) the Maghars, or men of the Cave, one of them having the name Al-Iskanderani (the man of Alexandria), whose book is the most celebrated amongst this sect. There is also a small book with the title of ספר ידוע, which is also precious for the men of this sect; Dr. Harkavy suggests that by "this sect" the Essenes are meant. (*e*) There rose in the time of the Roman emperors Isi (Jesus) son of Miryam, who was crucified at the instigation of Rabbanites. (*f*) The Qariats who were found, as it is said, on the Nile, 20 *Pharsangs* from Fostat. (*g*) Then come the divisions of the Rabbanites, *viz.*, the schools of Hillel and of Shamai. (*h*) Then follow the various forerunners of Qaraism. (1) Abu Isi of Ispahan, called Obadiah, and his followers, who were called Isuyîn, at Damascus; (2) Yudgan, who it is said was a pupil of the former; (3) The chief of the captivity, the famous Anan, a contemporary of Khalif Abu Jafar al-Mansur (780), who was very learned in Rabbinic matters, and whose work was translated from Aramaic into Hebrew by Haya Gaon and his father. Here the liturgist Yanai is mentioned. (4) Then followed Ishmael of Ocbar, in the days of the Khalif Al-Mustazam billah (942 A.D.). (5) After him comes Benjamin of Nehawend, who was also learned in Rabbinic matters. (6) Abi Amran of Tiflis (in Ar-

menia), called also Musa al-Safrani of Bagdad; (7) Malk al-Ramleh, Mishiyah of Ocbar; (8) Daniel of Qums, also called al Damagani. Qirqisani says: "This is all which reached us of these sects. The Qaraites of this time, who are derived from these various sects, differ so much, that we find scarcely two of them agreeing."

The third part contains the differences amongst the Rabbanites concerning precepts and ceremonies. The next chapter treats of those who represent God in a human dress, and attribute to him human action, such as we find in the books with the title שיעור קומה, אותיות דר' עקיבה, the book attributed to Ishmael (the high priest), better known with the title of היכלות דר' ישמעאל; some others of these attributes are quoted in the Talmud, in the ethical treatise called יראת רטא (in the MSS. sometimes followed by מסכת אבות). There are also mentioned extracts from the following treatises, viz., סדר גיהנם, תשובת אחאב and תלמוד בני רב. Chapters v. to vii. give an account of the ritual of the Samaritans, of the Sadducees and the dwellers in caves. The eighth chapter has for its object the Christian religion, and is the oldest known document of the kind written by a Jew; here we learn for the first time that David al-Moqametz, a philosopher quoted by Abraham and Moses ibn Ezra, and also by Jedaiah of Béziers (see *Histoire Littéraire de la France*, t. XXXI., p. 380, note 6, and addenda) was converted to Christianity, and that he translated from the Christian books, (in Syriac?) a commentary on Genesis and on Ecclesiastes. It is said that David was converted at Nisibis by a man called נאנא, for which Dr. Harkavy proposes נונוס, *i.e.*, Nonnus. David's criticism on the Gospel is curious, and worth while translating in *extenso*. The full name of *Almoqametz* is David ben Merwan ar-Raqi, known as אלמקמץ; this last expression Dr. Harkavy proposes to translate "the leaper" (Hebrew אלמקפץ), *i.e.*, David leaped from Judaism to Christianity, and probably back to Judaism, otherwise he would scarcely be mentioned by the Jewish authorities. Perhaps, however, the Arabic word אלמקמץ is formed from the word קמיץ "a shirt or cloak," and meant "putting on another dress." The ninth chapter treats of the habits of the sect אלקרעיה, who agree partly with the Samaritans and partly lean towards the Christians; for instance, they keep both the Sabbath and the Sunday. Our author says here that he once believed that the sect of אלקרעיה sprang up after Christianity, until he read the book of *al-Moqametz* with the title of כתאב אלצראה (the meaning of which is uncertain), where it is said that Christianity is a combination of Sadduceeism and the sect called אלקרעיה. The tenth chapter treats of the ceremonial differences between the

Rabbis in Syria and Babylonia (Irak). Chapters xi. to xviii. give the ceremonial differences between the Qaraitic sects mentioned above. Finally the last chapter treats of ritual differences between the Qaraites of the time of our author and earlier, from the sects mentioned above.

It is certain that Jehudah Hadasi, in his book with the title of אשכול הכופר § 91 (MS. 88), made use of Qirqisani's present treatise, either in the original Arabic or in a Hebrew translation. Whether Arabic writers, such as Masudi, Sharestani and more especially Maqrizi, who treat more or less of Jewish sects, knew Qirqisani's work is doubtful. This will have to be carefully investigated by any one who undertakes to give us the history of the Jewish sects according to Arabic and Hebrew sources. But it is difficult to take advantage of Dr. Harkavy's learned introduction to his present monograph, because it is written in Russian, a language nearly unknown to Jewish scholars out of Russia. The same is the case with the Hungarian monthly *Szemle*, which has often useful pages concerning Jewish literature, that are lost for all except those who are educated in the Hungarian schools. The result is that they are consequently passed over, which will be the case also with articles and essays written in Russian. Patriotism is not necessarily shown either by language or by religion. We hope that Mr. Thatcher, of Mansfield College, Oxford, who is busy with a monograph on the Jewish sects, will be able to make more ample use of Dr. Harkavy's learned essay, than we could, by the kind assistance of Mr. W. Morfill, Slavonic Reader in the University of Oxford. He will moreover give Hadassi's information according to MSS., and not according to the mutilated edition of Gozlow (Crimea).

A. NEUBAUER.

Studien zur Geschichte der Orthographie des Althebräischen von Dr. LEO BARDOWICZ, Rabbiner der Israelit. Gemeinde in Moedling, Francfort-on-the-Main, J. Kauffmann, 1894, viii. and 112 pp.

THE object of Dr. Bardowicz's treatise is to demonstrate that the vowel letters *alef*, *hē*, *wāw*, and *yōd* were not used so frequently in the Bible MSS. of the Talmudic epoch as in the masoretic text. He maintains Wellhausen's theory that the employment of the vowel letters was

left to the choice of the scribes, but that the orthography was definitely fixed in the first century, or later on by the Masora. Supplementing this Dr. Bardowicz tries to show that this deficiency of vowel letters lasted several centuries longer. He supports his theory not only by passages from Talmud and Midrāsh with varying orthography, but also by the assertion that in those times the *matres lectionis* were easily dispensed with. On the other hand he endeavours to point out that the rabbinical prohibition of writing defectiva *plene* and plena *defective* was not known till the time of Maimûni. Considering the complicated and rather unsettled nature of the subject, a lucid exposition of the way in which the vowel letters gradually penetrated the text of the Bible would be of the highest importance. In reading Dr. Bardowicz's book we cannot help appreciating the clearness of his propositions, the methodical arrangement of the matters under discussion, and particularly his intimacy not only with the literatures from which he draws his arguments, but also with the writings of modern scholars on the subject.

It is, however, a different question whether our real knowledge of the subject has been furthered by Dr. Bardowicz's learned investigations. Do we now see clearer when and how the vowel letters—and this is the *punctum saliens*—came to be employed in the earliest copies of the Old Testament? This is doubtful. The uncertainty in this respect remains the same as before. It is significant how cautiously Noeldeke expresses himself in his review of Wellhausen's theory on the subject which Dr. Bardowicz otherwise justly considers the most important progress in the investigation of the question. Now Chwolson, in his essay on the quiescent letters, starting from the example of the Old Phœnician incriptions, is justified in drawing conclusions for Hebrew, but he decidedly goes too far. The Mesha inscription (ninth century), the genuineness of which is no more doubted, and of which the language more nearly approaches the Hebrew of the Old Testament than the Phœnician, shows in contradistinction to the latter a rather regular employment of the vowel letters at the end of words, and an occasional one in the middle. In the Siloah stone, which is more than one hundred and fifty years younger, and written in the best biblical style, we find vowel letters at least regularly in the *Auslaut*. Dr. Bardowicz has omitted to take these facts into account at all, but they certainly give more conclusive evidence than the far younger sources, by means of which he endeavours to prove the contrary. The quotations from Ben Asher are rather colourless, as they admit both full and defective scriptions. The second one is, moreover, incorrectly translated, as מפי חכמים עשוים simply means, "From the mouth of doctors instituted," and probably does not refer to "the sages" in the rabbinical sense at all. Dr. Bardowicz himself cannot help

admitting that the orthography of Talmud and Midrāsh as handed down to us, is itself open to much comment. The passage from the Midrāsh quoted (sub. D) may serve as an example where, as Dr. Bardowicz rather timidly suggests, we should naturally read, כל חטא שבמקרא יתר א (instead of חסר), signifying that the א—just as in וירא, sub. E—is quiescent (in contradistinction to other forms, as Num. xv. 24, etc.). From Benveniste's observation we only gather that the evidences from Talmudical passages are not absolutely to be relied on. Their defective orthography may also have other reasons, such as economy of space, time, writing material, etc.

In this confusion, the real solution of the question may be found midway. We have in all probability to distinguish between the official text preserved in the Scrolls, and copies manufactured for public and private studies. As to the former, it will apparently remain difficult to come to any safe conclusion at all ; but with respect to the latter, greater liberty may have been allowed, and here Dr. Bardowicz's arguments are also much more satisfactory. In particular those adduced in Chap. II. deserve attention. At all events, Dr. Bardowicz has, with great industry and learning, compiled a large mass of valuable material, for which we are indebted to him.

H. HIRSCHFELD.

ספר יצירה *Das Buch der Schöpfung. Nach den sämmtlichen Recensionen möglichst kritisch redigirter Text, nebst Uebersetzung, Varianten, Anmerkungen, Erklärungen und einer ausführlichen Einleitung*, von LAZARUS GOLDSCHMIDT. Frankfort-on-the-Main : J. Kauffmann (in commission). 1894.

MR. GOLDSCHMIDT does not seem to be satisfied with the lesson given him by Dr. Neubauer in the *Guardian* (May, 1894), although its explicitness left nothing to be desired. However unpleasant the task, we must estimate his latest production at its true value, lest those who hope to find a scientific work be disappointed. Mr. G. correctly anticipates that his *Schroffheit*—or rather impertinence—will meet with disapprobation, but this "does not induce him to suppress the truth." There is a great difference between truth, or what he styles truth, and the arrogance with which a tyro criticises Zunz, Graetz, and other scholars, in terms which would even be quite unbecoming between equals in age and importance. His translation of the beginning of Saadyah's *Arabic Commentary* is wrong. Saadyah does not

say that Abraham *was* the author of the *S. Y.*, but that it was *ascribed* to him, which the Hebrew translator expresses אשר על שם אב המון נקרא. The following conclusion is rather amusing :—Because the author of the *S. Y.* speaks Hebrew, the book must have been written in a time when Hebrew was spoken. It was therefore composed in the second century B.C. In spite of his assertions on the title-page, Mr. G. has not consulted all the recensions of the text, but he distorted the latter considerably. Let us hope that he will in future be more conscientious and painstaking.

H. HIRSCHFELD.

LITERARY GLEANINGS.

By Dr. A. Neubauer.

XII.

The Hebrew Bible in Shorthand Writing.

No mediæval literature contains so many abbreviations as the Jewish in the Hebrew commentaries on the Bible, and the Talmudic treatises, and more especially in the stupendous literature of the casuistic Responsa. These abbreviations may be counted by the thousand, and they are moreover increased even now by writers who still use the Rabbinical language. Attempts to solve these abbreviations have been made since Buxtorf in his *De Abbreviaturis Hebraicis*, etc., Basel, 1640, up to the present time by the Abbé Perreau of Parma in his 1,700 *Abbreviature e sigle* (Parma, 1882), Autografia in 60 copies. These abbreviated forms consist chiefly of words of which the initial letters only are given; *e.g.*, to take the most common instances, the expression אע"פ, which represents the words אף על פי, "although," and בה"ה, which means ברוך השם, "blessed be God." But the greatest difficulty is felt in the solution of proper names. Let us take for instance a very frequent one, which is ר"אבן, of which the ר represents always the word Rabbi, the other three letters, viz., אבן may be Abraham ben (son of) Nathan, but also son of Nahman, of Nissim, or any other whose name begins with the letter *n*, not to speak of the fact that the א (Abraham) may represent names like Ahron, Elijah, Aryeh, and so on. It was economy of time and of paper which was the cause of these numerous abbreviations. In early manuscripts of the Talmud literature, we find fewer abridged forms of names and other expressions, but it is well known that disciples of the Talmud schools in Babylonia marked with initial letters the subjects which were taught there; these marks are usually called סימן, which represents the Greek word σημεῖον. When the Talmud was written down these mnemonic letters disappeared, but traces of them have remained in manuscripts of the Talmud, many of which were faithfully reproduced in the editions. The manuscripts, however, vary for these mnemonical letters. With this mode of putting down what the schools had taught, a Rabbi could carry in his pocket the whole Talmud teaching, as concerns the *Halakhah*, without noting down the detailed discussions; those were left to memory, with which the Eastern nations, and more

especially those of the Semitic race, are gifted. Nowadays there are Jewish boys who know by heart the Hebrew Pentateuch, with the Aramaic translation, the Psalms, the Prophetic Lessons, the Five Scrolls, and frequently with the commentary of Rashi. There are many young and old rabbis who know the Mishnah and the Babylonian Talmud in such a way that they will not only hit upon the tractate and the folio where a passage occurs, but also recite the whole folio with the preceding or following passage. The same is the case with the Arabs for the Korān and the important commentators, such as Baidhawi, Zamakshari, as well as for medical and astronomical books. The Rig Veda, and perhaps all the Vedas, were kept by memory for a long time.

Was the Bible or any part of it written in shorthand writing? This question has never been asked by any of the numerous Bible critics. Indeed, if that were the case, many emendations proposed by them could perhaps be explained by the tachygraphical method of writing. Traces of such short writing are mentioned in the Talmudic literature by the word נוטריקון, *νοταρικόν*, *notaricum*, of which the Greek and the Latin forms are not found in lexicons, but the form is certain by the many quotations in the Talmudic literature except in the Targum and the Toseftha (see Samuel Krauss' able essay, with the title of *Zur griechischen und lateinischen Lexicographie aus judischen Quellen*, in the *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, II. 3 and 4, p. 515), and it means shorthand writing. There are, however, two kinds of it in classical times: 1. The Roman one, where a letter represents a whole word; 2, The Greek, where the letters are shortened. Herr Krauss (*loc. cit.*, p. 513) is of opinion, and we agree with him, that the Rabbis have accepted the Roman method of shorthand writing. His proofs are the following: 1, The passage in the *Mishnah* (Jomá, III. 10), where it is said that the pious Helena, Queen of Adiabene, had made for the temple at Jerusalem a golden plate, on which the law for adultery (Numbers vi. 1 to 21) was engraved (אף היא עשתה טבלא של זהב שפרשת סוטה כתובה עליה). 2, Simeon ben Laqish, in the name of Jannai (about 230 A. D.) adds (B. T. *Gittin*, fol. 60[a]) באלף בית, which Rashi rightly explains by ראשי התיבות, *i.e.*, the initial letters of the words.

Another trace of short writing in the Talmud is to be found in the saying of R. Simeon, who says that by writing on the Sabbath the two Alephs (אא) of the word אאזרך (Isaiah xlv. 5) the Sabbath is profaned (for the word גלטורי which occurs in this passage see S. Krauss, *loc. cit.* p. 513). The shorthand form seems to be mentioned also in the Pal. Talmud (*Megillah*, fol. 73[a], col. 2, l. 32), where it is said that the scroll of Esther may be written for the Synagogue use

in shorthand writing (שהיתה כתוב גינגוטון; see Krauss, *loc. cit.*, p. 514, who solves the enigmatic word גינגוטון with the Latin *cognitum*, *i.e.*, גוגנוטון; not to be found in that sense. Might not גינגוטון represent a possible popular form γιγνωτον from γιγνωσκω ? Perhaps after all, the reading of דיגלטון—διγλοττον, "in two languages," is preferable. See Dr. Blau's able monograph, which has just appeared (p. 90) with the title of *Zur Einleitung in die Heilige Schrift*. Herr Krauss adduces the passage in the Midrash *Tillim* (iii. 3; B. T. *Shabbath*, fol. 105ᵃ), where it is said concerning the word נמרצת (1 Kings ii. 8), as follows: מהו נמרצת נוטריקון נ נואף מ מואבי ר רוצה צ צורו ת תועבה.

Even Biblical words were explained by the system of shorthand writing. This instance shows clearly the application of the Roman method. Perhaps also the Midrashic explanation of the name אב המון גוים=אברהם (Gen. xvii. 5) is found. In short the mention of *notaricon* is found in the Mishnah, the two Gemaras, the Sifré, the Mekhilta, and frequently the Midrashim, but not in the Tosefta and in the Targum (Krauss, *l. c.*, p. 515).

But with all the minute researches of Dr. Krauss, there is no definite instance in which the Jews accepted the Roman method of shorthand writing. Indeed, two fragments of Bible text found lately in Egypt and acquired by the Bodleian Library, show a different kind of shorthand writing. The one is in MS. Hebrew d. 39, fol. 1 (catalogue No. 2608, 1), containing Genesis xxvi. 11 to xxix. 15, much obliterated, and belonging, perhaps, to the end of the thirteenth or beginning of the fourteenth century; there are a few vowels-points, and accents. The second is in MS. Hebrew e. 30, containing, *a*, Isaiah v. 8 to ix. 8, fol. 48 (catalogue, No. 2,604, 11); *β*, Isaiah xliv. 4 to xlviii. 11, most likely written in the twelfth century on vellum 4to, 2 columns. *a* begins as follows:—

8 הוי בּ חעּ חּ שּ תּ כּ
9 באזני א־ל בּ לּ בּ אּוֹ
vi. 1 בשנת־מּ וֹ יּ שּ פר נּ שּ לּ לה
2 שרפּים מּ יּ מּ שפּשלּת יּ נתּם
3 וקרּא זן זּ מּ תשדה לּ ה
4 אּ קק בּ מּ
24 בחצים בּ שּ בשּ־מּ וֹ שּ
25 ו כל ר דּ יעּ בּשּ אּ וילקמּ

We see that each verse begins with the full words of the text, but for the rest I have not succeeded in finding out the method of the

abbreviations, and the use of them; certainly it is too complicated for use in primary schools. Perhaps when the photographic facsimiles appear in the catalogue of newly acquired MSS. in the Bodleian Library, one of the savants may find out this mystery. Anyhow, in this shorthand writing Isaiah would fill only twenty-six leaves. Possibly this kind of shorthand writing might explain what Maqrizi means by saying that a sect in Egypt called the Fayyumites (of Fayyum) explain the Law in a sense as if the letters of which it is composed were abbreviations. Sylvestre de Sacy explains this by *notaricon*. He says in his *Chrestomathie Arabe*, t. I. (2nd edition), p. 356, note 82, "Il paroit que Makrizi veut dire qu' Abou-Saïd (who cannot be identical with the famous Saadyah Gaon) interprétait la loi par cette espèce de cabale que les juifs nomment *Notaricon*. Les Arabes d'Afrique appellent les abbréviations חרוף מקטעה, au lieu que les Orientaux les nomment רווס חרוף, à l'imitation des juifs, qui les appellent ראשי תיבות." Such mysterious letters are found also at the beginning of some Suras of the Qorán, which are taken by commentators as abbreviations. Erpenius, indeed, says of them in his grammar, as quoted by De Sacy, *Ubi tamen aliquam conjecturæ libertatem sibi permittunt; statuentes singulis seorsum literis denotari aliquid peculiare, quare et literas separatas et singulares appellant.*

THE WRITINGS OF PERLES.

In addition to the works enumerated by Professor Bacher in his excellent biography (*supra*, pp. 1-23), I would mention the following :—

1. *Analekten* in Kobak's Jeshurun (German section iii., 1859, pp. 38-40. On page 44 of the same part is a review, probably by Dr. Güdemann, of Perles' "Meletemata Peschitthoniana").
2. *Gottesdienstliche Vorträge* delivered in Baja (1859), and similar addresses delivered in Posen (1864).

I believe, too, that he published a sermon against mixed marriages.

S. J. Halberstam.

The Jewish Quarterly Review.

APRIL, 1895.

LEOPOLD ZUNZ.[1]

THE first-fruits of genuine criticism of Jewish Literature produced in the nineteenth century constituted the offering which Leopold Zunz, while yet young in years, but already of mature intellect, laid on the altar of Jewish science. It is certainly true that already, in an earlier generation, that of Moses Mendelssohn, the buds of knowledge had begun to spring up among the Jews in Germany; but Mendelssohn and his contemporaries left sufficient work for posterity. They had but slight occasion and scanty opportunities for critical researches into Jewish history and literature. In both these departments Zunz may be pronounced the pioneer. He not only conferred a great boon on his people by showing them the path to the rediscovery of the innumerable gems of thought buried in their literature; he also rendered them an equally great service by demonstrating to the Gentile world that the text, "It is your wisdom and understanding in the sight of the peoples," was not empty of meaning. He rolled away the reproach, so frequently uttered by Christian scholars,

[1] [It will interest our readers to know that the writer of this Essay, author of the famous work *Dor dor Vedoreshov*, celebrated his eightieth birthday in the February of this year. This will be a fitting opportunity to add one more to the numerous congratulations which he has received.—ED.]

that the Jews have no critical science. The first essay, which he composed in his early youth, is entitled, *An Inquiry into Rabbinical Literature.*[1] Though the first-fruits of his study, its style is ripe and perfect as that of a veteran writer. He endeavours to define the subjects on which attention should be concentrated in order to bring to the surface the many priceless pearls to be found in the sea of Jewish literature. He particularises the preliminary studies requisite for the building up of a sound and thorough Jewish criticism. If we examine in detail the undertakings which he urges upon the scholars of his time, we shall find that they comprehend all those departments which have successfully engaged the Jewish intellect ever since Zunz threw light upon the paths and methods of inquiry; and, therefore, he may well claim to be styled the original worker in this field, and the guide to his many successors. He was not, however, merely a sign-post to others. He himself carried out the advice he gave, and took a leading part in the Jewish critical labours of the nineteenth century.

Soon after he had published his first essay, he tried his strength in biographical composition, and presented the world with a sketch of the life of one who was a brilliant light to the Jews in the Middle Ages, Rabbi Solomon Yizchaki (Rashi). This essay was a lesson to biographers in their art; though many before him had endeavoured to write lives of our great men, yet, lacking the critical faculty, they omitted, on the one hand, many important points, while, on the other, they gave currency to statements which were doubtful, and even spurious. But a biography like Zunz's, written in a spirit of scientific criticism, had never hitherto appeared. From this point of view, Zunz may be said to have been the first Jewish biographer, and his efforts served as patterns and models

[1] This essay was published in 1818. I did not know of its existence till many years after, when the late Rabbi J. L. Polack showed it to me. It was reprinted in the edition of his collected works issued in 1875.

to others. I feel no hesitation in affirming that Zunz's life of Rashi acted as an incentive to Rappoport to try his hand at work of a similar character. The latter printed biographical notices of various scholars in the *Bikure Ha-ittim.* Anyone who penetrates into the spirit of these articles will recognise that Zunz's method served—considerably modified, however—as Rappoport's guide. It is ridiculous to suppose that both savants hit on the same plans independently of one another; for when Rappoport wrote his biographies he had already before him Zunz's life of Rashi. Indeed, in his biography of R. Nathan, author of the *Aruch* (note 47), Rappoport explicitly refers to Zunz, whose arguments he attempts to refute. Zunz, in his biography of Rashi, does not confine his research exclusively to his subject, Rabbi Solomon ben Isaac. He enlarges the compass of his theme, and occasionally discusses, *en passant,* persons and events which, strictly speaking, fall outside the scope of his inquiry, or which needed only a cursory mention. For example, in the list of books and scholars quoted by Rashi in his commentaries, Zunz notes R. Jehudai Gäon, author of the *Halachot Gedoloth.* He does not, however, merely give the name, which for the purpose of his essay would have amply sufficed, but enters on a long disquisition concerning this work, examines the authenticity of the tradition which attributes its authorship to R. Jehudai Gäon, and adduces the opinions of various authorities on this point. In truth, this inquiry is, after all, only of secondary importance, irrelevant to his subject, the life of Rashi.

A similar procedure is adopted by him in the case of the hymnologist, R. Elazar Haqalir, mentioned in Rashi's Commentaries. Zunz discusses the poet at some length, and takes pains to refute the view that Rabbi Elazar Haqalir belonged to the later Tanaites—all of which was superfluous. A similar excursus is devoted to Rabenu Gershon, the light of the Diaspora. Rappoport, in his biographies, follows the same plan, but carries it to an inordinate

length, to the exhaustion and perplexity of his readers. Zunz, when he wrote his essay on Rashi, had, in my opinion, no intention of making it a complete summary of every detail, large and small, which would be indispensable for a comprehensive and perfect work. He only brought together material for a glorious palace, drew a beautiful and correct plan, and gave clear instructions how to build it in accordance with scientific rules. To others was left the task of rearing the edifice. Is not this indeed the architect's business—to make designs which the builders have to execute? Certain classes of work the cleverest designer is incompetent to carry out personally. Zunz honestly recognised that, for a perfect biography of Rashi, what was pre-eminently necessary was a full and careful examination of the wonderful results which that great teacher achieved for a knowledge of the Talmud in his Commentaries, Decisions and Responsa. Yet on all these subjects, Zunz has very little to say. Why? Because he knew full well that he was unequal to the task of the preliminary examination of the material. Like a genuine and conscientious scholar, therefore, he refrained from trespassing beyond the limit of his knowledge. While acknowledging the many excellencies of his work, I have found that, despite painstaking care and industry, errors crept into his essay, and many essential points were omitted.[1]

It also appears that Zunz thought that R. Joseph Bonfils, whom Rashi mentions, is identical with the Rabbi of that name, who taught R. Tam. But this cannot be the case, since R. Joseph, mentioned by Rashi, died in Rashi's lifetime, while R. Tam was still a young child when his grandfather, Rashi, died. When he mentioned R. Eliezer Gaon bar Isaac, he thought that the latter was Rabbi

[1] In speaking of Rabbi Gershon, the light of the Diaspora, he gives many unnecessary details, and forgets to mention the extremely important fact that R. Gershon, with his own hand, prepared a correct manuscript copy of the Gemara, which was in Rashi's possession (*Succah*, 40*a*). This is stated in *Tosaphoth* in various places. R. Tam quoted from this manuscript. (See my *Biography of Rashi*, Note 4.)

Eliezer Hagadol. But, according to *Tosaphoth*, R. Eliezer Hagadol was Rashi's teacher. Zunz, indeed, excludes this teacher from the list of authorities quoted by the great Exegete, it having escaped his notice that the latter mentions R. Eliezer Ha-gadol in the *Pardes*, where he styles him the teacher of R. Jacob the elder, as well as of his other teachers; Rashi also quotes his opinion anonymously in *Aboda Zara*, 74*a*, with the phrase, למדין ויש ממשנתו. The reference is clearly to R. Eliezer Hagodol (see *Pardes*, 238, *et aliis locis*; see also S. Bloch's *Biographical Notes on Rashi*, and my Biography). But what matter a few isolated errors? They do not affect the permanent and solid value of the essay. The author himself candidly admitted their existence, and, in fact, personally called attention to them. Ten years after the essay was issued, he printed in the Introduction to the *Gottesdienstliche Vorträge*, a list of his mistakes, some of which he corrected. We ought therefore not to regard the mistakes, but rather dwell upon the immense importance of this work, which paved the way to the science of Jewish biography, and which is so admirably calculated to serve as a model in this department of literary activity. These two essays which I have named, were the earliest seeds which he sowed in the field of Jewish science. The first was published in 1818, the second, four years later, in 1822, while the author was still a youth. Both quickly bore fruit in their influence on scholars and their work. Then many years passed, during which only fugitive articles came from his pen at rare intervals. It was, however, universally known that Zunz was studying, writing, and exploring, with incomparable zeal, the literary treasures buried in libraries, poring over neglected and forgotten manuscripts, and utilising them to the fullest degree in the researches in which he was engaged. In every place where he was known by name, and where his talents and abilities were fully recognised and appreciated, the results of his labours were ardently longed for.

At length, in the year 1832, expectation was more than satisfied by the publication of his great work, *Die gottesdienstliche Vorträge der Juden, Historisch entwickelt.* It would be wearisome to attempt here a description of this volume, with its multitude of new ideas in the history of Midrashic literature, or to pile up eulogies on its manifold excellencies. For who is not aware of the revolution it effected among Jewish students? Who does not know how it breathed a new spirit into the minds and hearts of unsophisticated readers of the Midrashim, and stimulated many of the students of the Torah to enter into similar investigations? But, strange to relate, notwithstanding the importance of the work, notwithstanding the extreme value of the jewels which it revealed in Midrashic literature, hitherto left unilluminated by the light of criticism; notwithstanding the honour paid both to the book and the author by all honest scholars, it did not at first yield any material profits. The price of the work, which ran to 500 pages, was moderate, and, as the edition did not go off easily, it had, after a few years, to be still further reduced. It is fifty-five years since I purchased a copy for a Reichsthaler. Zunz, as I have heard, did not derive any profit from his labours. This is the common fate of all authors who deal with Jewish literature. Many there be who eagerly seek their books like silver, but they bring no silver wherewith to purchase the books. Zunz accomplished two objects. First, he laid the foundations for a history of Midrashic literature, a subject never hitherto touched. His work also afforded material help towards comprehension of the evolution of culture among the Jews at successive periods, and may claim to have established the principles upon which Jewish history should be based. When we consider the results accruing from his work, we cannot deny that for all the authors who followed him, who occupied or still occupy themselves with these important departments, Zunz's researches have proved indispensable guides. Whether the fact be admitted or denied, whether

we acknowledge our indebtedness or not, he was undoubtedly a pioneer for all of us.

The motive that urged him to write the *Gottesdienstliche Vorträge* may be gathered from remarks in the preface. "Many hundred years have passed since Israel's glory departed, since he forfeited his freedom and country. But one treasure was left him—the Synagogue. This now became a home for the Jewish nationality. All who were devoted to their faith, found in it a refuge, where they received religious instruction and counsel; renewed their strength to endure terrible vicissitudes; obtained comfort in their sorrows; revived the hope they cherished that their freedom would again dawn. The service of the Synagogue was a rallying point to the Jewish people, and proved the safeguard of Israel's faith." This conception was the motor to his *Gottesdienstliche Vorträge.* Homilies in conjunction with prayers, were the perennial fountains which helped to produce a rich harvest of moral blessings. It would be his work to investigate scientifically the historic development of Homilies in the Synagogue. Another purpose would be indirectly served, the foundation stone would be laid for the history of the Jewish people.

It is natural that those who enjoy the fruits of men's thoughts should desire to know the benefactors who have given to them of their best. And by this nearer acquaintance with the teachers, the disciples are helped not a little to understand the teaching. When, therefore, Zunz saw what a great impression his book had made on intelligent readers, he thought it his duty to treat next of the authors of our mediæval literature. With extraordinary zeal and energy, he set about this new and difficult undertaking, published his *Beiträge zur Geschichte und Literatur* in 1845. In these researches, he throws light on the writers of the *Tosaphoth* and other mediæval authors, who occupied themselves with the science of Judaism. In my humble opinion, this subject had never before received such excellent treatment. One of our foremost contemporary

scholars once said to me that Zunz relied greatly, for this work, on the קורא הדורות, where the names of the writers of *Tosaphoth* are collected and classified. I replied, "No, sir; Zunz is not a hasty and superficial investigator, who insufficiently examines the sources he uses." I have also read his writings on the *Tosaphoth*, and fully recognise the value of his researches on this theme. They afford ample evidence of patient toil and critical insight, and have nothing in common with the bare outlines of the קוּהֲד. In one place I find he follows that work, and erroneously.[1]

It must be admitted that, as in his *Gottesdienstliche Vorträge*, so in his second work, he succeeded in showing that the Jews were not destitute of culture; that their literature is indeed a storehouse of knowledge and wisdom, an object materially served by his other writings. I specially name: *Die Synagogale Poesie*, on the Piyutim and Selichot, issued in 1855, and *Die Literaturgeschichte der Synagogalen Poesie*, connected with the former, but which did not see the light till 1865, after the *Ritus*, which consists of inquiries into Synagogal rites, had appeared in 1859. In my reminiscences (MS.) I have stated that when I descant upon those contemporaries to whom I owe a debt for enlightening me and rousing in me the spirit of literary emulation, my object is not to discuss or criticise the details of their inquiries, but rather to point out the aims for which they strove with more or less success. Accordingly, in this article on Zunz and his writings, I propose to survey the objects which he hoped to achieve by his literary efforts; to show to the world that Jews, even in the Middle Ages, had a science and literature, certainly not inferior to, and

[1] In my *History of Jewish Tradition*, p. 349, note 30, I have already shown that Zunz (*Zur Literatur u. Geschichte*, p. 48), follows the קוּהֲד, who mentions *R. Chayim ben Joseph* as a Tosaphist. Zunz adds the conjecture that R. Chaim, R. Tam's pupil, was the son of Joseph: the קוּהֲד, however, is in error; there is no Tosaphist of that name. The source of the mistake is Tosaphoth Menachot 88*a*, from which he quotes *R. Chaim ben Joseph*; R. Chia bar Joseph, our Amora, mentioned *ibidem* 90*a*, is however meant. In the later editions of the Talmud this is corrected.

perhaps even surpassing, those of their neighbours; to demonstrate the truth that at no period did the spirit of Jewish poetry cease to put forth buds and blossoms, and to produce fruit among the sorrow-laden Hebrew race, and to prove that Jewish poetry has an enhanced value, because it immortalises the annals of Jewish history. Many have wondered why Zunz consecrated a large portion of his life to inquiries concerning Piyutim, which Ibn Ezra already stigmatised, remarking, for instance, that Qalir, in his Piyutim, had abused the Hebrew language, like an enemy who breaks down the walls of a city. One of our modern critics, Lagarde, contemns Zunz for his interest in the Piyutim, and denies him any taste in Hebrew style. The first ground of objection may be dismissed as of a superficial character. The merit of Qalir's poetry does not consist in its form—the flowers of fancy, which flourish and wither, according to the variation of tastes; but in the contents, "in the wealth of ideas, which arouse and stimulate Israel's love to his God, and in the occasional beautiful pictures which dazzle the mind and captivate the heart." Ibn Ezra, the Spaniard, only found fault with the style. The same criticism applies to the Poetanim, who followed in Qalir's footsteps. Discussing them from this point of view, and in this spirit, Zunz accomplished a useful and valuable work, for which he had the requisite aptitude. His keen insight enabled him to perceive the depth of feeling from which the Piyutim welled forth. How beautifully has this been expressed by one of our most eminent scholars, Dr. David Kaufman, in his reply to Paul Lagarde (p. 20): "Leopold Zunz," he says, "the great artist who took a comprehensive view of every subject which he investigated, recognised, with the keen, critical sagacity natural to him, that, in order adequately to discuss the Piyutim, it is absolutely requisite to conceive and describe the hell of persecution, out of which the poetical Jewish literature in the Middle Ages sprang up. It is essential that we should go the poets' land, and see the places where

these pearls of thought were formed. Zunz, unsurpassed by predecessors or contemporaries, apprehended and comprehended the storm of sighs and groans in this literature which smite on the hearts of all who have the capacity to feel. He, as no one else, sympathised with the torrents of tears that produced the poetry of the Synagogue. He was seized by a great longing to open *our* eyes to the terrible calamities Israel sustained, so that we, too, might understand the overwhelming multitude of sighs, see the spring from which flowed the streams of tears. He wished to pass in review before us the heartrending events which occasioned the sighs and the groans. With wonderful art, without unnecessary ornaments of style, without rhetorical flourishes, simply by drawing our attention to the results which his calm, patient, and dispassionate studies produced, Zunz accomplished his work. And, therefore, he deserves to be called the historian of his people; for he narrated, truthfully and vividly, its annals in the dark and troublous mediæval days. He has shown how sorrows are wedded with supplications, like lightning and thunder, like anguish and tears." All who complainingly wonder at Zunz's devotion to the Piyut should ponder these words, and they will appreciate the magnificent work which he accomplished by his investigations into that branch of literature. They will recognise that what they have rejected is the corner-stone of Jewish history. Lagarde's strictures are not worth answering, especially after Kaufman, in his *brochure* (p. 28), has proved "that this Anti-Semite critic has less knowledge than the merest schoolboy of the subject he presumes to treat, that he is even incapable of translating, much less understanding, the Hebrew poetry of the Middle Ages."

II.

From the day the *Gottesdienstliche Vorträge* came into my hands, I was drawn towards its author, and felt for him a disciple's respect for his master. I studied his

work as assiduously and carefully as I was wont to do the Talmud and Posekim. I turned over his ideas in my mind, examined his arguments, tested his positions as far as the resources of my library allowed. Although I occasionally found statements of which I could not altogether approve, I could not say that he ever consciously misled. His quotations are always given faithfully. His criticisms are genuine and just. He is not guilty of perversions, in order to force the opinions of scholars into agreement with his views or subordination to his purpose. His inquiries were always conducted in the right way. He never seeks to dazzle his readers by empty rhetorical effects. If he knew that he could convey his meaning in a sentence of three words, he would not have added a fourth for the sake of embellishment. He deemed it despicable to conceal his true opinions in ambiguous phrases. Throughout the *Gottesdienstliche Vorträge,* I have not found any remark of a contentious character, or one that would betray chagrin, jealousy, or contempt for fellow-students. He does not try to force his opinions upon others by invective or artifice. Zunz's wish was to build up the house of Israel and heal its breaches, not to pull down its walls or lay bare its foundations. He never girds at any healthy Jewish customs; but he was not blind to the fact that some of them had been covered with an accumulation of dust. The whole of his life he consecrated to our literature, which, alas, is contemned by those who are ignorant of it within and outside the Jewish community. To proclaim its merits and convince both classes of its excellence was his heartfelt longing, which, indeed, he lived to see, in a great measure, realised. Many of those who had formerly despised Jewish literature became its firm admirers. Who can deny that the living interest which our Talmudic and Midrashic literature has aroused among non-Jewish scholars, is due in a considerable degree to the influence of Zunz's writings—as, indeed, has been

abundantly acknowledged. But the fame achieved by him among his own people reached a height which very few have attained. When Zunz died, I paid a tribute to his memory (*Beth Talmud*, Pt. V., p. 71), from which the following passage may be quoted: "Zunz was a wondrous phenomenon in our generation. Everyone knows that he could not be counted among the orthodox Jews. Nor, indeed, did he have the least desire to be so counted. And yet the members of this section of Jewry speak of him with the utmost respect and reverence. For this apparently strange anomaly we can only account by a clear recognition of the fact that the Jews are truly and sincerely grateful to all their benefactors. And Zunz who was a sterling benefactor to the whole of his people, was popular with them all. Jews, both orthodox and reform, draw the water of knowledge from his well. Not a single genuine investigator, whether belonging to one or the other party, will move a step in the study of our literary antiquities without Zunz's writings at his side. How, then, should the debt of obligation to him be denied or his memory fail to be preserved." I do not think that any honest critic will fail to agree with these sentiments. If isolated individuals among us have spoken against him, we can only deplore the fact. On more than one occasion Grätz criticised him in a manner equally unworthy of the critic and the subject. Whenever I noticed it I always felt grieved at seeing one of those whose utterances were unvaryingly received with respect and carried weight, publicly disparaging our great men. Do not ignorant critics pour contumely enough on Israel's scholars? Was there any need for one of our own masters needlessly to bicker with a fellow-scholar? What could have tempted Grätz to sin so grievously against Zunz? He surely knew full well that the educated and cultured classes would not honour him any the more on this account. I am convinced that though he affected to think lightly of Zunz, he acknowledged, in his inmost heart, the

nobility of Zunz's character and the exceeding value of his labours in helping to create and foster a just appreciation of Israel's literature. Who, indeed, so competent as Grätz to appraise the extreme importance of his great contemporary's work for the science of history? Who availed himself to a greater degree of that work than Grätz, whether he names his authority or passes it over in silence? Some of Grätz's defenders affirm that, when he was about to publish the first part of his history (Vol. III.), Zunz exclaimed jokingly: "What, another history of the Jews!"—a sneer which the historian never forgave. I certainly do not blame him for feeling resentment and expressing indignation, and can enter into his sentiments. He had devoted his physical strength, his intellectual energies, and his time to the preparation of a history of the Jews which he deemed was of paramount necessity because Jost's attempt had not, in his view, risen to the height of the theme. And now who is the one to throw cold water on his undertaking? Zunz, whose criticisms in all matters appertaining to history, are by all Jewish scholars esteemed so valuable! Not only does the great critic withhold approval from his work; he actually discourages it! Can we be surprised that Grätz was keenly sensitive to this, as it seemed to him, insulting attitude, and could never forget or forgive it? But what I fail to understand is, why Grätz should have seen fit to disparage and endeavour to drag into the dust his critic's knowledge and judgment, because the latter would not take him at his own valuation. In the pursuit of knowledge, the personal factor should be eliminated. The importation of individual resentment must inevitably lead to a perversion of truth and justice. If a nobleman has put a slight upon me, shall I avenge the affront on his child? In my opinion, this was not merely a crime but a blunder. Grätz was powerless to injure Zunz. He only hurt himself. A class of scholars of another stamp also proved themselves ungrateful. The orthodox rabbis who, at the same time,

were men of culture, assiduously pored over Zunz's *Gottendienstliche Vorträge*, wrote and published articles which were based on it, and in which the best part of their material were drawn from it. And yet in their piety (!) they never so much as mentioned Zunz's name. I marvel how a man who so far approves of another's work as to appropriate it wholesale, should not only deny his obligations to his authority, but should even presume to set up as his critic. But this conduct, though hard to justify, is easy to understand.

A Rabbi of the class to which I have referred, occupies a most unenviable pesition, if fate has cast his lines among a community of zealots, where his flock, upon whom he is dependent, are his masters. Such a Rabbi, we can all understand, would have to be very cautious about mentioning Zunz; the firebrands in his congregation would at once accuse him of being hand and glove with the reformers. He is not afraid, to nearly the same extent, of the reproachful interrogatory which the cultured man would put to him: "How is it that you conceal the name of the original discoverer and owner, from whose well you draw such copious draughts of wisdom?" I am acquainted with a certain student and author who, though he has appropriated a wealth of material from Zunz's writings, frequently without dropping a hint of its origin, has, nevertheless, made it his business to criticise Zunz on every possible opportunity. I have heard this scholar urge, in all simplicity, that the course he had adopted was a supreme need at the present day. The reverence paid to Zunz, he said, has grown into an idolatry to be stamped out, or at least, weakened. I could only laugh inwardly and think to myself, How happy this man must feel in his conceit! I recollected, at the same time, that in my long life, I have frequently seen dwarfs boastfully passing judgment on intellectual giants, whose height they were incapable of measuring. All his antagonists have not succeeded in diminishing by one hair's breadth Zunz's well-earned

fame, nor did their attempts trouble him in the least. He pursued the even tenour of his way, though they "sought many crooked devices." He was a man of peace, even towards those who openly waged war against him. His path was not in the storm; he hated the strifes of scholars, never defended himself against attack, neither treated his antagonists with contempt, nor overwhelmed them with invective or vituperation. He only had to exhibit his noble spirit and they were stricken dumb.

The report that, when the first volume of Grätz's history appeared, Zunz departed from his usual rule and spoke satirically, may lower him in our eyes. That he should have gone out of his way to disparage a work on the history of the Jews—a department, the investigation of which occupied the whole of his life—may well occasion surprise. But we shall not wonder if we consider the method which Zunz pursued for the attainment of his objects, and examine in detail his productions in this branch of science. After such a survey we shall be in a position to understand why a new historical work, at this period, was not to his liking. Zunz thought that the time had not yet arrived for rearing an historical structure worthy of Israel. His ideal was a complete and stately edifice, in which nothing should be lacking. This could not be raised till all the stones, large and small, had been brought together, and all the materials requisite for a perfect building, such as he designed, were on the site. Only thus could one hope to found a glorious palace. Zunz, therefore, concentrated his attention on the details and materials of history, and aimed at gathering together one by one, the facts which would form the stones of the historic structure. But it does not lie within the power of a single individual, or even a complete generation, to accomplish the entire task. The sentence of the Mishna served him, however, as an encouraging motto: "It is not thy duty to complete the work; do not therefore deem thyself free to neglect it." Let it not be thought that I

have attributed thoughts to Zunz which he never conceived, and that the above statements are of a purely supposititious character, and have emanated from my imagination. This is not the case. All the foregoing has been gathered from Zunz's own pithy remarks. In his biography of that most eminent Jewish critic, Azariah De Rossi, Zunz explicitly says (*Kerem Chemed*, Pt. V., p. 130): "that an intelligent man will seek knowledge in details, before he will venture to discourse on great subjects." Does not this sentence sum up the arguments of the last few pages? I find in these few words, a clear indication of his views on the writing of Jewish history. The essay on De Rossi's life from which I have quoted a tersely expressed, but widely comprehensive thought, is one of the most brilliant jewels in Zunz's diadem. The biographical sketch is a perfect mine of novel information for the history of the Jews in Italy during an entire generation (see Grätz, Pt. V.) No reader can help admiring its completeness. Not a single detail that has any bearing on De Rossi's life has been left untouched. How beautiful is the author's description of De Rossi's intrepidity, which scorned the snares of the rebels against the light. "Justice was his aim, his soul longed for truth, and in the might of his spirit, he could not refrain from plunging into the ocean of investigation. The waves of reason rolled about him and he heeded not the fluttering of the bats." Who will deny that in these vivid metaphors, Zunz gave us an idea, an inkling of the way in which he sought knowledge, and of the method which he followed in dealing with the bats. For neither were his ears sensitive to their fluttering which was drowned in the roar of the rushing waters of enquiry. This essay affords clear evidence of his complete mastery over Hebrew style, and of his desire to write the results of his studies in this tongue. Some German scholars scorn to compose essays on Jewish science in the holy language, and scoff at those who adopt this practice.[1] Zunz did not belong

[1] [Weiss himself invariably writes in Hebrew, and the present essay was written in that language.—ED.]

to their ranks. I am certain that he desired to have his *Gottesdienstliche Vorträge* translated into Hebrew, if he could only have found a competent translator who could be relied upon to interpret its exact meaning according to his conception.[1]

His fame as a master of Hebrew style travelled far and wide. Hence Krochmal, in his last testament, charged his sons to entrust his writings to Zunz for publication, confident that in the hands of so perfect a Hebrew scholar the undertaking would be brought to a successful issue. And indeed, how conscientiously Zunz discharged the task allotted to him is abundantly evident from his preface, in which he discusses, with admirable conciseness and in a few lines, the successors and heirs to the prophets, *i.e.* the chosen scholars of every age up to the time of Krochmal, to whose profound erudition in the Thora and Jewish history, he does full justice. He depicts the confusion in which he found the literary remains, out of which he was asked to construct a perfect literary work. When we consider the book in its present shape and form, we are compelled to admire the marvellous skill with which Zunz created it out of chaos. With equal brevity and lucidity, he surveys the contents of the chapters, not like a mere compiler of excerpts or abstracts, but like the true critical student he indeed was. As an appendix to the preface, he wrote a long note on the three grand ethical principles suggested by the essay אמונה צרופה which the author had begun. The intelligent and attentive reader will acknowledge that they constitute the entire basis of ethical science, as conceived by the students of Judaism, and, in a generalised form they express all the good qualities which the seeker after truth may be recommended to

[1] C. D. Lippe, of Vienna, thought, many years ago, of publishing a translation of this work. Zunz replied to the request for permission, that he was aware how much correction the book needed, which he could not personally execute on account of his advanced age. He would, however, be pleased, if I and my colleagues were to undertake the responsibility of superintending the publication of a correct translation.

cultivate. A careful study of this section has convinced me that it was written from the depths of the heart, for all the qualities indicated were combined in the author himself.

"Who is wise? He who learns from all men." This sentence might have been spoken of Zunz, who did not disdain instruction—and indeed was grateful for it—whatever the quarter from which it came. It is indeed refreshing to observe the absolute honesty with which he records his thanks to S. L. Rappoport, in the preface to his *Gottesdienstliche Vorträge,* and acknowledges how much influenced he was by this scholar in his researches into Jewish homiletics. Rappoport was not the only one thus favoured. He behaved towards every one in the same way; from the obscurest author of a wise thought he learnt eagerly, intelligently and appreciatively. The truth was always welcome to him, whatever was its source or authority, and whatever was the language or place in which it was promulgated. Absolutely indifferent was it to him, whether the author was a Talmudical casuist, Chasid, Cabbalist, Doctor, or sceptical philosopher; whether he wrote or spoke in any modern vernacular, or conveyed his thoughts in the ancient language of the Hebrews. The habits and customs of the country in which a writer was born and received his early training, never affected his estimate of his work. How many German scholars have I seen whose judgment of a man and his knowledge varies according to his society manners, religious beliefs and practice! Woe to any one who appears before such critics in a long coat and with curly *Peoth* over his temples. Even if the visitor should be a past master in Pilpul and wise as Daniel, he is forthwith condemned as a fool. The long coat, the *Peoth* and the Pilpul are irresistible evidence of the justice of the sentence. But double and treble woe to one who presumes to believe in the genuineness of the Cabbala, and *à fortiori* to one who studies that occult science. All the virtues cannot

extenuate the heinous offence of faith in the Cabbala! This was Grätz's attitude towards all who devoted themselves to Cabbala, and believed in its sanctity, and endeavoured to assist materially, or even merely showed a friendly interest in the students of the mysterious science. He pronounced "Anathema Maranatha" on their merits, qualities, efforts and achievements. See for instance, his remarks on Rabbi Joseph Caro, the Geonim, the author of the אורים ותומים and Rabbi David Oppenheim. Zunz did not act after this barbarous fashion. He aspired to imitate the noble attribute of God, who looks to the heart and not to the outward appearance; judges the man and not his clothes. If among a thousand inanities, Zunz found a single worthy thought, he detached it from its mean surroundings and gave it a noble setting in his own writings. It never entered his mind to hold up its original author to scorn because the pearl which he had created was encrusted with sand and earth.

Among his many noble qualities, the following seems to me the noblest. He never condemned any one for his religious opinions. I do not find in his works ridicule of the sayings of our ancient sages. He carefully weighed all their utterances, though they did not altogether accord with his own modern ideas. Their value did not, he thought, depend upon their approximations to our latter-day conceptions. Those views, even, which may to us appear erroneous, have a basis in the sentiments of the age that produced them. And to this he refers, in his introduction to Krochmal's work, when he says: "Without a knowledge of general history, we lack the clue to the history of our race. The customs and institutions of our ancestors that have any reasonable foundation, as well as their disputations and exegeses, originate in contemporary events." This proposition implies the following converse: Since our fathers' customs, institutions, controversies and expositions are the creatures of the ages in which they were born, the records of these peculiar institutions,

exegeses and disputations are reliable evidences of the sentiments and thoughts in the early periods when they first saw light. Hence, in order to discern the *Zeit-geist* of any period, it does not matter, in the slightest degree, whether its established customs, argumentations and expositions approve themselves, or are repugnant to our taste. In either case, they reflect the character of their age. This will help us to understand why Zunz shows no special preference for the expressions of ideas that would harmonise with his views over those that are antagonistic to his convictions. Both were subjects for calm and dispassionate inquiry. That which intrinsically is of secondary value, or even quite worthless, is useful inasmuch as it affords us knowledge of historical events and allows us an insight into mental dispositions and degrees of enlightenment and culture at different epochs. For the final purpose of his enquiry—the study of Jewish national history—all these elements formed valuable material.

Marvellous was the extent of his erudition in earlier and later Hebrew literature, and in all departments of criticism. Not unseldom does he quote from writings which seem, at first sight, hardly worth wasting time over. But, as already said, Zunz read everything, secondary and inferior, as well as the best literature. His strength lay in this, that, with his keen critical insight, he found every book that he read helpful to his purpose. Among a hundred inanities he always succeeded in discovering one valuable thought at least. Zunz practised devoutly the injunctions of the Talmudic sages: "Nothing uttered by a scholar should be scornfully rejected." And this indeed is the mark of a real student. Once I had in my hand a booklet called פתח האהל, consisting of short homilies on the Pentateuchal sections. I read it through from beginning to end, and could not help laughing at its fantastic homiletics and silly exegesis. But after I had finished it I found a few more pages appended. I turned over a leaf and was astounded to find that this volume which

had aroused in me nothing but contempt for its, as I thought, idiotic author, contained some excellent thoughts. The appendix was a valuable essay on the principles of Talmudic Methodology. This taught me a needed lesson which may be thus expressed: Do not despise a book because of foolish remarks it may contain. Search it for wise thoughts; and, if you only find one sentence that approves itself to your judgment, value the book for the sake of that sentence. Zunz deserves praise, because he paid heed to our inferior, as well as our worthier, literature. Not despising small things, he accomplished great; became a teacher of many minds and set an example to be admired and followed by all upright hearts. The reader must not imagine that I ever believed Zunz's knowledge of our ancient literature could be put on a level with the profound and extensive erudition of the great Talmudical scholars, who had at their fingers' ends every topic referred to in the Talmuds and other legalistic Jewish literature, were often able to repeat, word for word, the greater portion of it by heart, and knew in the same thorough fashion all the decisions of our illustrious jurists from Alfasi and Maimonides down to their own time, and were acquainted with every Midrash at its original source. Certainly Zunz was not an erudite scholar of that pattern. Heaven forbid that my love and reverence for the man should tempt me to transgress the line of truth in his praise. It would have been impossible for one who passed the greater portion of his childhood in the Gymnasium, and of his youth and early manhood in the University, to attain this degree of proficiency; the requisite leisure was, in his case, lacking. But Zunz, I fancy, had a unique method of gaining his wide scholarship. At the outset of his career he conceived the mighty project of diligently collecting the materials and noting all the sources indispensable for a knowledge of the historic evolution of the science of Judaism, and for a comprehension of the various periods and their progressive movements, and of the spirit

that breathes in their literary products. These authorities that Zunz gathered together would, he thought, ultimately form the firm bed-rocks on which a history might be reared. To attain this purpose he laboured unremittingly and unweariedly, and extracted from buried and long-forgotten works the material necessary for his plan. In this way he successfully mastered our extensive literature. With wonderful discrimination he gathered the roses from among the thorns in the garden of Jewish literature, separated the kernel from the shell, and acquired an almost unequalled acquaintance with books. We would, however, blunder egregiously if we hastily jumped to the conclusion that Zunz condemned the thorns to destruction, or cast away the shell as absolutely worthless. Much that others regarded as thorns was not so regarded by him. The argumentative methods of the Talmud, in some cases apparently perverse or casuistic; the strange Hagadas and astounding Midrashim; the Cabbala, which, to the sound intellect, wears a forbidding aspect;—all these elements of Jewish literature, which are foreign to our present conceptions and modes of thought, were in his eyes not thorns to be thrown on the fire, but fair plants, straight and upright at first, that had, however, in course of time, grown warped and twisted. They are not, on that account, absolutely worthless. By their help we can trace the progress and development of culture among the Jews. And since this forms one of the most important departments of Jewish history, it goes without saying that the prickly thorns and gnarled stems were necessary as providing a sure basis for investigation.

I have already stated that all Zunz's writings afford evidence that one of the chief purposes, which he always kept in view, was to show to the world that Israel is not devoid of culture, and that his literature is a store-house of knowledge. In this he followed the great light of Judaism, who wrote in his letter to the scholars of Lunel (Maimonides *Responsa*, No. 49) that his heartfelt desire was: "To

show the peoples and the princes the beauty of the Thora, for indeed she is fair to look upon." In all Zunz's great works this was his goal. He felt urged to proclaim that Israel had a literature rivalling the ancient and contemporary literatures, that this woe-stricken people had a history, philosophy, and poetry second to none.

To the question, What positive benefit will accrue should public opinion admit our claims to these excellencies, Zunz replied, at the beginning of his *Zur Literatur u. Geschichte :* "If men recognise that Israel has a history, a science, and a poetic literature, like other nations, they will honour Jewish science and literature. They will accord the Jews the right of mental and spiritual equality. This recognition of Israel's intellectual and moral elevation will lead to an outpouring of the spirit of humanity on the peoples. Mutual understanding will be followed by a bond of brotherhood; the admission of the claims of Israel's science and literature would have as its inevitable corollary a concession of equality of rights to Jews in practical life." These sentences throw a flood of light on Zunz's aims and ideals, the goal he set himself, and the path by which he hoped to reach it. Zunz fought for equality of intellectual, social, and political rights, not with violent acts or with words that pierce like swords. He proceeded gently and steadily. His weapons were logical and scientific arguments that compel assent. In the war of words he was careful not to reply to invective with invective. He sought to justify Israel, to bring to light his uprightness, to announce among the nations the purity of his ideas and the sublimity of his sentiments to be found expressly or implicitly in his unjustly maligned literature. But he did not propose to enter into controversies with the reviling opponents of Judaism concerning their beliefs, or to pour ridicule on them and their views. Experience taught him, as it is daily teaching us, that those who resort to hard measures miss their aim. *He* never missed it, because he observed the counsel of the text,

"Keep uprightness; look straight: there is a future for the man of peace." A seeker of justice, he pursued humility; but he never humbled himself to the proud, nor used the beggar's cringing tone, for he did not crave a boon, but asked justice. It ought, therefore, not to be imagined that Zunz, advocating the claims of his people, always eulogised its ethics and literature in a spirit of partiality, while he shut his eyes to its faults and deliberately concealed and denied its shortcomings. It was not so. Zunz was essentially a man of truth, and neither love nor hatred could tempt him to overstep the bounds of strictest accuracy.

III.

I deem it unnecessary to apologise for refraining from a discussion of every minute incident of Zunz's life; for I do not intend to speak of his birthplace, early training, teachers, and sympathetic fellow-students by whom he was influenced—his association with them, his separation from them, and choice of a unique path—the study of Israel's wisdom and the advancement of his people's welfare—to which noble and worthy objects he consecrated his life. I will also omit any detailed account of the vicissitudes which befell him in the various portions of his life, and the difficulties that he experienced in finding a position adapted to his abilities; how the fates mocked him and changed his fortune a dozen times. At one period he was a teacher of children; then he adopted the calling of preacher, and afterwards he became the editor of a newspaper. In none of these callings was he successful. At certain times he suffered destitution, and seriously thought of seeking a situation as clerk or accountant with a Berlin firm. His extreme poverty and despair actually drove him at one time to seek a post as מורה הוראה, and he applied to Choriner, of Brody, for a Rabbinic diploma, which he obtained from that Rabbi. Surely Zunz was conscious of his comparative ignorance of Jewish

legal *praxis;* and yet, for the sake of a livelihood and salary, he so far forgot himself as to be willing to accept an office unsuitable to him and for which he was unsuited. I will not dwell upon the misfortunes which he suffered till he received the appointment of preacher to the Old Synagogue at Prague. It was not very long before he voluntarily resigned this office and returned to Berlin. These biographical details need not detain us long. In Adam's book it was evidently written: "Zunz shall win renown as a scholar, but shall not be styled Rabbi." My purpose is not to narrate the incidents of Zunz's domestic, communal, and social life, and the troubles which fate and opposition brought upon him. I only desire to place on record here a necessary and impartial criticism of his literary attainments and achievements; to offer him a merited tribute of eulogy for the noble virtues which he taught by precept and example; and to acknowledge the debt I personally owe him for the influence his life exercised upon me and the instruction I derived from his books.[1]

Yet I cannot help touching here briefly on an incident that affected his posthumous fame. After Zunz, towards the close of a long and active life, had become the glory of Berlin Jews, he was, as is commonly known, honourably maintained by the heads of that community—not by way of charity, which Zunz would never have accepted, but in return for some light duties. The income from this source, added to the profits of his later publications, supplied his modest wants, and left something over. This residue he bequeathed to a relative who had faithfully tended his old age till the last moment. On this fact becoming known, slanderers spread an exaggerated report of the wealth he had left behind him. "Look," they said, "Zunz all his lifetime feigned poverty, and has accumulated a fortune."

[1] Recently an essay on Zunz, by Dr. Maybaum, of Berlin, has reached me, containing some interesting details gathered from Zunz's letters and from the diary he kept. Credit is due to Dr. Maybaum for having put together valuable materials for a complete life of Zunz. I have had but little occasion to use them in this article.

Who raised the outcry? Not the scholars who "eat bread and salt and drink water by measure, and weary themselves in the study of the Thora"; but those who live daintily at the expense of others, and traffic with their learning. May Heaven forgive them!

As regards his attitude towards Biblical criticism, he had but little occasion to give full expression to his views. A complete chapter (Ch. II.) of his *Gottesdienstliche Vorträge* is devoted to a critical discussion of the exact date of certain of the Scriptures; and he there demonstrates that, taking their contents and substance as a fair test, some of the Biblical writings could not have been composed at the dates commonly assigned them. I have not met a criticism of the Pentateuch in any of his formal works. But Zunz was not a man to hide the convictions at which he had arrived after ripe study and mature reflection. He, therefore, in his old age, arranged his ideas on this important subject, and published a long essay on Biblical criticism, which, however, is completely taken up with a disquisition on the Five Books of Moses. He calls attention to the objections that have been advanced against the Unity of the Pentateuch, and offers conjectures as to those portions of it which should be ascribed to a later period than that of the Lawgiver. His inquiries, which dissect the Thora with the critical knife, are obviously antagonistic to the accepted traditions of Jews. What moved Zunz to publish his opinions on a matter where they would, as he could clearly foresee, be regarded as thorns in the eyes of the bulk of Jewry? Nothing but the irresistible impulse that urges the investigator faithfully to declare his ripe and carefully-matured thoughts. The true critic cannot suppress the ideas, which, in his heart, he believes to be correct. This sufficiently explains why Zunz proclaimed with tongue and pen, and, in fact, published to the whole world, the views which he cherished as truth.[1]

[1] A large portion of that essay appeared in the periodical *Z. D. M. G.*, Pt. XXVII., p. 669; the rest in his collected writings, Pt. I.

But we must remember that his critical studies, which repudiate Moses' authorship for considerable portions of the books named after him, and ascribe them to later periods, were only treated by him as hypotheses with a purely scientific value, but with no legitimate right to affect the actual living practice of Judaism. And, according to Zunz, the main thing is not study, but practice. Zunz never, as far as we have heard, looked upon his books as a guide to conduct; never presumed to lay down the law; never took it upon himself to say: These precepts are beautiful, observe them; those are ugly and obsolete, abrogate them.

The principle that governed his thoughts and beliefs may be thus formulated: The institutions of Judaism, as developed in the course of ages, adopted and confirmed by the custom of the Jewish people, consecrated by antiquity, are sacred and inviolable. To lay hands on them is to attack the very citadel of Judaism. So he expressly declares in a reply which he addressed to the Abbé Chiarini, who presumed to teach the Jews the path they should walk in religion (Zunz, *Gesammelte Schriften*, Pt. I., Sect. 12. Berlin: 1875). In that answer to our would-be mentor, who advises the Jews as to what is good for them, and enjoins them that if they wish to prosper they ought to give up their oral traditions, and return to the Law of Moses—as the Karaites had done—Zunz explicitly says: "The history of every nation exhibits either a rise or fall —progress or retrogression. No nation ever reverts to its ancient position, no people has ever allowed itself to be fettered by the dead letter. Holy Writ, as well as history, teaches that the Law of Moses was never fully and completely carried out in its literal sense. Liberty was given to the great leaders of every generation to make modifications and innovations through the properly constituted and generally recognised authorities. Priests and prophets, kings and Synhedria,[1] made frequent use of this right.

[1] According to tradition, the text, ככל התורה אשר יורוך ("according

Hence, a *return to Mosaism* would be illegal, pernicious, and, indeed, impossible. As our would-be adviser does not approve of the whole of the laws of Moses, but picks and chooses divers parts which strike him as harmonising with the general spirit of Scripture, and others which accord with the sentiment prevalent at the present moment (and who can tell what the fate of the latter will be), would not the acceptance of his counsel thicken the confusion, create fresh sects and schisms, and inflame religious bigotry? Seventeen centuries' experience has abundantly taught the Jews that the strivings for innovations of this character have always disturbed the communal peace, jeopardised their social harmony, prosperity, and happiness, and been invariably succeeded by bitter pangs of conscience." Zunz, therefore, impelled by these views, sums up his arguments at the end of his reply substantially as follows:—"We religionists will never accept the advice tendered us by this critic. Any reform in the fundamentals of our faith is so much labour lost, and is indeed positively injurious to our best interests." The just inference to be drawn from this sentiment is, that, though Zunz was a severe Biblical critic, yet his scientific criticism had no connection with the living practice of religion, in which he did not deviate by so much as a hair's breadth from the customs of his people. Zunz, far from desiring or approving, abhorred every reform of traditional Judaism. According to the views expressed in this essay, he certainly believed that nothing was better for Jews than faithful adherence to the accepted religious customs of the Jewish people, which have become, by long usage, a part of Israel's religion.

---

to the law which *they* shall teach thee") points to the laws of the elders. Of the discretion allowed the prophets, Elijah's procedure on Mount Carmel is an apt example. In regard to the priests, it is said, "Thou shalt come to the priest who shall be in those days." Of kings, as legislators, I know of none whom Zunz had in mind, except Hezekiah. The Synhedrion's main function was legislatorial.

The essay from which I have just quoted was written in Zunz's youthful period, when his heart was full of hopes and plans for the distant future. In those days, there were not a few holders of, or aspirants to, the Rabbinical office, who gave themselves up, heart and soul, to the Reform movement. Some of these preachers whom I knew, would have overturned the whole edifice of Judaism, had it depended on their will or wish. But Zunz, as we have seen, even in his young days, was not of their party. Nor when, advanced in years, and ripened in knowledge, he stood at the summit of his fame, did he alter his opinion. His views on the abrogation of Jewish customs or institutions, are set forth with sufficient explicitness in his controversy with Geiger in 1845, between whom and himself a difference had broken out, which had the effect of considerably cooling their friendship. Geiger found it intolerable that a scholar of Zunz's stamp should bear him ill-will. Not a week had formerly passed without an interchange of correspondence and now a long time had elapsed without a line from Zunz. Even his own letters to Zunz had been left unanswered. Geiger wrote again to his friend a long letter, complaining of the latter's inexplicable silence and estrangement. This is not the place for large quotations from a correspondence which has no direct bearing upon our present purpose. But one point is noteworthy. Geiger blames Zunz severely and uncompromisingly, for having, in one of his essays, upheld the custom of wearing phylacteries, as a noble and sacred institution (*Gesammelte Schriften*, Part II., p. 172, *seqq.*). Geiger wonders at this advocacy. "Even admitting," he says, "that every popular custom may possibly have a deep meaning, what can be said in favour of this particular usage, which is based on a mistaken interpretation of the text (referring to רשב"ם's exposition), and approaches dangerously close to the superstition of wearing amulets and charms. Does such an institution deserve to be called holy?" He criticises Zunz for his essay (*Ibid.* 191) on the sanctity of the Abrahamic rite, in which the author

exclaims, "God forbid that we should tamper with this precept, which was in past times, and is still at the present day, reverenced as sacred by the whole Jewish people. Who will dare to abrogate, with impunity, this holy rite?" Geiger dissented, "Though I agree that it was unwise on the part of the *Reform Verein* to touch the rite of circumcision, which the bulk of Jews still hold sacred, yet I cannot comprehend the necessity of working up a spirit of enthusiasm for the institution on the ground that it is generally esteemed." On a third occasion, he took Zunz to task because he heard that the latter observed the regulations of Judaism in his household arrangements more strictly than ever. "If Zunz's scrupulousness and punctiliousness," he says, "were a consequence of the office he holds [he was, at that time, principal of the Training College for Jewish Teachers in Berlin], it would be intelligible." But he heard it reported that Zunz's strictness was an outcome of his inward convictions; that he thought it every Jew's duty to maintain in their integrity the traditional customs universally accepted by the community. This, to him, was incomprehensible. To Geiger's ambiguous words, Zunz replied clearly and decisively, without qualification or reservation, in terms that express his fundamental views on Reform in Judaism, of which the following is the gist: "The norm as well as the sanction for Judaism is the practice actually in vogue. Its obligation rests on the consecration of general usage. The great thinkers, Maimonides, Ibn Ezra, Nachmanides, have the right and privilege of building on this foundation. It is our duty to change *our own* ways; our *religion* needs no change. Foreign excrescences, that have attached themselves to the pure creed, need to be removed, but the sacred inheritance of the congregation of Jacob should not be touched. The outcry against the Talmud can only come from one who has renounced Judaism." Thus far Zunz. This is not the place to speak about Geiger. My object is to sketch in his own words Zunz's character, methods and views on practical Judaism, and he traditions in vogue,

which alone, according to him, can form an actual standard for the religious life. We may wonder at the combination, in an honest man like Zunz, of two diametrically opposed elements.

How is scepticism as to the unity of the Pentateuch to be reconciled with a marked reverence for tradition shown in a stern refusal to budge an inch from what has been consecrated by the adoption of the people? How is a zeal for the honour of the Talmud, which he carries to the extreme length of renouncing all communication with its detractors, compatible with a doubt, not kept to himself, but deliberately disseminated, as to the authenticity of the first five books of the Bible? We shall have no occasion for surprise if we bear in mind the point already touched upon, that for Zunz, study and practice are distinct provinces. The investigator should be at liberty to explore; the soul, God's gift, is not in bonds. But any professor of a particular religion is bound to rule his life according to the code that obtains among his co-religionists; and this code is indeed differentially religion.

Among his many excellent qualities, one stands pre-eminent—the virtue of toleration. He was patient towards the views of others, both in religion and criticism. Only wickedness exasperated him. Would that all Jewish scholars emulated him in this respect. Frequent experience should have taught us sufficiently that intolerance breeds discord, and peace alone promotes well-being. Alas! to the sore grief of all right-minded people, intolerance is an old evil among the Jews. We find it manifested first and foremost by those who differ in their dogmatic belief. "Hard-shell" orthodox Israelites in one camp, arrayed against free-thinking sceptics. Neither party can bear the other. The air is filled with their vehement and constant contentions. And yet both sides are thoroughly honest. The one is honest in its universal faith, the other in its spirit of universal

inquiry. What need of quarrelling? Let each cling to his genuine beliefs. A man has no business to set himself up as a judge of his neighbour's thoughts. This office belongs to God alone, who searches the heart. Such contentions have deprived us of many advantages, and ruined our communal peace. Yet, in spite of these notorious considerations, partisans persist in disputations. Why? Because intolerance has filled them with a mad perverseness. The discussions of Jewish scholars and critics are warped by intolerance. Scholars obstinately stand on their individual opinions without a shred of reason, as if they had sworn fealty to the children of their brains. Everyone regards his argument, no matter whether good or bad, strong or weak, as absolutely irrefragable, and cannot brook opposition. Intolerance is to blame when scholars belittle and disparage each others' work, and criticise hastily, adversely, and unjustly. Of these despicable vices, Zunz showed not a trace. He had an open mind for all views, even for those not accordant with the bent of his own ideas. He did not obstinately maintain his own opinion against sound reason. He welcomed every intellectual production, and encouraged and stimulated every student. His ear and heart were always ready to receive truth, whether it came from a renowned or obscure source.

One more quality I will finally note: Zunz never cared to write critical notices of contemporary work. I do not remember ever to have seen a critique by him on a new publication. When I brought out my *Hebrew History of Jewish Tradition*—I do not, at the present moment, remember whether it was the first or second part in connection with which the incident I am about to relate occurred—I sent him a copy, and in the letter which accompanied the presentation, asked him to favour me with his opinion of my work. He replied in eulogistic terms, such as I had hardly dared to anticipate, but added: "Your wish that I should write a critique [evidently misunder-

standing my request] is one to which I cannot accede. To write critical notices on new books was never my *métier*." How wise was this self-denying ordinance! No office is more ungrateful than that of a critic. I have noticed in the press the writings of over a hundred authors, and in every case vexation has been the result of my labours. Authors' whims are enough to make one weep. One man writes a book; another examines it and gives an honest judgment, praising temperately its merits. But what is the poor critic to do with the faults and positive inaccuracies and errors? Are the blemishes to be glossed over for the sake of the author? And yet many knights of the pen are so hypersensitive that they cannot bear it to be said that their books contain errors. Others, have I seen, who knock at the scholar's doors and humbly beg: "Oh, dear critic, deign to notice my work, proclaim its praises." The critic, good-naturedly notices the work, but his honesty will not permit him to hide its faults, and so he earns the author's undying hatred. Zunz acted wisely in refraining from all criticisms on contemporary literature.

Summarising the virtues of the hero of this sketch, I would say that he was of "noble temper," that he loved his fellow-men and endeavoured to guide their steps to the Thora, that he was an honest worker, a fruitful explorer. Not more than bare justice was done him in the eulogy which I published at his death, in which I said that "his work still lives and will live for ever. His memory will never fade." Israel will honour, to the last generation, the man who devoted all his energies, during the whole of his life, to the study, elucidation, and exposition of the literature of Judaism.

I. H. Weiss.

ALFONSO DE ZAMORA.

VERY little is to be found in bibliographical works concerning Alfonso, who was one of the chief contributors to the Polyglott Bible, called *Complutensis*, in the matter containing the Targum. Roderiguez de Castro[1] says that Alfonso was born in 1480 A.D., and embraced Christianity in 1492. We shall see, later on,[2] that our author was born in 1474, and that there is no date mentioned concerning his conversion. As to his death, Le Long[3] mentions the year 1531, without indication of the source from which he derived it; we shall find later on[4] that Alfonso wrote as late as 1544, when he describes himself as old and unhappy. The same confusion will be found concerning Alfonso's letter,[5] addressed to the Jews at Rome, where he called himself the son of the wise (Rabbi) Juan de Zamora; from which we may conclude that Alfonso's father also embraced Christianity, perhaps to escape the frequent massacres at Zamora. There were at Zamora many celebrated families, such as the ancestors of Isaac Ibn Aramah,[6] author of עקדת יצחק, and of those of Jacob Ibn Habib, author of the עין יעקב.[7] Zamora had a special rite (מנהג) concerning ה' שחיטה.[8]

Alfonso, to judge from his pure Hebrew style, was educated in a Jewish school before he went to the University of Salamanca, as was the case with Paul Coronel[9] and

---

[1] *Biblioteca Española*, t. I., p. 399. [2] See below, No. xviii.

[3] *Bibliotheca Sacra* (fol. 1723), t. II., p. 604*b*.

[4] See below, No. xviii. [5] See below, p. 401.

[6] *Kore Ha-dorot* (ed. Cassel), fol. 30*a*. [7] *Ibid.*, fol. 32*a*.

[8] MS. Bodl. Hebrew d, fol. 43, ומנהגים שנוהגים בהן במדינת סמורה ואשבונה.

[9] F. Delitzsch, *Studies on the Compl. Polyglott*, 1872, p. 27.

Alfonso de Alcala,[1] who were his coadjutors for the Complutensian Bible, which appeared in 1515. Our Alfonso seemed to be in great favour with the Cardinal Ximenez de Cisneros, and later on with his successor as Archbishop of Toledo, Don Alfonso de Fonseca, to whom he dedicated his second edition (1526) of the Hebrew grammar in Latin. The first appeared at the end of the fifth volume of the *Complutensis.*

The following is the dedication which is to be found in the second edition (fol. סס 8*b*), from which we learn that Alfonso re-edited it in Alcala de Henares, with the help of Professor Pedro Siruello. It was set in type by Roderigo de la Torre in the printing office of Michael de Egia, under the supervision of Professor Don Juan de Pedraso.

דברי המחבר ׳

ויהי בימי אדוננו הקיסר דון קארלוש מלך ספרד ורומה ׳ המגדיל אמונתנו הקדושה . בשנת אחת עשרה למלכו :

אני אלפונשו דֵי סָאמוּרָה בן החכם יואן דֵי סאמורה הנקרא בְּיביל חברתי זה ספר הדקדוק מלשון הקדש עם שאר אמרים חכתובים עמו ׳ והוא שלם עם כל שרשיו ׳ שהעתקתי אתו בלשון רומיית בפי סדריה ועניניה ושמושיה ׳ מכל אשר השיג ידי ומאשר ראיתי בספרי המדקדקים הקדמונים : וזה עשיתי ברשות ובמאמר אדוננו הכהן הגדול של טליטולה ׳ כי הוא הראשון בכהונת מלכות ספרד ׳ ולפני גדולתו ומעלתו כל עמו תמיד יפלא ויחרד ׳ אשר נקרא בשמו דון אלפונשו די פּוֹנְשֵׁיקָה : וחברתיו בכאן במתא אַלְקָאלָא די אִינָארִיש בבית החכמה ובקהלת החכמים והמורים אשר היו בה ׳ כי כולם ידעו אתי וחם חזקוני ואמצוני לחברו ׳ ויותר מכולם המורה וחכם גדול פֵּידרוֹ סִירוּאֵילוֹ כי הוא עזרני בכל כחו בכוונתו השלימה ׳ אשר בחכמת אלהים תמימה ׳ כי בטורח גדול עשיתי זה בעבור שהיה להם חשק גדול לדעת ולהבין הלשון הזה אשר יש צורך גדול להאיר להם בו ׳ להספיק ספקם ולהבין סתרי הספרים ׳ ארבעה ועשרים מאירים כספרים ׳ כולם נכוחים

[1] Castro, *l.c.*, who quotes from Paulus Colomesius' *Italia et Hispania Orientalis*, p. 218.

למבין וישרים למוצאי דעת · ובהסכמת כולם עשיתי זאת לעבודת האל נורא ואיום · עד שיפוח היום · ולא לעשות לי שם כי לא שמתי זהב כסלי :

ונדפס בבית מיכאל דֵי אִיגְיאָה איש ישר ונאמן ודורש טוב לעמו : והיתה השלמתו ביום שלישי שהוא יום ראשון לחודש מָאיוֹ · שנת אלף וחמש מאות ועשרים ושש למנין ישועתנו · על יד המחוקק רודריגו דֵילָה טוֹרֵי אומן ישר ונאמן ומבין באומנות תיקון האותיות ודפיסתן יותר מכל אשר נמצאו במלכות ספרד : בימי המורה וחסיד דון יואן דֵי פֵּידְרָאסָה מתקן ושופט בבית החכמה הזה : תהלה לאל : בנלך ואעיי :

ברוך נותן ליעף כח · ולאין אונים עצמה ירבה :
ישמע חכם ויוסף לקח · ונבון תחבולות יקנה :
תן לחכם ויחכם עוד · הודע לצדיק ויוסף לקח :
אשרי אדם מצא חכמה · ואדם יפיק תבונה :
כי טוב סחרה מסחר כסף · ומחרוץ תבואתה :
בילאו · · ברוך יהוה לעולם אמן ואמן :

On the last folio, after the Symbolum, come the following lines, from which we can see that Alfonso had many enemies, and felt himself unhappy, in spite of his successful career.

ישוע משיחי · שמע שיחי · הצג רוחי · מאפך :
שחר קמתי · צור משענתי לא ישנתי · מפחדך :
זכרתי יום · נורא ואיום · למצוא פדיום · מנגדך :
אנא אל נא · הושיעה נא · עת לחננה · בישועתך :
זכור עמלי · אל חי גואלי · רפא חבלי · ברוחך :
ומעמים · ושאון לאומים · אשר קמים · על עבדך :
הצילני · כי חרפוני · בראות עני · בעברתך :
על קנאתם ושנאתם · ונאצותם · אורחותיך :
הניעמו · הורידמו · תביאמו · במשפטיך :
בי כל כסלם · זהב תבלם · ובלב כולם · שכחוך :
שנאו חכמה · אהבו מרמה · הלכו רומה · בלי יראתך :
ולי אני · הושיעני · כי מגני · בתורתך :
הסר מעלי · בוז מעללי · ושלח אלי · תשועתך :
רב פעלים · ואל אלים · במקהלים · אודה שמך :

Between the Grammar and Dedication we find (on page BB) the famous Letter addressed to the Jews at Rome and the surrounding country for controversial purposes, written in Hebrew with an interlinear Latin translation. The book seems to be so rare, that the bibliographers have never seen it, and give therefore a wrong description of it. Many have said that this Letter is to be found in the Complutensian Bible after the Grammar, which is not the case. Le Long, and many after him, confound Alfonso's Letter with St. Paul's Epistle to the Hebrews, which Alfonso translated into Latin. Castro and Maittaire give the right description of it. As far as our knowledge goes, copies of this Letter are to be found in the British Museum (two copies), in Paris and Berlin. Neither the Bodleian library, nor the University library of Cambridge possesses a copy of it. Being so rare, we believe we are justified in giving a description of it.

The title of the Letter is the following:—

אגרת ששלח המחבר ממלכות ספרד אל היהודים אשר במדינת רומה לתפוש אותם במשובתם

and it is divided into seven chapters. The first begins as follows: אנשי חיל קהל רומה וסביבותיה אליכם אישים אקרא containing a kind of introduction, and the second chapter gives proofs from the Old Testament for the Trinity. They are the same which we find in all controversies. The chief passages are, (*a*) in Isaiah vi. 3, where we find three times קדוש "holy"; (*b*) in Zechariah xii. 10. Alfonso says: והנה זכריהו הנביא נבא והעיד במקום הזה על סתר השלוש לפי שאמר והביטו אלי · ומלת אלי במקצת ספרים כתובה אליו ונקראת אלי להורות כי אב ובן ורוח הקדוש הכל אחד. In fact, the Codex Babylonicus has the variation of אליו and אלי.[1] We shall see, later on,[2] that Alfonso was well versed in grammar as well as in Massorah. Finally, Alfonso quotes the famous passage in the *Zohar*, קדיש אבא קדיש ברא קדיש רוחא דשמיא.

---

[1] See Baer's edition, 1878, p. 89, and ed. Ginsburg, 1894, p. 1115.

[2] See page 402.

Chapter 3 has for subject the Hebrew grammar. The writer says that he has studied the grammatical works of Judah Hayyuj, of R. Jonah, of the Ben Ezras, but all of them are without method, and none of their disciples can write Hebrew. The following is the Hebrew text:—

ראיתי להזכיר בסדר חכמותיכם שהן דקדוק ופירוש התורה ותלמוד וקבלה קצת הספקות וקושיות שיש לכם באמונתנו הקדושה שהם קלים להשיב לכם: ואתחיל מהראשון בראשונה והאחרון אדבר באחרונה: כי בחכמת הדקדוק ראיתי כל מה שכתבו המחברים הקדמונים שהם רַבִּי יהודה וְרַבִּי יונה: וגם ראיתי מה שחברו האחרונים שהם רַבִּי דוד קַמחי בספר המכלול · וְרַבִּי משה אחיו בקיצורו עם פירושו · והקדמת רַבִּי בנימין בר רַבִּי יהודה: וגם ראיתי מה שכתב רַבִּי אברהם אֶבֶן עֶזְרָה: והנה אין בכל ספריהם אפילו סדר אחד ישר שיסמכו התלמידים עליו לדבר לשונם בסדר הדקדוק · כי עד היום לא נמצא אפילו תלמיד אחד שיוכל וידע לדבר לשונכם בסדר הדקדוק כמו שעושים היום המאמינים אמונתנו הקדושה שמדברים לשון רומיית על סדרי דקדוקם אשר נתנו לחם המחברים הקדמונים והאחרונים · והם לועגים עליכם בעבור שאינכם יודעים לדבר לשונכם אם לא תלכו אל הספרים ארבעה ועשרים להזכיר הפסוק אשר ידבר אליכם לפי ענינכם · ואני אומר כי על זה אמר ישעיהו בדרך קינה · נלעג לשון אין בינה · וקודם זה אמר עם עמקי שפה: וסבת זה היא · כי המחברים שזכרתי לא ידעו לתת הסדרים הצריכים לדקדוק לשונם ובלבלו דבריהם בלא סדר וכתבו הרבה דברים יתֵרים שלא לצורך עד שילאה כל אדם לקראם ולהבינם וחסרו הסדרים היותר צריכים · ועל כן היתה מלאכת הדקדוק בעיניהם כאבן מעמסה · ותחי עליהם למשא · ולכן למדו לשונם על הרגל · כי אז טוב להם שלא ילאו ויגעו לריק · ולעגו עליהם המאמינים לחסרון דעתם · ובעבור שלא להֵראות כבד פה וכבד לשון לא כתבתי לכם כל המקומות אשר טעו בהם המחברים בדקדוקם · אך אם תרצו להודיעם לבניכם כתבו אלי ואני אשלח לכם כל כבדות דבריהם על דרך שם ופעל ומלה · אשר נטו בשכלם אל השמאל ולא אל הימין: ובסבת זה נפלו ולא יקומו ואבדה תקותם · כי ידוע לכל כי חבית הנבנה אל עפר הארץ במהרה יפול כי אין לו יסוד כי אם לא השיגו הדרך הישרה והטובה בחכמת הדקדוק השפלה לחסרון שכלם:

כל שכן שלא ישיגו בפירושם להבין ולגלות כל דברי הארבעה ועשרים ספרים · שהם מאירים כספירים · שחכמיכם הבינו ופירשו אותם על דרך הפשט או להועלת לבד כמו שפירש רַבִּי לוי בן גרשם · אבל לא על צורות גדולות ונפלאות כמו שהבינו ופירשו החכמים והמורים המאמינים אמותנו הקדושה···

In the fourth chapter he says as follows:

עוד נוכל לומר בסתר אותיות דָּם וָפֵּץ כי כבר ידעתם כי הן כתובות לעולם בסוף המלות ואמרו חכמיכם כי צופים (theorici) אמרום לתשלום המאות · ואינָהּ כבה מספקת שיכתבו על זה בסוף המלות · ועוד כי אין מספרן דומה למספר כְּמִנְפָּץ חביריהן · ומספר תשלום המאות באותיות דם וף עד היום לא נהגו אתו בשום דיני ממנות מפני שהוא ספק אבל אותיות דם וף הן כתובות בסוף המלות להורות מה שאמרתי למעלה בפרק השני כי לקץ הימים ישובו וירוחמו · רוצה לומר כי אז ינפצו דברי הכתוב ויבינו מה שלא הבינו·····

The sixth chapter has for subject the Talmud, of which Alfonso says the following :—

עוד חברו חכמיכם התלמוד בשתא סדרי שהם זרעים ומועד ונשים קדשים טהרות נזיקין · שכולם נכללים בשתי המלות האלו שהם זמן קטן · בעבור כי כן היו לזמן מעט · ויש שם בתוך המשפטים והתורות דברים רבים על דרך חידות וכזבים ודבלים כי אינם מועילים שאם ידעו אותם המאמינים ילעגו מהם · כמו פתרון החלומות שאמרו שהחלום אחד מששים בנבואה · ומאמינים בו וצמים עליו ומתפללים ופותרים אתו · והוא חלישות חמוח ובלבול השכל · וכן יש חדות רבות מחכמיכם כמו שאמרו איבריה דרב פלוני כחמת בת תשעה קבין · שאם הוא על דרך משל למה המשילוהו באיברו ולא בראשו או זרועו או ידו שעשו צחוק למאמיני אמונתנו הקדושה · וכן מאמר עוג מלך הבשן על מחנה ישראל דהוה תלתי פרסאי איזיל אנא ואיעקר טורא ואשדי אגבייהו שקליה ברישיה ואתו נמלי ונקבוהי ונחת לכתפיה · בעא למרמייה רבוהי לשיניה ותברוהי ועל דא כתיב שני רשעים שברת · אל תקרי שברת אלא שרבבת · כי בושתי לקרא ולשמוע הדברים האלה · וכן הנפלאות המספרים שאומרים אתרחיש ליה ניסא · ודברים אחרים רבים כאלה אשר מצחקים

מהם המאמינים היום · ובסבת זה המלך והמלכה שעברו דון פירנאנדו ודניא אלישבע גזרו לשרוף כל התלמוד שהלשינוהו יהודים רבים שהיו עבדיהם · כי מהרסיך ומחריביך ממך יצאו : ואני אומר לכם שאם ישרפוהו שהיו עושים עמכם חסד גדול למצוא מרגוע לנפשכם בעבור כי אין לכם תועלת בו כי הסברות רבות ומשונות זו מזו שעד היום לא ידעו האמת לדון משפטיהם · ולדרוש לאלהיהם · והקושיות רבות · במלות שונות ורובם בלי תשובה · וכן כתב החדושין על זה רִבִּי משה בר נחמן · והוא בלבל השכל האמיתי · ואף רב אַלְפַּס חביא ספקות רבות אף כי הוא המובחר שבהם · ובראותי כל אלה לא הבאתי לכם רְאָיות מן התלמוד לפי שהוא ספר בלבול : מה שאין כן למאמינים אמונתינו הקדושה בחקיהם ובדתיהם ובערכאות שלהם כי כולם ברורים ונכונים ומפורשים ויודעים בלי בלבול כל חכמותיהם ובלי ספקות וקושיות · ואם כן איך תבינו אל פעולות יהוה ואל מעשה ידיו · ובסבת זה יתקיים בכם הכתוב למטה שאומר יהרסם ולא יבנם אם לא תשובו להאמין אמונתנו הקדושה :

The seventh chapter treats of the Kabbalah, of which we give the following extract:—

עוד חברו חכמיכם חכמת הקבלה העיונית והיא חכמתכם ובינתכם אבל לא לעיני העמים כי הם משחקים עליכם מהנוטריקון וגיא מַטְרִיא והתמורה שהוא גְּפַת אגוז כמו שידעתם כי גימל ונון ותיו מורות על שלשתם · ובעבור שדברו חכמיכם בהכמה הזאת לפי רצונם בלי יכוד ותבונה לכן כל השמעים דבריהם יתמהו תמיד מהם כי הם דברי קסם וחידות נשים · ושומר רוח לא יזרע · ולכי דעתכם חכמת הקבלה קבלה משה מסיני ולא כתבה בעבור שיש בו סודות הרבה שלא יבינם כל אדם בינוני אם לא יהיה חכם גדול · ואלה הסודות נשארו בסכום האותיות או בצורה ובנוטריקון או בדברים היתָרים בכתוב או בענין האותיות או המלות :

We shall now enumerate, chronologically, Alfonso's literary productions, original (which are few) as well as copies, with the complete Hebrew postscripts. We do not pretend to be exhaustive, for it is possible that some works of his exist in some provincial libraries in Spain. It is even possible that there are some of his MSS. in one or another of

the Madrid libraries, as well as at the Escorial, which we have overlooked. We hope that our learned friend, D. Fidel Fita, will be able to supplement the lacunæ. We shall see[1] that no work of Alfonso is recorded between 1500 and 1516, but we can scarcely believe that Alfonso remained inactive for fifteen years.

I., DATE 1500.

Targum on Prophets, with a Latin translation, to be found in the University Library of Madrid, without name, but probably by Alfonso de Zamora. Colophon:—

נשלם תרגום הנביאים בעזרת גואלנו שוכן מרומים בצווי הנעלה דון פראי פראנסישקו זימֵינֵיץ אדון הכהנים הוא ברחמיו יאריך לו ימים ויקיים בו מקרא שכתוב תורת אמת היתה בפיהו ועולה לא נמצא בשפתיו בשלום ובמישור הלך אתי ורבים השיב מעין ונא' כי שפתי כהן ישמרו דעת ותורה יבקשו מפיהו כי מלאך ה' צבאות הוא ונשלם בכ"ז יום לחדש גוליו שנת אלף וחמש מאות לביאת גואלנו מלך המשיח וחסימן כי בבו בחר אדני אלהים לכהונה דון פראי פראנסישקו גימיניץ קארדינאל די אישפניא ארסיבישפו די טולידו בחסד אלהים:

Made by the command of Cardinal Ximenez; finished the 27th July, 1500 A.D.

II., DATED 1516.

MS. at the University Library of Salamanca. This MS. contains: (1) השער בגדר השיר, "On Poetry," by Gabirol, attributed to Moses Qamhi (in the Latin translation written *Camchi*) in the edition; the real author is David Ibn Yahya;[2] (2) "the Accents according to the Italian and Sephardic rites"; (3) "R. Meir ben Todros Abulafia's Masoretic treatise (מסורת)," finished the fifth of Elul, 4987 A.M. =1227, at Toledo. Colophon:—נשלם כל הספר הזה ביום ב' ו' ימים להדש אוטוברי בשנת אלף ות"ק וי"ז ללידת מושיענו ישוע משיח ע"י אלונשו די שאמורה עבדו בכאן במרא אלכלא

[1] See below, Nos. I. and II.

[2] See Steinschneider, *Catal. Libr. Heb. Ox.*, p. 866.

בטרחות גדול.....די אינריש. Finished at Alcale de Henares, Monday, the seventh of October, 1516, under great difficulties. Alfonso claims to have taken this treatise from a copy made by Baruch Ibn Sahl (סהל), who transcribed it from the autograph, and there he saw the author's signature, R. Meir hal-Levi ben R. Todros. The date of composition, 4987, as well as the words ועיני ראו חתימת שמו is also found in the Escorial MS., G. Pluteo I., No. 5, which contains the commentaries on Psalms by D. Qamhi and M. Meiri, and those by Rashi and Levi b. Gershom on the five Megilloth, Ezra and Nehemiah, followed by שטר מכירת חמן למרדכי and the מסורות ס׳, but the name of the copyist, Baruch, does not occur in it, as far as we have noticed it. (4) "D. Qamhi's Dictionary," dedicated to Ximenes (ברשות דון פר׳ שמיניץ), and here Alfonso says that he is forty-two years old. He gives the title of these four treatises, which are translated into Latin, as קרית ארבע (Genesis xxii. 2), in allusion to the numbers of the books found in it. There are some glosses on the last two treatises. At the end of the MS., by another hand, it is stated that the King Don Carlos, son of Doña Juana (דוניא גואנא), daughter of Don Fernando and Isabella, went to Spain in the year 1518, when he was seventeen or eighteen years old, and brought with him a councillor, called שיביש, who had put enormous taxes upon the people. This caused a revolution against the king, and he had to return to his country with great shame.

III., DATED 1517.

"Targum of Hagiographa," with a Latin translation (forming the second volume of No. 1). Colophon:— נשלם ביום רביעי שמונה ימים לחדש אבריל שנת אלף וחמש מאות וי״ז ללידת מושיענו יהושע משיח על יד אלפונשו די סמורה במאמר דון פראנסישקו שִׂימִינִיז די סיסנירוש כהן גדול של טוליטולה במתא אלכלה די אֵינָרִיש שבה לאל:

Made at the wish of Cardinal Ximenez at Alcala de Henares, finished Wednesday, the 8th of April, 1517.

IV., DATED 1519.

In the Angelica at Rome, No. 21,[1] "Grammar and Dictionary of Joseph Caspi (see *Histoire Littéraire de la France*, t. XXXI., p. 499). Colophon:—נשלם הספר הזה ביום שביעי כ"ג לחדש גולייו שנת אלף וחמש מאות ותשעה עשר ללידת מושיענו יהושע המשיח על יד אלונשו די סאמורה עבדו בכאן במתא אלכאלה די אינאריש. Copied at Alcala de Henares, finished on Saturday, the 23rd July, 1519.

V., DATED 1519.

"Escorial Pluteo 2. c. 85. Moses Qamhi's מהלך, with Benjamin's notes and a part of the מכלל." Written at Alcala de Henares, finished in December, 1519.

VI., DATED 1520.

At the end of a Bible with the lesser Massorah, written Tebeth, 5242=1481, at Tarasona, by Yom Tob, son of Isaac Amarillo (see *Archives des Missions Scientifiques*, 2nd série, vol. v., p. 424), followed by the text of the "Megillath Antiochos" (in Hebrew), we find the following colophon:—אני אלונשו די סאמורה יום ראשון מחדש מארסו שנה אלף ותקכ משם והלאה הוסר כחי ונחלש רוחי ועיני כהו ותעו נתיבותי וכל אחבי כחשוני ושנאוני והיו לו לאויבים ולא מצאתי מנוח לרוחי ולכף רגלי וימי נזעכו ורוחי (effaced) לאלהים..... ותצא מן העולם:

In this postscript, dated the 1st of March, 1520, Alfonso complains of his friends who turned from him; he is unhappy and ill (see below, p. 414).

VII., DATED 1520.

Escorial Pluteo I., No. 4. "Genesis," with Spanish translation and marginal notes, has the following colophon:—נשלם הספר הזה של בראשית עם הנוסחאות מל' רומיות הכתובות עמי ביום ג' כ"ו ימים לחדש גוניו שנת אלף ות"ק

[1] See the Catalogue, p. 94.

וכ׳ שנים ללידת מושיענו ישוע משיח על יד עבדו אלפונשו די סאמורה במתא אלכאלה די אינאריש לחכם הגדול בחכמת אלהים כי די סירואילו כי שמעו בכל הארץ שבת ליי. Finished Tuesday, the 26th June, 1520, at Alcala de Henares for Sirillio (see above, p. 399).

VIII., DATED 1526.

National Library, Madrid, C. 33, No. 5. D. Qamhi, Dictionary without vowel points, except the word קָמחִי, probably by Alfonso, dated Thursday, the 11th August, 1526, according to the end, where we read, יום ה׳ י״ו ימים לחדש אגוסטו שנת ת״ק וכ״ו ללידת מושיענו ישוע המשיח דכרתי ואמרתי כי המורה אנטוניו דילה פואיטה לא יקומו דבריך ואני אומר שהוא יעמיד בית חכמת אלכאלה די אינאריש. At beginning we read: נאמר לכהן קוריא שישמני פירושי הנביאים שהם לי נקודות כי שלא יתפאר על שאנגיז וחביריו שאינם יודעים לקרוא בלי נקודות ויש לו פירושים בלי נקודות כמו מלאכת אדון גדול ויהיה לי יותר נחת רוח ומעט עמל:

Finished Thursday, 16th August, 1526. He mentions the Professor Antonio de la Foveta as being opposed to the establishing of an university at Alcala de Henares. He mentions the priest Corea who reproached Sanjez that he could not read unpointed Hebrew. We cannot elucidate the matter in dispute; nothing of it is mentioned in La Fuente's *Historia de las Universitades en España.*

IX., PROBABLY 1526.

The second edition of Alfonso's Hebrew Grammar and his letter addressed to the Jews at Rome, see above, p. 398.

X., DATED 1527.

Univ. Libr. Madrid. A Latin translation of Genesis, with the following colophon:— בימי המברך? דון אנטוניאו די קאשקאנטו המתקן נשלם הספר הזה ביום שני י״ד יום לחדש אינירו שנת אלף וחמש מאות ועשרים ושבע למנין ישועתנו על יד אלפונסו די סאמורה במתא אלכלה תהלה לאל:

Finished the 14th of January, 1527, at Alcala de Henares at the time of the corrector (?) Don Antonio de Cascanto (?).

XI., DATED 1527.

MS. in the National Library of Paris, Hebrew No. 1229. David Qamhi's Grammar, text with Latin translation, has the following colophon:—נשלם חלק הדקדוק · נכתב ספר המכלול הזה לנגיד והחכם הכולל אידוארדו לְיאוּ ציר נאמן ממלכות אינגילאטיירא לאדוננו הקיסר דון קארלוש מלך ספרד ורומה המגדיל אמונתינו הקדושה ונשלם ביום שביעי שני ימים לחודש נביאימברי על יר אלפונשו די סאמורה במתא אלקאלה די אינאריש בשנת אלף ותק וכז למנין ישועתנו בעצת החכם השלם מאשטרי פאבלו נוניז קורוניל איש תם וישר ירא אלהים וסר מרע אשר שמעו בכל הארץ ברוך נותן ליעף כח ולאין אונים עצמה ירבה :

ברוך יהוה לעולם אמן ואמן :

Written for Eduardo Leo, English Ambassador at the court of the Emperor Charles V., at the advice of Maestro Pablo Nuñez Coronel, finished Saturday, the 2nd of November, 1527.

This MS. also has קָמְחִי. No doubt that the Spanish Jews pronounced this name *Camhi;* indeed, the nickname of הַחִטִי given to our David by the Provençal Rabbi can only be explained by the Arabic word *Qamh,* "wheat," and has no sense if pronounced *Qimhi,* from קמח, "flower." There are now families in the East called *Qamhi* and *Qimhi*, of which the former is the Hispanico-Arabic pronunciation, and the latter that of the Franco-Germanic pronunciation, who only know the word קֶמַח and not the Arabic *Qamḥ.*

XII., DATED 1530.

National Library, Madrid, No. 12, contains the Latin translation of Isaiah, Daniel, and Lamentations. Colophon:—שלשת הספרים האלה שהם קינות ודניאל וישעיהו במתא אלכלה די אינריש על ידי אלונסו די סאמורה ונשלמו ביום שביעי י״ח יום לחדש אוטוברי לשנת אלף ותק ול למנין ישועתנו :

These three books were written at Alcala de Henares, finished on Saturday, the 15th of October, 1530.

XIII., DATED 1532.

Aramaic introduction to the Targum of Isaiah, begun at Salonica, Tuesday the 28th of February, 1532, according to the following words in the Leiden MS., יום ג׳ כ״ח היברורי התחלתי מלאכת שלמנקה שנת לב׳. The name of Alfonso does not occur in the MS., but there can be no doubt that he is the author, for Alfonso alone had charge of the Targum for the Complutensis.[1] Cardinal Ximenez has his full praise, as well as Coronel.

The following Introduction is to be found in the MS. Warner, 65 F :—

הקדמת מלאכת התרגום שכתבתי למדינת שאלאמאנקה :
דברי כותב הספר הזה : לכל הקורא בו בדבר כל חוזה :
תרגומא דנביאיא מפרש עם מליצותא דלישנא דרומאי לקיבליה
כתיבא בדיל דירחטון כל דקריין ביה ולא יטעון : דיעל תרגומא
חדא פקיד וגזר למיעתק ולמיכתב חכימא שלימאה בחכמתא
דאלהא דשמיא : דון פריהיי פראנסישקו שימיניץ די סישנירוש
כהנא רבא דטליטולה קדמאי מן ספרדתא : ודא עבד בתר דבנא
ביתא החכמתא רבא ויקירא דחזינא יומא דין במתא אלכלה די
אינאריש ובתר דגזר ופקיד למידפס כל ארבעה ועשרין ספרין
דאוריתא בארבע לישני דאינון מתחזן תמן לדוכרנא רבא ויקירא :
ודא עבד בדיל למידע ולמולף סהרין סגיאין וקשיטין ומהימנין
ויציבין דאישתכחו בלישנא דעבראן לסעדא להימנותנא קדישתא
דישוע משיחא בר אלהא חיא : ובתרגומא חדא דנביאיא דתרגם
יהונתן בר עזיאל אישתכחו פיתגמין דקשוט דאנון מסעדין
להימנותנא קדישתא : ובנבואת ישעיהו בר אמוץ אישתכחו יתיר
מבכולהון : ועל דא איתכתב תרגומא חדא בסיפרא הדין לסוכלי
תנותא ומנדעא טבתא : בדיל דיהסנון ויהנון לאיסתכלא הני
פתגמיא דתרגומא כל חד מנהון באתרי ויטרון יתהון בליבהון :
ומליצותא חדא דלישנא דרומאי אעתק יתה מלביה חכימא
שלימא בחכמתא דאלהא והוא גבר שלים בדחלתא דיי : ועדי

[1] See Steinschneider's *Catalogus Codd. Hebræorum Bibl.*, Acad. Lugduno Batavorum, 1858, p. 281.

מין בישא דאיתקרי בשמיה מאשטרי פאבלו קורוניל די שמעיה בכל ארעא[1] : וספרא חדין איתכתב לשואה יתיה בבית ספריא דחכימין שלימין · דאינון בקרתא יקירתא דשאלמאנקה בלימודא יקירא וישיבתא רברבתא בדיל דאינון מיניה כל דיתרעון למידע סתרין מהימנין דאוריתא : וכען שכינא בנבואת ישעיהו בר אמוץ בדיל דאיתנבי על ישוע משיחא בר אלהא חיא פתגמין טבין כמא דמיתחזי בחדין כתיבא דקרינא ביה בדין אורחא :

XIV., DATED 1534.

University Library, Madrid. "Commentary of D. Qamhi on Isaïe," written by Hayyim ben Samuel Ibn רוגאת, completed by Alfonso, has the following colophon: די אלפונשו סמורה כתב חסרוני הספר הזה והם נקודים ונשלם בשנת אלף ותק ולד למנין ישועתנו במתא אלכאלה די אינאריש, completed at Alcala de Henares in the year 1534.

XV., DATED 1534.

MS. Madrid Bibl. Nac. David Qamhi's Dictionary has the following colophon: נשלם חסרון ס׳ המכלול הזה והוא הנקוד על יד אלפונשו די סמורה במתא אלכאלה די אינריש לשום אותו בבית הספרים אשר שם יעיינו בו החכמים והמורים כדי לחבין סתרי הספרים יד מאירים כספירים בשנת אלף ותק ולד למולד ישו ביום ב׳ ב׳ ימים לחדש אוטוברי. Completed at Alcala de Henares, finished on Monday, the 2nd of October, 1534. To be kept in the Library at the disposal of students.

XVI., DATED 1534.

"Targum Onqelos" (MS. Escorial), followed by תוספתות התרגום, which are those found in the so-called "Targum Yerushalmi," on היא מוצאת (Gen. xxxviii. 25), ויגש אליו (Gen. xliv. 18), לישועתך (Gen. xlix. 18), and ויהי בשלח (Exod. xiii. 17), followed by the words: וחשאר תוספתות החומש הם כתובות בספר הזה במקומם "The other passages will be found in their places." Colophon: אלפונשו די סמוראה כתב חסרוני הספר הזה בשנת אלף ותק ולד למנין

[1] From ומליצותא (l.) seems to be erased in the MS.

ישועתנו במתא אלכאלה די אינָאריש שבח לאל. Completed at Alcala de Henares finished in 1534.

XVII., DATED 1536.

MS. Nac. Library, containing the Pentateuch, completed by Alfonso, has the following colophon:— נכתבו חסרוני החומש הזה על יד אלפונשו די סאמורה במתא אלכָאלָא די אינאריש ונשלמו ביום רביעי י"א יום לחדש אוטוברו שנת אלף ותק ולו למנין ישעתנו שבח לאל. Completed at Alcala de Henares, finished on Wednesday, the 15th October, 1536. MS. Leiden.

XVIII., DATED 1544.

Letters addressed by Professor Sornosa, at the University of Alcala de Henares, to Pope Paul III. and to Cardinal de Santa Balvina, asking protection in the name of all the Professors against D. Juan Tavera, who persecutes the University. We have no means of finding out what these persecutions were; it seems against Hebrew teaching. These letters were either translated into Hebrew, if not composed, by Alfonso. He says here that he is about seventy years old, and has not yet seen happiness. He has pointed these letters for the use of those who are not advanced Hebrew scholars. He adds that he alone remains now of the wise men of Spain who were exiled in the year 5252 (1492 A.D.).

אגרת ששלח המורה סוֹרְנוֹסָה שופט ומישר בישיבת אלכלה די אינריש לאב הקדוש אשר במדינת רומי אב קדוש אדוננו פאולו השלישי כהן גדול ונשא מן הקדושה והכללית קהלת רומי כבר ויודעת קדושתך וחכמתך רבה מה שאומר שלמה בכל חכמת הגדולה שנתן לו האל כי בשבח החכמה האריך מאד ואמר אשרי אדם מצא חכמה ואדם יפיק תבונה · כי טוב שחרה מסחר כסף ומחרוץ תבואתה · וקדושתך יודעת כי אדם ביקר ולא יבין נמשל כבהמות נדמו והחכמה היותר אמיתית והישרה היא אותה שנבין בה הכתוב הקדוש שמספר שם מעשי האל ונפלאותיו שברא את העולם בחכמתו הגדולה והנפלאת · כמו שאמר שלמה בחכמתה יהוה בחכמה יסד ארץ כונן שמים

בתבונה ומתוך החכמה הזאת יהיה לנו יראת האל כמו שאמר
אם תבקשנה ככסף וכמטמונים תחפשנה · אז תבין יראת יהוה
ודעת אלהים תמצא · כי מתוך זאת החכמה תגדל ותנשא
אמונתנו הקדושה והכללית שאם נאמין אותה באמת אז נשיג
מלכות השמים · ויש עזרה אחת גדולה להבין הכתובים
הקדושים ביותר מאד · והיא השלש לשונות שהן רומית ויונית
ויהודית · כי כן הזהירנו גירונימו הקדוש בהקדמתו ואמר שאם
יהיה לנו ספק בספרים ארבעה ועשרים שנקרא ונלך ללשון
יהודית · ואם בבשורות משיחנו ישוע שנלך ללשון יונית ואנחנו
עבדיך כל החכמים והמורים היושבים בישיבה הזאת בעיר
אלכאלא די אינאריש כלנו נושקים רגליך וידי קדושתך בשכלות
גדולה ולמדנו אלה השלש הלשונות הנזכרות ועסקנו בהן כדי
להגדיל אמונתינו הקדושה והכללית · ואנחנו מבקשים ושואלים
מקדושתך רבה שתעזרנו בעבור אהבת האלהים שיש בקדושתך
ותצילנו מיד אויבנו כהן טליטלה שרדפנו על לא חמס בכפינו ·
והוא אדון העיר הזאת ונקרא בשמו דון גואן טאבירה ומביא
עלינו בכל יום תמיד צרות רבות ורעות · ועבר על מצותיך
וכתביך הקדושים שנתת לנו להנן בעדנו וגם כן עבר על כתבי
האבות הקדושים אשר היו לפניך וכתביך וכתביהם לא קיים ·
ולא די שלא קימם אלא שקרע כתביך הקדושים השופט ששם
עלינו בזדון גדול והוא יושב בעיר הזאת הנזכרת ונקרא בשמו
קירוגה · וגם כן עבר על מצות אדוננו הקיסר דון קארלוש שהוא
הגין עלינו וצוה שלא יעניגו ושישמרו חוקותינו עד שישוב
למלכות ספרד ולא די שקרע שופטהו כתביך אלא שהכה על
הלחי לשליח ששלחנו אליו שיקרא כתביך הקדושים לפניו כי
בצרה גדולה אנחנו עמו ונחשבנו כצאן טבחה בעיניו : ולא
ידענו למה עושה זאת העוות · אם מקנאה או משנאת החכמה
או אהבת הממון או להקטין זכרון הכהן של טליטולה שבא
לפניו ויסד זאת הישיבה בכונת עבודת האל שנקרא בשמו
פריחיי פראנסישקו שימיניץ שהיה איש תם וישר וירא אלהים
וסר מרע כמו שנראה ככל מלאכותיו הטובות שעשה · וסבלנו
עד עתה כל הצרות הרעות הנזכרות בתקות עזרת קדושתך
שאתה יושב במקום האלהים ואתה איש אלהים קדוש · כי אם
תעשה קדושתך השאלה הזאת ששאלנו יהוה יהיה בכסלך
ושמר מלך מלכך ואני חמורה סורנוצה מישר ושופט מן
הישיבה הטובה הזאת כתבתי לקדושתך האגרת הזאת בהסכמת
כל החכמים והמורים היושבים בה ואני והם משתחוים לקדושתך

רבה בשפלות גדולה ובכל יום תמיד אנו מתפללים לאל שיגדיל קדושתך לעבודתו הקדושה ברחמיו אמן :

נכתבה ונשלמה האגרת הזאת לעבודת האל ביום שני שלשים ואחד יום לחדש מארסו שנת אלף וחמש מאות וארבעים וארבע למנין ישועתנו בישיבת אלכלה די אינאריש על יְדי אלפונשו די סאמורה מלמד לשון יהודית בזאת הישיבה לכל הרוצים ללמדה · והרי אני כבן שבעים שנה ולא זכיתי ליום טוב עד היום : וכתבתי זאת האגרת בנקודותיה כדי שיבין אותה כל אדם בינוני אף כי לא יהיה חכם כי לחכמים אין צריך נקודות אלא שישלמו חסרוני · כי אני נשארתי לבדי מכל חכמי ספרד מן גירוש מלכות קאשטיליה שהיה בשנת חמשת אלפים ומאתים ושתים וחמישים לבריאת עולם למנין שמונים בו היום כל היהודים היושבים בכל העולם בגלות בעונם

סוף שבח לאל

finis laus deo ובכל אותיות השימוש עשיתי זה האות ✓ כדי שיכירם הקורא ואל יתמה | בכלמה מי שיראם :

Para el Cardinal de Santa Balvina.
Illustrissimo y Revectissimo (so).

אדון נאור ונעלה מאד :

כבר יודעת אדנותך וחכמתך רבה מה שאומר ירמיהו הנביא בראות משובת המון עמו שהיו מבזים דברי האל שהיה אומר להם בכל יום · ובכאב נפש ועצבת לבו צעק ואמר אלכה לי אל הגדולים ואדברה אותם כי המה ידעו דרך יהוה משפט אלהיהם · אך המה יחדו שברו על נתקו מוסרות שרצה לומר כי גדולי העם ושריו ושפטיו ומנהיגיו חייבים ליישר ולתקן כל דבר מעקל ורע שיראו בהמון העם · והזהיר להם שאם לא יעשו כן כי כלם יאבדו · ובעבור שלא עשה כן אבדה ירושלם כמו שאנו רואים היום וקוראים בספר קינות ירמיהו שחרבה ירושלם על עוות הדין שהיו עושים תמיד בה כמו שאמר ישעיהו הנביא צדק ילין בה ועתה מרצחים · וכן אמר עוד גזלת העני בבתיכם : וכמו שאלה הנביאים צעקו על עוות הדין שהיה בירושלם כן אנחנו עבדיך וצאן מרעיתך צועקים לאדנותך כל החכמים והמורים היושבים בישיבה הזאת בעיר אלכלה די אינריש כי אדנותך מגין ואדון הישיבה הזאת · וכמו שעד עתה עשה אדנותך חסדים רבים וטובים עמנו לחגן בעדנו כן שאלנו עתה לאדנותך שתגן עלינו ותעזור לנו כי כחן טליטולה שנקרא

דון גואן טאבירה מביא עלינו צרות רבות ורעות כמו שיספר לאדנותך יותר באריכות מליצנו בעדות שיש לו מזה · כי אינו רוצה להקים החקות והחנות וכתבי האב הקדוש והאבות הקדושים שהיו לפניו שנתן לנו להנן עלינו · ועבר על מצות קדושתו הוא ואמניו ושופטהו קרע כתבי אב הקדוש ונקרא קירוגה · והוא זדוני מאד וגם כן עבר על מצות אדונינו הקיסר דון קארלוש שהוא מגין ואדון הישיבה הזאת כמו אדנותך · והוא צוה שלא יזיקנו בשום דבר קטון או גדול עד שישוב למלכות ספרד · כי אז יתן סדר כדי שישמרו כל החקות והחנות והחסדים כמו שסדרם פריהיי פראנסישקו שימיניץ כהן טילוטולה שיסד הישיבה הזאת לעבודת האל · ועל כן אנחנו עבדיך שואלים מאדנותך שתספר כל הדברים האלה לאב הקדוש ותשאל לו שלא יאבה כל הרעות האלה בקהלת האלהים כיון שהוא יושב במקומו · והוא איש אלהים קדוש · כי בתקות עזרת אדנותך סבלנו עד עתה כל הצרות האלה ועסקנו תמיד בחכמת האלהים כדי להגדיל אמונתנו הקדושה והכללית ואם תעשה אדנותך זה ששאלנו אז יהוה יהיה בכסלך ושמר רגלך מלכך : ואני המורה סרנוצה מישר ושופט מן הישיבה הזאת כתבתי לאדנותך האגרת הזאת בהסכמת כל החכמים והמורים המשבים בה ואני והם משתחוים לאדנותך בשפלות גדולה · ובכל יום תמיד אנו מתפללים לאל שיאריך חייך בבריאות ושלום לעבודתו הקדושה · כי לא שכחנו החסידים הגדולים שעד עתה עשה אדנותך עמנו · האל יציל אדנותך מרעה אמן :

נכתבה ונשלמה האגרת הזאת ביום שלישי שהוא יום ראשון לחדש אבריל · שנת אלף וחמש מאות וארבעים וארבע למנין ישועתנו באלכלה על יד סאמורה כתב ומליץ האגרת הזאת laus deo שבח לאל :

The first letter was finished on Monday, the 1st of March, 1544. Here Alfonso calls himself teacher of Hebrew at the University of Alcala de Henares. The second letter was finished on Tuesday, the first of April, 1544.

XIX., DATED 1558.

MS. Bibl. Nac., No. 13, contains Exodus in Latin, with the following colophon :—

נכתב הספר הזה בכאן במתא אלכלה די אינריש לתת אותו בבית הספרים שיועיל לכל התלמידים הבאים ללמד מארץ אחרת

ינשלם ביום ו' כ"ז יום לחדש נוביימברי שנת אלף ותק ונח למולד ישו על יד אלפונשו די סמורה והוא שחבר והדפיס דקדוק לשון עברית בלשון רומית ונכתב ונשלם בימי המורה וחסיד ואיש ישר מושין פאשקואל מתקן ושופט בבית החכמה הזה תהלה לאל:

Written at Alcala de Henares for the use of such students as came to Alcala from another country; finished Friday, the 27th of November, 1558, by Alfonso, author of a Hebrew Grammar in Latin, which is printed. This MS. was written in the time of Professor Musen Pascual, Officer of the University.

XX., DATED 1532 (doubtful).

Castro[1] mentions a MS. in the Escorial Library, written on paper at Alcala de Henares, finished in the year 1532, which contains a theologico-controversial treatise with the title of ספר חכמת אלהים "Book of the Wisdom of God." At the end it is said that it was written by Alfonso de Zamora. It is probable, says Antonio, that this treatise is an amplification of the "Letter to the Jews of Rome" (see above, p. 401), and what makes it probable is, that a note in the MS. says that it was written at the desire of Don F. Juan de Toledo, Bishop of Cordova. The MS. is written in two columns, of which the one contains the Hebrew text and the other is left blank, probably intended for a Latin translation similar to the Letter addressed to the Jews of Rome. We have not seen this MS. in the Escorial Library.

XXI., WITHOUT DATES.

A. MS. No. 18 of the Bibl. Nac., contains D. Qamhi's מכלול, with the following colophon:—אלפונסו די כאמורה כתב כל הנקוד בספר המכלול הזה. All the pointing was by Alfonso.

B. MS. No. 19, contains the "Dictionary," of which a part is on vellum. Colophon injured:— ליום ··· | נשלמו ונכ··· ב' י"א יום. Qamhi is here written קמחי.

[1] *Biblioteca Española*, tome I., p. 400.

Don Nicolas Antonio[1] mentions the following treatise of our author: "Compendium Alphonsi Zamoræ Universorum Legis veteris præceptorum," in 4to. He says it was mentioned in a Catalogue of the Library at Soria (Aragonia). Whether it was a printed book or a MS., he cannot say.

P.S.—After this article was in type, the Bodleian Library acquired a copy of the Grammar (p. 399), in which a leaf is missing but supplied by a modern hand.

A. NEUBAUER.

---

[1] *Bibliotheca Hispana Nova*, vol. I., fol. 56*a*.

JEWISH ARABIC LITURGIES.

II.

As a second instalment of my contributions to the above subject, I intend giving some specimens of Piyyutim in which Hebrew and Arabic are mixed. They are taken from two MSS., viz., *Cod. Loewe*, 14,[1] and *Cod. Montef.*, 379.[2] The mixture of languages appears much less strange and out of harmony, if we consider that, apart from their close relationship—vulgar Arabic in particular has even more striking resemblance to Hebrew than the classical language —the same characters are used.

Both Piyyutim are *Habdālāhs*. In L. the first is written twice: fol. 52, among a group of songs styled פיוטים מלוקטים, and fol. 67, as a drinking song, and is of a very convivial character. I reproduce both pieces, chiefly on account of their linguistic interest, as their poetic value is very small, and appears still less in the translation.

As to the distribution of the languages, in I. the second half verses are Hebrew, and so is also the whole of the lines concluding the strophes, with exception of the first. There are, however, encroachments on both sides. The final two words are Aramaic. In II. Arabic strophes alternate with Hebrew ones. The strophes have each a separate rhyme, but all the last lines rhyme with a refrain.

No. III. consists of a prose piece taken from MS. Loewe 18,[3] which forms, with slight variations, the Arabic rendering of a narrative of the Talmud *Berāchōth*, 58.[4] In the

[1] See *Monatsschrift*, xxxviii., p. 406; I call it L, the first copy A, the second B.

[2] I call it M.

[3] See *Monatsschrift*, *ib.*, p. 412.

[4] Cp. *Yalkut* to Ezek. xxxiii. 29.

MS. the piece forms the concluding part of the homilies on the portion *Aharē Mōth*, and ends like all others in a rhymed prayer.[1] It is written in vulgar Arabic, which is occasionally intermixed with Persian and even Turkish words.

[1] For a series of homilies on שמני, taken from the same MS., see my *Arabic Chrestomathy*, etc., pp. 14-19.

I.

הבדלה מטרנוזא בלערביה

L., fol. 52vo, 67ro. M., fol. 165vo.

I. אנא אל איום ונורא — שדי נאדר בגבורה
יא מן ירא ולא יורא — תרזקנא אלעשר ותורה

II. אסראב לקדים לבאלי — אם אראהו אשכה
למעצר מן עיניב אלדייאלי — יין אדום והוא צח
תריזקהו לי יא אלעאלי — לעולמי עד לנצח
עסים רמונים טוב יינים — אשתה אשכח כל צרה יא מן

III. למודאם לקדים אלבאלי — אידא יחדאר פסעודה
נסכאר נחמיד אלקאדיר — בקול רינה ותודה
יזמאע קאומו למובדאר — אל עיר ציון חמודה
בחסד וברחמים אל תמים — יגאל אומה פדורה יא מן

IV. מבאריך איסים מולאנא — בורא פרי גפנים
חתא נה זדנא — יהיה ברוך מבנים
די הווא גרס לנא — במה להסיר יגונים
יין טוב יסיר כל מכאוב — וירחיב דעת קצרה יא מן

Superscription: L., פיוט מטרוז.
I. A., אמן הוא יורא. M., ארזוקנא.
II. (A., v. III.). [1] A., סראב. [3] A., יא ריב אלעאלי.
III. (A., v. II.). [1] A., סראב אלקדים אלבאלי, error of the copyist. M., שרב לקדים אידא יחדאר עלא שלחן.
[2] B., אלקאדר. M., נשבור ללמלך.
[3] (Missing in A.) M., מולאי אלחאדר אנאדר בתוך קהל ועדה L., r., יגמע — r. אלמבדר.
IV. [1] (Missing in M.)— r. מבארך. A., נבאריך — r. אסם.
[2] A., לנח. [3] A., לדי דאלייא גרסואנא.

V. המי כתיר יא סאדא ותרד דמעת עיני
אידא אלכאבייא ראקדא מקנקן כלה ייני
כתורת לסחאב בלא פאיידא ומא פיהום מן יסקיני
יין אדמדם כעין דם מוסיף כח וגבורה יא מן

VI. בנאדם אידא תציב לכמאר שתה ואל תאמר די לי
גוויז מא בקא ליך פלעמאר והרבה שמחה וגילי
סראב לחמאר מעא לספאר עם דגים ובשר צלי
אהובי אל תקח הגדי ואל תשתה חמרא חיורא יא מן

VII. גזלאן כבאש ומעאליף שחוט ועשה מטעמים
ואידא כנות פאהים ועאריף ואתה בן חכמים
לא תשרי לבקרי אסאריף ואל תתן בו הדמים
ידידי אל תקח הגדי אשר הוא כחוש בשרא יא מן

V. [1] (M.. v. IV.). [2] M., אידא נשוף.—M. ולייס בנים מן ילקיני
[3] A., אצחאב. A. חתא מן ישקיני.
VI. [1] r. אבן אדם, see Marcel, *Voc. Fr.-Ar.*, s. v. *homme*. תסיב.
[2] r. בקא לך — r. פי אלעמר. [3] r. אשרב אלכמר.
[4] r. אלצפר. M. לספר ולחמר.
VII. [2] A., ונתי ווליד לחכמים. [3] AB. אלבנגרי, r. אלבקרה.

II.

חבדלה מטרנוזא בעלערבייא

L.. fol. 58ro. M., fol. 164vo.

I. חי העולמים הדרך רכב צלח שוכן מעונים אליהו הנביא שלח
יא אלא אהרן פרנ עלא קאומך אדליל
כאליתו מאמחון יסבי וויברי מתיל אלעליל
ווירסלו ינון יכלצהו כלאץ גליל
מן באיין לגומאן פראז עליה וויסתראח שוכן מעונים

II. ושלח מחרה גואל מבטח עמך

Superscription: L., פיוט מטרוז.
I. [1] L., הדרך — L., שלח (cp. Ps. xlv. 5) — M., מרומים.
[2] M., אילה — L., פרז — M., קוומך אן דליל.
[3] M., ישבי כדלך מתל עליל [4] L., יכלסו כלאם אלזאליל.
[5] M., אלגוים יפובנא אלמשיח.

נעלה בשירה לבית מרומך
בשפה ברורה יספרו את עצמך
אנו מקוים בשם האל בטח שוכן מעונים

III. עאלים מא בינא אלא אלוואחד פי סמא
רסלנא אלנואל נמסוו כולנא לתמא
וויבשרנא זא למשיח נרגאוו רדאה
אלקאוום אלהאיים פראז עליה וויסתראה שוכן מעונים

IV. נורא ואדיר החיש בבוא משיחך
עורה והאר חשכים ברב כחך
ושלח מהרה תשבי לקבץ עמך
קבץ נפוצות אל תוך הגן וטוב וצח שוכן ישנים

V. קרבת לישועה לא תקנטוסי האייא סאמעין
קאדיר פי סאעא יפכנא רב אלעלאמין
נמשו סריעה לבית המקדש בית אלחאנין
ירושלים בית אלעבאדה וולפלאח שוכן מעונים

VI. בנאה אבינא יצחק יכלסנא פי האר לעדאב
רא אלחאל בינא דאך יא מן נזל למא וסוחאב
יא מן לא יולחאק לא תוסחב אלינא בחסאב
אנתא הוא רחים אלאה ארחמאן וצאלה שוכן מעונים

VII. קומו בצהלה שישו ושמחו וצהלה אל רם ונעלה
ולהר ציון תעלנו כל איש בגילה ישמח ויט אהלו
השב שבוים העם אשר הוא דל ושח
שוכן מעונים אליהו הנביא שלח

II. In M. missing.

III. [1] M., אללה — L., פסאמא. [2] M., נמשיו אל כול פי חמא. [3] M., באלמשיח — r. נרגו רצאה (missing in M. as well the following line).

V. [1] L., קריבא — r. שי, M., לא תקנטו יא [2] M., יצרפהא. [3] M., ובניו דאך בית אלחסין. [4] M., בלאד אל עיבדא.

VI. L., פוזאה בונא — M., יפוכנא. [3] M. אלדי אלהאל בנא דאק. L., למוסאחאב. [2] M., אמן אילהו אלחאק.

III.

fol. 66ro.

מעשה פי ר׳ זירא ע״ה לישי[1] צרב ואחד יהודי מלקות ליש בעל גויה ראח
אלרשע אשתכא לאל סולטאן וקאל לסולטאן תעלאם יא מולאנא אל[2]
סולטאן באן ר׳ זירא ביחכם גיר דסתורך וביקתל וביצרב גאבו[3] לסולטאן[4]
קאל לה עליש אצרבת הדא קאל לה יא סידי לאגל אנה גאמע חמארא ואל
תורה קאלת ובכל בהמה לא תתן שכבתך וקאלת כל שוכב עם בהמה
מות יומת קאל לה ענדך שהוד קאל לה נעם גא אליהו זל ותשבה בצורת
ואחד מן גמאעת אל סולטאן אמר אל סולטאן ילזמה אל קתל קאל לה
ר׳ זירא יא סידי אל סולטאן נחנה[5] מן יום אלדי כרב מקדסנא ראח
חוכמנא ואנעטא לכם ואלדי אנתי בתרידו אעמלו מעה קעד אל סולטאן
ואלחכאם וצרבו שור[6] וכאן ר׳ שילא חאצר פתח תומה וקאל לך יי
הגדולה והגבורה וגו׳ ללאיכר קודאם אל סולטאן קאל לה אל סולטאן
אש קולת קאל לה בסבח אלה אלדי כלק סלטנתכם מתל סלטנתנא קאל לה
אל סולטאן היכד אנת׳ עבדכם ענדכם מערפה אקיעדאך עלא מכדתן
אעטיתך דסתור תטלאע תקעוד עלא באבנא אעטא סיף בולאד[7] וקעדה עלא
באבה הוא קאעד עלא באב אל סולטאן והוא טאלע דיך אל רשע תא
ישתכי עלא ר׳ זירא פקאל אל רשע אללה ביעמלכם ללכאתכין קאל לה יא
רשע אל גוים תמתלו אלא אלחמיר כק בשר חמרים בשרם קאל לה בעבר
בקול לסולטן אנכם בתסמוהם חמיר הוא עאבר בילקיהא לסולטאן קאל
ר׳ שילא אל תורה קאלת הבא להרגך השכם להרגו וזאדא רודף הוא פקאם
ר׳ שילא וצרבה בלסיף וקתלה סמע אל סולטאן קאל ולולא מא יסתחק אל
קתל מא קתלה קאל ר׳ שילא גדא לנא נס פי הל[8] ספוק נקול פיה דרשה
ראח ללמדרש ודרש לך יי הגדולה הוא מעשה בראשית כק פיהא עושה
גדולות עד אין חקר והגבורה האדי יציאת מצרים כק או הנסה אלים לבא
לקחת לו גוי והתפארת היא אל שמס ואל קמר אלדי וקפהם יהושע כק
וידם השמש והירח עמד וחנצח היא מלכות הרשעה שתפול במהרה וההוד
היא מלחמת עמלק כק כי יד על כס יה כי כל בשמים ובארץ היא מלחמת

---

[1] לאי שי. [2] Often written thus in MS. [3] For גאבה.
[4] *lissultān* (with art.). [5] נחנא. [6] Persian *discussion*.
[7] *pulād* (Persian). [8] so! *hāl*.

סיסרא כק טן השמים נלחמו הכוכבים ממסלותם ובארץ היא מלחמת נחלי ארנון כק עַל כן יאמר בספר מלחמות יי ומתנשא היא מלחמת נג כק הנני אליך נוג נשיא ראש משך וסובל לכל לראש חתא אל צויבאשי[9] אלדי יקסם אל מא מווכל מן ענד אלה וקאל במתניתא עלא אסם ר׳ עקיבא לך יי הגדולה היא שוקאק אל בחר כק וירא ישראל את היד הגדולה והגבורה היא בכורות מצרים והתפארת היא מתן תורה והנצח היא ירושלים וההוד הוא בית אל מקדש יבני אללה בסורעה פי חיאתנא קאל ר׳ חייא בר אבא קאל ר׳ יוחנן נמיע אל אנבייא מא אתנבה אלא לזמאן משיח לאן עהב שאיי אן[10] עצים לאן עין לם קשעאת אלהים זולתך וכתיב מה רב טובך אשר צפנת ליראיך פעלת לחוסים בך נגד בני אדם

אללהם יא סייד	אל סאדאת
יאעצים אלעז	ואל בהנאת
יא מן לך וקאר	וכראמאת
יא עאלם נמיע	אלמסתוראת
יא מן לם מכפא	ענאך אלכפייאת
יא כתיר אלרזק	ואל רחמאת
יא כאשף	אל כרוב ואלגמאת
יא ראפע אל שר	ואל בלייאת
יא מן לך	אל מלך ואל גברוואת
יא מן תצלאח	לך אל כובריאת
אתי מסיחאך	בפרחאת
ואבני קדסך	בלשמס ואל קמרייאת
ונעבדך פיה	בסאייר אלנגומאת
בתסביחאת	באמלאת

כק שירו ליי כי נפלאות עשה

[9] Turkish, *sūbāshī*, Talmud, חייש גרגיתא.

[10] Nunation, see my remarks *R. E. J.*, No. 50, p. 261.

TRANSLATION.

I.

I. O Mighty God! O King girded with strength;
Thou who seest all, but art thyself invisible,
Grant us knowledge and wealth.

II. Let us drink old wine, at the sight of which I rejoice,
The clear red wine pressed from the grapes of the vine.
O Most High, grant me its enjoyment for ever!
That juice of pomegranates, the choicest of wine,
Will I drink and forget all sorrow.

III. When the old, long-preserved wine stands at the repast,
Let us be thankful, and praise God
With rejoicing and grateful voice.
May He gather his scattered people to Zion, the glorious city,
With mercy and grace may the All-perfect redeem the dispersed.

IV. Praised be the name of the Lord, who created the wine;
May Noah, our ancestor, who planted for us
That which removeth grief, *be the most blessed of men.*
Good wine soothes all pain
And cheers the oppressed spirit.

V. I am full of grief, and the tear runs from my eye[1]
When the cask is low and the wine gone from the cup.
Many are the clouds, but they avail naught,
There is nothing in them to drink;
But wine, red like blood, increases strength.

VI. O son of man, when thou findest wine,
Drink, and say not: Enough!
Enjoy thy remnant of life, and increase merriment and rejoicing,
With fat and roasted viands take wine both red and yellow.
Friend, partake not of the flesh of the kid, drink not the wine which is white.

VII. Slay deer, lambs and fatted calves, and prepare fine dishes.
If thou art cunning and a son of wise men,
Buy not old kine, and spend no money on it.
Friend, partake not of the flesh of the kid,
Because it is poor and lean.

II.

O Eternal, *in thy majesty ride*:
Thou who dwellest in the heights, send Elijah the Prophet.

---

[1] Perhaps imitation of the refrain in Ibn Gabirol's drinking song, בכלות ייני תרד עיני פלגי מים, see Kæmpf, *Nichtandalus. Poesie*, etc., I. 183; II. 207.

I. O God of Ahron, redeem thy oppressed people;
In its desolate state it weeps and languishes like one stricken.
Send *Yinnōn* to rescue it with a great salvation:
Redeem it from the Romans,[1] that it may find rest.

II. Send soon the good Messenger of thy people,
Let us go up to thy exalted Temple
With pure lips to sing thy power.

III. The sole God in heaven, he knoweth our condition;
Send us the Redeemer that we may all go up to Zion.
May he announce unto us: The Messiah has come,
Deliver the wandering people that it may find rest.

IV. O Awe-inspiring, hasten the arrival of thy Messiah,
Awake and lighten the darkness by thy great power.
Send speedily the Tishbite to collect thy people;
Gather the dispersed into the flowery garden.

V. Help is near, despair not, O obedient ones!
The Almighty in heaven, the Lord of the world, will redeem us.
We will hasten to the Temple, the abode of the Merciful,
Jerusalem, the place of worship.

VI. For the sake of our father Isaac, deliver us from this trouble;
Look upon our condition, thou who descendedst in a cloud;
O Inscrutable, do not reckon with us:
Thou art the merciful God.

VII. Arise, rejoice and be mirthful!
Most High, bring us all to the mount of Zion in joy,
That we may there pitch our tents:
Return the exiles, the people oppressed and humble.

III.

R. Zērā[2] once sentenced a man to be flogged, as a punishment for his bad conduct. The culprit went to the king in order to complain. "Know, O King," said he, "that R. Zērā judges without thy authorisation, slays and flogs." They brought the Rabbi to the king, who said: "Why didst thou flog this man?" He replied: "Because he violated the law." "Hast thou witnesses?" asked the king. "Yes,

[1] For *Mohammedans;* in this form not to be found in Zunz, *Synagogale Poesie*, Beil. 16.

[2] In the Talmud it is R. Shĭlah.

Elijah came in the form of one of the king's attendants," whereupon the king said the man deserved to be killed. R. Zērā said: "O Sultan, from the day of the destruction of our Temple, judgment has been taken away from us and given to you; what thou wishest I shall do with him." The ruler and the judges (once) were holding a sitting in court. R. Shilā, who was present, opened his mouth to explain the verse: *Thine, O Lord, is greatness and power*, etc. (1 Chr. xxix. 11). When he had well nigh finished, the ruler came to him and asked him: "What hast thou said?" "The praise of God," he answered, "who has created your dominion as well as he had ours." The king said: "Since thou art so wise, I will let thee sit on a cushion, and give thee permission to come and sit at my gate." He gave him a sword of steel and made him sit at his gate. There he sat when that wicked man came in order to complain about R. Zērā, and said: "God will prove you liars." He replied: "O most wicked of heathens, who are compared to asses, as is written" (Ex. xxiii. 20). The man answered: "I shall inform the king that thou hast called him an ass." R. Shilā thought, the law says: Should anyone come to slay thee, try to anticipate him, and this man has that intention. So he killed him with his sword. When the ruler heard it, he said: "Had he not deserved it, he would not have been killed." R. Shilā remarked: "A miracle has been performed for us by means of that verse on which I will give a derāshā." He went to the Bēth Hammidrash and lectured on the verse (see above): *Thine, O Lord, is greatness*, i.e., creation; *Strength*, exodus from Egypt; *Glory*, sun and moon which Joshua stopped; *Victory*, speedy subjugation of the dominion of wickedness; *Majesty*, war with Amalek; *For all that is in heaven and on earth*, war with Shinear; *On earth*, war against the valleys of Arnōn; *Exalted*, war with Gog; *For every head*, even the police officer who distributes the water is appointed by God. The Mishnah explains the verse, on behalf of R. Aqibha, as follows: *Greatness*, dividing of the sea; *Strength*, death of the first-born of Egypt; *Glory*, granting of the land; *Victory*, Jerusalem; *Majesty*, the Temple, may it soon be rebuilt in our life. R. Hiyya bar Abbā said on behalf of R. Yōhanan: Prophets will only appear until the time of the Messiah, for the future world is great. No eye has seen *a God besides thee*, and it is written: *How great*, etc (Ps. xxxi. 20).

O God, Lord of lords!
O thou who art long-suffering and forgiving;
O thou who knowest all mysteries;
O thou from whom no secret is hidden;
O thou who art great in granting and pitying;
O thou who removest grief and sorrows;

O thou who takest away evil and calamities;
O thou who art the Most High;
O thou who art magnificent;
Rebuild thy sanctuary, where we will worship thee.
There also shalt thou be worshipped
By sun, moon and heavenly hosts
With perfect glorification, as it is written: *Sing ye* (Ps. xcviii. 1).

H. HIRSCHFELD.

THE EXPULSION OF THE JEWS FROM ENGLAND IN 1290.

(Concluded from p. 258.)

IX.—The Jews in Relation to the Church of the Thirteenth Century.

The Popes of the earlier part of the Middle Ages had found enough employment for their energies in the effort to maintain their own position in Christendom; and they had neither the wish nor the power to seek a conflict with a race that remained wholly outside the Church. In the twelfth century there was no other general Church Law directed against the Jews than that which forbade them to live in the same houses with Christians, and to have Christian servants.[1] In England especially, Churchmen of the twelfth century showed towards the Jews a tolerant spirit, and made no effort to augment their unpopularity or to diminish their privileges. The examples of Anselm, and of his contemporary, Gilbert of Westminster, show that in the attempts made at that time by men of high position in the Church to convert the Jews, no method was employed except that of reasonable persuasion.[2] Churches and monasteries took charge, at times of danger, of the money, and even of the families, of Jews. Such friendly intercourse as existed between Jews and Christians was allowed to go on without any attempt at ecclesiastical interference.[3]

[1] See the Decrees of the Third Lateran Council of 1179, Mansi, *Concilia*, XXII., 231.

[2] St. Anselm, *Epistolæ*, III., 117 (Migne, *Patrologiæ Cursus Completus*, Vol. 159, columns 153-155; Gilbert of Westminster, *Disputatio Judaici cum Christiano* (Ibid. 1005-1036).

[3] *Chronicles of Stephen, Henry II., and Richard I.* (Rolls Series), I.,

The accession of Innocent the Third to the pontificate brought about a rapid change in the attitude of the Church towards the Jews. Innocent was the first to advance, on behalf of the Papacy, the claim that the Lord gave Peter not only the whole Church, but the whole world to rule,[1] and he endeavoured with a merciless enthusiasm, from which all unbelievers and heretics in Christian countries had to suffer, to make good his claim, and to establish in Europe one united Catholic Church. He took his stand on the doctrine, which his predecessors had held[2] in a modified form, and without ever acting on it, that the Jews were condemned to perpetual slavery on account of the wickedness of their ancestors in crucifying Christ; and he thought that they ought to be made to feel, and their neighbours likewise, that it was only out of Christian pity that their presence was endured in Christian countries.

The position of the Jews at the time of Innocent's accession to the pontificate was very far from being such as his theory required. They had magnificent synagogues, they employed Christian servants, they married, or were said to marry, Christian wives; they refused, in what some Christians regarded as a spirit of outrageous insolence, to eat the same meat and to drink the same wine as the Gentiles, and they made no secret of their disbelief in the sacred

310 (among the victims of the massacre at Lynn in 1190 was *quidam Judæus, insignis medicus, qui et artis et modestiæ suæ gratia Christianis quoque familiaris et honorabilis fuerat*); *Gervase of Canterbury* (Rolls Series), I., 405. (The Jews help the monks of Canterbury in their struggle with the Archbishop in 1188); *Rotuli Litterarum Clausarum* (Record Commission), I., 20*b*. (*Rex, &c., domino Lincolniensi Episcopo, &c.; mandamus vobis quod non permittatis injuste catalle Judæorum receptari in ecclesiis in diocesi vestra*, February 28th, 1205); *Chronica Jocelini de Brakelonde* (Camden Society), p. 33. (A.D. 1190, *Abbas jussit solempniter excommunicari illos qui de cetero receptarent Judeos vel in hospicio reciperent in villa Santi Ædmundi*); Jacobs, *The Jews of Angevin England*, 269. ("*English Jews drink with Gentiles.*")

[1] Moeller, *History of the Christian Church, Middle Ages* (Eng. Tr.), p. 279.

[2] Mansi, *Concilia*, XXII. 231.

history of Christianity. Moreover, they were suspected of exercising a considerable influence on the growth of the heresies which it was the chief work of Innocent's life to combat. The Vaudois, the Cathari, and the Albigenses, all kept up Jewish observances, and were said to have learnt from the Jews their heretical dogmas; the Albigenses, indeed, were accused of maintaining that the law of the Jews was better than the law of the Christians. And, nevertheless, Christian kings supported the Jews in every way. They countenanced their usury, they refused (so, at least, Innocent said) to allow evidence against them on any charge to be given by Christian witnesses, and they even employed them in high offices of State. In view of these facts, Innocent thought that a great effort of repression should be made, and he wrote to the King of France, the Duke of Burgundy, and other monarchs, asking for their assistance in the work of reducing the Jews to that condition of slavery which was their due. He decreed in his general Church Council that Jews should be excluded in future from public offices, and that they should wear a badge to distinguish them from Christians; and he renewed the old regulation of the Church, which required them to dismiss Christian servants from their houses. In order to ensure that the last provision should be observed, he decided that any Christians having any intercourse with Jews that transgressed it should be subject to excommunication. For the enforcement of his other anti-Jewish measures he relied on the help of the temporal power in all Christian countries.[1]

The declaration of war made by Innocent III. was a terrible calamity for the Jews; but though it affected at

[1] Letters of Innocent (Migne, *Patrologiæ Cursus Completus*, Vols. 214-217); Lib. VII., 186; Lib. VIII., 50, 121; Lib. X., 61, 190; *Corpus Juris Canonici* (Leipzig, 1839), II., 747-8; Graetz, *Geschichte der Juden*, VII., 7, 8; Depping, *Les Juifs dans le Moyen Age*, 183; Hahn, *Geschichte der Ketzer*, III., 6, 7; Hurter, *Geschichte Papst Innocenz der Dritten*, II., 234; Güdemann, *Geschichte des Erziehungswesens, u.s.w.*, I., 37; Rule, *History of the Inquisition*, I. 10, 17.

once the whole of Christian Europe, still its evil results might have passed away in time. Popes were but men and politicians; and just as Innocent had, by the publication of his wishes and decrees concerning the Jews, set himself in opposition to his predecessors, so might his successors, in their turn, moved by different feelings or taking a different view of the interests and duties of the Church, set themselves in opposition to him, and go back to the old lenient opinions and practice. But within a few years of the death of Innocent, the work of attacking the Jews ceased to be in the hands of any one man, and passed over to a body of men habitually influenced not by personal or political considerations, but only by what they conceived to be the interest of religion, and filled with a hatred of the Jews more fierce and fanatical and steadfast than that of the Popes could ever have been.

The Dominican order was formally constituted in 1223, and from the earliest years of its existence devoted itself to the task of rooting out unbelief from the Christian world. The work that its members at first professed to regard as peculiarly their own was that of preaching, but on the Jews their preaching had no effect. With an ingenuity and determination worthy of the order that in a later century was to provide the Inquisition with its chief ministers, the Dominicans devised and carried out another plan of action. Assisted by converted Jews who had joined them, they undertook the study of Hebrew, and their master, Raymundus de Peñaforte, induced the King of Spain to build and endow seminaries for the purpose.[1] Armed with this new knowledge, they were able to attack, first, what they represented as the foolish and pernicious contents of such Jewish books as the Talmud, and secondly, the stubbornness of the Jews who refused to accept the doctrines of Christianity, the truth of which the Dominicans professed to be able to demonstrate from the Old Testament. Two incidents which must at the

[1] Graetz, *Geschichte der Juden*, VII., 27.

time have been famous throughout Europe illustrate their method of warfare. In 1239 Nicolas Donin, a converted Jew who had become a Dominican friar, laid before Gregory IX. a series of statements concerning the Talmud. Helped, no doubt, by all the influence of his order, he induced the Pope to issue bulls to the Kings of France, England, and Spain, and the bishops in those countries, ordering that all copies of the Talmud should be seized, and that public inquiry should be held concerning the charges brought against the book. In England and Spain nothing seems to have been done, but in Paris the Pope's instructions were carried out, and, at the instigation of the leading Dominicans, St. Louis ordered that all copies of the Talmud that could be found in France should be confiscated, and that four Rabbis should, on behalf of the Jews, hold a public debate with Donin, in order to meet, if they could, the charges that he was prepared to maintain. In the course of the debate, which was held in the precincts of the Court and in the presence of members of the Royal family and great dignitaries of the Church, Donin asserted that the Talmud encouraged the Jews to despise, deceive, rob, and even murder Christians, that it contained blasphemous falsehoods concerning Christ, superstitions and puerilities of all kinds, and passages disrespectful to God and inconsistent with morality. The Rabbis answered as best they could, but the court of Inquisitors decided that the charges had been substantiated, and ordered that all the confiscated copies of the Talmud should be burnt. After a delay of about two years the *Auto-da-fe* took place, and fourteen cartloads of the Talmud were sacrificed.[1] The other famous incident of the kind took place in Spain. Pablo Christiano, a converted Jew, who, like Donin, had joined the Dominicans, challenged the Jews of Aragon to a discussion on the differences between Judaism and Chris-

[1] *Révue des Etudes Juives*, I. 247, 293; II. 248; III. 39; Noel Valois, *Guillaume d'Auvergne*, pp. 118, 137.

tianity, and induced James I. to compel them to take up the challenge. The famous Nachmanides came forward as the representative of his co-religionists. Pablo undertook to show that the Old Testament, and other books recognised by the Jews, taught that the Messiah had come, that he was "very God and very man," that he suffered and died for the salvation of mankind, and that with his advent the ceremonial law ceased to be of any effect. Nachmanides denied that any of these propositions could be substantiated from the Jewish sacred books. For four days the disputation was carried on in the presence of the king and many great personages of Church and State. Of course the verdict was that the Christian disputant had beaten the Jew.[1]

The method of conducting these two controversies showed that the Dominicans were determined to use every possible weapon against the Jews. The Talmud, a huge, heterogeneous and unedited compilation, contains passages which are trivial and foolish, and others, written by men who had memories of persecution fresh in their minds, which express bitter hatred towards the "Gentiles," that is, the Romans who had taken Jerusalem, and had destroyed the nationality of the Jewish race. It was easy for an opponent to pick out such passages, to assert that what was said against the "Gentiles" expressed, not the feelings of the victims of persecution against the Romans of the second century, but the feelings of all Jews towards all non-Jews, at every time and at every place, and to convince an uncritical audience that those who held in honour the book that contained such passages were enemies of religion, against whose influence it behoved all Christian powers to guard the faithful. Similarly, by compelling the Jews to take part in a discussion concerning the prophecies of the Old Testament, the Dominicans imposed on them the choice between the two alternatives of betraying their religion by

[1] *Histoire Littéraire de la France*, XXVII., 562-3; Graetz, *Geschichte*, VII., 131, 135.

acquiescing in what they believed to be a false interpretation of their scripture, or else of proclaiming publicly their disbelief in doctrines which were at the very foundation of Christianity. The effect on the ruling classes in Europe of the two discussions just mentioned must have been very great. And the Dominicans were continually carrying on the same work, though, of course, seldom before audiences so distinguished. Pablo, for example, travelled about Spain and Provence, compelling the Jews, by virtue of a royal edict that had been issued in his favour, to hold disputes with him on matters of religion.[1] Many other members of the order devoted their lives to the same pursuit,[2] and thus did their best to fill the rulers of the Church with a dread of the terrible consequences that the existence of Judaism threatened to the Christian religion.

And, unfortunately for the Jews, their religion began to be feared at the same time as cruel and powerful fanatics like Innocent and the Dominicans were doing their best to cause it to be hated. There is good reason to believe, though detailed evidence is not abundant, that towards the end of the Middle Ages Judaism exercised over the superstitions of other faiths the same fascination as in the first century of the Roman Empire. Thomas Aquinas believed that unrestricted intercourse between Jews and Christians was likely to result in the conversion of Christians to Judaism, and for that reason he thought it right, in spite of the general liberality of his opinions concerning the Jews, that intercourse with them should be allowed to such Christians alone as were strong in the faith, and were more likely to convert them than to be converted by them.[3] "It happens sometimes," wrote a Pope of the thirteenth century, "that Christians, when they are visited by the Lord with sickness and tribulation, go astray, and have recourse

[1] Graetz, *Geschichte der Juden*, VII., 135; J. Jacobs, *Inquiry into the Sources of the History of the Jews in Spain*, xviii., 18.

[2] *Scriptores Ordinis Prædicatorum* (Quétif and Echard), I., 246, 396, 398, 594.

[3] Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologiæ*, Secunda Secundæ, Quæstio X.

to the vain help of the Jewish rite. They hold in the synagogues of the Jews torches and lighted candles, and make offerings there. Likewise they keep vigils (especially on the Sabbath), in the hope that the sick may be restored to health, that those at sea may reach harbour, that those in childbirth may be safely delivered, and that the barren may become fruitful and rejoice in offspring. For the accomplishment of these and other wishes, they implore the help of the said rite, and in idolatrous fashion show open signs of devotion and reverence to a scroll, not without much harm to the orthodox faith, contumely to our Creator, and opprobrium and shame to the Universal Church."[1]

The anti-Jewish feeling that grew up from the causes that have just been described called into existence new institutions and measures designed for the purpose of humbling the Jews and checking the growth of Judaism. In compliance with the cruel request of Innocent, most of the monarchs of Europe compelled their Jewish subjects to wear a badge.[2] Local church councils, which hitherto had contented themselves with the attempt to enforce the old prohibition against the employment by Jews of Christian servants and nurses, now went further, and forbade Christians to allow the presence of Jews in their houses and taverns, to feast or dance with them, to be present at the celebration of their marriages, their new moons, and their festivals, and to employ their services as doctors.[3] The Popes of the latter part of the thirteenth century appointed Dominicans in various countries of Europe to perform the duty of preaching to the Jews, and of holding inquisitions into their heresies, in the hope that with the help of the secular power they might stamp them out.[4]

In England the relation of the Jews to the Christians underwent somewhat the same changes as in Continental

[1] Baronius, *Annales Ecclesiastici* (ed. Theiner), XIII., 87.

[2] *Revue des Etudes Juives*, VI. 81 ; VII. 94.

[3] Mansi, *Concilia*, XXIII., 1174-6 ; Martène, *Thesaurus*, IV., 769.

[4] Deeping, 198 ; Hahn, *Geschichte der Ketzer*, III., 13 ; Rule, *History of the Inquisition*, I. 27, 80, 81, 91, 332, 335-6.

Europe. Before the thirteenth century the Jews in England had, as has been said above, been free from molestation by the Church,[1] and their chief danger had been from the brutality and greed of the disorderly populace, of desperate outcasts, and of marauding Crusaders.[2] The first great attack made on them by any constituted power came from Stephen Langton, who, not content with passing at his Provincial Synod a decree which, in accordance with the regulations of Innocent, enforced the use of the badge and prohibited the erection of new synagogues, went so far as to issue orders that no one in his diocese should presume, under pain of excommunication, to have any intercourse with Jews, or should sell them any of the necessaries of life. The Bishops of Lincoln and Norwich issued the same orders in their dioceses.[3] Many other bishops in the reign of Henry III. did their best, partly by legislation in their diocesan synods and partly by the use of their personal and spiritual influence, to check intercourse between Jews and Christians.[4] Of course the king's guardians, in the interest of the royal income, a considerable part of which was derived from the Jewry, interfered to prevent the measures of Langton and his colleagues from being carried into effect. And Henry, when he took into his own hands the work of government, while, on the one hand, he showed his sympathy with the fears of the Church by building a house for the reception of Jewish converts,[5] and by lending the sanction of the civil power to the decree that ordered the use of the badge,[6] nevertheless followed the example that his guardians had set, and protected the Jews against the aggression of the Church.

---

[1] *Supra*, p. 428. [2] *Supra*, pp. 82, 83, 89.

[3] Wilkins, *Magnæ Britanniæ Concilia*, I., 591; Tovey, *Anglia Judaica*, 83; Rye, *History of Norfolk*, 87.

[4] Wilkins, *Magnæ Britanniæ Concilia*, I., 657, 693, 719; *Letters of Bishop Grosseteste* (Rolls Series), 318.

[5] Matthew Paris, *Chronica Majora*, III., 262.

[6] Tovey, *Anglia Judaica*, 148.

There were many reasons which might have caused Edward to sympathise more strongly than his father had done, with the anti-Jewish feelings of the Church. He was a pious man and a pious king, filled with a sense of his kingly duty towards "the living God who takes to himself the souls of Princes."[1] He was a Crusader, though the great crusading age was over, a founder of monasteries, a pilgrim to holy places; and through his confessors he was in close connection with, and under the influence of, the Dominican order.[2] Some of his bishops were determined enemies of the Jews. John of Peckham, for example, the Archbishop of Canterbury, insisted at one time on the demolition of all the small private synagogues in London, at which the Jews were in the habit of worshipping after the confiscation of their great public synagogues at the end of the reign of Henry III.; at another time he demanded from the king the help of the temporal power against Jews who having once been converted to Christianity, wished to go back to their old faith; on another occasion he took the bold step of writing to the Queen concerning her business transactions with the Jews, solemnly warning her that unless she gave them up she could never be absolved from her sins, "nay, not though an angel should assert the contrary."[3] At Hereford, Bishop Swinfield was so determined to prevent intercourse with Jews that, when he heard that certain Christians intended to be present at a marriage feast to be given by some rich Jews of the city, he issued a proclamation threatening with excommunication any who should carry out their intention, and, when his proclamation was disregarded, he carried out his threat.[4]

---

[1] Rymer, *Fœdera*, I., 743.

[2] Tout, *Edward I.*, pp. 69, 149.

[3] John of Peckham, *Registrum Epistolarum* (Rolls Series), I., 239; II., 407; III., 937; Wilkins, *Magnæ Britanniæ Concilia*, II., 88-9; Prynne, *Second Demurrer*, 121-2.

[4] *Household Roll of Bishop Swinfield* (Camden Society), pp. c., ci.

Certain events that happened, or were said to have happened, in England in Edward's lifetime, some, indeed, under his own observation, may well have seemed to him to justify the attitude of the Church. In 1275 a Dominican friar was converted to Judaism.[1] In 1268, while Edward was in Oxford, the Chancellor, masters and scholars of the University, and the Parochial Clergy, were going in procession to visit the shrine of St. Friedswide when, according to a story that gained general credence, a Jew of the city snatched from the bearer a cross that was being carried at their head and trod it under foot.[2] At Norwich, early in Edward's reign, a Jew was burnt for blasphemy.[3] At Nottingham, in 1278, a Jewess was charged with abusing in scandalous terms all the Christian bystanders in the market-place.[4]

Edward's conduct could not but be influenced by the general tone of opinion in the Church, by the strong anti-Jewish feeling of some of his bishops, and by the follies, real or supposed, of the Jews themselves. In continuation of his father's policy he made, throughout his reign, such contributions as, with his scanty means, he could afford, to the support of the House of Converts.[5] He renewed the edict concerning the wearing of the badge, and extended it to Jewesses, whereas it had formerly applied only to Jews.[6] In order that the Dominicans might be able to carry on in England the same efforts at conversion as they were already pursuing in France, Spain and Germany, he issued to all the sheriffs and bailiffs in England writs bidding them do their best so induce all

[1] Graetz, *Geschichte der Juden*, VII., note 11. *Florence of Worcester* (English Historical Society), II., 214.

[2] Tovey, *Anglia Judaica*, 168.

[3] *Forty-ninth Report of the Deputy-Keeper of the Public Records.* p. 187.

[4] *Forty-seventh Report of the Deputy-Keeper of the Public Records*, p. 306.

[5] *Dictionary of Political Economy*, Article, "Jews (House for Converted)."

[6] Tovey, *Anglia Judaica*, 208.

the Jews in the counties and towns under their charge to assemble and hear the word of God preached by the friars.[1] To meet the danger to religion that might arise from the blasphemous utterances of Jews, he ordered that proclamation should be made throughout England that any Jew found guilty (after an enquiry conducted by Christians) of having spoken disrespectfully of Christ, the Virgin Mary, or the Catholic faith, should be liable to the loss of life or limbs.[2]

Thus far Edward was prepared to go, and no farther. He believed that the Jews, so long as they remain Jews, lived in ignorance and sin, and he did what he could to help the friars in the effort to convert them. He believed that some among them were likely to make blasphemous attacks on Christianity, and he did what he could to keep them in check. But he believed that it was possible for them to live in peace and quietness, carrying on trades and handicrafts, among Christian neighbours in Christian towns. And it was to enable them to do so that he adopted the policy of 1275, and bade the Jews renounce usury, giving them at the same time permission "to practise trade, to live by their labour, and, for those purposes, freely to converse with Christians." But, as we have seen, there were imposed on the Jews who attempted to avail themselves of this permission, legal disadvantages which wholly unfitted them for industrial competition with non-Jews, and compelled them to continue the practice of usury. That Edward recognised this fact is shown by the issue of the revised Statute of Usurers some years after 1275; but that measure was inconclusive and inconsistent with the rest of his policy. Sooner or later the conclusion would have forced itself on him that until the Jews were, by the acquisition of the right to become burgesses and gildsmen, enabled to enter into industrial

---

[1] *Forty-ninth Report of the Deputy-Keeper of the Public Records*, p. 95; Rymer, *Fœdera*, I., 576; Madox, *Exchequer*, I., 259.

[2] Tovey, *Anglia Judaica*, p. 208.

competition on equal terms with Christians, all his efforts to make them traders instead of usurers would be wasted. He would then have had before him two alternatives. He might, on the one hand, have declined to sacrifice his seignorial rights over the Jews, whom he had described in the Statute of 1275 as "talliable to the king as his own serfs, and not otherwise," and in that case he would have had to recognise that his whole Jewish policy was an impossible one. Or he might, on the other hand, have revoked the provision in the statute which forbade the Jews to be in "scots, lots, or talliage with the other inhabitants of those cities or burgesses where they remained." Such a measure would have been a step in the only direction which could possibly lead to the success of his policy. But it would not by itself have been enough to secure success; for, when the legal difficulties of the Jews had been removed, there would still have remained the social difficulties which proceeded from the dislike in which they were held by the Church and the people; and, unless these difficulties also could be removed, so that the Jews might be in a position of social equality, as well as legal equality, with Christians, and associate with them in friendly intercourse, the king's policy would be as far from success as ever. Which alternative Edward would have decided to adopt is, of course, a question we have no means of answering; but the decision was taken out of his hands by the interference, for the first and last time in English history, of the head of the Catholic Church in the relations between the Jews and the king.

At the end of 1286, Honorius IV. addressed to the Archbishops of Canterbury[1] and York[2] and their suffragans the following bull:—

"We have heard that in England the accursed and perfidious Jews have done unspeakable things and horrible acts, to the shame of our Creator and the detriment of the

[1] Baronius, *Annales Ecclesiastici* (ed. Theiner), XIII., 10, 11.

[2] *Révue des Etudes Juives*, I., 298.

Catholic faith. They are said to have a wicked and deceitful book, which they commonly call Thalmud, containing manifold abominations, falsehoods, heresies, and abuses. This damnable work they continually study, and with its nefarious contents their base thoughts are always engaged. Moreover, they set their children from their tender years to study its lethal teaching, and they do not scruple to tell them that they ought to believe in it more than in the Law of Moses, so that the said children may flee from the path of God and go astray in the devious ways of the unbelievers. Moreover, they not only attempt to entice the minds of the faithful to their pestilent sect, but also, with many gifts, they seduce to apostasy those who, led by wholesome counsel, have abjured the error of infidelity and betaken themselves to the Christian faith; so that some, being led away by the treachery of the Jews, live with them according to their rite and law, even in the parishes in which they received new life from the sacred font of baptism; and hence arise injury to our Saviour, scandal to the faithful, and dishonour to the Christian faith. Some also who have been baptised they send to other places, in order that there they may live unknown and return to their disbelief. They invite and urgently persuade Christians to attend their synagogues on the Sabbath and on other of their solemn occasions, to hear and take part in their services, and to show reverence to the parchment-scroll or book in which their law is written, in consequence of which many Christians Judaise with the Jews.

"Moreover, they have in their households Christians whom they compel to busy themselves on Sundays and feast-days with servile tasks from which they should refrain. And so they cast opprobrium on the majesty of God. They have in their houses Christian women to bring up their children. Christian men and women dwell among them; and so it often happens, when occasion offers and the time is favourable to shameful actions, that Christian

men have unblessed intercourse with Jewish women and Christian women with Jewish men.

"Yet Christians and Jews go on meeting in each others' houses. They spend their leisure in banqueting and feasting together, and hence the opportunity for mischief becomes easy. On certain days they publicly abuse Christians, or rather curse them, and do other wicked acts which offend God and cause the loss of souls.

"And although some of you have been often asked to devise a fitting remedy for these things, yet you have failed to comply. Whereat we are forced to wonder the more, since the duty of your pastoral office binds you to show yourselves more ready and determined than other men to avenge the wrongs of our Saviour, and to oppose the nefarious attempts of the foes of the Christian faith.

"An evil so dangerous must not be made light of, lest, being neglected, it may grow great. You are bound to rise up with ready courage against such audacity in order that it may be completely suppressed and confounded and that the dignity and glory of the Catholic Faith may increase. Therefore by this apostolic writing we give orders that, as the duty of your office demands, you shall use inhibitions, spiritual and temporal penalties and other methods, which shall seem good to you, and which in your preaching and at other fitting times you shall set forth, to the end, that this disease may be checked by proper remedies. So may you have your reward from the mercy of the Eternal King. We shall extol in our prayers your wisdom and diligence. Let us know fully by your letters what you do in this matter."

X.—The Effects of the Clerical Opposition.

Edward was too religious to disregard the wishes of the Pope, expressed thus formally and solemnly and with the utmost strength of language. And he had special reasons for paying heed to the words of Honorius IV., on whose money-lenders he was dependent for loans, and whose

predecessor had, by the exercise of his spiritual powers, secured for him a tenth part of the goods of the clergy of England.[1] From the moment of the issue of the bull, the policy inaugurated by the statute of 1275 was doomed. For of the two alternatives that Edward would have had before him in any further Jewish legislation that he might have undertaken—the alternatives of the abandonment of the policy of 1275, or the extension of it by further measures for the assimilation of the status of Jews to that of Christians—the Church now demanded that he should at once adopt the former. It demanded that the Jews of England should live isolated from the Christians; and this they could do only so long as they kept to pursuits, such as usury, for the practice of which they required no connection with the organisation of a gild or a town.

For a time Edward could take no decisive measures, since when the bull reached England, he had left for Gascony.[2] In that province nothing had apparently as yet been done to satisfy the demand made by the Council of Lyons, in 1274, that alien usurers should no longer be tolerated in the land of Christians. It was hopeless to try to enforce in a distant dependency the policy that had been beset in England with so many difficulties, and had now incurred the direct opposition of the Church. The only alternative was expulsion, a measure that on French soil suggested itself the more naturally, since two French kings had practically adopted it already. Before he returned home, Edward issued an order that all Jews should leave Gascony.[3]

The application of the same measure in England was a more serious matter, since the English Jews were doubtless a much larger community than those of Gascony. But, determined not to tolerate them as usurers, and convinced

---

[1] Rymer, I., 560-1.

[2] Edward left England May, 1286. *Florence of Worcester* (English Historical Society), II., 236.

[3] *Willelmi Rishanger Chronica et Annales* (Rolls Series), 116; *Flores Historiarum* (Rolls Series), III., 70-71.

of the hopelessness of his efforts to change them into traders, Edward had no alternative but to treat them as he had treated their coreligionists in Gascony.

No doubt he was influenced in his resolution by the members of his family and court. His wife and mother and various of his officers had been in the habit of receiving liberal grants from the property and forfeitures of the Jews.[1] They must have known that this resource was decreasing steadily, and was not worth husbanding, and they must have welcomed a measure which would bring into the King's hands a fairly large amount of spoil capable of immediate distribution. And, probably, some of the ecclesiastical members of the court felt, as his mother certainly did,[2] a religious hatred of the Jews and a religious joy at the prospect of their disappearance.

XI.—The Expulsion.

Of the course of events for the first few months after Edward's return to England, very meagre accounts have come down to us. His searching inquiry into the conduct of the judges during his absence[3] must have taken up most of his time and energy. As soon as he had meted out punishment to those whom he had found guilty of corruption, he turned to the Jewish question. On the 18th of July, 1290, writs were issued to the sheriffs of counties, informing them that a decree had been passed that all Jews should leave England before the feast of All Saints of that year.[4] Any who remained in the country

[1] *Forty-second Report of the Deputy-Keeper of the Public Records*, 593; *Forty-fourth Report*, 109, 295; *Forty-fifth Report*, 72, 163; *Forty-ninth Report*, 81; *Calendar of Patent Rolls from* 1281 *to* 1292, 62, 193; *Archæologia*, VI., 339; Madox, *History of the Exchequer*, I. 225 *w*; 230 *b*; 231 *l*; John of Peckham, *Registrum Epistolarum*, II. 619; III., 937; Rogers, *Oxford City Documents* (Oxford Historical Society), 208, 219; Tovey, *Anglia Judaica*, 200.

[2] Graetz, *Geschichte der Juden* (Second Edition), VII., note 11.

[3] *Chronicles of Edward I. and Edward II.* (Rolls Series), I., 97; *The Chronicle of Pierre de Langtoft* (Rolls Series), II., 185-6.

[4] Tovey, *Anglia Judaica*, 240.

after the prescribed day were declared liable to the penalty of death.[1]

Every effort was made by the King to secure the peace and safety of the Jews during the short period for which they were allowed to remain, and in the course of their journey from their homes to the coast, and from the coast to their ultimate destination. The sheriffs were ordered to have public proclamation made that "no one within the appointed period should injure, harm, damage, or grieve them," and were to ensure, for such as chose to pay for it, a safe journey to London. The wardens of the Cinque Ports, within the district of whose jurisdiction many of the Jews would necessarily embark, received orders of the same spirit as those that had been addressed to the sheriffs of the counties. They were to see that the exiles were provided, after payment, with a safe and speedy passage across the sea, and that the poor among them were enabled to travel at cheap rates and were treated with consideration.[2] These general orders were reinforced by the issue of special writs of safe-conduct for individual Jews.[3] The exiles were allowed to carry with them all of their own property that was in their possession at the time of the issue of the decree of expulsion, together with such pledges deposited with them by Christians as were not redeemed before a fixed date. A few Jews who were high in the favour of royal personages, such as Aaron, son of Vives, who was a "chattel" of the King's brother Edmund,[4] and Cok, son of Hagin, who belonged to the Queen,[5] were allowed before their departure to sell their houses and fees to any Christian who would buy them.

On St. Denis's Day all the Jews of London started on their journey to the sea-coast.[6] The treatment that they met with was not so merciful as the king had wished.

---

[1] *Bartholomæi de Cotton, Historia Anglicana* (Rolls Series), p. 178.

[2] Tovey, *Anglia Judaica*, 240-2.

[3] *Ib.* 241; *Calendar of Patent Rolls from* 1281 *to* 1292, 378, 381, 382.

[4] *Ib.* 379. [5] *Ib.* 384. [6] *Ibid.*, 232.

Many of the richer among them embarked with all their property at London. At the mouth of the Thames, the master cast anchor during the ebb-tide, so that his vessel grounded on the sands, and invited his passengers to walk on the shore till it was again afloat. He led them to a great distance, so that they did not get back till the tide was again full. Then he ran into the water, climbed into the ship by means of a rope, and bade them, if they needed help, call on their Prophet Moses. They followed him into the water, and most of them were drowned. The sailors appropriated all that the Jews had left on board. But subsequently the master and his accomplices were indicted, convicted of murder, and hanged.[1]

One body of the exiles set sail for France. During their voyage fierce storms swept the sea. Many were drowned. Many were cast destitute on the coast that they were seeking, and were allowed by the King to live for a time in Amiens.[2] This act of mercy, however, called forth the censure of the Pope, and the *Parlement de la Chandeleur*, which met in the same year, decreed that all the Jews from England and Gascony that had taken refuge in the French king's dominions should leave the country by the middle of the next Lent.[3] Another body, numbering 1,335, and consisting, to a great extent, of the poor, went to Flanders.[4] The only known fact that we have to guide our conjectures as to the ultimate place of settlement of any of those who left England is that, in a list of the inhabitants of the Paris Jewry, made four years after the Expulsion, there appear certain names with the additions of *l'Englische* or *l'Englais*.[5] It may well be that many Jews

---

[1] Walter of Hemingburgh, *Chronicon* (English Historical Society), I., 21, 22; Bartholomæus Cotton, *Historia Anglicana* (Rolls Series), 178; *Annales Monastici*, III., 362, IV., 327.

[2] *Opus Chronicorum* in *Chronicles of S. Albans, J. de Trokelowe, etc., Annales* (Rolls Series), 57.

[3] Laurière, *Ordonnances des Rois de la France*, I., 317.

[4] *Fortieth Report of Deputy-Keeper of Public Records*, p. 474.

[5] *Revue des Etudes Juives*, Vol. I., pp. 66, 67, 69.

from England, speaking the French language, were able, in spite of the Act of the *Parlement de la Chandeleur*, to become merged in the general body of the Jews of France, who were many times as numerous as those of England had been.[1] Many, too, may have thrown in their lot with their 850,000 coreligionists of Spain.[2]

The property that they left behind them in England consisted of such dwelling-houses, and other houses, as remained to them in spite of the strict conditions imposed by the Statue of 1275, of the synagogues and cemeteries of their local congregations, and of bonds partly for the repayment of money, and partly for the delivery of wool and corn for which the price had been paid in advance. All fell into the hands of the King,[3] except, possibly, the houses in some of those towns, such as Hereford, Winchester, and Ipswich, of which the citizens had by the purchase of manorial rights become entitled to all fines and forfeitures.[4] The annual value of the houses, as shown in the returns made by the sheriffs, was, after allowance had been made for the right of the Capital Lords, about £130. The value of the debts, as shown in the register made by the officers of the Exchequer, was about £9,100, but the amount for realisation was diminished by the King's resolve to take from the debtors, not the full amount for which they were liable, and which, under the amended statute of the Jewry,[5] could include three years' interest, but only the bare principal that had been originally advanced. Even this was not fully collected; payment was, by the King's permission, delayed, and confirmations,

[1] Graetz, VII.. 267. [2] *Ibid.*, 155.

[3] Langtoft, II., 189 ; Hemingburgh, II., 21 ; Madox, *Exch.*, I., 261.

[4] Johnson, *Customs of Hereford*, p. 100 ; Madox, *Firma Burgi*, 12, 19, 23. I am not at all confident of the accuracy of Mr. Johnson's statement, on which the latter half of this sentence is founded. Certainly some of the houses of the Jews of Hereford, Winchester, and Ipswich, were granted away by the king (*Lansdowne MSS.*, British Museum, Vol. 826, part 5, Transcript 4, *Rotuli Originalium* (Record Commission), I., 73*b*-76*a*.

[5] *Papers Anglo-Jewish Historical Exhibition*, p. 230.

made in 1315 and 1327, of the renunciation of interest, show how long some of the debts remained outstanding. Edward III. finally gave up the claim to all further payment.[1]

It was ordered that the houses should be sold and the proceeds devoted to pious uses.[2] But it appears that they were nearly all given away to the King's friends.[3]

XII.—The Necessity of the Expulsion.

The Expulsion was not the act of a cruel king. The forbearance which marks the orders to the officers who were charged with the execution of the decree had been shown by Edward many a time before, when he protected Jews against claims too rigorously enforced, and ordered that his own rights should be waived where insistence on them would have deprived his debtors of their means of subsistence.[4]

Nor was it prompted by greed. It is true that immediately after it, and according to the account of many chroniclers, as an expression of gratitude for it, the Parliament voted a tenth and a fifteenth.[5] But this can-

---

[1] *Rotuli Parliamentorum*, I, 346*b*; II., 8*a*, 402*a*; *Statutes of Realm*, 1 *Ed. III.*, Stat. 2, § 3.

[2] Tovey, 235; Prynne, *Second Demurrer*, 127; *Papers*, *Anglo-Jewish Historical Exhibition*, 21.

[3] A list not quite complete, of the houses belonging to the expelled Jews is contained in the Manuscript known as *Q. R. Miscellanea* : "Jews," No. 557, 9 and 11 (Public Record Office). A list of persons who received from the King-grants of Jews' houses, to hold at a nominal rental, is printed in *Rotulorum Originalium Abbreviatio* (Record Commission) pp. 73[a]-76[b], and the deeds of gift are copied in full in *Lansdowne MSS.* (British Museum) Vol. 826, Part 5, Transcript 4. Nearly all the houses mentioned in *Q. R. Miscellanea* are granted away by deeds included in the *Rotuli Originalium* and the Lansdowne Transcript.

[4] Madox, *Exch.* I. 2, 248*h*, 258*i*, etc.; Tovey, 207; Prynne, 2*nd Ten*, 59, 76; Rymer, *Fœdera*, 523, 598.

[5] *Chronica Monasterii de Melsa* (Rolls Series), II., 251-2. *Annales Monastici*, III., 362; W. de Hemingburgh, *Chronicon* (English Historical Society) II., 22.

not have been a bribe offered beforehand, for the writs announcing the decree were issued on the fourth day after that for which the Parliament was summoned.[1] It is impossible to suppose that in so short an interval the question was brought up, the policy chosen, the price fixed, and the decree issued. It is equally impossible that Edward's conduct should have been affected by the prospect of the confiscation of the small amount of property that the Jews left behind them.

The Expulsion was a piece of independent royal action, made necessary by the impossibility of carrying out the only alternative policy that an honourable Christian king could adopt. And the impossibility was not of Edward's making. It was the result of many causes, and the knowledge of it had been brought home to him by many proofs. The guesses of our contemporary, and all but contemporary, authorities who take on themselves to explain his action, show how many were the obstacles before which he had to confess himself vanquished. In one chronicle the Expulsion is represented as a concession to the prayer of the Pope;[2] in another, as the result of the efforts of Queen Eleanor;[3] in a third, as a measure of summary punishment against the blasphemy of the Jews, taken to give satisfaction to the English clergy;[4] in a fourth as an answer to the complaints made by the magnates of the continued prevalence of usury;[5] in a fifth as an act of conformity to public opinion;[6] in a sixth, as a reform suggested by the King's independent general enquiry into the administration of the kingdom during his absence,

---

[1] Parliament was summoned for July 15th; see Parliamentary Paper 69; of 1878 (H. of C.) "Parliaments of England"; the writs ordering the Expulsion were issued on July the 18th; see Tovey, 240.

[2] French Chronicler of London, in Riley's *Chronicles of Old London*, 242.

[3] *Annales Monastici*, II., 409.

[4] *Ib.*, III., 361.

[5] W. de Hemingburgh, II., 20.

[6] *Chronicles of Edward I. and Edward II.* (Rolls Series) Vol. I. 99 ("Omnes Judæi . . . . *concedente* Rege Edwardo . . . . . exulantur").

and his discovery, through the complaints of the Council, of the "deceits" of the Jews.[1]

Each of these statements gives us some information as to the nature and extent of the failure of Edward's policy. None gives the true cause, for none sets before us the true position of the Jews and their relations with their neighbours. It is true that it was the bull of Honorius that finally compelled Edward to give up his attempt to assimilate the position of the Jews to that of Christian traders. It is true, no doubt, that his mother had from the first dissuaded him from generous treatment, and, perhaps, had induced him to lessen the chance of the success of his policy by asserting his right over them as over his serfs.[2] But the bull of the Pope and the personal influence of the Queen-mother were alike unnecessary. If Edward had waived all his rights, if the Church had in his reign relented towards the Jews instead of increasing its bitterness towards them, both acts of generosity would have come too late. The same causes that had made the Jews accept the position of royal usurers at the end of the eleventh century, and of royal chattels at the end of the twelfth, made it impossible for them to give up either position at the end of the thirteenth. From the moment of their arrival in England they had been hated by the common people. They never had an opportunity of acquiring interests in common with their neighbours, or of entering their social or industrial institutions. Isolation brought with it danger. For the sake of safety they had to accept royal protection; and their protectors long held them in a close grip, until one at last refused to tolerate them under the same conditions as had satisfied his predecessors. But to

[1] *The Chronicle of Pierre Langtoft* (Rolls Series), II., 187-89.

[2] Cum . . concesserimus Karissimæ matri nostrae Aleanorae Reginae Angliae quod nullus Judaeus habitet vel moretur in quibuscunque villis quas ipsa mater nostra habet in dotem. . . *Papers of the Anglo-Jewish Historical Exhibition*, pp. 187-8. *Forty-fourth Report of the Deputy Keeper of the Public Records*, p. 6. Graetz, *Geschichte der Juden* (Second edition), VII., note 11.

have given them their freedom would only have been to expose them to the old dislike and the old danger. If Edward had allowed them to become citizens, and had set at naught the bull of Honorius, he would have seen the English towns refusing to support his policy and denying to the Jews the right to join the gild merchant, to learn trades and to practise them, and to enjoy the protection of municipal laws and customs.

For towards all new-comers, of whatever race or religion, the English burgesses of the Middle Ages showed a spirit of unyielding exclusiveness.[1] But the feeling against the Jews was far greater than that against any other class. Every reference to them in English literature, before the Expulsion and long after it, shows its strength and bitterness. "Hell is without light where they sing lamentations," says one poet of them.[2] Another who, writing a few years after the Expulsion, mentions the massacre at the coronation of Richard I., finds in it nothing to wonder at, and nothing to regret. To him it is only natural that "The king took it for great shame That from such unclean things as them any meat to him came."[3] The chroniclers of the time refer to them again and again, and always in the same tone of dislike. "The Jews," says Matthew Paris, in his account of one of the most cruel of Henry III.'s acts of extortion, "had nearly all their money taken from them, and yet they were not pitied, because it is proved, and is manifest, that they are continually convicted of forging charters, seals and coins."[4] "They are a sign for the nation like Cain the accursed," he says elsewhere.[5] The eulogist of Edward I., when he recounts the great deeds of his hero, tells with pride and

[1] Compare the treatment of the Flemings, who settled as weavers in different towns of England soon after the Conquest, but had to retreat to one district in Wales, where they lived under special royal protection. Cunningham, *The Growth of English Industry and Commerce*, 176; and see Gross, *Gild Merchant*, II., 155-6.

[2] Jacobs, 14.

[3] *Ibid.*, 107.

[4] *Historia Anglorum*, III., 76.

[5] *Ibid.*, III., 103.

without a word of pity how "the perfidious and unbelieving horde of Jews is driven forth from England in one day into exile.[1] And just as no punishment that they can suffer is regarded as too heavy for their sins, so no story of their misdoings, whether it be of the murder of Christian children, of insults to the Christian religion, or of fraud on Christian debtors, is too improbable or too brutal or too trivial to be repeated.[2]

The popular hatred showed itself in deed as well as in word. The massacres of 1190 were imitated on a small scale at intervals during the sojourn of the Jews in England. Bradiers and hosiers bakers and shoemakers, tailors and copperers, priests and Oxford scholars were all ready to take part in the looting of a Jewry.[3]

Nor was there any influence exercised by the higher classes to make the populace less intolerant.[4] A great lady declared that it was a disgrace for one of her rank to sit in a carriage in which a Jewess had sat. A great noble thought it a good jest, when a Jew on his estate fell into a pit on a Friday, to order that he should not be helped out either on the Jewish Sabbath or on the Christian, in order that the absurdity of the Mosaic legislation might be demonstrated—at the cost, as it resulted, of the Jew's life.[5]

Bishops supported with eagerness the charge of child-murder repeatedly brought against the Jews,[6] though Popes and Councils had declared it to be groundless[7]; and the judge who showed the greatest eagerness for the punish-

---

[1] *Chronicles of Edward I. and Edward II.* (Rolls Series), *Commendatio Lamentabilis*, II., 14.

[2] M. Paris, *Chronica Majora*, V., 114; *Annales Monastici*, IV., 503; *Gesta Abbatum Monasterii, S. Albani* (Rolls Series), I., 471.

[3] *Annales Monastici*, IV., 91; *Norfolk Antiquarian Miscellany*, I., 331; *Forty-fourth Report of the Deputy-Keeper of the Public Records*, 188; *De Antiquis Legibus*, Camden Soc., 50; Tovey, 156; Prynne, *Second Demurrer*, 118.

[4] Jacobs, 26.

[5] W. Rishanger, *Chronica et Annales* (Rolls Series), p. 4.

[6] M. Paris, *Chronica Majora*, IV. 30, 31.

[7] Hahn, *Geschichte der Ketzer*, III., 35, n. 2.

ment of the Jewish prisoners who were accused on the monstrous charge of having murdered Hugh of Lincoln, was a man who was held in especial honour by his contemporaries as a scholar and a circumspect and discreet man.[1]

Thus the Christians were not likely to endure the Jews as neighbours and fellow-workers, and the Jews, even if they had been permitted, would have been as little willing to live the life and follow the ordinary pursuits of citizens. It was not that they loved usury as a calling. On the contrary, they entered willingly into all those professions that gave them the opportunity of being their own masters and living according to their own fashion. Many of them were physicians, and among the most esteemed in Europe.[2] In Italy, where the municipal and gild organisations were easier to enter, and less narrow and exacting in their constitution, than those of England,[3] they worked at trades.[4] In Sicily, under Frederic II., some Jews were employed as administrators, and many more were agriculturists.[5] In Rome, one was treasurer of the household of Pope Alexander III., and in Southern France another filled the same office under Count Raymond, of Toulouse.[6] In Austria, they were the financial ministers of the Archduke,[7] and in Spain, one was chamberlain to Alphonso the Wise, and many others were in the service of the same king.[8] In England, some Jews were attached to the Court of Henry III., and treated with special favour; others were useful and valued adherents of Richard, King of the

---

[1] M. Paris, *Chronica Majora*, V. 517; *Annales Monastici*, I. 345.

[2] *Révue des Etudes Juives*, XVIII., 258; *East Anglian*, V. 10; Jacobs, 88-9.

[3] Perrens, *Histoire de Florence*, III., 220-1, 226. Gregorovius, *Gesch. der Stadt. Rom.*, V., 308.

[4] Thomas Aquinas, *Opusculum*, XXI.

[5] Güdemann, *Gesch. des Erziehungswesens*, etc., II., 287.

[6] Güdemann, II., 71; *Hist. Litt. de la France*, XXVII., 520.

[7] Graetz, VII., 97.

[8] *Ib.*, 125-7.

Romans,[1] and, after the prohibition of usury, others, as we have seen, became corn-merchants, and wool-merchants.

But the whole character of the Jews, their religious beliefs, and their national hopes, were such as to make repellent to them those close relations with Christians and Englishmen which would have been necessary if they had entered into the feudal or municipal organisations of the Middle Ages. They could not, without violating their religion, eat at a Gild feast, or take part in its religious ceremonies. Their teachers, like those of the Church, warned them against social intercourse with the Christians, "lest it might lead to inter-marriage."[2] They did not speak the English language.[3] They remained willingly outside the national and municipal life.

Their isolation caused them no sorrow. Rather must it have been dear to them as a sign that they were faithful members of the one race to which in truth they belonged, the race of Israel. The interests that filled their mind were those that were common to them, not with the inhabitants of the country in which they lived, but with their brethren in faith and race scattered throughout the world. The rapidity and copiousness with which the stream of Jewish literature poured forth in the Middle Ages, showed how unfailing was the strength of the Jewish life which was its source. In Southern Europe the Jews waged among themselves fierce controversies over problems such as were suggested by the support that some of their Rabbis gave, or appeared to give, to the Aristotelian doctrines of the eternity of matter and the uncreativeness of God.[4] Among the English Jews, and in the communities of Northern France with whom the English Jews were in continual communication, literature, though less contro-

[1] *Royal Letters* (Rolls Series), II., 46 ; Madox, I., 257 *g* ; Rymer, *Fœdera*, I., 356.

[2] Jacobs, 269.

[3] JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, IV. 12, 551 ; *Hist. Litt. de la France*, 27, 485, 650, *sq.*

[4] *Hist. Litt. de France*, XXVII., 27, 650, *sq.*

versial and engaged with less deep questions, sufficed, nevertheless, even better to provide continual and engrossing interest for the orthodox. There were read and written, down to the last years before the Expulsion, commentaries and super-commentaries on the Bible and the Talmud, lexicons and grammars, treatises on ritual and ceremonial. The Rabbis discussed what blessings it was right to use on all the occasions of life, on rising in the morning, or on retiring to rest at night, on eating, on washing, on being married, on hearing thunder.[1] The English Jews were strict observers of the ceremonial law,[2] they made use in daily life of the minutiæ of Rabbinical scholarship, they drew up their contracts "after the usage of the sages,"[3] and thus, like all the Jews of mediæval Europe, they were continually reminded, in the pursuit of their ordinary interests and occupations, that they were a peculiar people. How proud they were of the position is shown by the poetical literature which, as preserved in the Jewish prayer book, is the most precious legacy that mediæval Judaism has left us. It was common to Jews in all lands; it commemorated all the sorrows of their nation, and gave expression to all their hopes. It made them feel that, scattered as they were, they yet had a destiny of their own, and it banished from their minds, as a counsel of baseness, the thought of making themselves one with the "Gentiles" around them. It reminded them that exile and persecution, and ultimate triumph were the appointed lot of Israel, and that the same teachers who had prophesied that the Chosen People should suffer, had also prophesied that in the fulness of time they should be redeemed. They knew that in the hour of danger and persecution there had never been wanting martyrs to testify in death to the unity of God and to the Glory of

---

[1] *Hist. Litt.*, 435, 441, 462, 484, 487, 507, *sq.*; JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, IV., 25.

[2] Jacobs, 286.

[3] *Archæological Journal*, XXVIII., 180.

his Name. And they could not doubt that the Lord of Mercy and Justice would mete out due recompense to the oppressors and the oppressed.[1]

Thus the memory of their past, and the commonplace occurrences of their daily life, continually strengthened the bonds that bound Jews together after twelve centuries of dispersion. In the thirteenth century of the Christian era, as in the first, they still regarded the Holy Land as their true home. Three hundred Rabbis from France and England went thither in 1211.[2] There Jehudi Halevi ended his days.[3] There Nachmanides taught that it was the duty of every Jew to live, and, true to his own lesson, he set out on his pilgrimage in the seventieth year of his age. And in his own and the next generation many Jews from Spain and Germany followed his example.[4] A Jewish traveller of the Middle Ages says of certain of the communities of his coreligionists that he visited: "They are full of hopes, and they say to one another, 'Be of good cheer, brethren, for the salvation of the Lord will be quick as the glancing of an eye:' and were it not that we have hitherto doubted, and thought that the end of our Captivity has not yet arrived, we should have been gathered together long ago. But now this will not be till the time of song arrives, and the sound of the turtle-dove gives warning. Then will the message arrive, and we shall ever say 'The Name of the Lord be exalted.'"[5]

Nowhere in Europe could such men have been content to live the life of those around them, to bind themselves with the ties of citizenship, to find their highest hopes on earth in the destiny of the town, or the country, in which they dwelt. They were but sojourners. They lived in expectation of the time when the Lord should return the Captivity of Zion, and they should look back on their exile as rewakened dreamers.

---

[1] Cf. L. Zunz, *Die Synagogale Poesie des Mittelalters*, Berlin, 1856.

[2] Graetz, VII., 6. [3] *Ibid.*, VI. [4] VII., 138; VII., 307-8; VII., 188-9.

[5] Benjamin of Tudela, trans. Asher, I., 163.

Without the privilege of isolation they could not live; and if in England the communities of the Gentiles had been open to them, they would never have entered them.

The Expulsion of the English Jews was an event of small importance alike in English and in Jewish history. In England the effect that it produced was barely perceptible. The loss of their capital was too slight to produce any economic change. The only class that benefited from their departure was the Florentine merchants, whose trade grew from this time even greater than before.[2] Political results of importance have sometimes been attributed to the Expulsion. The victory of the towns over the King has been said to have been hastened by the loss of the financial support of the Jews.[3] But it cannot have come any the sooner for the disappearance of a community from whom the King had long ceased to get any real help in his enterprises abroad, or in his struggles at home. The trading classes still complained after the Expulsion, as they had done before it, of the prevalence of the "horrible practice of usury, which has undone many, and brought many to poverty,"[4] and the "horrible practice" prevailed none the less; and perhaps the poorer agricultural classes of England, the newly enfeoffed rent-payers, found, as did the corresponding class in France,[5] that the expulsion of the Jews only compelled them to go to more cruel money-lenders than before. The coin was clipped as regularly after the Expulsion as before it, and the Christian goldsmiths were as rigorously treated as the Jewish money-

[1] See the Tables in Thorold Rogers' *History of Agriculture and Prices*, Vols. I. and II.

[2] Peruzzi, *Storia del Commercio e dei Banchieri de Firenze*, 175.

[3] Papers, *Anglo-Jewish Historical Exhibition*, p. 211.

[4] *Rotuli Parliamentorum*, II., 332-350. [5] Graetz, VII., 101.

lenders had been.[1] The Church, which had helped to drive out the Jews, soon found itself in conflict with Christian heresy, compared with which Jewish unbelief was harmless.

The Jews, on their side, were driven from a land which thirty-five years earlier they had begged in vain to be allowed to leave.[2] They went forth to join the far greater bodies of their countrymen in other lands, and with them to fulfil the career of sorrow that they had begun. The loss of their inhospitable home in England was but one episode in their tragic history. From France they were again to be expelled, despoiled and destitute.[3] In Germany the blood-accusation met them as in England.[4] In Spain popular massacres and clerical persecution were already preparing the ground for the Inquisition.[5] The time was still far off when Jew and Christian could live side by side and neither suffer because he would not worship after his neighbour's fashion. That time could not come until society was more heterogeneous, and the circles of interest of ordinary men wider, than they could be in the thirteenth century, until the citizen ceased to live his life, bodily and spiritual, within the walls of his native town, under the shadow of the Church.

B. Lionel Abrahams.

---

[1] J. de Trokelowe, etc., *Chronica et Annales* (Rolls Series), 58 ; Ruding *Annals of the Coinage* (Third Edition), I., 198-202.

[2] M. Paris, *Chronica Majora*, V., 441, 487.

[3] Graetz, VII., 264-7 ; Depping, 228-9.

[4] Graetz, VII., 181-8, 252.

[5] *Ibid.*, 163-4, 318-20, 363.

SOME TRANSLATIONS OF HEBREW POEMS.

Of the following translations by Miss Nina Davis, Miss Elsie Davis, and the Rev. Dr. Edward King, the specimens from Kalir and Ibn Gebirol have never been turned into English verse before. The selections from Jehuda Halevi have been several times so rendered, notably by Mrs. Lucas in *Songs of Zion*, but the alternatives that follow are so meritorious that they cannot fail to prove interesting. Kalir has received far too little attention in England. Though his lines are harsh and difficult, he undoubtedly possessed more poetic force than any other of the New-Hebrew poets, Jehuda Halevi perhaps not excepted. Ibn Gebirol, though his merits have not been questioned, has also received, so far, but scanty justice from translators.

I. A.

The Prophet Jeremiah by the Cave of Macpelah.

Translated from the Original Hebrew of Kalir.

The Prophet standing by the fathers' graves,
With soul o'erwhelmed he speaks, for solace craves ;
" How can ye lie at rest, beloved ones,
While sharpened swords consume your captive sons ?
Where now, O fathers, lurks your merit rare
In that vast wilderness of land laid bare ?
They cry each one with lamentation sore
For children banished, sons that are no more ;
They pray imploring with a cry for grace,
To Him who dwelleth in the realms of space.
Ah ! where is now God's promise made of old ?
'I will not my first covenant withhold.'" [1]

---

[1] Lev. xxvi. 45.

Changed is My glory,
From them departed,
They have not feared Me
Nor seen the right way ;
From them I hid Me,
And still they turned not,
Nor to Me yearned they ;
Shall I restrain Me,
Hearing them utter
" Our God He is not " ? [1]

Then father Abraham with bitter cry,
Implored, a suppliant lowly, God on high ;
" Ten times in vain for them great trials I bore,
For woe ! mine eyes have seen destruction sore ;
Ah ! where is now Thy promise made of old,
Abram, thou shalt not fear, thy Shield behold.' " [2]

Far have they wandered,
Erred after strange gods,
And they have hewn them
Cisterns which hold not :
Shall I restrain Me
When they regard not
My sacred mandates ?

And thus did Isaac all his sorrow tell,
Unto the Lord who high in Heav'n doth dwell :
" Wherefore was I appointed to be slain,
My seed is crushed and low in chains has lain ;
Ah ! where is now Thy promise made of old,
' My covenant with Isaac I will hold ' ? " [3]

Unto my prophet
Sorely rebellious,
They have polluted
My holy mountain :
Lo, I am weary
With ever hearing
Their cry which riseth
From the earth upwards ;
Shall I restrain Me
Seeing the slaughter
Of Zechariah ? [4]

---

[1] Jer. v. 12. [2] Gen. xv. 1.
[3] Levit. xxvi. 42. [4] 2 Chron. xxiv. 20.

And then spake he with learning deep endowed,[1]
His form with shame and bitter sorrow bowed ;
" My little ones I reared with holy care,
How are they caught within the fatal snare !
Ah ! dearly have I paid, a thousand-fold,
My erring children's debt of guilt untold."
Thus spake the faithful shepherd in his woe,
Covered with ashes and in dust laid low.
" My tender sheep, in genial shelter reared,
Lo ! how are they before their season sheared !
Ah ! where is now Thy promise made of old,
'There shall not be a widow in the fold' ?"[2]
With voices of distress the air is rent ;
With sobs doth Leah to her despair give vent,
And Rachel weeping for her children dead ;
Zilpah with face of anguish, heart of dread,
And Bilhah grieving for the evil day,
Her hands to God uplifted in dismay.

Turn, O ye perfect ones,
Unto your rest again ;
I will fulfil for you
All that your hearts desire ;
Down unto Babylon
With you My Presence went,
Surely will I return
Your sons' captivity.

NINA DAVIS.

THE CONFESSION.

From the " Royal Crown," by Ibn Gebirol. Translated from the Hebrew.

My God, I know that mine iniquity
Is heavier than my feeble words express,
And to recount my trespasses to Thee
Doth memory fail, for they are numberless.

[1] Jacob : *vide* Midrash Rabbah תולדות and Talmud Megillah, pp. 16 *b* and 17 *a*.

[2] Jerem. li. 5.

Yet some do haunt my mind, but these, indeed,
Are as a drop of water from my sea
Of sin, whose roaring billows may recede,
And by confession, calm'd and silenced be.
O Thou in Heav'n, pray list, and pardon me.

Thy precepts have I scorn'd, Thy Law transgress'd,
Rejecting from my wayward heart Thy word ;
Slander I spake, and in my truant breast
Lurk'd vice indulgent, therefore have I err'd.

Falsehood and pride and violence combined
To dog my steps and lead them far astray ;
When men have counsel ask'd, oft did I blind
Their eyes with fraud, and evil counsel say.

I have rebell'd, blasphemed, yea, scorn'd and lied ;
I have revolted and perversely done ;
I have betray'd and stiffneck'd did abide,
Defiant strove Thy just rebuke to shun.

How have my deeds been sinful, weak and vile,
My ways corrupt and errant from Thy path,
Daring Thy precepts with deluding wile,
To merge beneath the tempest of Thy wrath.

Though great the sorrows that o'erwhelm my brow,
These sorrows issue from Thy righteous hand
Where mercy ever dwelleth ; hence I bow
And court the shaft that sped at Thy command.

My God, I mourn, for self-accusers rise :
" Thou hast Thy Maker grievously defied,
Hast acted graceless folly in His eyes
For mercies, when His judgment bade Him chide."

Thou need'st no service at my humble hand,
Yet gav'st me life and bless'd my happy birth ;
Thy spirit bade my budding soul expand,
To blossom on Thy fair and wondrous earth.

And Thou hast rear'd me with a father's care,
Strengthen'd my limbs and nursed the tender child
Lull'd on my mother's gentle bosom, where
Thine all-protecting wing and blessing smiled.

And when I grew and all erect could stand,
Thou did'st enfold me in Thy fostering arms
Guiding my tott'ring steps with Thy right hand
To manly strength, which scorneth all alarms.

The ways of wisdom did'st Thou then command
To shield my heart 'gainst sorrow and distress,
Conceal'd within the shadow of Thy hand,
When fear and wrath did all the land oppress.

How many an unseen danger have I pass'd !
Before the wound the balm is yet prepared ;
A remedy before the spear is cast,
The foeman vanquish'd ere the war's declared.

Heedless I placed my head 'twixt lion's teeth,
And thou to rescue me their jaws did'st break;
When sickness held me with her heel beneath,
Thy heav'nly balsam came for pity's sake.

And when Thy judgment thunder'd in the storm
Thy favour arm'd Thy servant 'gainst its blow ;
When death assail'd him in pale famine's form,
Thy halo veil'd him in a saving glow.

When plenty reign'd my share of wealth I won,
But when I roused with provocation sore
Thy wrath, as doth a father to his son,
Thou did'st chastise, that I should sin no more.

Then unto Thee I cried in dire distress,
My soul immortal with Thee favour found,
Thy mercy shed in Thy benign excess
A perfect faith, within my heart, profound.

Among the foolish who blaspheme Thy name
With clamour loud, Thou hast not cast my lot ;
'Mongst erring ones who 'gainst Thy word exclaim,
Thy laws deriding, number'd I am not.

Of visage fair are they, yet foul deceit
Lurketh like leprous spots deep sunk within ;
Though, on the surface smiling ripples meet,
Beneath are billows wild, and black as sin :

A vessel, fill'd to brim with shame and woe,
  Varnish'd with glitt'ring waters to allure,
Distill'd of malice, virtue's direst foe
  Its touch unclean, defilement to the pure.

I am unworthy of the saving love
  Thou hast to me Thy servant ever shown,
So must I waft my song of praise above,
  And unto Thee my gratitude make known.

My soul, Thy gift divine, was pure as light;
  Alas! no more, my sin hath stain'd its crest.
I wrestled with the Yezer Ra[1] in might,
  But all too weak I sank—yet not to rest.

Contrite, Thy saving pardon I entreat,
  I feel Thy glory flood my yearning soul;
Vanquish'd proud sin is helpless at my feet,
  And I, Thy servant, reach Thy radiant goal.

ELSIE DAVIS.

FROM THE HEBREW "DIVAN" OF R. JUDAH HALEVI.

I.—TO ZION.

Hast thou no greeting for thy captive sons,
Poor remnant of thy flock, who seek thy weal?
"Peace to thee, far and near!" Lift up thy voice
Through all thy region—west, east, north, and south!
And "Peace" to me, Hope's prisoner, who sheds [Zech. ix. 12.
His tears like Hermon's dew, and only longs
That they might fall (where dews fall) on thy hills.
Thy woe-gone state I wail with jackal cry,
But, should I dream captivity restored,
I am a harp, to echo forth thy songs.
For Bethel and Penî-êl how I yearn!
For Mahanaim, and each trysting-spot
Where angels met thy pure saints of old:
There the Shekinah neighboured close with thee,

[1] The evil imagination.

And He that formed thee set thy open gates
Hard by the open gates of highest heaven.
The glory of the Lord thy only light!
Not sun, or moon, or stars that lightened thee!
May it be mine to shed my life-blood there,
Where on thy sons God's spirit erst was shed.
Thou home of kingship! throne of God!—Ah! woe,
That slaves now sit upon thy lordly thrones!
Oh, might I range through spots where seer and sage
Received for thee the unveiled speech of God!
Oh, had I wings, that I might fly afar,
And soothe the serried cares of this poor heart
Amid the serried range of Bether's hills, [Cant. ii. 17.
I'd fall upon my face upon thy soil,
I'd find sweet pleasure in thy very stones,
And cherish to my heart thy merest dust;
Much more when standing by my fathers' graves,
Lost in deep wonder, there where Hebron holds
The dearest even of thy sepulchres.
I pass, in thought, through forest and through field;
I stand in awe by Gilead and the hills
Which tower round thy borders—Nebo first—
Mount Nebo and Mount Hor—most sacred they,
Where "two great Lights" thy lights and teachers shone.
Thy very air breathes life into the soul!
Thy smallest dust more sweet than sweetest myrrh!
Thy streams run honey from the dripping rocks!
How sweet it were to walk with naked foot
Through ruins that were once God's oracles!
'Twas here thy ark was treasured, here thy cherubim
Once dwelt within this inmost shrine of thine.
I shave my head—cast down its beauty's crown,
And curse the fate that, in an unclean land,
Profanes the beauty of thy Nazarites. [Lam. iv. 7.
What pleasure can I find in food or drink,
While those that are but dogs can rend thy lions?
How can the light of day gladden mine eyes,
That see crows gnaw the carcase of thine eagles?
Oh, cup of woe! Give pause! give breathing-space!
My reins and soul are full of bitterness. [Job ix. 18
I think on Aholàh—I drink thy cup;
On Aholibàh—then I drain its dregs. [Ezek. xxiii
O Zion, "perfect beauty," grace, and love

Of old thou bindest on thee—yea, the souls
Of sages, too, are bound up in thy life.
These gladden in thy weal, these wail thy woe,
These weep thy ruin. Still, from captive pit,
Towards thee they yearn, and towards thy sacred gates
Each from his place they bow them down in prayer.
Thy bleating flocks, though captive and dispersed
From mount to hill, can ne'er forget thy Fold :
Still to thy skirts they cling and strive to climb
Up to the stately palm-growth of thy breasts. [Cant. vii. 9.
Shinar and Patros ? Can *they* match thy state ?
Their vanities thy Urim and thy Thummim ?
Thy Princes—Prophets—Levites—Minstrels ?
To each of these what can the world compare ?
The diadem of every worldly throne
Must change and pass away—thy wealth remains ;
Thy crown of consecration is for aye ;
Thy God desires thee for His Throne. Ah, blest
Is "he whom God shall choose and draw him nigh"
That he may dwell for ever in thy Courts ;
And "Blessèd he who waits" till he attain [Dan. xii. 12.
To see thy light mount up, thy Dawn break forth,
To witness peace upon thy chosen ones,
To gladden in thy joy as thou return
Unto the vigour of thine ancient youth.

II.

Oh, fairest joy of Earth,
Thou City of the King,
For thee my soul is home-sick,
A banished Westerling !
Compassion stirs my bowels
When calling back the past ;
Thy Glory that is captive !
Thy beauty that is waste !
Oh, had I wings of eagles
I'd seek thee, nor refrain
Till tears had poured upon thee
And watered thee like rain :
I'd seek thee, though thy King
Is now no more in thee,

Though dragon, asp, and scorpion,
Take place of Gilead's tree;
Thy very stones I'd cherish
And lovingly embrace,
Sweeter to me than honey
Thy broken clods should taste.

III.—The Voyage.

Thine is my soul, O God. In hope or fear
To Thee it bows and yields incessant praise.
In Thee I joy when carried to and fro;
To Thee give thanks in all my pilgrimage.
When the ship spreads her stork-like wings to fly, [Zech.
When deep makes roar to lower deep, and moans— [v. 9.
As if it learn'd that sorrow from my heart—
It makes the ocean like a caldron seethe;
It makes the deep sea like a wizard's pot.

* * *

When teeming creatures seem to ban the ship,
Sea-monsters waiting for their coming meal!
A time of anguish like to first-born throes
With children at the birth—no strength to bear!
Should I lack food?—the sweetness of Thy name
Is in my mouth the best viaticum.
Nor shall I care for buying or for building,
For "get or gain," or any loss that haps;
I even learn to leave my daughter dear,
The darling of my soul, though she to me
Is dear as only child can only be.
I can forget her son—That rends my heart!
No poem comes without the thought of him!
Fruit of my body! child of my delight!
Can Judah e'er by Judah be forgot!
Yet this I count but dross for love of Thee;
That I might come within Thy gates with praise;
There would I stay and reckon this my heart
As a whole-offering on Thine Altar bound.
I'd make my grave within Thy Holy Land
There to remain, a witness to my love.

IV.—The Earth in Spring.

Then, day by day, her broidered gown
  She changes for fresh wonder ;
A rich profusion of gay robes
  She scatters all around her.
From day to day her flowers' tints
  Change quick, like eyes that brighten,
Now white, like pearl, now ruby-red,
  Now emerald-green they'll lighten.
She turns all pale ; from time to time
  Red blushes quick o'er-cover ;
She's like a fair, fond bride that pours
  Warm kisses on her lover.
The beauty of her bursting spring
  So far exceeds my telling,
Methinks sometimes she pales the stars
  That have in heaven their dwelling.

V.—Divan No. 52.—A Prayer.

O God ! before Thee lies my whole desire,
Although it find no utterance on my lips.
One moment of Thy will—then let me die !
Ah, would that this request of mine might come !
The rest of life I would yield up to Thee,
And sleep the sleep that should be sweet to me.
Absent from Thee, my very life is death,
But could I cleave to Thee, then death were life.
But I know not the "wherewithal to come," [Mic. vi. 6.
Or what should be my service and my work.
  "Teach me Thy ways, O Lord,"
And from my folly's bondage bring me home.
Teach me while yet I have some power left
To make amends, and spurn not mine affliction.
Ere that day comes when I must be a burden,
When my last end lies heavy on mine end,
And I must bow, unwilling, while slow waste
Consumes my strength, too weary to uprise ;
And so I go whither my fathers went,
Dwelling where they themselves are dwelling now.
Stranger am I and pilgrim *on* this earth,

Only beneath the sod my heritage!
So far my youthful days have had their will.
Ah! when shall I myself, too, have *my* will?
That "world" which he "hath set within my heart" [Eccles.
He hath refused to let me seek as end. [iii. 2.
How can I serve my Maker while I am
Bound by my evil, slave of my desires?
How shall I aim at any high emprise,
That am to-morrow "sister to the worm"?
How should my heart gladden at any good,
Whereas I know not what may hap to-morrow?
The days and nights are busily engaged
In wasting me away, till I be gone!
One half of me they scatter to the winds,
The other half they bring again to dust.
What shall I say? My evil tracks me down,
A stern foe from the cradle to the grave.
What share have I in time, except Thy will?
If Thou be not my lot, what lot have I?
Spoiled of all merit, robbed and naked left,
Thy righteousness alone must cover me.
Yet why should I tell out my prayer in words?
O God, before Thee lies my whole desire!

EDWARD G. KING.

GLEANINGS FROM THE BOOK OF ISAIAH.

THE text of the prophetic writings appears to afford very little justification for the theory which regards them as representing "Notes of Discourses." The utterances of the prophets were, to a great extent, suggested by special inquiries, or particular occasions. Their style was, as a rule, concise, vigorous, pointed; it might be abundant, but seldom diffuse, and when most eloquent, then most symmetrical; neither requiring nor admitting abbreviation. Even the prophecies of Ezekiel, which approach more nearly to the nature of set discourses, afford by their very repetitions the best proof that they have not suffered abridgment. In a few passages of Jeremiah (*e.g.*, xxi. 11-14; xxv. 3, *seq.*; xxvi. 4-6; xxxiv. 21, 22; xxxvii. 17) we have something like a summary or recapitulation; but these passages tend rather to illustrate the originality of those from which they are derived. The prophets delivered oracles; they did not preach sermons.

This is the reality which underlies a second theory—Ewald's theory of "Fly-sheets." But what was the material aspect of these documents? The answer is not far to seek. When we recollect that the Ten Words are represented as inscribed on two tables of stone, and that Isaiah (viii. 1; cf. *v.* 16, and xxx. 8) and Habakkuk (ii. 2, 3), registered their predictions upon tablets, we are entitled to suppose that in many an unrecorded instance the uttered "Word of Jahveh" was thus preserved, circulated, and transmitted to posterity. The arrangement of the Decalogue, and other laws contained in the "Book of the Covenant," in pairs of pentads (Addis, *Documents of the Hexateuch*, Vol. I., p. 142. Cf. Tylor, *Primitive Culture*,

chap. vii., esp. pp. 260, 261), may point to the use of a diptych. Cf. Isaiah viii. 16, *sup. cit.*; Jer. xxxii. 10, 11, 14; and Maunde Thompson, *Handbook of Greek and Latin Palæography*, chap. ii., esp. pp. 18, 20, 25.

The collected utterances of any prophet would thus exist, in the first instance, on a series of tablets, analogous, in some degree, to the Latin *caudex*. "Plurium tabularum contextus caudex apud antiquos vocabatur; unde publicæ tabulæ codices dicuntur." How easily might members of the series become detached, displaced or lost! On the back or margin of such tablets matter more or less cognate to their proper contents might subsequently be inscribed. Sooner or later the whole series would be copied into a roll (Jer. xxxvi.), the "leaves" or columns of the latter in some measure corresponding to the faces of the original tablets. How far, if at all, these divisions of the written text might coincide with elements of the subject-matter, units of rhythmical form, and so with the paragraphs of the modern version, I must leave it for others to determine; confining myself to the suggestion that in the hands of a skilled palæographer a measurement of the space occupied by component portions of the Hebrew text might sometimes prove a valuable aid to criticism, and afford a clue to the arrangement, or disorder, of the prophecies.

Isaiah, in his long lifetime, may well have put forth more than one collection of his utterances. It is at least a probable hypothesis that the earliest "Book of Isaiah" began with what is now chap. vi.; and that to this was originally prefixed the title, "The Vision of Isaiah, the son of Amoz, which he saw concerning Judah and Jerusalem"; which with an editorial date now occupies chap. i. 1. When the later prologue replaced the earlier vision, the form of the title, we may suppose, was changed to that which now stands at the head of the second chapter.

According to Duhm (*apud* Cheyne, JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, Vol. V., p. 298), the closing words of vi. 13 are an interpolation. And certainly the idea of "the holy seed"

belongs to the age of Ezra (Ezr. ix. 2), rather than to that of Isaiah. The prophet would never have attached holiness to heredity. He had no occasion to contrast Jew and Gentile. His mind was rather occupied with a moral distinction existing in Israel itself. But is any part of this verse genuine? One can understand a threat of extermination. And, on the other hand, we are familiar with the idea of "the remnant." But why predict, first its survival, and then its destruction, as in the former part of this verse? Is not this a *vaticinium ex eventu*, a reference to the misfortunes which befell the returned exiles? (Ezra iv., etc.; Neh. i. 3, and perhaps Zech. xiv.). And how can this beginning be reconciled with the sequel?

Isaiah vi. 1-12 should, I think, be followed immediately by vii. 18-25. Verses 1-17 of the latter chapter are derived from another source, possibly from "the Book of the Chronicles of the Kings of Judah" (2 Kings xvi. 19). In chap. viii. the prophet still speaks in his own person as far as *v.* 18, which is the natural conclusion of the section; but *v.* 19 should perhaps follow *v.* 15. It is possible that all which we have as yet considered should precede chap. ii. 6. It would seem from viii. 16-19 that there "was a famine of hearing the words of Jahveh" (Amos viii. 11), as in the last days of Saul (1 Sam. xxviii. 6). In chap. ii. 6 we have the reason.

Chap. viii. 20 is perhaps spurious, being in part based on *v.* 16, and in part serving as an artificial link to connect *vv.* 16-19 with *vv.* 21, 22. In regard to the latter, two things, and two things only, seem clear. They have no relation to the rest of chap viii., but a very intimate one to chap. v. 30. I am led to the conclusion that the passage viii. 21-ix. 7 (in the English version) was at one time appended, by way of antithesis, to the eloquent termination of chap. v. If we observe that the first part of v. 30 is parallel to the preceding verse, and the second part to viii. 22, we shall be the more inclined to follow Dr. Siegfried and Canon Cheyne in transposing viii. 22 and 21.

Both verses appear to me to describe the sufferings and despair of a people carried into captivity.

Cheyne (J. Q. R., IV., 565) arranges the text in this order:—v. 1-24; ix. 7-20; v. 26-30. In Vol. V., p. 298, he quotes, with apparent approval, Duhm's observation that "v. 30 is a marginal gloss suggested by viii. 22." Let us, then, for v. 30, *substitute* viii. 22, followed by viii. 21, and this by ix. 1-7. Referring chaps. vi. 1.-viii. 18, with the changes above indicated, to a position at the commencement of the book, the text from v. 1 to x. 4 will for the first time fall into a tolerable order; but, while there can be little doubt that x. 1-4 should be incorporated in chap. v., I regret the loss of v. 25 involved in the proposed arrangement, and I do not understand the necessity of removing ix. *vv.* 7-20 (8-21 Eng.) from their present place. But these verses need a climax? We have it in x. 5. The oracle which fills the latter part of chap. ix., when originally published, may very well have ended with the third occurrence of its menacing refrain. In that early book of Isaiah which we are trying to reconstruct, it served to prepare the way for the prophecy next to be discussed.

The section beginning at x. 5 has undergone both displacement and interpolation. The original order of the text may perhaps be restored approximately as follows:—x. 5-11, 12-15, 16-18 (33, 34), 19, 24-26; xvii. 12-14; x. 28-32; xiv. 24-27 (cf. Cheyne, J. Q. R., IV., 566; and on Duhm, V. 299). Chap. xiv. *vv.* 24, 25, explain why the invasion has been permitted which is so vividly described in x. 28-32. In chap. x. *vv.* 20-23 are very suspicious, and break the sequence of 5-19, 24-26. Verse 27 is, I think, spurious, and based on xiv. 25. The Messianic prophecy in xi. 1-9 is linked to that which precedes it by x. 33, 34, much in the same manner in which the similar utterance in ix. 1-7 is connected, as I suppose, with chap. v. by means of v. 30, viii. 22, and viii. 21. In neither case is the connection a strong one. In chap. x., *vv.* 33, 34 are almost certainly misplaced, while, besides these and the

passage under discussion, all that intervenes between x. 28-32 and its natural sequel in xiv. 24-27 is undoubtedly exilic and post-exilic.

Both ix. 1-7 and xi. 1-9 are, if I am not mistaken, the work of the same hand, whether or no it be the hand of Isaiah. The Divine names borne by the royal child in ix. 6 are *only* explicable in the light of xi. 2. These passages taken together do plainly describe, I will not say an incarnation, but at least an *avatar* (see Monier-Williams, *Hinduism*, S.P.C.K., p. 100 *seq.*, esp. 103 *ad fin.*; and compare the heroes of Israel with those of India, Jud. xiii. 25, etc.; 1 Sam. x. 6, xi. 7, *et sœpe*). One may be excused a protest against the pedantry which degrades "Father of Eternity" into "Giver of Booty," and couples such a title with "Prince of Peace."

But were these predictions the work of Isaiah? It is conceivable that the mind of the prophet should pass through the stage in which he and his own children, with their symbolic names, "are for signs and wonders from the LORD of hosts which dwelleth in Mount Zion," to the idea of a child, presumably of the house of David, whose birth and name should be a pledge of the protecting presence of Jahveh; and finally to the conception that such a child animated by his spirit should be destined to manifest the principles of his rule. It is also possible that this development came to pass more gradually, not in one but in a series of minds. It cannot be denied that the words of ix. 1 (cf. Ps. lxviii. 27), "In the former time . . . Galilee of the nations," suggest a period later than that of Isaiah. Both the passages under discussion offer a curious contrast to ch. iii. 4, 12. In the first instance these ideal hopes may have been associated with the child Josiah, who at eight years of age was called to the throne by a popular movement, who ten years later became the agent of a prophetic Reformation, and who at least attempted to assert in some degree his authority over the former Northern Kingdom. (I may be allowed to refer to

what I have written on this subject, in defence of the genuineness of Jer. iii. 6-15, J. Q. R., VI. 278, 279.) But if Duhm be right in tracing allusions to ix. 1-6 (Heb.) in xxvi. 15*a* and xxxiii. 23 (J. Q. R., V. 298), and if we bear in mind Cheyne's significant remark on ix. 6 (*Last Words on Isaiah*), "Such an elaborate sentence-name as Luzzatto supposes would not be natural in Isaiah's time, though it might be in that of the writer of Chronicles," the possibility of a much later date ought not to be excluded from our view.

I have previously suggested that xi. 1-9 should be followed by ii. 2-4. The words which form the commencement of that noble passage "nowhere else occur at the beginning of a prophecy." Nor can I find anywhere a position more appropriate than that above indicated. Note especially the connection between "my holy mountain" in xi. 9 and "the mountain of the LORD'S house" in ii. 2, 3 *a*; between xi. 3, 4 and ii. 3 *b*, 4 *a*; between xi. 6-9 and ii. 4 *b*, *c*. The two passages are in a great measure parallel. It does not necessarily follow that both are of the same date. But did they stand in juxtaposition, who would think of separating them? It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that both, and perhaps also ix. 1-7, are alike post-exilic.

The last section of ch. xi., especially *vv.* 11, 15, 16, agrees with the end of ch. xix. (23-25) and that of ch. xxvii. (12, 13), in the parallelism between Egypt and Assyria, which in xi. and xxvii. are regarded as places of exile whence Jahveh should recover the "remnant of his people," the "outcasts of Israel," the "dispersed of Judah" (xi. 11, 12; cp. xxvii. 12, 13). In the former passage we may note, beside the Deutero-Isaianic touch of the *highway* in *v.* 16 (cp. xix. 23), the drought threatened to Nile and Euphrates (cp. xix., 5-8, and Jer. l. 38). In ch. xxvii., 12, 13, the "flood of the River," and the "brook of Egypt" are merely put for the regions of which they formed the boundaries. The concluding reference to "the holy mountain at Jerusalem," reminds one of xi. 9, and ii. 2, 3.

In the latter part of ch. xix., Egypt and Assyria appear in a new and strange light, associated with the people of Jahveh. This result appears to be reached by a series of steps, which may be traced from *v.* 16 onwards. Whoever will explain the allusions in xliii. 3, 4, and xlv. 14, will also enable us to understand those in xix. 16, 17, 20, and perhaps in xviii. 7, with which should be compared Zeph. iii. 10. May we suppose that all these passages belong to the age of Cyrus ?

Even at an earlier period, as we know from Jer. xl. 7 *seq.* (see esp. xliii. 5-7, 13, xliv. 1, 15, xlvi. 14), there existed in Egypt a numerous colony of Jewish refugees. We know the places of their settlement; Migdol, Tahpanhes, Noph, and the country of Pathros (cf. Is. xi. 13); perhaps also Beth-shemesh (cf. Isa. xix. 18). We are informed of the nature of their religion. It was that which characterised the mass of Jeremiah's contemporaries; a cultus of Jahveh which did not exclude the traditional and popular worship of the Queen of Heaven. Far less was it likely to acknowledge the restrictions of Deuteronomy. Under these circumstances the erection of altar and pillar to Jahveh in Egypt (Is. xix. 19) was probably a matter of course, unless indeed we are meant to understand that hereafter the obelisks of Heliopolis should be dedicated to the God of Israel. But this settlement contained within it at its origin a germ of better things: the influence of Jeremiah and his disciple Baruch. At a later period, it may be supposed, prophetic sanction for the sacrificial worship of Jahveh in exile, was devised in the passage before us, and justified by the hope of conversion for Egypt and Assyria. In this connection, Ps. lxviii. 31 should also be compared.

It may be worth while to note that the genuineness of the reference to Asherim and Sun-images, which has been thought to imply a pre-exilic date for xxvii. 9, appears to be as doubtful as that of a similar clause in xvii. 8. Both may be due to the hand of a later student of the text (cf .2 Chr. xiv. 5, xvii. 6). Isaiah xvii. 6 also presents a

suspicious resemblance to vi. 13 and xxvii. 12. That xi. 10 is merely a gloss has been formerly suggested (J. Q. R., V., 348). Chap. xii. may, with considerable probability, be ascribed to the writer of the very similar passages in xxiv.-xxvi. Chap. xiii. 1 belongs to a group of unauthentic and inappropriate titles which are only important as marking a stage in the history of the book. It is very remarkable that with this sole exception, we have, as yet, met with no express reference to Babylon. Nor in chap. xiii. 2-13—a description of the day of Jahveh, which exhibits a certain resemblance to the commencement of chap. xxiv., and a closer analogy to xxxiv.—is Babylon ever mentioned. After verse 13 follows, not a transition, but a complete *hiatus*. In the first part of the chapter the execution of Jahveh's judgment is still future. In verse 14, Babylon is already fallen. But nowhere is its fall described. Either an important passage is lost, or the text is wrongly arranged. As it stands, we are left to conjecture the subject of verse 14.

This group of prophecies might perhaps be arranged as follows:—xii., xiv. 1-21, xiii. 14-22, xiii. 2-13. The concluding verses of chap. xiv. are parallel to xiii. 14-22, and might be omitted without much loss. Both passages offer points of contact with chap. xxxiv.

It is with some hesitation that I suggest a more startling alternative, which yet in an investigation of possibilities should not be altogether overlooked, namely, that the two parts of Isaiah xiii. might serve as prologue and epilogue to the great prophecy against Babylon contained in Jer. l., li., with which, beyond all question, they are very closely connected. (It is not safe to *assume* the priority of Isaiah xiii.). On this hypothesis the first part of the chapter in Isaiah (xiii. 2-13) would be followed by Jer. l. 2; the second part (*vv.* 14-22) would be attached to the proper conclusion of Jer. li. 44 ("and the nations shall not flow together any more unto him"), thus supplying a subject to *v.* 14 (cf. Jer. li. 6-9). I need not repeat what I have said in *Studies in the Book of Jeremiah*, on chaps. l., li.

It is, however, natural to compare Isaiah xiv. 1, 2 with Jer. l. 4-7, 17-20, etc. But there is at least one noteworthy difference. The passages in Jer. l. are marked by the parallelism of Israel and Judah. Isaiah xiv., *vv.* 1, 2, agree with chap. xl. *seq.*, in that of Israel and Jacob. Nor is there anything in Jer. l., li., like the prediction in Isaiah xiv. 1*b* (cf. lvi. 36). On the whole, the commencement of Isaiah xiv., unlike the preceding chapter, is related to the Second Isaiah rather than the Second Jeremiah.

Gathering here and there gleanings from the wide field in which so many able reapers are at work, I would suggest that in xxiv., verses 13-16 should be transferred to the end of the chapter, where they would afford a natural transition to xxv. At the close of xxxiii. the greater part of *v.* 21 ("But in the place of broad rivers and streams [*scilicet* Babylon] there shall go," etc.), and the whole of verse 23 appear to me interpolated in an earlier text. One of the easiest and greatest improvements in the arrangement of the book would be the simple omission of chapters xxxvi.-xxxix. The variations from the text of Kings should be noted in that book, and the Psalm of Hezekiah printed as an appendix to it. The result of this change would be to bring Isa. xxxv. into immediate juxtaposition with chap. xl., to which it is so intimately related. More than one place might be found for it in the great prophecy of Israel's restoration. We need only recognise that it is properly an integral part of that work, from which it has unfortunately become detached. Another passage in the same case may be found, as I have formerly pointed out, in lxvi. 7-13. But I omitted to notice its most interesting feature. It describes the first arrival at Jerusalem of the returned exiles, among whom was, in all probability, the Evangelical Prophet himself. It might fitly be assigned to a position following chap. xlix., and if the prophecies of the Second Isaiah were arranged in chronological sequence, it should mark the point of transition from the Babylonian to the Palestinian chapters. (See JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, II., 315).

After l. 1-3 there is an evident *hiatus*, and a new section commences at verse 4. A more natural sequel may be found in chap. lix., which begins with a reply to the question asked in l. 2.

I do not know whether the fluctuating conception of the Servant of Jahveh has ever been illustrated from that of Piers Plowman. Professor Skeat, according to a review of his edition in the *Academy* for January 29th, 1887, by Mr. Henry Bradley, says that, in the early part of the poem, Piers "is a blameless ploughman, and a guide to men who are seeking the shrine of Truth"; afterwards he is Jesus Christ; and, later still, he "denotes the whole Christian body." And then the reviewer proceeds to criticise and explain the seeming confusion, with the saying that Piers represents "the ideal humanity." May we say in like manner that the Servant of Jahveh now represents the actual, and now the ideal Israel; not exactly the pious "kernel of the nation," but rather the nation viewed in its ideal aspect, its religious character, its prophetic destiny; and so also represents at times the individual prophet, and, at times, the ideal of the office which he is called upon to fulfil? Between these four conceptions there is no necessary inconsistency; rather they serve to supplement and correct each other.

As the whole great prophecy has a distinct exordium in chap. xl., so it has an appropriate close in chap. lxii. But the actual termination (lxii. 12), though admitting comparison with that of Ezek. xlviii., is not quite so effective; and the magnificent fragment which follows (lxiii. 1-6) is evidently separated from its proper context. Happily these defects allow a complete remedy. Chap. lxiii., *vv.* 1-6, which, as Graetz points out (J. Q. R., IV. p. 6), bear no especial reference to Edom, should simply change places with lix. 19-21. The last clause of lix. 18 is an obvious editorial addition, intended to supply a link between *vv.* 18 and 19. The close relation between lix. 15 *b*-18 *a* and lxiii. 1-6 is indisputable. The originality and the correct

position of lix. 19, 20 may be open to doubt. But when once indicated, it can hardly, I think, be questioned, that in lix. 21 we have the fitting conclusion of the entire prophecy, the final promise of Jahveh to Israel. In a sense it has been fulfilled.

GREY HUBERT SKIPWITH.

Note on the order of the text in Hosea i.-iii.

I wish to supplement what I have previously said upon this subject (J. Q. R., VI. 298) by the further suggestion that chap. iii. should itself be transferred to a position immediately following i. 9. There is no doubt that chap. i. should terminate at this point; and there is clearly a break between the narrative which thus concludes, and the pleading which begins at ii. 2 (Eng.). On the other hand, the second narrative (in chap. iii.) would follow naturally at the end of the first; while, as the text now stands, I think every reader must have felt a sense of bathos in turning from chap. ii. to chap. iii. And in this way the position of the three verses which stand after i. 9, can be accounted for consistently with the hypothesis previously suggested, that with two exceptions (i. 10 *b* and ii. 1, Eng.) they should follow chap. iii.; the two exceptions being glosses on i. 9.

It may be proper to add (March, 1895) that the foregoing *Gleanings from the Book of Isaiah*, as well as *Studies in the Book of Jeremiah*, were written in the opening months of 1894, so that I had not the opportunity of consulting any more recent work. With regard to Is. xl., I have ventured to put a query, which still remains unanswered, in *The Academy*, for February 2nd, 1895 (p. 105, col. 3).

FLORILEGIUM PHILONIS.[1]

My object this evening is to say something about Philo to those who know a little about him already. I am not going to tell you the ordinary things about his life and environment which you will find in every text book, nor shall I attempt the slightest account of his philosophical system as a whole. If anybody has casually read Principal Drummond's book on Philo, he will follow my lecture the better, but he will not necessarily find it superfluous or wearisome unless he has read that admirable work four or five times through. Let me say at once about Dr. Drummond's book how much I owe to it. I have only one fault to find, and that is on the score of brevity. It is much too short. All we have is well worth having, but we want a good deal more which we have not got. I hope a considerably enlarged edition may appear before long.

Object and Method of the Essay.

Do not then expect even an outline of Philo's system. But, on the other hand, I will not confine myself to vague generalities. Philo is so strange and curious a writer that he lends himself to this method of treatment very readily. You can moralise about that fusion of Greek and Hebrew ideas of which, on a large and philosophic scale, he is the greatest and most important illustration; you can make sage deductions upon his failure to influence the development of Judaism, or wise reflections upon his influence on Christian theology; you can laugh at his extraordinary methods of exegesis, and contrast his allegorical explanations and Scriptural difficulties with other and perhaps better solutions in modern times; you can show how he attempted a union of irreconcilable opposites, and in accordance with your own opinions you can point the moral and adorn your tale.

My object is far simpler. It is merely to pick out and arrange from the great mass of the Philonic writings certain salient thoughts and sentences which seem worthy of notice and recollection. If I had dared, I would have called my lecture, "Tit-Bits from Philo." In another generation I should have said, "Elegant Extracts." Though letting Philo speak mainly for himself, I shall string my extracts together upon a thread of my own; but the thread will not be systematic or philosophical.

Before I begin, however, I should like, after all, to have just two or three minutes for moralising and general remarks.

I dare say I shall often quote admiringly some statements of Philo

[1] A Lecture delivered before the Jews' College Literary Society on February 10th, 1895.

which are not Philo's at all. I do not mean that he did not write them, but that he borrowed them, perhaps consciously, from some other philosopher. It is not merely that his doctrine of the Logos is based upon Heracleitean and Stoic teaching. In almost every part of his religious and ethical writings he is under obligations to the Greeks. Philo, moreover, had read and used the works of many philosophers which have since been lost, and scholars are beginning to investigate his writings as a possible source for the knowledge of these half-forgotten treatises. When Cohn and Wendland have given us a critical edition of Philo's text, their successors in the same field may use that text for an annotated edition in which the extent of Philo's philosophic indebtedness will be fully revealed.

Philo and the Greeks.

It was to the purpose to say that here because most of what we admire in Philo to-day is fundamentally Greek rather than fundamentally Hebrew. It is Greek philosophy, coloured, modified, transfigured by Hebraism.

Different readers will naturally be arrested by different passages, and one man's Florilegium Philonis would differ from another's. On the whole, it is just to say that Philo improves on nearer acquaintance. Large tracts will always remain dull, arid and of no present-day value. But certainly the oases in his desert are better and more numerous than would appear at first sight. In the middle of a rhetorical and unattractive passage we often come across some striking idea or phrase, and if anyone desires to make a collection of these, it is dangerous for him to read too carelessly even the most uninviting sections. On the other hand, these striking phrases and ideas have sometimes a peculiar disappointment of their own. We feel now and then as if Philo let them escape him unawares, as if he were unconscious of his own merits. When he seems just on the point of developing something of lasting value, as often as not the fine idea is not worked out, and the telling phrase is succeeded by a mass of platitudes or aridities. Still, that is no reason why these isolated gems should not be rescued from their unattractive surroundings.

If Philo is often striking, it does not follow that he is helpful. Nor is that which is striking, even in the ethical and religious sphere, of necessity available for homiletical ends. But it may be striking all the same. It is, moreover, in grand generalities that Philo excels; his ethical details are few and disappointing.

His readers must remember two things more. Professor Jowett has said that "no one can duly appreciate the Dialogues of Plato who has not a sympathy with mysticism." Now the same warning applies to Philo. In spite of his lack of poetic sensibility and proportion, Philo is deeply

Philo and Mysticism.

imbued with the characteristic yearnings and qualities of the mystic. It was partly through him and his school that mysticism of a very pronounced type became a prevailing force in the last great manifestation of Greek philosophy. Not a few, then, of the passages which I shall quote, just because they *are* mystic, will appeal to some, and seem vague or foolish to others.

Philo's earnestness.

A second point is this. Rhetorical and long-winded as Philo is, far-fetched and turgid as his language, he was, nevertheless, tremendously in earnest. And that about which he is in earnest will seem a little strange and remote to many excellent persons. It is, to put it briefly, the knowledge of God. That is his quest. Most people are perhaps too sure about God's existence to trouble themselves very much about knowing him. Such a quest lies outside their lives and is unfamiliar to them. But Philo is desperately anxious to know all that he can about the nature of God. It is a religious passion with him, and yet he seeks this knowledge by philosophic means. Even if he ends in ecstasy, his road thither lies through metaphysics. But the truly religious man realises now that the knowledge or vision of God is rarely to be attained on these lines. "The upright shall behold God's face. The pure in heart shall see God. He judged the cause of the poor and the needy—was not this to know me, saith the Lord?" It is curious that both in the Rabbinic and Alexandrian developments of Judaism, there should be a note of false intellectualism. "An empty-headed man cannot be a sin-fearing man, nor can an ignorant person be pious." So said Hillel; but the man of true religion knows better. Philo, too, speaks scornfully of the "common herd," to not one of whom has been granted a share in true life.[1] But, though he does not understand that the only—or would it be humbler to say, the surest—pathway to God leads through the gates of goodness, and though he does not appreciate the fact that for goodness wisdom is not essential, these defects do not make his own yearning for the knowledge of God less earnest and real.

His intellectualism.

The knowledge of God is his quest, but God is unknowable.

Unfortunately for him, while he failed to realise the efficacy of goodness in the knowledge of God, he was also sceptical about the power of wisdom as a method by which to reach the goal. He wants to know God, to have an intellectual vision of his veritable nature, to draw near to his sovereign reality. But he is also convinced that God in the fulness and essence of his being cannot be known by man. The creature cannot grasp the Creator. If he could be fully known, God would not be God, and man would not be man. We know in part, but in part only.

[1] I. 611. The references are to the pages of Mangey.

Why God is not fully knowable, and what aspects of him may nevertheless be known, can be read in the books about Philo, and I am not going into these matters here. On the one hand, there is the theory of the Logos and the divine Powers ; on the other, the God-like reason of man. All I want to point out is that both elements of Philo's philosophy, the constant yearning to know God and the abiding conviction that God is unknowable, are alike absent from the mind of average humanity. At least they are not perpetually present in our consciousness. Apart, therefore, from the difficulty of his subject, we cannot properly appreciate Philo without an effort.

One word more. God is unknowable. But since, to Philo, the Pentateuch contains all truth, this truth is in the Pentateuch. Yet the Pentateuch contains all sorts of very specific statements about God. You know how Philo deals with these statements. They are allegories or accommodations. But not all of them. The *ethical* statements are true as they stand. Hence the ethical perfection of God has to be fitted in with Philo's philosophic agnosticism. How this is done is luminously explained by Dr. Drummond.

And as I have come to speak of Philo's conception of God, let me start my Florilegium at this point. That conception as a connected whole can be learnt from the text-books. I give only detached fragments of it which contain some striking phrase, expression, or idea. I may add that where I am able to make use of Dr. Drummond's translations I have freely done so. This has been more frequently the case in the earlier than in the later portions of my essay, for my first excerpts about Philo's conception of the Divine nature are almost all quoted by Dr. Drummond.

The Divine ubiquity.

One of Philo's ideas about God which appeals to us most strongly, though we can hardly get any very clear realisation of it into our minds, is that of the Divine ubiquity. Philo is very emphatic on this point. Those who take the Paradise story literally are guilty of impiety. Such a mythological tale (*μυθοποιία*) should not even enter our minds. Why should God plant a paradise? "For not even the entire universe would be an adequate home for him, for he is a place to himself, and full of himself and sufficient to himself, filling and containing all other things, which are deficient and desert and empty, but himself being contained by nothing else, as being himself one and the whole." [1] And again, "He has reached everywhere, he looks to the ends, he has filled the universe, and of him not even the smallest thing is desert." [2]

Like many of us to-day, Philo is desperately anxious to maintain, and

---

[1] I. 52 (Dr. II. 29). [2] I. 220 (Dr. II. 42).

if possible, to explain at once the transcendence and the immanence of God. Thus, for example, he can be regarded either as everywhere or as nowhere; "nowhere, because he generated place along with the bodies which occupy it, and we may not assert that that which has made is contained in any of the things produced; everywhere, because having stretched his powers through earth and water, air and heaven, he has left no part of the universe desert, but, having collected all things together, made them fast with invisible bonds, that they might never be dissolved."[1] "God," he tells us elsewhere, "is not in time or place, but above them both, for having all created things under himself, he is contained by nothing, but is outside of all. And yet, though above and outside creation, he has, none the less, filled creation (*τὸν κόσμον*) with himself."[2] The analogy of the human mind to the human body does not properly apply to the relation of God to the world, for we have not created our bodies, but God has created the world. "He does not only penetrate through and pass beyond the universe by his mind, but also by his essence."[3] There is only one sense in which he who is "not only here but there and elsewhere and everywhere," may be said to be more in one place than in another. It is not that, like a body, he occupies one place by leaving another, but that he uses an "intensive motion."[4] Philo, as Dr. Drummond says, seems to mean that "though God remains immovable in his omnipresence, yet his power may be manifested with varying intensity in different places, just as he is said to dwell in the purified soul as in a house, because his watchful providence is most conspicuous there."[5]

The Transcendence and Immanence of God.

Philo's views respecting the transcendence and immanence of God may be profitably compared with the theology of the Stoics and of Aristotle. Whereas most workers come to Philo from the Greeks, Jewish students may perhaps come to the Greeks through Philo. Though this would be to reverse the order of time and logical sequence, it would be very interesting to know the impression which Philo made upon an open-eyed and open-minded student who knew his Old Testament and his Talmud, but was unacquainted with Greek philosophy.

Philo considers the Deity to be as much above the limitations of time as he is above the limitations of space. This conception is not profitable for any except professed students of philosophy, and I will

---

[1] I. 425 (Dr. II. 41). [2] I. 229.

[3] *οὐκ ἐπινοίᾳ μόνον ἐπεξεληλυθέναι ὥσπερ ἄνθρωπον ἀλλὰ καὶ τῷ οὐσιώδει.* I. 466.

[4] I. 176. [5] Dr. II. 43.

only quote a part of one passage, which has been also specially dwelt upon by Dr. Drummond. "God is the creator of time . . . . . nothing is future to him, to whom the limits of time are subjected, for his life is not time, but eternity, the archetype and pattern of time. And in eternity nothing is either past or future, but only present."[1] Very similar is a passage in Plutarch: "We must not say of God that he was or will be . . . . . but only that he is. And he is not in regard to time, but to changeless and timeless eternity, in which there is no after or before, sooner or later. For God being one, by one *now* has filled the 'Ever.' . . . . . In him is no 'has been' or 'will be,' he is without beginning and without end."[2]

The Divine Perfection.

The Omnipresent Deity is naturally conceived as supremely perfect. Here the philosopher agrees with the humblest believer. But Philo expands and interprets this idea of perfection in more than one interesting way. Using a well-known term in Greek philosophy, he declares that God is all sufficing to himself (*αὐταρκέστατος ἑαυτῷ*). "He is full of himself and sufficient for himself, both before creation and after it. For he is changeless, and needs no other thing at all, for all things are his, but he does not belong to anything."[3] The reasons because of which finite beings need other finite beings such as themselves do not apply to God, for he possesses all things in himself by the infinite resources of his manifold nature. "He is all the most precious things to himself, kindred, relation, friend, virtue, blessedness, happiness, knowledge, understanding, beginning, end, whole, all, judge, opinion, counsel, law, action, sovereignty."[4] This rather incongruous list of the Divine perfections is characteristic of the wilder or more unrestrained moments of Philo's style. Rhetorical, but yet more reasonable is the following: "God is the first good, all beautiful, blessed and happy, or, if one is to speak the truth, he is better than the good, happier than happiness, more beautiful than beauty, more blessed than blessedness, and whatever is more perfect than these."[5]

As all things are God's and the apparent possessions of the creature are but temporary gifts and loans, Philo insists that "God is the only true citizen (*πολίτης*), while all created beings are sojourners and strangers."[6] Whatever is most desired and excellent

---

[1] I. 277 (Dr. II. 45).

[2] *De Ei apud Delphos*, XX. The passage is also quoted by Hatch, Hibbert Lectures, p. 242; cf. Zeller *Philosophie der Griechen*, III. 2 (3rd Ed.), p. 168, *n.* 4, for the relation between Philo and Plutarch.

[3] I. 582 (Dr. II. 48); II. 194.

[4] I. 128 (Dr. II. 49).

[5] II. 546 (Dr. II. 31).

[6] I. 161.

in humanity, Philo essays to prove is only fully realised in God. Thus, for instance, "God alone is the most absolute and real peace, but begotten and corruptible matter is all continual war."[1] Again, "God alone truly feasts. For he alone rejoices and alone is glad and alone has good cheer, and to him alone does it belong to keep peace unmixed with war. He is without pain and without fear and unparticipant of evils, unyielding, unharmed, unwearied, full of pure blessedness. His nature is most perfect, or rather God is himself the summit and end and boundary of blessedness, sharing in nothing else with a view to his own improvement, but communicating what is peculiarly his own to all individual beings from the fountain of the beautiful, himself."[2] These descriptions of the Divine nature might profitably be compared and contrasted with the striking conception of God's character and life in the twelfth book of Aristotle's *Metaphysics*. Aristotle is more guarded and restrained in his language: his notion of the Divine blessedness restricts itself to the intellectual ideal of pure thought, feeding, as it were, upon itself; but he, too, as Schwegler points out, is roused out of his customary and severe serenity by the conception of the infinite bliss of him from whom "heaven and nature depend."

God's relation to the World.

Aristotle, on the other hand, removes God farther from the world than Philo. The Aristotelian God, whose own eternal activity is a *νόησις νοήσεως*, pure thought returning upon itself, may be the Prime Motor of the world, but lives his independent life. But Philo's God is not only a God of thought but also a God of goodness; and, therefore, though Philo may theoretically describe his life as the same both before creation and after it, we can hardly conceive the God of Philo as ever existing without a universe on which to manifest the creative and moral aspects of his many-sided Being. Indeed, Philo asserts God to be always creating. "God never ceases to create, but as it is the property of fire to burn, and of snow to cause cold, so also it is the property of God to create."[3] But this ceaseless activity is consonant with the idea of absolute rest. Rest merely means the absence of fatigue, and if you can imagine a perpetual work combined with absolute freedom from effort and weariness, you would have combined in a single conception the idea of activity and the idea of repose. This is precisely the case with God. "God alone truly rests, but his rest is not inactivity—since the cause of all is by nature active, and never ceases from creating the most beautiful things—but the most unlaborious energy, without distress, and with amplest ease."[4]

---

[1] I. 692 (Dr. II. 53).
[2] I. 154 (Dr. II. 49).
[3] I. 44.
[4] I. 154 (Dr. II. 53).

The real cause of creation could be conceived as inherent in the necessities of the Divine nature. God being as naturally creative as fire is "naturally hot," he must always have objects on which to exercise his providence and his goodness. Philo, however, does not venture to go as far as this, which would be an infringement upon the Divine αὐτάρκεια—upon God's all-sufficiency to himself. "Why, then, did he create that which was not before? Because he was good and bounteous."[1] For "God creates nothing for himself, for he needs nothing; but he creates everything for the creature who is in need of receiving it."[2] Müller has pointed out that, though Philo himself quotes a famous passage in Plato's *Timæus*, to the effect that God made the world because he was good, and desired that "all things should be as like himself as they could be," yet God's goodness probably meant to Plato something different from what it meant to Philo.[3] To Philo God's goodness is essentially ethical. It is equivalent to God's grace, which he also repeatedly declares to be the cause of creation. Thus he says, "For the just man seeking the nature of all things makes this one most excellent discovery, that all things are due to the grace of God. Creation can give nothing, for it owns nothing. To God alone grace is native. To those who ask the origin of creation, one could most rightly reply that it is the goodness and grace of God which he bestowed on the race which is after his image. For all that is in the universe and the universe itself are the gift and bounty and grace of God."[4] The inherent necessity of the Divine nature to display creative beneficence is clearly indicated in another passage, where Philo says: "All is due to God's grace, though nought is worthy of it; but God looked to his own eternal goodness, and considered that to do good befitted his own blessed and happy nature."[5]

The cause of creation.

So far as to creation in general. As to the gloomier side of it, Philo has nothing to say worth repeating. His championship of the Divine providence, and his explanations of evil in the *De Providentia*, assuming that this treatise has been proved genuine by Wendland, are little more than excerpts from the Stoics, and show no trace of having been transfigured in the process of adoption.[6] They are, therefore, valuable as throwing light on Stoical doctrine, but give us little or nothing specifically characteristic of Philo. In one passage else-

---

[1] I. 585. [2] I. 147.

[3] *Timæus*, 29 E, 30 A, quoted in Philo, I. 5. Müller's edition of the *De Mundi Opificio*, p. 156 *seq.*

[4] I. 102 *fin.*

[5] I. 288 *fin.* Cf. a curious passage in Plutarch's *De Defectu Oraculorum*, XXIV.

[6] Cf. Dr. II. 58.

where he just touches upon the question why the perfect God produced an imperfect world. Is the inanimate world—is even the body, the source of so much evil, if not evil itself—created by the goodness of God? Philo does not venture to say that God created what seems to us evil; but he does say that inanimate nature, as well as all living things, were made by God's goodness, and not merely by the sheer exercise of irresponsible authority: "For the manifestation of the better there was necessary the creation and existence of the worse; but both are due alike to the power of the same goodness, namely, to God." [1]

God's goodness.

As regards the ethical perfections of God, Philo does not, or cannot, go beyond the utterances of the Prophets and the Psalter. A few passages are perhaps worthy of notice. God, as Ruler and Lord of the Universe, and as endowed with free will, has the power of doing good and the power of doing harm; but his *will* is only to do good. When he is called Everlasting God, this implies that he gives his gifts, not on some occasions only, or intermittently, but always and unceasingly, that he adds grace to grace and blessing to blessing, in an inexhaustible and continuous supply.[2] Elsewhere he says, "God is not a salesman (πωλητήρ), lowering the price (ἐπευωνίζων) of his own possessions, but the bestower of all things, pouring forth the ever-flowing fountains of favours, not desiring a recompense; for neither is he in need himself, nor is any created thing competent to bestow a gift in return."[3] He has a fine conceit about God's mercy: "In order that mankind may continue to exist, he mingles mercy with judgment, and he not only pities after he has judged, but he judges after he has pitied, for with him pity is older than judgment, seeing that he knows those who are worthy of punishment, not after judgment but before it."[4]

Theory of Divine benefits and punishments.

As God is the cause of good, and of good only, Philo is rather uneasy in his mind on the subject of Divine punishment and retribution. He vacillates. Punishment—even if regarded as a corrective, and therefore as a good—has yet in it some resemblance or imitation of evil (τὸ μιμηλάζον ἀγαθὸν κακῷ, ἡ τιμωρία). Hence its execution is entrusted to certain subordinate ministers and agents, even as man himself, because a creature who can choose evil as well as good, was not fashioned by God alone.[5] Thus, when the calamitous and evil aspect of "punishment" is considered, Philo tends to dissociate it from

[1] I. 101. [2] I. 342.

[3] I. 161 (Dr. II. 50); cp. Milton, "God does not need either man's work or his own gifts."

[4] I. 284.

[5] I. 555-557; cp. I. 16, and I. 432, and Dr. II. 139-155.

God (as if the problem of evil were made one whit easier by any hypothesis of ministering angels or opposing devils) ; when he looks upon it as a good, he tends to take it up into the sum of the Divine forces, which are themselves aspects or manifestations of God's nature and being. In such moods he does not hesitate to speak of the punishing powers of God, because they merge with the Divine beneficence. "Perhaps," he says, "we should include the punitive among the beneficent powers, not merely because they are parts of laws—and law is made up of two parts, the honour of the good, and the punishment of the wicked—but because punishment often admonishes and makes temperate the sinners themselves, and if not them, at least their associates. For the punishments of others make the ordinary race of men better, for they fear to suffer the like." [1] But no one can say that this is very original or suggestive.

He is more interesting on the theory that both God's grace and his punishments are proportionate to the nature which has to enjoy the one or to suffer the other. Thus he says, "The Creator, knowing the natural weakness of created things, does not desire to benefit or chastise them to the limits of his own power, but only according to the power which he sees in those who are to partake of either punishment or benefaction." [2] In the creation of man, God did not look to "the greatness of his own graces—for these are boundless and not to be circumscribed —but to the capacities of the recipient. For the creature cannot receive in the same proportion that God can give ; for his powers exceed measure. But the creature being too weak to receive of his gifts, would have sunk under the burden, if God had not meted out his benefits in due proportion and measure suitable to each." [3] Another ingenious idea of his is that even a constant series of benefits would cause surfeit and irritation. The same thought, on a higher plane, is hinted at by Tennyson : "God fulfils himself in many ways, Lest one good custom should corrupt the world." "Therefore God restrains a first kind of benefits lest the recipients should be satiated with them and grow wanton, and dispenses a second sort instead of the first, and then a third instead of the second, and in general, new kindnesses in the place of old, sometimes different and sometimes the same. For the creature is never wholly without a share in God's graces, for otherwise he would utterly be destroyed, but it cannot endure them in one plentiful and abundant rush." [4]

There is also found a further application of the idea to man's knowledge of God. Here the student will at once notice a parallel to a favourite notion of some modern theologians, that God's revelation of himself is gradual and proportionate. Thus, in answer to the

---

[1] II. 546. [2] I. 285 *init.* [3] I. 5. [4] I. 254.

urgent request of Moses, "Show me thyself," God replies, "I can but reveal what it is possible for you to receive. Human nature cannot attain to a full knowledge of the Divine being."[1] And elsewhere Philo remarks, "God does not pronounce his oracles (χρησμοί) in proportion to the greatness of his own eloquence (λογιότης), but to the power of those who are to be helped by them."[2]

Though these sayings of Philo need adaptation to the expanded thought of our own time, they are undeniably suggestive. Not less so are some of his notions about the Biblical anthropomorphisms. These too, according to Philo, are an accommodation to human weakness and human needs. He frequently observes that there are two apparently contradictory statements in the Scripture about God: "He is as man," "He is not as man," of which the second is truer than the first. Yet the first is the basis of many Biblical sayings. The general reason for this is the familiar one, that man, if he wishes to allege anything about God beyond the mere fact of his existence, cannot avoid human analogies. "We cannot," says Philo, "get out of ourselves, and so we get our conceptions of the uncreated God from our own attributes."[3] At the same time this human incapacity is made to subserve a purpose of instruction. "We cannot constantly store up in our soul the verse, so worthy of the Cause, 'God is not as man,' so as to escape all anthropomorphic expressions; but generally participating in the mortal, and unable to think of anything apart from ourselves, or to escape from our own destinies, sunk in the mortal like snails, and wrapt in a ball like hedgehogs round ourselves, we form our thoughts both about the Blessed and Incorruptible and about ourselves, shrinking from the absurdity of statement, that the Divine is in the human shape, but setting up again the impiety in fact, that he is subject to human passions Therefore we attribute to him hands, feet, ingress, egress, enmities, alienations, wrath,—parts and passions inappropriate to the Cause."[4] Among these "parts and passions," Philo reckons the oath. The Bible makes God swear in order that it may both "confute and console our weakness." That is to say, we shall believe an oath among ourselves the better, if God himself is supposed to employ it. But more specifically Philo limits the notion of anthropomorphisms to those terms which speak of God as angry and jealous, or to those which seem designed to threaten and terrify. Expressions which rouse our fear he regards as entirely educational, and his observations about them are curious and suggestive.

Biblical Anthropomorphisms: their cause and purpose.

---

[1] II. 218. [2] I. 253.
[3] I. 419. [4] I. 181 *fin.*, 182 (Dr. II. 12).

There are some men, he says, so dull in nature (ἀμβλεῖς) that they cannot form any conception of God without a body. We must be content if such persons can be restrained from sin by the fear produced through anthropomorphic descriptions of God.[1] Philo thus characteristically associates a low intellectual conception of the Divine nature with an imperfect morality and an imperfect service of God. In another elaborate passage he insists that passions such as anger or regret are wholly inapplicable and foreign to the Divine nature. That they are found in the Pentateuch is for the object of "admonishing those who could not otherwise be brought to a sober frame of mind (σωφρονίζεσθαι)." Philo can no more sever truth from goodness than error from moral evil. They who, by defect of nature or education, cannot "see acutely" into the "true mysteries" of God are "intractable and foolish servants" in practical life. They cannot be helped by truth, for they are unable to appreciate it. Let them learn, unwillingly, through false terrors, by fear. The "passions and diseases" of the soul are at once intellectual and moral. To Philo, no less than to the author of the Fourth Gospel, the two are inextricably blended together. He cannot distinguish the one from the other, so that two things which to ourselves seem wholly alien are identical to him. These mental and moral diseases (for they are both in one) could best be healed if Moses represented God "as using threats and indignation and inexorable wrath and weapons for attack upon evil-doers, for thus only is the fool admonished." And then, just as he has connected anthropomorphic beliefs with the fear of God, so he proceeds to connect the love of God with the truer, more spiritual conception of the Divine nature. "With the two fundamental assertions, God is as man, and God is not as man, two other fundamental principles seem closely interwoven and akin: fear and love. For all the exhortations to piety by means of the laws depend either on the fear or on the love of God. To those, then, who do not in thought ascribe to God either part or passion of man, but worthily honour him on account of himself alone, love is most appropriate, but to all others, fear."[2]

Confusion of low intelligence with low morality.

In spite of these divisions Philo makes no absolute chasm and gulf between man and man. He had the philosopher's customary contempt for the vulgar herd, he bewails the infinite number of bad men and the paucity or even absence of the good (I. 64, 585, 611), but he does not anywhere imply that there is any natural or predetermined barrier by which those who, in his own language, are the servants of the body may not become servants of the soul. "Every man," he says, "as regards his mind, is

But no absolute gulf or difference of kind between man and man.

[1] I. 283. (Dr. II. 14).

[2] I. 656.

related to the Divine reason, for he is an impress or fragment or radiance of that blessed nature."[1] If it be asked why this privilege was conferred upon man, whose mixed and earthy composition was apparently unworthy of so high a distinction, and who often uses it to such ignoble ends, Philo replies that "God being bountiful loves to bestow good on all men, even on those who are not perfect, urging them to the desire and attainment of virtue. So he displays his exceeding wealth of riches, which suffice even for those who will gain no great benefit from them. Hence he has made no soul barren (ἄγονος) of good, even if the use of good be impossible to some."[2] Elsewhere he says: "The powers of God are ubiquitous not merely for the benefit of pre-eminent men, but also of those who seem to be insignificant. To them, too, God gives what harmonises with the capacity and measure of their souls, for he measures out with equal rule what is proportionate to each."[3] None are of necessity quite shut out from a glimpse of the Highest. "Who is there so without reason and soul, as never, either voluntarily or involuntarily, to conceive a notion of God? For a sudden apparition (φαντασία) of the good frequently flits past even the wickedest, but they cannot retain or keep a hold on it. For it quickly passes away from those who have come to dwell with it when they have lived beyond the bounds of law and justice, as indeed it would never have visited them at all if it were not to convict those who choose evil instead of good."[4] However rhetorically Philo may talk of the endless number of the bad, there is no necessity, according to his psychology, for assuming any wide and fixed cleavage among humanity, between children of God on one side and children of the devil upon the other. "In every man," he says in another passage, "even in quite ordinary persons, there is an instinctive hatred of vice (μισοπόνηρον πάθος) and this innate passion when roused makes its owner a champion and defender of anyone who seems to be wronged."[5] He is tolerant enough to admit that lack of opportunity may often account for lack of visible excellence. To him, as to the Greeks, opportunity (καιρός), if not Divine, is at least the companion of Deity. "Virtue has been, is, and will always be, but it is, perchance, obscured by unfavourable circumstances (ἀκαιρίαι), and again revealed by opportunity, the servant of God."[6] Many a sinner and many a hero is unable to display either his wickedness or his virtue. Many men are born with capacities for wisdom, self-restraint, or justice, but "the beauty of the images in their minds they are unable to reveal through their poverty or obscurity, or through bodily disease or some other of the many misfor-

The power of opportunity.

[1] I. 35. [2] I. 50. [3] I. 614. [4] I. 265.
[5] II. 312. [6] I. 455.

tunes which attend upon the life of man. The good they have is, as it were, cabined and confined. But if the temperate man, for example, be possessed of wealth, he can show that riches, which are usually blind and provocative of luxury, may be "seeing" by his use of them . . . . Without these opportunities, virtues may exist, but they are immoveable, ike silver and gold, treasured up in unknown recesses of the earth, and of no use to mankind." [1] Philo, therefore, adopts the Platonic paradox that the good fortune of the wicked is their deepest calamity. "For weakness and impotence are profitable to the bad, just as abundance and strength are most advantageous to the good." [2]

Every kind of life may be dedicated to God.

In one passage even, just after he has refused to the "common herd" any share in true life, he well points out how all kinds of lives, and not only the philosopher's, may be consecrated to God. The thought comes to him, it must be owned, indirectly. It is a corollary of his favourite theory, on which he delights to insist, that all our faculties and powers, as well as all our surroundings and possessions, are the gift of God, and in no wise our own. "Moses has shown that we should all confess our gratitude for the powers we possess: The wise man should dedicate his sagacity, the eloquent man should devote his excellence of speech by the praise of God in prose and verse; and, in general, the natural philosopher should offer his physics, the moralist his ethics, the artist and the man of science the arts and sciences they know. So, too, the sailor and the pilot will dedicate their favourable voyage, the husbandman his fruitful harvest, the herdsman the increase of his cattle, the doctor the recovery of his patients, the general his victory in fight, and the statesman or the monarch his legal chieftaincy or kingly rule. In a word, he who is no lover of self (ὁ μὴ φίλαυτος) will regard God as the true cause of all the powers of body and soul and of all external goods. Let no one, therefore, however humble and insignificant he be, despairing of a better fortune, scruple to become a suppliant of God. Even if he can expect nothing more, let him give thanks to the best of his power for what he has already received. Infinite are the gifts he has: birth, life, nurture, soul, sensation, imagination, desire, reason. Reason is a small word, but a most perfect thing, a fragment of the world-soul,

---

[1] I. 398. Cp. Seneca *De Vita Beata*, xxii.; "Quis autem dubii est, quin haec major materia sapienti viro sit animum explicandi suum in divitiis quam in paupertate, quum in hac unum genus virtutis sit non inclinari nec deprimi, in divitiis et temperantia et liberalitas et diligentia et dispositio et magnificentia campum habet patentem." Hence the wise man:—non amat divitias, sed mavult! non in animum illas, sed in domum recipit!

[2] I. 430.

or, as for the disciples of the Mosaic philosophy it is more pious to say, a true impression of the Divine image."[1]

This more human touch is not frequent in Philo. It may perhaps be noted again in his appreciation of honest failure in the quest of highest good. He marks its value, and offers a true consolation: "Labour in the pursuit of that which is perfectly good, even if it fail to reach the goal, is sufficient of itself to benefit the labourer."[2] And elsewhere he says: "We sympathise with those who, loving God, seek after him, even if they find him not; for the search for the good, even if it miss its end, is able of itself to cause great joy."[3] So, once more: "If in your quest for God you will find him is uncertain, for to many persons he has not made himself known, and their toil has found no consummation; but the mere search for him has given them a share in what is good; for impulses towards excellence, though they fail to attain their end, give joy to those who have them."[4]

The value of Failure in the quest of God.

The search for God: that, according to Philo, is the life-work of man. All else is environment and accessory. That search is also service, and the method of both is philosophy. To reach the goal, or even to advance along the road, there are two fundamental requirements. Of these the first is common to Philo with the Platonists and the Stoics, though he carries it a point further than it yet had reached. It may be summed up as the depreciation of the body and the exaltation of the mind or soul. (To Philo there is no such separation of the moral and intellectual life as is habitual to ourselves.) To γένεσις, that is, to what comes and goes, is born and dies, imperfection—on one side manifesting itself as error, on the other side as wickedness—is inevitably attached. Because we are material—and therefore transitory—we are of necessity sinful. But because we also bear within us an immaterial and divine image, we are capable of goodness and knowledge and the vision of God. Hence the body is, if not the cause, at all events the accessory, of all sin. Desire and pleasure are the sources of evil. "The body is wicked by nature, a plotter against the soul." It is a dead thing, and we have ever to carry a corpse about with us. So, too, said Epictetus, and the great Emperor quotes him approvingly. We get from Philo the customary tirades against the fleeting pleasures of sense, against glory and ambition and riches and outward show and worldly pomp. For the soul to live the body must die. To love the unbegotten, one must despise everything which partakes of γένεσις, which comes and passes

Two fundamental requirements in the search for God.

The first is: Repression of the Body, of Pleasure, and of γένεσις.

[1] I. 612. [2] I. 186. [3] I. 230. [4] I. 96.

away, "The lust of the flesh and the lust of the eyes and the vain glory of life." It is a thought which is common to all higher religions and to a hundred philosophies: it is a truth—or at least it contains a truth—expressed in endless tongues and endless fashions. Its rhetorical form and longwinded exaggerations may irritate us in Philo; but in the last resort we are bound to acknowledge that between a noble utterance such as, "If any man love the world, the love of the Father is not in him," and the most turgid fulminations against "the body" in Philo, the difference is one of form: the thought remains substantially the same.

Philo's asceticism.

In Philo, as in many other of the later philosophers, as to some extent even in Plato, there lurks a measure of asceticism. "Plain living" has always been associated with "high thinking." The exact amount of this asceticism is disputed. The true answer only partly depends upon the authenticity of the treatise *Quod omnis probus liber*; it depends rather upon which set of certain inconsistent passages one should lay the greater stress, and regard as more truly Philonic. On the one hand Philo maintains that the ideal is not merely moderation of passion, but its absolute excision and death;[1] he bids men fly from the polluted prison-house, the body, and from its keepers, pleasure and desire, to die to the life of sense that they may partake of incorporeal and incorruptible life with God.[2] He inveighs against the luxury of elegant Alexandrian life, of which he gives a somewhat vivid picture. He describes the costly extravagance in food and drink and apparel, the golden goblets and the golden crowns, and even the golden beds. "The legs of the beds are of ivory, or, at a great expense of money and labour and time, they are adorned with rich mother-of-pearl or inlaid with variegated tortoiseshell. And some are all of silver or all of gold, set with precious stones, brocaded with flowers and golden embroideries, as if for display and not for use."[3] No persons who indulge in senseless luxury such as this can be "pupils of the sacred word." They only are "true men, lovers of temperance and order and reverence, who have laid the foundations of their lives in self-restraint and endurance and contentment, as the safe harbourage of their souls where they can lie at anchor without risk or harm. They are superior to money and pleasure and glory; they despise food and drink except in so far as to ward off the violence of hunger. They are most ready to endure hunger and thirst, heat and cold, and all other

---

[1] I. 113. Μωυσῆς . . . οὐ μετριοπάθειαν ἀλλὰ συνόλως ἀπάθειαν ἀγαπῶν. From another point of view, however, we find Philo marvelling at those philosophers who say that virtue is ἀπάθεια. I. 603 *fin.*

[2] I. 437, 264. I. 666.

trials in the pursuit and acquisition of virtue. They like best what is most easily provided, so that they are not ashamed of cheap apparel, but on the contrary, think extravagance in dress a great reproach and hindrance. To them the soft ground is a costly bed, their mattresses are bushes, grass and leaves ; a stone, or a mound of earth is their pillow." [1]

As God needs nothing and has all so the bad man is ever insatiate, always thirsting for what he has not got. The good man, on the other hand, bordering both on mortal and immortal nature, has some needs because he owns a body ; but they are few and simple because "his soul desires immortality." [2] "One should practise oneself, therefore, to need little. For this is to be very near to God." [3] Ambition is the "last infirmity." "Some say that the last thing the wise man puts off is the cloak of vainglory. For even if he has conquered all other passions, he is liable to be worsted by ambition and the praise of the multitude." [4] The lovers of self and sense are made to describe the righteous as "usually inglorious and despicable, lowly persons in want of life's necessaries, less honoured than dependents or even slaves, sordid, pale and cadaverous, hungry-looking and ill-fed, very sickly, practising how to die." [5]

But many passages could be cited which serve apparently to preach an opposite doctrine. The truth is that the highest life to Philo, as to Aristotle, was contemplative rather than practical. The lonely thinker, rather than the active philanthropist or busy statesman, is their ideal, and asceticism consorts with isolation ; but to both philosophers alike the life of action is the indispensable prelude and preparation to the life of thought. Philo was too acute a psychologist not to realise the place of pleasure among the springs of action. "The bad man," he says, "treats pleasure as the *summum bonum* ; the good man, as a necessity. For without pleasure nothing happens among mortals." [6] Several times he urges that there is a false as well as a true temperance ; perhaps it might be more correct to say, a false as well as a true asceticism. This he calls "niggardly and illiberal," by means of which you will no more reach true temperance than you can gain piety by superstition, or become wise through craft. "If you see anyone refusing to eat or drink at the customary

There is a false as well as a true Asceticism.

---

[1] I. 639. Not without dignity is his description of the "higher life," *αὐστηρὸν καὶ ἐπιστημονικὸν βίον, γέλωτος καὶ παιδιᾶς ἀμέτοχον, συννοίας καὶ φροντίδων καὶ πόνων μεστὸν, φιλὸν τοῦ θεωρεῖν, ἀμαθίας ἐχθρὸν, χρημάτων μὲν καὶ δόξης καὶ ἡδονῶν κρείττω, ἥττω δὲ σωφροσύνης καὶ εὐκλειας καὶ βλέποντος οὐ τυφλοῦ πλούτου.* I. 479 *fin.*, 480 ; cp. II. 163.

[2] II. 377. [3] II. 666. [4] II. 668.

[5] I. 198. [6] I. 70.

times, or to wash and anoint his body, or neglecting his clothes, or sleeping on the ground in the open air, and in these ways simulating self-control, you should pity his delusion, and show him the path by which self-control may really be attained. All that he has done is ineffectual and wearisome labour, ruining both soul and body by hunger and other evils."[1] This seems written in a different tone from that other passage quoted before, in which they who make the ground their bed and a stone their pillow are extolled as true pupils of the Sacred Word.

The right use of external goods.

Philo admits that evildoers are mainly men of wealth and repute; but he gives curious reasons, partly prudential and partly moral, why wealth and honour and social enjoyments should not be avoided by the good, or by those who are seeking for the highest life. Because you see the wicked thinking much of riches, pleasure and renown, and praising injustice as the source of all these things, do not he says, "turn in the very contrary direction, and pursue a life of poverty and lowliness, or one of severity and isolation. You will thereby only irritate your adversary, and arm a bitterer foe against you. Apply yourself not to the same actions as he, but to their sources, to honour, office, wealth, possessions, and the various beauties of colour and form."[2] The object in each case is to show up the wicked man—to "convict" him, in Philo's own language (διελέγξαι), by making the right use of the material through which he displays his villainy, licentiousness, or intemperance. The money he either hoards or wastes you will use in gifts to the poor, in dowries to the daughters of impoverished parents, and in services and donations to the State. At a banquet the glutton will make himself ridiculous to all, but you will put him to shame by your moderation, while, even if you are pressed to indulgence, you will never turn pleasure into disgust, but "if one may say so, you will be drunk with sobriety"[3] (νηφάλια μεθυσθήσῃ). But at this point Philo gives, as it were, a higher turn and a nobler basis to his argument. He must have been acquainted with false Stoics and hypocritical

[1] I. 195. Cp. from a slightly different point of view, Seneca, *Ep.* I. 5: "Illud autem te admoneo, ne eorum more, qui non proficere sed conspici cupiunt, facias aliqua quæ in habitu tuo aut genere vitæ notabilia sint. Asperum cultum et intonsum caput et neglegentiorem barbam et indictum argento odium et cubile humi positum...evita."

[2] I. 549 *fin.*, 550.

[3] I. 550. This would not have sounded so absurd to Philo's contemporaries, or to our own great-grandfathers, as it sounds to ourselves. It was solemnly debated among the Stoics whether the wise man may get drunk; and the same discussion is taken up by Philo, I. 350 *seq.* Cf. Arnim, *Quellenstudien zu Philo von Alexandria* (1888).

ascetics, such as Lucian laughed to scorn in a later age, for his denunciation of them seems more pointed than usual, and was probably drawn from life. "Truth would rightly blame those, who, without due examination, abandon the pursuits and avocations of ordinary life, and say they have learnt to despise reputation and pleasure. It is an empty boast. They do not really despise them, but they put forward their sordid and solemn looks, and their seemingly austere and hard life as baits, so as to seem true lovers of moderation, temperance and self-denial. But they cannot deceive those who are not led away by outside show, but look more closely within. . . . . Let us say to such people, 'You profess to love a life of solitude. What social virtues did you show before? You disdain money. When you were engaged in business, did you ever seek to act justly? You pretend to neglect the pleasures of the senses. Did you show moderation when you had the opportunity? You despise honour. When you were in office did you show humility? You laugh at the State, not perceiving how useful the thing is. Did you first practise and inure yourselves in the private and public affairs of life, and having become good citizens and householders by your excellence in the twin virtues of politics and economics, did you then only emigrate to a better and higher life?' For we must work our way through the 'practical' life before we come to the life of contemplation ; the contest of the one must precede the higher contest of the other. It is thus we can escape the charge of laziness and indifference. So the Levites were commanded to discharge their offices till they were fifty, and only when released from their practical service might they consider and investigate the nature of things, receiving this other kind of life, which finds its only satisfaction in knowledge and contemplation, as a reward for the adequate fulfilment of their practical duties. In fine, it is necessary that they who would concern themselves with things Divine should first of all have discharged the duties of man. It is great folly to think we can reach a comprehension of the greater when we are unable to overcome the less. Be first known by your excellence in things human, in order that you may apply yourselves to excellence in things Divine."[1] In modern words : although mysticism, as a mode of life or psychical condition, is higher in the scale than philanthropy, you must become a first-rate philanthropist before you can become a first-rate mystic.

The service of man must precede the uninterrupted service of God.

No one will fail to compare this passage of Philo with the Republic of Plato. A few lines lower down in the same treatise (the *De Profugis*), he asserts that "the noblest contest for man is the service

[1] I. 551.

of God." The service of God is not identical with the service of man, but has a special sphere of its own. It is a *βίος* by itself. But if noblest, it is also hardest. We have a tendency to suppose that a life such as that of a busy statesman is infinitely harder than the life of the philosopher or the religious recluse. Philo would hold the contrary. "Hence," he says, "if, with inadequate purification, thinking we have washed off the defilements of life, we advance to the outer court of this Divine service, we spring back from it more quickly than we came, unable to endure its austerity, the sleepless devotion, the constant and unwearying toil. For the present, then, we should avoid equally the worst life and the best." [1]

"Human virtue," as he elsewhere says, "must walk upon the earth and yet must aim at heaven." [2] In his treatise on the Ten Commandments, he points out that the first four "words" relate to God, and the last five to man, while the fifth is the bridge between the two, because "the nature of parents seems to lie on the borders of the human and the Divine. It is human by reason of its kinship to men and the other animals, and through the perishableness of the body; it is Divine because the function of generation resembles God, the generator of all." He then goes on to make the following shrewd remark: "Some people, attaching themselves to one portion of the Decalogue, seem to neglect the other. For filled with the unmixed draught of religious yearning, they have bid farewell to all other occupations, and have dedicated their whole life to the service of God. But those who suppose that there is no good beyond well-doing towards man, care only for human intercourse, and by their social zeal share their possessions with their fellows, and seek to alleviate distress to the utmost of their power. Now both the exclusive lovers of man, and the exclusive lovers of God, we may rightly call half-perfect in virtue. The perfectly virtuous are they who excel in both." [3]

The perfectly virtuous are exclusive lovers of neither man nor God.

In his more sober moments, Philo fully recognises the social nature of man. In one place he even goes so far as to speak of the few who have been inspired with a divine madness, as made semi-savage by their ecstasy (*οὗτοι μὲν δὴ τὴν ἔνθεον μανίαν μανέντες ἐξηγριώθησαν*). With

[1] I. 552. [2] I. 478.

[3] II. 199. Cp. the very striking passage in Antoninus, III. 13 (A man should do all things, even the smallest, remembering the bond (*σύνδεσις*) between the human and the divine: *οὔτε γὰρ ἀνθρώπινόν τι ἄνευ τῆς ἐπὶ τὰ θεῖα συναναφορᾶς εἰ πράξεις, οὔτε ἔμπαλιν*), with which Gataker aptly compares 1 Cor. x. 31, 32, and Pirke Aboth, II. 17 (Philo, I. 530 *fin.*) is partly in point also. All forms of self-control are ends in themselves, yet they are nobler (*σεμνότερα δὲ φαίνοιτο*), if they are practised for the honour of God (*εἰ θεοῦ τιμῆς καὶ ἀρεσκείας ἕνεκα ἐπιτηδεύοιτο*).

them he contrasts those who are disciples of "a gentle and tamer wisdom, by whom religion is earnestly cultivated, and yet human duties are not neglected." Such men find favour in the eyes both of man and God.[1] It is safest to follow their guidance, fervently to honour God, but not to neglect our own nature.[2] Man is not born for himself alone. "Selfishness produces unsociability and impiety. Man is a social animal by nature. Therefore he must live not only for himself, but for parents, brothers, wife, children, relatives, and friends, for the members of his deme, and of his tribe, for his country, for his race, for all mankind. Nay he must live for the parts of the whole, and also for the entire world, and much more for the Father and Creator. If he is indeed possessed of reason, he must be sociable, he must love the world and God, that of God he may be beloved." "He must not deem all the world an appendage to himself, but himself an appendage to the world."[3]

Yet on the subject of solitude and social intercourse Philo is inconsistent. We may gather that his own philanthropy was rather in word than deed. He has seldom a good word to say for the professional statesman; like Plato, he regards him as an inharmonious person, in conflict with himself.[4] The bad man is a busybody. He haunts the market-place, the theatre, the law courts, the council chamber, the assembly, and every meeting and concourse of men. He is a chatterer, confuses and muddles together truth with falsehood, things sacred with things profane, the serious with the comic, what is private with what is public. He is a lounger and a lazybones, always anxious to know other people's concerns, so as to rejoice over their calamities and to envy their success. The good man, on the other hand, is said to love solitude, not that he is a misanthrope, but "because he has guarded himself against vice, which the common crowd welcome, rejoicing whereat they should grieve, and grieving whereat they should rejoice. Wherefore the good man, for the most part, shuts himself up at home, and hardly ever crosses his threshold." If he goes out, he walks in the country, and the companions he loves are the best of all mankind—the famous ones of old, "whose bodies have been dissolved by time, but whose virtues are kindled into life

Philo's inconsistency.

---

[1] I. 584. Cp. Antoninus, VI. 30, "Reverence the gods and help men: short is life: there is only one fruit of this earthly life, a holy disposition and social acts." VII. 31, *φίλησον τὸ ἀνθρώπινον γένος. Ἀκολούθησον θεῷ.* As a matter of fact, according to Philo, piety and philanthropy commonly go together. II. 30.

[2] I. 585. *θαυμάζοντες μὲν τὸν αἴτιον ὑπερφυῶς, τῆς δὲ καθ' αὑτοὺς φύσεως μὴ ὑπερορῶντες.*

[3] II. 662; I. 275.

[4] II. 47, etc.

by the books that tell of them in prose and verse."[1] Socrates and Milton would have something to say to a philanthropy so barren, to a goodness so untested and untried.

Society and solitude.

Philo cannot get over an abiding contempt for the multitude and their vices. His constant feeling is that the solitary wisdom of the rapt theosophist is higher than the "gregarious wisdom" of human action. "Divine wisdom is a friend of solitude, for God possesses her, and God is alone, and therefore she loves aloneness. But human wisdom is tame and domestic and gregarious, she haunts the cities of mortals, and her delight is with the sons of men."[2] In one passage he says that if a man really and truly wants to despise all desires, and to subdue all passions, "he must fly from home and country, and kinsmen and friends, without turning back." Many persons, he adds, have been cured of wild desires by such "migrations," which must, however, be migrations into solitude, for "there are snares (δίκτυα) in a foreign country, just like the snares at home."[3] A regular justification of eremites! But elsewhere he incidentally tells us that in his own case he has not always found solitude efficacious to thought. "I have often left my kinsmen, friends and country, and betaken myself to the desert, that I might perceive some higher vision, but it has profited me nothing. My thought, scattered or stung by passion, has not reached its goal. Sometimes, on the other hand, in a crowded assembly, I make of my mind a solitude, when God has scattered the turmoil in my soul, and taught me that it is not the difference of places that works the good or ill, but God who moves and guides the chariot of the soul wherever he prefers."[4]

The right method of suffering.

On another point in the ascetic ideal, which comes home much more to every one of us to-day, Philo is very wanting. For any explanation of sorrow, for any comfort in misfortune and misery, we may search almost in vain in all his writings. Here the Psalter on the one side, Epictetus and Seneca on the other, are far more effective and original. It is this unreality, this want of relation to the actual lives of men, which makes so much that

---

[1] II. 4. [2] I. 491 *init.* Cp. I. 506.

[3] II. 411. Cp. Friedländer's admirable monograph, *Zur Entstehungsgeschichte des Christenthums*, p. 83, for the bearing of this and other similar passages upon the question of the Therapeutæ and the authenticity and date of the "*De Vita Contemplativa.*"

[4] I. 81 *fin.*, 82 *init.* The same thought occurs in Antoninus (The true "retreat" is "within"), IV. 3, and Seneca, *Ep.* 82, 104.

he has written artificial, useless and out of date. Two or three passages only seem worthy of notice. Quoting the verse in Deuteronomy, "God humbled thee, and suffered thee to hunger and fed thee with manna," he remarks that this humbling was in truth propitiation. "When we are spoiled of our pleasant things and seem to be ill-treated, then in truth is God propitious."[1] But elsewhere the simple and sufficient sense of the Biblical narrative is allegorised away.[2] Very curious and characteristic is one other passage in which he attempts to show for what reason, and in what spirit suffering should be borne. "It is proper," he says, "for God to create and for man to suffer (*πάσχειν*). God gives, man receives. If we once realise that 'suffering' is proper and necessary to man, we shall easily endure whatever befalls, however grievous and burdensome it may be." Once recognise that it is ours, as it were, by right and necessity, to suffer, and we shall endure as we ought, "resisting and setting ourselves in battle against calamity, by fortifying and barricading our mind with patience and endurance, most potent of virtues." He then attempts to explain his meaning more clearly by two curious metaphors. The first is taken from shaving. A creature can be shaved in two ways, either purely passively like a sheep, or like a man where the "sufferer" reacts against the agent (this he calls *τὸ ἀντιπεπονθὸς κατὰ ἀντέρεισιν*), and positively helps the shaver to perform his work, putting himself in the right attitude, and so on. Such a one combines "suffering" with "doing." So too in the case of beating; a slave or a freeman stretched on the wheel as a punishment of crime is purely passive, but a boxer parries the blow. We are then not to endure our calamities like the shorn sheep, or the beaten slave, but to react on destiny, since suffering is necessary for us all. "So shall we not, like effeminate persons, be broken and weakened utterly by the faintness and relaxation of our souls, but braced and strengthened in mind, we shall be able to mitigate and lighten the onset of impending ills."[3]

The life, then, which depreciates the body and exalts the soul is true life. "Death in life" is the lot of him who lives the slave of passion and of vice. For there are two kinds of death, one the separation of soul from body, but the other the peculiar death of the soul itself, "the ruin of virtue, the reception of vice."[4] The true philosopher is ever practising how to die to the life of the body, that he may partake of a bodiless and incorruptible life with God."[5] He "dies that he may live," and when he *is* dead in the ordinary sense, he "lives the happy life in God."[6] "For this is the best definition of immortal life, to be filled with a spiritual

The two deaths.

[1] I. 121. [2] I. 544. [3] I. 153, 154 *init.*; cp. I. 127.
[4] I. 65; cp. I. 200. [5] I. 264. [6] I. 200.

love of God. So the priests, Nadab and Abihu, died that they might live, exchanging mortality for life incorruptible, and departing from the creature to the unbegotten Creator."[1] It may be noted that Philo uses the word "immortal" to denote indifferently the highest life on earth and the eternal life after death: the two ideas fade and pass into each other. There is the same half-conscious confusion in his use of the word "everlasting" (*αἰώνιος*), as where he exclaims: "Is not the taking flight to God everlasting life, and is not the running away from him death?"[2]

So much for the one fundamental condition for the achievement of the *summum bonum:* let me now mention the other. We not only need a kind of life, but also a mental attitude; more precisely a particular kind of humility. It is primarily an intellectual humility which is required, but, quite characteristically, this merges into and includes a moral humility as well. Its contrary vice is the attribution of our own mental, moral, psychical and physical powers to ourselves, regarding man as the measure of all things, and as the independent author of whatever he feels, does and knows. Whereas, in fact, the true agent is God: God is the cause, man the instrument.[3] This aberration is moral as well as intellectual: it involves not only pride and arrogance, but also selfishness. He who regards himself as the cause of his own wisdom and happiness lives for himself and not for God. Self-conceit in the mental sphere corresponds in the moral sphere to selfishness. They are merely two sides of the same shield. What appears here as *οἴησις*, appears there as *φιλαυτία*.[4]

The second fundamental requirement: a particular kind of humility.

The emphasis both on word and thing—so far at least as regards *οἴησις*—seems peculiar to Philo. It is not enough for him that you should regard your own mind as a "fragment" or "image" of the Divine. The Stoics did the same. But what he objects to is the independence of the created mind. The Stoics—in their earlier days—regarded man as a kind of separate or little deity, which once started could and did proceed wholly by itself. He could come into line with, or he could go off at an erring tangent from the world-deity, of which he was the offshoot or emanation. To Philo this Stoic position seemed to set up a false and spurious liberty. Not that he denies the freedom of the will. He asserts it strongly. Man has been given "a volitional and self-deter-

The doctrine of οἴησις.

---

[1] I. 554 *fin.*; *ὅρος ἀθανάτου βίου κάλλιστος οὗτος ἔρωτι καὶ φιλίᾳ θεοῦ ἀσάρκῳ καὶ ἀσωμάτῳ κατεσχῆσθαι.*

[2] I. 557.

[3] God is the *αἴτιον, τὸ ὑφ' οὗ*: man the *ὄργανον, τὸ δι' οὗ*. I. 162.

[4] Cp. Dr. II. 288-292.

mining judgment," and is endowed with "voluntary and preferential energies."[1] But this very freedom is a purely arbitrary gift of God. And not only so, but all the faculties of man—physical and psychical alike—the "first movements," as he calls them, of the soul (*τὰ πρώτα κινημάτα*), in each individual as they occur, are the separate and voluntary gifts of the Creator.

οἴησις in Stoic philosophy.

The word *οἴησις* already occurs in Euripides;[2] and Philo quotes with approval the "proverb of the ancients," that "self-conceit is the hindrance of progress."[3] It is found two or three times in Antoninus and in Epictetus, and (with *οἴημα*) some six times in Plutarch.[4] In all these writers it is a synonym of *τῦφος*, and is equivalent to arrogance or conceit. But it is mainly applied to the intellect, and means the false belief in one's own knowledge when one is really ignorant. Philo, who apparently uses the word much more frequently than any other writer, gives it a specially religious meaning. It is the error and the vice of thinking that our knowledge and goodness are really our own, that we are the true owners of our own powers, and the true authors of all which by their help we see and do and know. *οἴησις* is that form of arrogance which has been attributed to the Stoics, and Philo, in a measure, anticipates Pascal and many another Christian theologian in its denunciation.[5]

A digression upon the alleged arrogance of the Stoics, and the meaning of it.

The difference of opinion between Philo and even such later-day Stoics as Seneca and Epictetus on this subject is, I imagine, to be largely accounted for by their different conceptions of God. The Stoic pantheism was always getting the better of a humbler and more Theistic view of the relations between God and man. And Bonhöffer has shown how those passages in Epictetus which, as it would seem, speak most plainly of the need of divine help in the fight with sin or in the achievement of knowledge, must be taken with many a grain of pantheistic salt. So, too, with Seneca, who, in this as

---

[1] I. 280 (Dr. I. 347-350).

[2] Eur. *Frag.* 644. *βαρὺ τὸ φόρημ' οἴησις ἀνθρώπου κακοῦ.*

[3] II. 652: *οἴησις, ὡς ὁ τῶν ἀρχαίων λόγος, ἐστιν ἐκκοπὴ προκοπῆς. ὁ γὰρ κατοίομενος βελτίωσιν οὐκ ἀνέχεται.* This proverb is attributed by Stobæus to Bion, by others to Heracleitus. Cp. Ed. Bywater, p. 51, under "Spuria."

[4] Cp. Antoninus, xii. 27, ix. 34, with Gataker's notes; Plutarch *Moralia*, 39 D, with Wyttenbach's notes; Epictetus, *Diss.* II. 17, 1. The first thing a student of philosophy has to do is *ἀποβαλεῖν οἴησιν.* Cp. II. 11, 1, 6-8; III. 14, 8. Bonhöffer, *Epictet und die Stoa*, I. 4.

[5] Cp. *Select Discourses, by John Smith.* Ed. Williams, Cambridge, 1869. Pp. 400, 401, "This is more or less the genius of wicked men; they will be something in themselves, they wrap up themselves in their own being, move up and down in a sphere of self-love, live a professed

in so many other things, combines the most pronounced differences in his own writings, and has given sharpest expression to the opposing extremes of Stoic philosophy. We find him, for example, expatiating on the benefits which man owes to God, and insisting that none are or can be good without God's help ; but, on the other hand, Seneca, far more than Epictetus, is wont to descant, with offensive arrogance, on the equality of the wise man to God, nay even upon his absolute superiority. The power to be good or wise God has given to all, the attainment of goodness is man's own. *Quid haberes, quod in philosophia suspiceres si beneficiaria res esset?*[1] Philo would close his ears in holy horror.

Stoic independence: man the son of God, but emancipated.

To the Stoics the human "I" which acts is also divine, but it is a real and separate and responsible being. If it is blameable for its sins, it is commendable for its virtues. What we achieve, alike in knowledge as in goodness, may be rightly regarded as our own, because it has been won by our own powers. That I am good or that I know may be due to the divine which is in me. But it is none the less my own work, the work of the semi-divine being which is called man. If I act rationally, I *ipso facto* follow the will of God. The struggle and the triumph involved in "not my will but thine," the peace of the Everlasting Arms beneath us and around, were unknown to the Stoic, because he had an inadequate sense of the personality of God and of the frailty of man. God was too similar in kind to himself. The sense of distance in wisdom, knowledge and goodness was very insufficient. "Nearness" meant, not capacity to hearken and to save, not sympathy and care, but equality or co-essentiality of nature. Man is the son of God, but only because he is part of an omnipresent and undivided reason, which in him has been lit up with a separate consciousness. To the Jew man is not the son, but the child of God, and the metaphor depends less on the idea of kinship through participation in a common nature than on the moral relations subsisting between father and child ; on the son's conviction of the father's infinite superiority in power, wisdom and goodness, on his absolute trust and confidence in the father's loving kindness, compassion and care.

---

independency of God, and maintain a *meum et tuum* between God and themselves. It is the character only of a good man to be able to deny and disown himself, and to make a full surrender of himself unto God, forgetting himself and minding nothing but the will of his Creator ; triumphing in nothing more than in his own nothingness, and in the allness of the Divinity. But, indeed, this, his being nothing, is the only way to be all things ; this, his having nothing, the truest way of possessing all things." An admirer of St. Paul could say, a fine and truly Pauline passage ; an admirer of Philo could say, how noble and Philonic !

[1] Cp. Ep. XC. *init.*, LXXIII. *fin.*, LIII. *fin.* ; *De Benef.*, iv. 6 ; Zeller, iii. 1, p. 727, n. 4 ; Bonhöffer, I. 85, II. 83-86.

For the Stoics knew little (Bonhöffer says Epictetus knows nothing) of the conflict between duty and desire, between the higher and the lower self. If you know the good, you must needs desire it. Hence they felt the less need for divine aid to quicken the infirm will and help it to victory. The intense consciousness of frailty and of sin leads on to the conviction that the unassisted will is insufficient to overmaster that frailty, or overcome the power of that sin. Then with the realisation of the need of God's assistance, there comes the prayer for it, and with the prayer the assurance of response. But the Stoic can scarcely require or admit a further divine element in human goodness, over and above the fact that human reason is itself divine. Which is right, Stoic or Jew, this is not the place to discuss. But Dr. Drummond is on Philo's side. He at least holds that high spiritual experience is the direct gift of God. "Spiritual things," he says, "are spiritually discerned, and no striving of the senses and the intellect, no enforcement of duty by the determined will, can ever discover that which is revealed only in visitations of the Spirit. The filial mind, the communion with God, the sense of Divine love and peace flooding our inward being, which are the essence of Christianity, cannot be created by strenuous endeavour any more than our own volition has created our physical frame ; they must come as a birth from on high, opening our eyes to a new world of heavenly beauty, and ravishing our ears with the sound of angelic songs, and giving to the conscious soul a rapture which, at its entrance on the visible scene, it could not know."[1] This passage might have been written by Philo almost as well as by Dr. Drummond ; only Philo would have expanded the statement to include all moral and intellectual excellence. If the mind or soul (he would say) were not divine, it could not be divinely fertilized, but if it were not divinely fertilized from on high, it would not, by its own unaided power, give birth to noble issue in thought and word and deed. "It is not, I think, inaccurate to say that every addition to knowledge, whether in the individual or the community, whether scientific, ethical or theological, is due to a co-operation between the human soul which assimilates, and the Divine power which inspires."[2]

The Stoic does not acknowledge, because he does not feel the need of direct aid from God to man.

The religious attitude of mind could in some ways be hardly more emphatically and even devotionally expressed than by Epictetus. Resignation to the divine will is a fundamental principle of his teaching, though we who read him with a deeper sense of the separate self-consciousness of man and God, and of the dependence of the one upon the other, put an added meaning into his words. A man, he

The contrast between Epictetus and Philo.

[1] Drummond, *Hibbert Lectures*, 1894, p. 220.

[2] A. J. Balfour, *The Foundations of Belief*, p. 329.

says, must "attach himself to God." What does this mean? "Whatever God wills, he wills; what God does not will he does not will also." "What God chooses is better than what I choose." And so on. Nevertheless man is independent. You can will to be good, and good you can become. But this willing, "this use of appearances," is itself God's gift. God has entrusted you to yourself, you are your own God-given "deposit"; therefore, though you must condemn your weakness and errors and get to realise them as soon as possible, there must be no despair, no mistrust in your own capacity of achievement. For God is in you. Mistrust in yourself were mistrust of God. Epictetus combines together, as fundamental pre-requisites of philosophy, the abandonment both of conceit (*οἴησις*) and mistrust (*ἀπιστία*). With him, as with the Stoics generally, God as an active and potent force in human life and labour is mainly conceived of as immanent within the human soul. It is true that he is within because he is also without, but there is no further inter-action between the two aspects. To Philo, God is rather without than within; so far as he is within, it is of grace rather than of nature, and the coalescence of human and divine is less organic than occasional. To the Stoics, man's independence, though in the last resort a gift, is yet strongly marked. Man must recognise his own divinity, and so find his salvation and his strength. To Philo, the sense of man's dependence is never wanting. God gives to the individual as well as to the kind, and what he gives he can withhold. Man must recognise God's divinity and all which it implies; he must look above far more than he must look within. It is in the realisation of the divinity of God and not of his own that he must find his salvation and his strength.[1] This we shall see proved and exemplified by Philo's doctrine of *οἴησις*. A selection of passages will bring his conception of it more clearly before us.

Philo's conception of οἴησις.

"Self-conceit is an unclean thing by nature."[2] It supposes that mind is creative, whereas in reality "the mind is not the cause of anything, but only God, who is before the mind."[3] Through the eyes the mind obtains a conception of colour, through the ears of sound, through the nostrils of smell, through the tongue of taste, and so it generates "the greatest evil of the soul, self-conceit. For it con-

[1] Yet Philo also teaches the Stoic doctrine that every man is not only created in the divine image, but is a "fragment" of Divinity through his mind. He is no more consistent than Seneca; but of him, as of Seneca, we may say with Bonhöffer (I., p. 85), "Wir können ihm dies nicht verübeln, da ein die Vernunft befriedigender Ausgleich zwischen göttlicher Gnade und menschlicher Freiheit auch heute noch nicht gefunden ist."

[2] I. 53.

[3] I. 75.

ceives that all which it has seen, heard, tasted and smelt, is its own possession, and that it is the discoverer and contriver of them all."[1] "But so long as the mind thinks itself the cause of anything, it is far from yielding and confessing to God. And this very act of confession and gratitude is itself God's gift."[2] "To God alone it befits to say 'mine, for all things are his" (Cp. 1. Chron xxix. 14). "He who says, 'mine is my mind, mine my senses, mine their products, for thought and perception are in my own power,' is a slave to his mind and senses, bad and pitiless masters."[3] As slave to the mind you are condemned to perpetual ignorance; as slave to the senses, to the domination of desire. He seems to suppose that if you think your senses are your own, you will use them lawlessly; instead of controlling them, they will control you. Mixed up with that doubtless is the further feeling that you cannot triumph over desire without the aid of God, nor can you receive this aid unless you realise its need by realising the utter dependence of every faculty, whether low or high, upon the Divine Bestower. Hence, he says that it is impossible to "master pleasure unless the soul confesses that its actions and its progress are of God, and ascribes nothing to itself."[4]

Self-renunciation and its meaning.

Again, he says "there are two minds: the mind of the universe, which is God, and the mind of the individual. He who flees from his own mind takes refuge in the universal mind, and he confesses that the creations of the human mind are nought, and ascribes everything to God. He who flees from God, deems him the cause of nothing and himself the cause of all. . . . Such a person is a thief, he steals the property of another (for all things are God's), and he receives a heavy wound which is hard to heal, self-conceit, akin to ignorance and boorishness."[5]

Here, too, the intellectual and the moral are closely mingled; self-conceit is the parent of "forgetfulness, ingratitude, and self-love," and only when you know yourself do you realise God. "For remembering your own nothingness in everything, you will remember the greatness of God in all."[6] No religion without humility. No service of God without a sense of the nothingness of man. A vivid sense of

---

[1] I. 149; God is always the *cause*, the human mind is but the *instrument*.

[2] I. 60. [3] I. 126.

[4] I. 83. Philo sees a danger in obtaining any excellence, whether moral or intellectual, by means of labour, lest the soul should think it has acquired such excellence by its own power, and not through God who implanted the desire for it (ὁ τὸν ἔρωτα χαρισάμενος). Labour must not produce οἴησις. I. 114.

[5] I. 93. [6] I. 173, 172; cp. I. 538.

human finiteness must precede the realisation of the Divine infinitude. "When Abraham knew most, he most completely renounced himself: for he who renounces himself, understands God."[1] But this humility does not involve fear. For precisely when man has recognised his own nothingness to the full, he may take confidence to supplicate God."[2] "He will then abandon treacherous self-conceit (ἡ ἐπίβουλος οἴησις), and find in self-knowledge the most useful purification."[3] "For the descent of the soul is its ascent by self-conceit, but its true ascent is a return from pride."[4]

The ethical effects of humility and of οἴησις.

Since then nothing is truly our own, not even life itself, but all good things of soul and body are gifts of God, Philo draws the important ethical consequence that we should use these gifts to good purpose. "Having the use of them, we shall take care of them as God's property, remembering that the Master, when he pleases, may recall his own. And so our grief at their removal will be much lightened. The 'many,' thinking all they possess their own, straightway at the loss of anything are plunged in grief. To realise that the world and all that it contains is the work and property of God is not only a truth, but tends powerfully to consolation."[5] The gifts of God, he says elsewhere, must be received, not for oneself, but as loans or deposits, to be returned at their due season, and therefore treated with all care. Self-conceit makes men regard these gifts as property, and self-love following on self-conceit makes men use and misuse this supposed property for themselves instead of for society and for God. Philo notes three main deposits which God has placed in our custody,

---

[1] I. 629 *fin.* The play in Greek is untranslateable: ὅτε μάλιστα ἔγνω, τότε μάλιστα ἀπέγνω ἑαυτόν . . . ὁ δ' ἀπογνούς ἑαυτὸν, γινώσκει τὸν ὄντα. Cp. I. 653.

[2] I. 477; cp. I. 151 *fin.*: "Those who come down from boasting (οἴησις) are raised up by the reasoning of virtue (ὁ ἀρετῆς λόγος) to true renown."

[3] II. 252. [4] II. 667.

[5] I. 160; cp. Epictetus *Encheiridion*, xi: "Never say about anything, I have lost it, but say, I have restored it. Is your child dead? It has been restored. Is your wife dead? She has been restored. Has your estate been taken from you? Has not, then, this also been restored? But he who has taken it from me is a bad man. But what is it to you, by whose hands the Giver demanded it back? So long as he may allow you, take care of it as a thing which belongs to another, as travellers do with their inn." Cp. Plutarch *Ad Apollonium Consolatio*, chap. xxviii. 116 A, with Wyttenbach's notes. Euripides *Phœnissæ*, 555-557 (perhaps spurious) οὗτοι τὰ χρήματ' ἴδια κέκτηνται βροτοί, τὰ τῶν θεῶν δ' ἔχοντες ἐπιμελούμεθα· ὅταν δέ χρῄζωσ', αὖτ' ἀφαιροῦνται πάλιν. Antoninus XII. 26; Seneca *Ad Marciam*, x.

soul, speech, and sense. Those who attribute these things to themselves misspend them all. Their soul is treacherous, their speech insolent, their "senses" insatiate. But those who attribute them to God, use their minds to contemplate the things of God and his goodness, their speech to honour and praise him, and their senses to understand his world. "And if any man were able with every part of him to live to God rather than to himself, by his senses investigating the visible world to discover truth, by his soul contemplating with true philosophy the world of mind, and by his speech glorifying the Creator and his works, such a one would indeed live a happy and a blessed life."[1]

Repentance and its value.

Philo is wont to use very violent language in these oppositions of the good and the bad. The "selfish" man has a whole catalogue of vices appended to his special fault; the man who "attributes all things to God" has all the virtues. Yet, as I have indicated before, he does not absolutely preclude the notion of a passage from the category of evil to the category of good. And so we may notice that repentance is occasionally alluded to. "Never to sin," he acknowledges, "is the peculiar quality of God, perhaps also of a divine man; to repent is the quality of a wise man."[2] But, "while iniquity is swift and continuous and frequent, repentance is slow and deliberate and in the future."[3] Philo will not admit the famous Rabbinic paradox that repentance is superior to perfection (τελειότης).[4] It is the principal blessing of the second class, whereas the highest, though possibly unattainable blessing is a never-failing recollection of the best.[5] Such a recollection, if ever present to and realised by the mind, would, I suppose, according both to Socratic and Philonic psychology, prevent the possibility of error or of sin. "Even in the souls of those who repent, the scars and impressions of their old wickedness remain."[6] Still he calls repentance, like conscience, a "councillor who does not flatter, and is incorruptible,"[7] and he also implies that one can never know that it is too late to mend. "God, the pitying Saviour, can easily bring back the mind from long wandering and in evil plight through pleasure and desire—hard taskmasters that

---

[1] I. 487, 488. Cp. Epictetus *Discourses*, I. xvi., "On Providence," ending with the noble words, "If I were a nightingale, I would do the part of a nightingale; if I were a swan, I would do like a swan. But now I am a rational creature, and I ought to praise God; this is my work. I do it, nor will I desert this post so long as I am allowed to keep it; and I exhort you to join in this same song."

[2] I. 569; II. 405. [3] I. 569. [4] II. 5. [5] II. 405.

[6] II. 228. The Stoics taught the same as regards the incomplete healing of the passions of the soul. Cp. Seneca *De Ira*, I. 16, quoting Zeno; *Fragments of Zeno and Cleanthes*, Ed. Pearson, No. 158, p. 195, and Epictetus *Discourses*, II. 18. [7] I. 697.

they are—into the right way, if only it has once determined to pursue the good flight without turning round."[1] "Repentance can soothe conscience, that stern and unbribable judge."[2]

As I have been led to speak of conscience, I will here quote some passages about it and use them as a bridge by which we may pass on to consider Philo's views as to the exact relation of the human to the divine.

The conscience.

The history and growth of conscience is a fascinating subject. Not without interest too is the history of the term. From Euripides onwards it begins to appear in Greek literature and philosophy. Euripides employs the word σύνεσις, which is also found in Polybius, with the full meaning of conscience. But this word did not meet with general acceptance, and was exchanged for συνείδησις or τὸ συνειδός. The former word occurs once in the Wisdom of Solomon, and several times in the Epistles of St. Paul. The Stoics elaborated the theory of conscience, and often used the word. The Latin translation, *conscientia*, is frequent in Seneca, and is already employed by Cicero. Epictetus uses (though not frequently) both συνείδησις and τὸ συνειδός, and both terms are found in Plutarch.[3] Philo, with scarcely more than two exceptions, confines himself to τὸ συνειδός. I should imagine that there are few earlier writers who speak more fully and frequently of conscience than he.

Conscience is primarily the "convicter" (ἔλεγχος) and the judge seated in the soul, unabashed in threat and in reproof.[4] Against men's will it stings them into confession of their evil deeds.[5] It is the "true man" dwelling in the soul, now ruler and king, now judge and umpire, now witness and accuser, convicting and restraining.[6] Philo sometimes drops the term τὸ συνειδὸς altogether, and speaks only of ὁ ἐπὶ ψυχῆς ἔλεγχος, the convicter in the soul.[7] It is unerring, truth-telling, incorruptible.[8] It gives the consciousness of rectitude as well as the consciousness of sin.[9] It is born with the birth of the soul, unsusceptible of wrong, by nature ever hating the evil and loving the good; it not only accuses and convicts, but teaches, persuades, exhorts,

---

[1] II. 427. But on the other hand some souls which wish to repent God does not allow to do so (I. 129 *fin.*).

[2] I. 634.

[3] More accurately συνείδησις occurs once only in a doubtful fragment (XCVII.), τὸ συνειδὸς once also (*Diss.* III. 22, 94), and the phrase συνειδέναι ἑαυτῷ twice (III. 23, 15, and *Ench.* 34). But Philo's conception of conscience should really be compared with the Stoic theory of the Δαίμων, Cp. Bonhöffer, *Epictet. und die Stoa* (1890), pp. 81-86.

[4] I. 30. [5] I. 423. [6] I. 196 *init.*

[7] I. 565; I. 291. [8] I. 236; II. 649. [9] I. 474.

and if its owner yields, it rejoices and is reconciled, but if he resents it wages an endless war with him, both day and night, till his miserable and accursed life is ended.[1] Hence, "the wicked man bears ruin within him, for there dwells within him a designing foe. For the conscience of the evil doer is his sufficient punishment; it makes the soul cowardly, as if it had received a blow."[2]

Conscience and the Logos.

In speaking of the law of Leviticus v. 20 (E. V., vi. 1), Philo assumes that the sinner is his own accuser, being convicted by his own conscience. When he has restored the deposit and goes to the temple to seek remission, the convicting conscience is the "blameless Paraclete" or advocate, whom he takes with him. For it has saved him from incurable misfortune, the deadly disease of sin, and restored him to perfect health.[3] Just as we speak of conscience as the voice of God, so Philo identifies it with the Divine Logos. In one sense it is, as it were, the cause of sin, as well as the cause of well-doing, for without its presence in the soul no erroneous action could be deserving of blame, and sin would therefore be impossible. Hence Philo can say: "As long as the Divine Logos has not entered our souls all our actions are blameless." Faults of ignorance and inexperience deserve pardon. But when the true priest, conviction (*i.e.* the Logos, or conscience) enters within us, like a purest ray of light, we see the guilt of actions done previously in ignorance.[4] The Logos comes to us as an angel-guide, removing the stumblingblock before our feet.[5] Conscience is the "undefiled high priest" (another synonym for the Divine Logos), for whose perpetual life within the soul we shall do well to pray.[6] "Let us supplicate God, convicted, as we are, by the consciousness (*συνειδήσει*) of our own misdeeds, to chastise rather than let us go. For if he let us go, we shall no more be servants of a gracious Lord, but of pitiless matter (*γενέσεως τῆς ἀνηλεοῦς*); but if in his goodness he chastise us gently and equitably, he will correct our faults by sending conviction, the Chastener, his own Logos, into our mind, through whom, putting it to shame and reproaching it for its offences, he will bring us healing."[7]

In what senses is God within man?

Let us pass on now to consider more specifically in what ways, according to Philo, God may be said to be within man, both habitually in the race and more particularly in the good. How is his presence manifested? In one sense God may be said to be within every man, because God "breathed into him from above something of his own Godhead" (*τῆς ἰδίου θειότητος*).[8] By virtue of his mind, every man contains "an impression, or fragment, or ray of the divine nature."[9] As Dr.

[1] II. 195. [2] II. 659. [3] II. 247. [4] I. 292.
[5] I. 299. [6] I. 563. [7] I. 219.
[8] I. 208. [9] I. 35, 332.

Drummond says, Philo was "deeply moved by the wonderful powers of reason, which extended itself to embrace the universe, and he could explain them only on the supposition that the Creator had breathed into the soul from on high a portion of His own divinity."[1] The marvellous operations of the human mind, which flies through space and outstrips time, would be impossible if God did not "seal the invisible soul with his own impressions, that not even earth might be without an image of God."[2] For how could the human mind, within the narrow space of a membrane or of the heart, be able to embrace the vastness of heaven and of the universe, unless it were "an undivided fragment of that Divine and blessed soul? For nothing in the Divine is cut so as to be separated, but is only extended. Wherefore the mind, sharing the perfection in the universe, whenever it contemplates the cosmos, widens with the limits of the universe, receiving no rupture, for its power is ductile."[3] This interesting passage seems to imply that Divine reason being omnipresent, it may be said that we are in God, as well as that God is in us.

"Nothing earth-born," consequently, is "more like God than man."[4] To his earthly material there has been superadded "divine spirit."[5]

Human reason is of Divine origin.

Hence he is "mortal as to his body, but immortal as to his mind."[6] His body is "the sacred temple of a rational soul."[7] He is a "relative and kinsman of God because of his participation in reason."[8] On the moral side, reason, the divine image, "made real and stamped (*οὐσιωθεῖσα καὶ τυπωθεῖσα*) by the seal of God, the impression of which is the eternal Logos," is the source of both good and evil.[9] For "mind and reason are, as it were, the home of virtue and vice; in them they seem to dwell." Some rational beings partake only of virtue, such as the stars. (Philo shares the Aristotelian belief that the stars are rational and animated beings.) Man has a mixed nature, capable both of wisdom and folly, evil and good.[10] It is noticeable that Philo does not complete the series by the hypothesis of a rational being that is wholly evil. He may be credited with the negative excellence of dispensing with a devil.

In this general sense, then, God is within every member of the human race. I said before that Philo cuts no clear division between man and man, and does not refuse to the vilest all trace of the Divine.[11] The grave difficulties which undoubtedly ensue on making

---

[1] Drummond, I. 329, 330. [2] I. 208.

[3] I. 508 *fin.*, 509 *init.* (Drummond, I. 329). [4] I. 15.

[5] I. 32. [6] I. 32. [7] I. 33.

[8] II. 338. *ἀγχίσπορος θεοῦ καὶ ἐγγενὴς κατὰ τὴν πρὸς λόγον κοινωνίαν, ὃς αὐτὸν καίτοι θνητὸν ὄντα ἀπαθανατίζει.*

[9] I. 332. [10] I. 17. [11] I. 265.

reason the distinctively divine element in man are wholly unobserved by him, or, if observed, neglected. If human reason is the parent of sin, the immanent divinity is the cause of evil. If it is the same reason which helps the scoundrel to the carrying out of a cunning crime, and prompts the soldier to a deed of heroism, or the philosopher to the contemplation of truth, why is not the "God within" the prerogative of the sinner as well as of the saint? For the solution of these high questions we must seek no guidance in the works of Philo. Unreconciled with the theory that every man, in virtue of his reason, bears the image of God within him, he lays down the more specialised doctrine that God "dwells" only in the souls of the good—in those who are worthy to receive so high and marvellous a guest.

How far, it may well be asked, is the doctrine purely metaphorical? From one passage at the end of the *De Sobrietate*, it might seem to be so. Philo interprets the blessing of Noah to mean that he prays that God may dwell in the house of Shem, and he then proceeds to say, "What more fitting house in all creation could be found for God than a completely purified soul?" "But God is said to dwell in a house, not in a local sense, for he contains all things, and is contained by none, but as showing special forethought and care for that particular spot. . . . . Let everyone, then, on whom the Divine favour has showered good, pray to God that he may receive the Ruler of all as a dweller in his house, for he will raise this petty dwelling, the mind, to a great height above the earth, and fasten it to the boundaries of heaven."[1] This would seem to mean no more than that God, as it were from without, exercises a special providence towards the good. But other passages show that something more is intended. For example: "Since God thus invisibly enters the place of the soul, let us prepare it, as well as we can, to be a worthy dwelling for him. For if we do not, he will unawares remove to another house, which seems to him wrought better. For if, when we are going to receive a king, we beautify our houses, sparing no means of adornment, that his rooms may be as luxurious as possible, as befits his rank, what sort of a house should we prepare for God, the King of kings and Ruler of all, who, in his condescension and love, has deigned to visit his creatures, and comes down from the limits of heaven to the ends of earth for the benefit of our race? A house of wood or stone? The idea is impious. For not even if the whole earth were suddenly turned into gold or something more precious still, and were all used up in the construction of colonnades, and gateways, and halls, and vestibules and temples, would it become a step for his feet. A fitting soul alone is a worthy house."[2]

Yet God only dwells in the souls of the good.

[1] I. 402.

[2] I. 157; cp. II. 672 (Drummond, II. 281).

Removing the metaphorical dress, Philo's meaning apparently is that there is a real Divine reaction upon those who deserve it. Such a reaction or influence is not necessarily a violation of law, and it is conditioned by the likeness, at however great an interval, of the human mind to the Divine.[1] "Do not," Philo says elsewhere, "seek for the City of God on earth, for it is not built of wood or stone, but seek it in the soul of the man who is at peace with himself, and a lover of true philosophy."[2] In this sense, then, of the real Divine influence, which by the law of God's relation to his human kinsman, is granted to those who are fitted to receive it, there can be and there is, a scale of increasing Divine immanence which culminates in inspiration. The lower stages of the scale are symbolised by the advent of the Logoi, the "Divine thoughts" (or by angels, their personifications); the highest stage is reached in the advent of God himself. Hence Philo says, "In the understandings of those who are perfectly purified, the God and sovereign of the universe walks about noiselessly, alone and invisibly—for there is also an oracle delivered to the wise man. in which it is said, 'I will walk about in you, and will be your God'; but in the understandings of those that are still undergoing cleansing, and have not yet entirely washed out the life, foul and sordid with heavy bodies, angels, Divine Logoi, walk, making them bright with the cleansing materials of excellence."[3]

A scale of Divine immanence.

Combined or parallel with this doctrine of God's immanence, and partly, perhaps, only another form of it, there can be traced in Philo's writings the doctrine of the help rendered by God to man, both in moral effort and in the acquisition of knowledge, culminating in the knowledge of God himself. These two are not really separated in Philo's mind; both are *ἀρεταί*. The notion of an unlettered saint, as ignorant of philosophy as a babe, so true to fact and so familiar to ourselves, was an unrevealed truth for the Jewish sage of Alexandria. But just as there are degrees of God's immanence, so there are degrees of God's help. It may come through his Powers, or through the Logos, or through himself. Then, too, *pari passu* with this scale of help, goes the result of it, the degree of knowledge and of virtue attained by its means.

God's help in the attainment of virtue or knowledge.

The doctrine of the proverb "God helps those who help themselves," on which from various reasons preachers now are wont to lay much stress, was not unknown to Philo. He too speaks of the divine help as given only to those who are fitted to receive it, and in response

[1] Cp. II. 428. [2] I. 692.

[3] I. 643; cp. I. 638; Drummond, II. 262.

to their own exertions. Nevertheless, not unfrequently he tends in a marked manner to depreciate the function or share of human labour and effort in the attainment of moral virtue and intellectual knowledge.[1] He inclines to do this from a twofold reason. First of all, man is made thereby more dependent upon the grace of God. "Without divine grace it is impossible to abandon things mortal, or to abide amid the incorruptible."[2] The more feeble and uncertain the issue of human effort, the less chance for vanity and self-conceit (*οἴησις*). Secondly, in the higher stages of the knowledge of God, Philo could hardly explain, in consistency with his own theory of the divine nature, how such deeper vision could be won by mortal man, unless it were due to special inspiration, over and above the general immanence of God in all men, though doubtless based upon it and conditioned by it.

Philo's strange use of φύσις in this connection.

Aristotle had allotted to nature (*φύσις*), to habituation (*ἔθος*), and to teaching (*διδαχή*), their own proper shares in the acquisition of virtue. In Diogenes Laertius's chapter on Aristotle *ἄσκησις* is substituted for *ἔθος*. The division in this form is adopted by Philo, but is applied by him in a peculiar way and interpreted for his own ends. For *φύσις* is regarded as including not only the natural endowment with which one starts at birth, but the inspiration bestowed by God. Hence the results of *φύσις* are usually higher than those of *ἄσκησις* and *διδαχή*. But it must be remembered that even to Philo the division between these factors in the moral and intellectual life is not a hard and fast one (II. 9). The man who starts on his race by the help of *ἄσκησις* or *διδαχή* can only reach the goal by the grace or inspiration of God.[3]

Teaching, training, and nature.

Philo's full doctrine on this point cannot be expounded here. It is well known that he has made each of the three great Patriarchs a type of the perfected result of "teaching," "training," and "nature." Abraham represents the first, Jacob the second, Isaac the third. But all three reached the goal at last, and obtained the vision of God.[4] As a corollary to his theory he has to assume that men start with different endowments, and that these differences are predetermined by God. "There are some persons whom God, even before their

[1] At the same time he acknowledges that God has made labour the condition of every good and virtue. And a few lines further on he says: *εὐσέβεια δὲ καὶ ὁσιότης ἀγαθὰ, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἄνευ θεραπείας θεοῦ τυχεῖν αὐτῶν δυνάμεθα· θεραπεία δὲ ταῖς ἐν πόνοις φιλοτιμίαις συνέζευκται.* I. 168.

[2] I. 379.

[3] And Philo acknowledges that the end reached by all these is the same. I. 646.

[4] I. 524, 591.

birth, fashions pre-eminently, and foreordains to them a peculiar lot." [1] From the deep problems here raised, Philo, as Dr. Drummond truly says, "glides off" in the most unsatisfactory way. The thought is dissipated and lost sight of "in a cloud of allegory." [2] The ideal representative of the virtue which comes from φύσις is described as complete and perfect from the outset. He is "self taught," but this "self taught" means taught of God. "He is not improved by investigation or effort, but from his birth he finds wisdom made ready for him ; it is rained down on him from heaven, and he drinks of it pure draughts and is ever drunk therefrom with a rational intoxication." [3] Inflated language of this kind is very frequent. The "self taught" start at the point which διδαχή and ἄσκησις may bring others to in the end by constant effort and laborious toil. "They have already at hand the gifts of God in all perfection : they need no improvement, having reached, through the excellence of their nature and the fair endowment of their souls, a spontaneous and effortless wisdom." [4] Philo, however, acknowledges that each of the three types of life is the result of all three factors working together, though each is made to represent that factor which predominates in it. "For teaching cannot be perfected without nature and practice, nor practice unless founded on nature and teaching, nor can nature reach the goal without teaching and practice." [5] At the same time Aaron, who gains "virtue" by labour, is less perfect than Moses, who receives it without labour from God.[6] This gift of God may come at any moment, and be, as it were, engrafted upon the previous results of "practice" and "teaching." But it is still spoken of as "self-taught" wisdom. "It is useful, if not for the acquisition of perfect virtue, at least with a view to civic life, to be trained in old and primeval opinions, and to pursue the ancient reports of noble deeds which historians and poets have repeated for their own age and for their successors. But when, without our foresight or expectation, a sudden light of 'self-taught' wisdom flashes upon us, which opening the closed eye of the soul, makes us seers instead of hearers of knowledge, putting in the understanding the swiftest of the senses, vision, instead of the slower, hearing, it is vain to exercise the ears with words." [7] Philo, as we shall see, is a firm believer in sudden intuition, which, from his point of view, is the same thing as sudden inspiration. It is very curious that in one and the same paragraph he speaks of God "bestowing the principles (θεωρήματα) of his own wisdom without our toil or trouble, so that suddenly we find a treasure of perfect bliss," [8] and then of those who

---

[1] I. 104. [2] Drummond, II. 311. [3] I. 571.
[4] I. 524, cp. I. 646. [5] II. 9.
[6] I. 114, cp. I. 617. [7] I. 178 (Drummond, II. 8).
[8] I. 286 (Drummond, II. 310) ; cp. I. 441.

"through the excellence of their endowment (φύσεως εὐμοιρίᾳ) make a hundred discoveries without any investigation, by the help of happy and well directed conjectures." And he does not appear to see any difference between the one class and the other. The conjecture is a divine chance ; but on the other hand it needs the natural endowment, which is also the gift of God. The old θεία τυχὴ of Herodotus receives, as it were, a sort of philosophical justification.

Omitting inspiration in its higher aspects for the present, let us now see in what other ways Philo teaches that help is rendered to man by God or by his Logos. When the help is ascribed to the Logos, rather than to God himself, this is because our realisation of the Divine is the subjective counterpart of the objective Divine aid. And this realisation may not, and usually will not, extend further than to the Logos, if, indeed, it extends so far.[1]

The help given to man by the divine Logoi.

Philo is wont to talk of the Divine Logoi as helping man. What does he mean by this ? A sudden thought which deterred from evil or spurred to good, a noble passage in an inspired book, the stirring utterance of a great preacher—these might all be regarded as so many separate fragments of Divine reason, which are born in, or enter the soul, but in the last resort, owe their origin to God. Philo refers much to direct Divine agency, which we should only indirectly ascribe to it.[2] Thus he says, "God, not disdaining to come into sensible perception, sends his own Logoi to assist the lovers of virtue ; and they treat and completely heal the sicknesses of the soul, giving sacred admonitions as immovable laws, and calling to the exercise of these, and like trainers of gymnasts, implanting strength and power." [3]

Of the human soul, the bodily, or as it were, earthly part, is the basis, while the mind, or heavenly part, is the head. "Up and down, through the whole soul, the Logoi of God move incessantly ; when they ascend, drawing it up with them, and disjoining it from the mortal part, and showing only the vision of things which are worth seeing ; but when they descend, not casting it down (for neither God nor a divine Logos is the cause of injury), but descending with it out of humanity and compassion towards our race, for the sake of giving assistance and alliance, in order that, breathing forth what is salutary, they may revive the soul also, which is still borne along, as it were, in a river, the body." [4] Then follow the lines quoted already, how God walks in the minds of the

[1] I. 122.

[2] In all this, and what follows, I have been greatly helped by Dr. Drummond's book.

[3] I. 631 (Drummond, II. 257 ; cp. 120, 218, 256, 307, 308-310).

[4] I. 642 *fin.* 643 (Drummond, II. 261).

perfectly purified, while his Logoi walk in those who are still not wholly cleansed of error or of sin. "It seems quite clear," says Dr. Drummond, "that Philo is referring in this passage to Divine thoughts that visit and purify the mind, those 'broken lights' of God, which beam softly upon us when we cannot bear the full-orbed splendour."[1] As he elsewhere says, "If even a thought (ἔννοια) of God enters the mind, it immediately blesses it, and heals it of all its diseases."[2] The Logos is said to help those who are akin, or inclined to virtue, and when it calls the soul to itself, to freeze together its earthly and appetitive elements."[3] "On some the sacred Logos enjoins commands like a king; others it instructs, as a teacher his pupils; others, not knowing what is the best of themselves, it helps like a counsellor, who makes wise suggestions; while to others again, like a gracious friend, it reveals persuasively many mysteries that the uninitiated may never hear."[4] It is difficult to say how far in this and similar passages the metaphors extend. But that Philo holds that the compelling or advising or restraining thought, which springs up within, must have a corresponding *vera causa* without —a Divine without that answers to the Divine within—seems to follow from a passage in which the saving impulse or thought is distinctly stated to reach the soul "from the outside." "So long as the mind thinks it firmly understands the objects of mind, and the sense the objects of sense, the Divine Logos stands afar off. But when each confesses its weakness, such a soul the Logos comes to meet and welcomes; it has renounced itself, and awaits the Divine aid that comes to it invisibly, and from without."[5]

The help given by the Logos.

In virtue, as in knowledge, God meets the sincere suppliant half way.[6] "How great is the grace of God, who anticipates our delay, and comes to meet us, to the perfect benefit of our souls!"[7] It is God who fertilises virtue by sending down the seed from heaven.[8] "It is God alone who can open the womb of the soul, and sow virtues in it, and make it

God the fertilizer.

---

[1] Drummond, II. 262. [2] I. 130.

[3] I. 633, 121. Cp. I. 640, where we hear of a Divine Logos that wrestles with Jacob, and gives him strength, and Dr. Drummond interprets the allegory to refer to "Divine thoughts which discipline and strengthen the mind," II. 260.

[4] I. 649. [5] I. 638 *fin.* [6] II. 407. [7] I. 130.

[8] I. 103, 147; cp. Seneca, Ep. LXXIII. *ad fin.:* Nulla sine deo mens bona est. Semina in corporibus humanis divina dispersa sunt, quæ si bonus cultor excipit, similia origini prodeunt et paria his, ex quibus orta sunt, surgunt: si malus, non aliter quam humus sterilis ac palustris necat ac deinde creat purgamenta pro frugibus.

pregnant and bring forth the good."[1] The same office is elsewhere assigned to the Logos. "The divine Logos flows forth like a river from wisdom as its fountain head, that it may water and fertilise the heavenly shoots and growths of the souls that love virtue."[2] "The Divine command (*σύνταξις*, another form of the Logos) illuminates and sweetens the soul that itself can see." [The Divine influence must meet with a properly receptive nature.] "It shines upon it with the light of truth, and it seasons with sweet persuasion those who thirst and hunger after virtue."[3] In fine: "How could the soul have perceived God if he had not breathed into and touched it so far as man's capacity allows? The human mind would not have ventured on such a flight, to grasp the nature of God, if God had not drawn it up to himself, so far as it could be drawn, and had not moulded it according to the powers which are within man's capacity to perceive."[4]

Let us now note a few interesting points in Philo's conception of the different stages in the knowledge of God, which can be fairly understood, even when taken out of their proper place in his philosophical system as a whole.

The knowledge of God: its origin, approaches and limitations.

Through the sense of sight philosophy arose. The soul was entranced by the spectacle of the sun and moon and planets and stars, and from an investigation into the causes of their movements philosophy began.[5] Some thinkers were wise enough to adopt the opinion that the heavenly bodies were not "self-impelled by irrational movements of their own, but impelled by the intelligence of God, whom it was, therefore, fitting to call Father and Creator."[6] Philo is of opinion that men have won a belief in God through what we now call the argument from design. The very existence of the world demands a belief in the world's Creator, as we infer an architect from the existence of a house. "They who reason in this manner conceive God through his shadow, realising the craftsman through his work."[7] This is not the more excellent way, and does not lead to the most perfect apprehension of the Divine; but, as the result of the unaided effort of the human mind, Philo thinks it deserves great praise. Such philosophers have "advanced upwards from below, and climbing, as it were, the rungs of a heavenly ladder, they have reached the Creator by logical reasoning through the contemplation of his works."[8]

---

[1] I. 123 *init.* Cf. I. 158, of the Divine Powers (Drummond, II. 312). The theological, and perhaps historical importance of this and many other similar, but stronger and more *bizarre* passages, has been recently emphasised by Mr. Conybeare in the *Academy*, December 22nd, 1894.

[2] I. 690. [3] I. 566. [4] I. 51. [5] I. 12, 18. [6] II. 331.

[7] I. 107. [8] II. 415.

Philo's aim is to approach as near as he can to God as he is in himself, apart from what he may be inferred to be from his works. He frequently admits that this aim cannot possibly be realised. "One must first become God—which is impossible—in order to be able to comprehend God."[1] He goes so far as to say that "it is sufficient for human reason to attain to the knowledge that there is, and exists, something as the Cause of the universe; but to pass beyond this, and inquire into essence or quality, is superlative folly."[2] "God is not even apprehensible by the mind, except only as to existence. Existence is what we realise of him; beyond existence, nothing."[3] Dr. Drummond has shown in what ways Philo passes out of and beyond this philosophical agnosticism, and how far he is justified in doing so.

In his relation to the world, God is Ruler and Creator, and these facts or inferences stamp him straightway as all-powerful and good.

God as Ruler and as Creator.

His two main names, Lord (*κύριος*) and God, typify his ruling and his goodness. It is a law of nature that a creator should care for that which he has made.[4] Realising God then as Ruler, we fear him; realising him as Creator, and therefore as a benefactor, we love him.[5] But neither aspect of him is the highest to which we can attain. The ruling faculty and the creative faculty are the two great powers of the Godhead. As Ruler, God is a legislator, enjoining what is right, forbidding what is wrong; as Creative and good, God is propitious; he has pity and compassion upon his work.[6] To each of these powers or aspects of God as realised by man, a phase of human character belongs. Of these, more anon. There is a further and higher aspect of God, or in other words, a further and higher stage in the knowledge of him, which represents the combination of the two fundamental powers of rule and creation, authority and goodness.

The Divine Logos.

This aspect is that of the Logos, the reason of God in every phase and form of it that is discoverable or realisable by man. "By the Logos God is both ruler and good."[7] The apprehension of the Logos is the highest stage in the knowledge of God which is obtainable by ordinary man. It practically implies and includes every aspect of him which can be won independently of absolute inspiration. Most of us have to be content with considerably less; we are able to catch a glimpse of God, now in one aspect, now in another; we rarely can realise him in that combination of many aspects, which in their rational unity and completeness

---

[1] II. 654 (Drummond, II. 17).

[2] I. 258 (Drummond, II. 18). [3] I. 282.

[4] *νόμος γὰρ φύσεως ἐπιμελεῖσθαι τὸ πεποιηκὸς γεγονότος.* II. 415.

[5] Cp. *e.g.*, I. 63, 144, 342, 343, 581, 582, 645.

[6] Cp. I. 560. Drummond, II. 83, and II. 18-20. Drummond, II. 91.

[7] I 144.

are symbolised by the Logos.[1] It is only before the mysterious, impenetrable Being, who manifests himself in all these functions of reason, that the worshippers of the Logos fall short. But the wisdom and happiness which are bestowed by the Logos, or which, as we may say, attend its realisation, are painted by Philo in the most glowing colours, just as the Logos itself, though, or rather as, inseparable from God, possesses all nameable qualities of the Divine. Commenting on the verse in the Psalms, "The river of God is filled with water," Philo declares that "it is absurd to give this name to any earthly river." But the Psalmist clearly signifies the divine Logos, "that is full of the fountain of wisdom, and is in no part of itself bare or empty. Or rather, as some one has said, it is diffused throughout the universe, and is raised up on high, through the continuous and unbroken flow of that everlasting source. In another verse of the Psalm, it is said: 'The course of the river gladdens the city of God.' What city? For the present sacred city, in which the holy temple is, lies far from the sea and from any rivers; so that it is clear that the Psalmist wishes to suggest something different from the obvious meaning, by way of metaphor. And in truth the continuous rush of the divine Logos is borne along with eager but regular onset, and overflows and gladdens all things that are. In one sense he calls the world the city of God, for it has received the full cup of the divine draught, and has exultingly received thereby a perpetual and imperishable joy. But in another sense he gives this name to the soul of the wise, wherein God is said to walk as in a city. And who can pour out the sacred cup of true joy to the blissful soul which holds out the most sacred cup, which is its own reason, except the Logos, the cupbearer of God, the master of his feast? And the Logos is not cupbearer only, but is itself the pure draught, itself the joy and exultation, itself the pouring forth and the delight, itself the ambrosial philtre and potion of happiness and joy."[2]

God above the Logos.

Nevertheless God is above the Logos, and there is a possible realisation of him, which transcends all that even the Logos can suggest to us. For though God be the mind or reason of the universe, we have not, in so naming him, "discovered his essence or given an exhaustive description" of his nature. "Pure Being is a more comprehensive conception than reason, and includes other predicates. Being, for instance, is eternal and omnipotent, and may have other attributes unknown to us, none of which is necessarily involved in the rational. Reason, therefore, is a mode of the Divine essence, but not that essence itself; and as in the

[1] I. 122.

[2] I. 691. Rightly, I think, does Professor Rendel Harris speak of this chapter from the *De Somniis* as "magnificent" (*Fragments of Philo*, 1886, p. 2).

case of all the powers, God exhausts and transcends it. He may accordingly be spoken of as the fountain from which it flows, as the Being who is before it."[1] Even the Logos is but the shadow of God.[2] "God is before the Logos, and superior to every rational nature."[3] Though "when you have been brought by wisdom as far as the Divine Logos, you have found the head and consummation of your devotion, you have still not reached God in his essence, but see him afar off. Or rather you only see that God is far from all creation, and the understanding of him most widely distant from all human understanding."[4]

A very chosen few can advance beyond the Logos.

Yet the inspired mind, which does not start in the quest for God from his works, can get beyond the Logos. "There is a more perfect and more purified mind, initiated in the great mysteries, which knows the Cause, not from the effects, as it would the permanent substance from a shadow, but, having looked beyond the begotten, receives a clear appearance of the unbegotten, so as to apprehend from himself him and his shadow, the latter meaning the Logos and this Cosmos."[5] "Such a mind was Moses, who said, 'Show me thyself, that I may see thee with knowledge; do not reveal thyself to me through heaven, or earth, or water, or air, or anything in creation; and let me not see thy essence reflected in any other thing, as in a looking-glass, but only in thee, who art God."[6] But such highest knowledge of God can only be reached by the inspiration or revelation of God himself.[7] From the knowledge of the perceptible world man may pass to the knowledge of the invisible Logos, but the knowledge of primal Divine Being is above both, and obtained in a different way.[8] But it is always true to say that the special revelation is only vouchsafed to those who are worthy of it in mind (which to Philo implies in character) before it comes. Only the rarest few can bear more than the sight of the Logos: it is to the "perfect" alone that "the first God" can be revealed.[9]

The upward journey of the mind.

The upward journey of the mind to the supreme vision of God is finely depicted in the following passage:—"As is God in the universe so is the mind in man: it is unseen, but sees all things: its essence is obscure, but it comprehends the essence of everything. And by arts and sciences it cuts for itself many roads and pathways, and passes

---

[1] Drummond, II. 183.

[2] I. 106 (Drummond, II. 190-194). [3] II. 625.

[4] I. 630 (Drummond, II. 20, 184, 195). Cp. I. 229 *fin.*, showing how God can be at one and the same time very near and very far.

[5] I. 107 (Drummond, II. 194). [6] *Ibid.* cp. I. 289.

[7] (*θεοῦ*) *τὴν ἰδίαν ὕπαρξιν ἀναφῆναι θελήταντος ἱκέτῃ . . . ἀλήθειαν δὲ μετίασιν οἱ τὸν θεὸν θεῷ φαντασιωθέντες, φωτὶ φῶς.* II. 415; cp. II. 18.

[8] Cp. I. 419. [9] I. 128; I. 655, 656.

through sea and land, searching out all things within both. And it soars aloft on wings, and having investigated the air and its changes, it is borne upwards towards the æther and the revolutions of the heavens. It accompanies the stars and the planets in their circling motions, following love, the guide of wisdom, and passing beyond the sensible, it yearns for the intelligible world. Perceiving there the patterns and forms of what it had seen before in the world of sense, it is seized by their exceeding beauty with a sober intoxication, and, like the celebrators of Corybantic rites, it is overcome by enthusiasm, and filled with high desire. So it is carried forward to the very summit of the intelligible world, and seems to draw near to the great king himself. Then, as it longs to behold him, the pure and unmixed rays of Divine light are poured upon it like a torrent, so that its eye is dazzled by the brilliancy."[1]

Inspiration.

Inspiration, if given by God, must be prepared for by man. It needs the complete abandonment of bodily desires, the absolute consecration of mind and soul to God. Without a wish or a thought that is not concentrated on truth and virtue and God, a man must "pour forth his soul's blood as a libation, and sacrifice his whole mind to God the Saviour."[2] He must break the bonds which the cares of mortal life entwine around him, and, with the utmost strain of his soul, press forward to the glorious visions of the uncreated.[3]

Referring to Genesis xii. 1 ("The Lord said unto Abraham, Get thee out of thy country, and from thy kindred and from thy father's house"), Philo exclaims: "If any desire come over thee, O soul, to inherit Divine bliss, then abandon not only thy 'land,' the body, and thy 'kinsmen,' the senses, and thy 'father's house,' the understanding (τὸν λόγον), but flee from thyself, and depart out of thyself, like men possessed in a rapt frenzy of prophetic inspiration. For when the mind is in a state of ecstasy, and no longer under its own control, but maddened and agitated by heavenly love, it is drawn up towards God, and truth is its leader and clears a path before its feet, so that it may go forth upon the highway to become the heir of things Divine."[4] Philo even maintains that this ecstatic condition of the mind affects the condition of the body. "When men are inspired, not only does their soul become excited and raving, but their body too becomes ruddy and fiery in colour, the inward heat of joy showing itself even externally, so that many foolish persons are deceived thereby, and confound enthusiasm with intoxication."[5]

---

[1] I. 16. The relation to the Phædrus is obvious.
[2] I. 76.
[3] I. 380.
[4] I. 482.
[5] I. 380.

Philo doubtless approaches near to the theory to which mystics of all ages have inclined, that the highest condition of the mind is pure passivity: the human is blotted out to receive the Divine. What is human is individual and mortal: even mind is often connected with sense and desire, and the separate selfhood that holds asunder from God. To become one with the Divine the self must be merged in God, and to be merged in him, its own functions and activities must be extinguished. Thus the highest faculty of the mind topples over into an abyss on the other side: having reached the summit of activity, it is ready to become the mere passive phonograph, on which to receive the impress of the divine. Alluding to Gen. xv. 12 ("And when the sun was going down, a deep sleep fell upon Abraham"), Philo says:— "As long as our mind still shines and is active, and pours a noonday light over all our soul, we are under our own control, and are not possessed; but when the mind draws near its setting, then divine ecstasy and madness may fall upon us. For when the divine light shines, the human light sets, but when the divine sets the human light reappears. This is wont to be the case with prophets. For at the coming of the Divine Spirit our mind retires, but when the Spirit departs it comes back again. For the immortal may not dwell with the mortal."[1] In another place he goes so far as to say that "a prophet utters nothing of his own, but is a mere interpreter. It is another who suggests all his words, and while he is inspired he is unaware that his own reason has vanished and has left the citadel of his soul: the Divine Spirit having entered in, plays upon his voice as on an instrument, and sounds within him to make clearly manifest that which he prophesies."[2] Whether in spite of his remark that the Scriptures testify of "every good man (whom they mention) that he is a prophet," he would have ventured to apply the name to himself may well be doubted. But he is not afraid to confess that he has been visited at certain high and select moments, and even unawares, by divine inspiration. He says that his soul "was often accustomed to be possessed by God and to prophesy about things which it knew not."[3] He speaks of the "invisible spirit which was wont to commune with him."[4]

The highest activity of the mind becomes pure passivity.

Philo's own inspiration.

---

[1] I. 511.

[2] II. 343. But Réville is perhaps scarcely right in calling this the *only* passage, "où se trouve la conception matérialiste d'un homme-machine, mû par l'esprit de Dieu." *Le Logos d'après Philon d'Alexandrie*, p. 50. Cp. Drummond, I. 12, 14, and the passages there quoted.

[3] I. 143 *fin.* (Drummond, I. 21).

[4] I. 692.

And elsewhere he dwells on the manner of his inspiration in detail. "I am not ashamed to relate the way in which I am myself affected, which I know I have experienced countless times. Intending sometimes to come to my usual occupation of writing the doctrines of philosophy, and having seen exactly what I ought to compose, I have found my mind fruitless and barren, and left off without accomplishing anything, reproaching my mind with its self-conceit (οἴησις), and amazed at the power of Him who is, by whom it has turned out that the womb of the soul is opened and closed. But sometimes, having come empty, I suddenly became full, ideas being invisibly showered upon me and planted from above, so that by a divine possession I was filled with enthusiasm, and was absolutely ignorant of the place, of those present, of myself, of what was said, of what was written ; for I had a stream of interpretation, an enjoyment of light, a most keen-sighted vision, a most distinct view of the subjects treated, such as would be given through the eyes from the clearest exhibition of an object."[1]

Philo's theory that every power or faculty is due to the grace of God would probably have prevented him from becoming insufferably conceited by the consciousness of these supernatural visitations. For otherwise, in accordance with his own doctrine, the fact of inspiration must, I imagine, imply the possession of every kind of excellence. The good man is on the borders of the human and divine, connected with the former as touching his mortality, with the latter as touching his virtue. He is half man, half God.[2] Yet filled as his mind is with "divine love," he forgets himself and all things in his rapture towards God.[3] He is of that race select, "who live not far from God, with the images of immortal beauty before their mind's eye, and guided always by heavenly love."[4]

Man's attitude towards God: Fear and Love.

In all the stages of development, on all the rungs of the ladder on which man mounts higher and higher towards a better or more adequate knowledge of the infinite God, there are two main attitudes of the mind with which God is regarded. These two main attitudes are those with which we are familiar to-day. They are fear and love. The passages in Philo's writings which speak of them are interesting in themselves, and still more when we silently compare them with the notions about the fear and love of God current among ourselves both in the Jewish and in the Christian world. We may begin by quoting a general statement which sums up a considerable portion of his entire doctrine. "God," he says, "demands from us nothing hard or complicated, but something very easy and simple.

[1] I. 441 (Drummond, I. 14). [2] I. 689 ; cf. I. 484 ; II. 452.
[3] I. 689. [4] II. 421.

It is to love him as a benefactor, or, if that be too much, at least to fear him as our Ruler and Lord."[1] It will be remembered that Philo conceives the Deity to be called Lord (κύριος) as Ruler, and God as Creator. As a Ruler, with the power that belongs to kings of doing both good and harm, he is justly feared; as Creator he desires and wills only the good, both because the cause of creation was the Divine goodness, and also because, as we have seen, it is a "law of nature" for a maker to care for that which he has made.

Love is therefore superior to fear. "A life according to God is defined by Moses as a life that loves God."[2] It will also be remembered that Philo connects the principles of Love and Fear with the two Biblical statements, "God is like man," and "God is not like man"; for all the exhortations to observe the laws that lead to piety are based either upon the fear or the love of God. "To those who do not suppose that God possesses either part or passion of man, but honour him worthily for himself alone, love is most appropriate, while to all others fear."[3]

The Six Divine Powers.

Fear and love correspond to the Deity's two fundamental powers. The many aspects of God are of great value from a human and a religious point of view. Not all of us can realise him in the same way, so that his manifold nature, or rather the manifold forms of its manifestation, give something for each of us to lay hold of and appreciate; for, as Philo observes, with a rare access of gentleness and sympathy, "we have neither the same weakness nor the same strength." He identifies the six main "powers" of God (of which the Logos is the first) with the six cities of refuge. "Very beautiful and well-fenced cities they are," he says, "most admirable refuges for souls that are worthy to be saved for evermore. Good and gracious is the ordering of them to prepare and strengthen men for good hope." Now, of the five powers that succeed to the Logos, two are primary and three are secondary. The two primary are our old friends the Creative and the Regal or Ruling Power, and these are combined into a harmonious unity in the Logos. The creative power is elsewhere called Goodness, the regal power, Authority. "By goodness God created the universe, by authority he rules it, and the Logos unites the two, for by Reason (or thought) God is both ruler and good."[4] Of the three secondary powers, one is a

---

[1] II. 257. It is strange that Philo does not quote Micah vi. 8. He very rarely indeed quotes the Prophets, preferring the most strained and ludicrous interpretation of a Pentateuchal passage to the most superb and direct passage elsewhere.

[2] τὸ μὲν οὖν κατὰ θεὸν ζῆν ἐν τῷ ἀγαπᾶν αὐτὸν ὁρίζεται Μωυσῆς. I. 238. Cp. I. 228.

[3] I. 283.

[4] I. 144.

subdivision of the Creative, namely, the Propitious, through which "the Artificer pities and compassionates his own work," while the other two are subdivisions of the Regal, in its more restricted aspect as the Legislative Power. They are the Preceptive and the Prohibitive Powers, obviously corresponding to and suggested by the positive and negative commands of the Pentateuchal law. Omitting the Logos, Philo conceives that the five powers represent five aspects in which men think of God. The first aspect is the Creative, "for he who realises that everything has been created has already acquired a great good, namely, the knowledge of the Creator, which immediately persuades the creature to *love* his Maker." The second aspect follows the Regal power: "By the control of necessity the subject is admonished through *fear* of the Ruler, when he does not, like a child, obey his father through love." The third aspect rather erratically takes us back to the first power. It is the aspect which appeals to the sinner: "For he who is convinced that God is not inexorable, but is gracious through the essential kindness of his nature, repents of his sin through hope of forgiveness." It is noteworthy that the two lowest aspects of God are those which regard him as a Lawgiver. The one is the aspect realised by him who finds happiness in doing all that God has commanded; the other by him who, at all events, avoids evil by not doing what God has forbidden.[1]

With the Second and Third Power Love and Fear correspond.

As the Logos is superior even to the creative power, it might be thought that there should exist a corresponding aspect superior to Love, and this is indicated by Philo himself in certain passages, where he states that to the perfect worshipper God is both Ruler and Creator in one. Love and Fear are united together in a nameless combination which includes and transcends them. One could make an Hegelian or homiletic application of this idea, and suggest how the contraries of Fear and Love are dissolved and reconciled in a higher unity above them. "Of bad men the Deity claims to be called Ruler and Monarch; of the improving, God; of the best and most perfect, Lord and God together and at once."[2] "He thinks it right that the bad man should be governed as by a Master; the improving benefited as from 'God,' in order that by benefits he may reach perfection; but that the perfect should be ruled as by a Master, and benefited as by God."[3] It is, therefore, necessary to attempt to realise both the "goodness" and the "authority" of God; for then we shall also learn "the union and combination of these undefiled powers, the majesty of God's rule

The combination of Love and Fear.

[1] I. 560, 561.

[2] I. 581.

[3] I. 582; cp. I. 476. The "improving" is ὁ *προκόπτων*—a term borrowed from the philosophy of the Stoics.

appearing in the manifestations of his goodness, and his goodness appearing in the manifestations of his rule. So shall we acquire the virtues born of these conceptions, a love (φιλοφροσύνη) and reverence (εὐλάβεια) of God. Then in prosperity we shall not talk big, remembering the greatness of God's mighty rule, and in adversity we shall not despair, remembering God's gentleness" (ἡμερότης).[1]

But Philo is not always consistent, and sometimes prefers to this combination a Love which has cast out or is independent of Fear.

Love alone.

Jacob's prayer, "Then shall the Lord be my God" (Gen. xxviii. 21), Philo interprets to mean: "May he no longer display to me the despotism of his absolute authority, but the beneficence of his saving power, that is gracious to all; removing from the soul the fear felt towards him as to a Master, and implanting the friendship and affection that may be felt to a Benefactor."[2] Again, of Abraham, the lower type of character, the Deity is called God and Lord; of Isaac, the highest type, he is only God. "For the one disposition needs the care of two powers, rule and beneficence, that through the might of the Ruler it may obey his orders, and through his goodness be greatly aided. The other disposition needs beneficence only. It cannot be bettered by the Power of admonishing Rule (for it possesses the good by nature), but through the gifts showered from above, it is good and perfect at the start. . . . . What can be a greater good than to obtain pure and unmixed beneficence? And what can be more wonderful than the mixture of gift and rule? Perceiving which, Jacob prayed that 'the Lord might become his God,' for he desired no longer to fear (εὐλαβεῖσθαι) him as a ruler, but to honour him lovingly as a benefactor" (ὡς εὐεργέτην ἀγαπητικῶς τιμᾶν).[3]

Thus Philo can be quoted in support of either view: for fear and love combined, or for that perfect love which knows honour, but is ignorant of fear.[4]

---

[1] I. 144. With Philo's idea that the most perfect attitude of man towards God is a combination of Love and Fear, may be compared a striking sermon of the late Dr. P. F. Frankl on the same subject. Frankl contends that it is Judaism alone which maintains this harmonious combination as contrasted with the one-sided emphasis on Love and on Fear in Christianity and in Mohammedanism respectively. (*Fest und Gelegenheits-Predigten.* Berlin, 1888, pp. 191-199.)

[2] I. 342 *fin.*, 343 *init.* [3] I. 645.

[4] Seneca says (*De Benef.* IV. 9): "Deos nemo sanus timet. Furor est enim metueri salutaria nec quisquam amat quos timet." I doubt whether the second half of this sentence is true. It should, perhaps, be remembered that, in the passage quoted above, Philo speaks of the reverence (εὐλάβεια), not of the fear (φόβος) of God. Now εὐλάβεια in Stoic terminology is the opposite of φόβος, as χαρὰ is the opposite of ἡδονή. Diog. L. VII. 116.

It will be noted that Philo associates the love of God with the conception of him as a Creator. But, as we know, such a conception is not the highest. God as the Good creator is still only God as seen in his works, or as manifested by his power. The Creative is his greatest power—if we put the Logos as a combination of two powers on one side—but still a power only, not the pure Being to which the power belongs. If love belongs to the realisation of the power, what is the "principle" which belongs to the realisation, so far as the human mind can go, of the Being who includes the power and transcends it? Is there any attitude towards God which transcends love?

We can extract no distinct answer from Philo to this question. But in spite of the quotations which I have just given, I hardly think that Philo gave as deep and as unselfish a connotation to the word love as we do to-day, or as, I believe, was given to it by the mystical Jewish writers of the Middle Ages. Love, to Philo, seems tinged with a taint of selfishness. It is exclusively suggested by God in his relation to man. Because he has created us and taken care of us, because he acts beneficently, mercifully, and tenderly towards us, *therefore* we love him. Our love is dependent on what he has done for us, is doing, and will do. But higher than the knowledge (and through knowledge the adoration) of God for what he has done are the knowledge and adoration of him for what he is. "In our holiest moods, when we can detach ourselves from the plurality of what he does, and adore him simply for what he is, we contemplate him as the one reality."[1] The philosopher seeks to know and to realise God as he is in himself, over and above and transcending all his aspects and manifestations. The mystic knowledge of him, which may indifferently be regarded as the supreme result of human thought at its highest pitch and moment of development, or as the flowing over of the Divine into the human, so that the latter, as a separate, conscious, finite mind, is temporarily suspended in its exercise and individuality—this mystic knowledge of God does not realise him as Ruler or Creator, but as Being. It looks away from his works and away from man, and seeks communion and rest in the endless and infinite depths of the Divine personality, wherein all that is separate and finite is now unified, included and summed up. The rapture or ecstasy which attends this knowledge may appear to the mystic as a phase of adoration which rises even superior to love. Its worship is, at any rate, wholly pure, for it has nothing to do with the relation of God to man.

Is there any attitude towards God above love?

That something of this sort was in Philo's mind may be gathered

---

[1] Drummond, II. 93.

from the long and interesting passage in which he allegorises the story of the three divine "messengers" who appeared to Abraham before his tent: "The spoken words," he explains, "are symbols of things apprehended in intelligence alone. Whenever, then, a soul, as it were in midday, has been illumined on all sides by God, and, being entirely filled with intelligible light, becomes shadowless with the beams that are shed around it, it apprehends a triple representation of one subject; of one [of the three] as actually existing, but of the other two as though they were shadows cast from this. Something of a similar kind happens, too, in the case of those who live in perceptible light; for there often occur two shadows of bodies at rest or in motion. Let no one suppose, however, that the word shadow is used strictly in relation to God; it is merely a misapplication of the term for the clearer exhibition of the subject we are explaining, for the reality is not so. But, as one standing nearest to the truth would say, the middle one is the Father of the universe, who in the sacred Scriptures is called by a proper name the Self-existent, and those on each side are the oldest and nearest powers of the Self-existent, of which one is called Creative and the other Regal. And the Creative is Deity (*θεός*, or God), for by this he deposited and arranged everything into a cosmos, and the Regal is Lord (*κύριος*), for it is right for that which has made to rule and hold sway over that which has been produced. The middle one, then, being attended by each of the two powers as by a body-guard, presents to the seeing intelligence a mental image or representation (*φαντασία*) now of one, and now of three; of one, whenever the soul, being perfectly purified, and having transcended not only the multitudes of numbers, but even the duad which adjoins unity, presses on to the idea which is unmingled and uncomplicated, and in itself wanting nothing whatever in addition; but of three, whenever, not yet initiated into the great mysteries, it still celebrates its rites in the lesser, and is unable to apprehend the Self-existent Being from itself alone without anything different [from pure being], but apprehends it through its effects as either creating or ruling. This, then, is as the proverb runs, 'a second voyage,' but none the less partakes of opinion dear to God. But the former method does not partake of, but is itself the opinion dear to God, or rather it is truth, which is older than opinion and more honourable than all opining."[1]

The triple representation of God.

Philo proceeds to "explain" his statement by saying: "There are three classes (*τάξεις*) of human character, to each of which one of the three conceptions of God has been assigned. The best class goes with the first, the conception of the Self-existent Being; the next

[1] All this is the translation of Dr. Drummond, II. p. 91.

goes with the conception of him as a Benefactor, in virtue of which he is called God ; the third with the conception of him as a Ruler, in virtue of which he is called Lord. The noblest character serves Him Who Is in all the purity of his absolute Being ; it is attracted by no other thing or aspect, but is solely and intently devoted to the honour of the one and only Being ; the second is brought to the knowledge of the Father through his Beneficent power ; the third through his Regal power. What I mean is this : Among men, when they perceive that people approach them with the pretext of friendship for the hope of gain, they look askance and avoid them. They fear a feigned flattering and fawning as something hurtful and offensive. But God, who cannot be harmed, gladly welcomes all who choose to honour him, on whatever ground it be ; he thinks it right to dismiss none with contumely, but almost in plain words tells those whose souls have ears to hear : 'My highest rewards are reserved for those who honour me for myself alone ; the next best for those who hope to receive some good, or expect to find an escape from punishment ; for even if their service is hireling or selfish, nevertheless it moves within the Divine circumference, and does not wander without. The reward reserved for those who honour me because of myself is to be my friend ; the reward for those who honour me for their own needs is less than friendship, but yet consists in not being regarded as strangers. For I receive him who for his own advantage desires to share in my beneficent Power, and him too who, to avoid chastisement, supplicates in fear my Power of Lordship and Rule. For I am well aware that such men will not only not become worse, but will actually become better ; by their continuous service they attain at last to a pure and simple piety. Even if the motives from which men perform their service differ with their characters, there is no need to find fault with them, for one end and aim is common to them all, the worship of God."[1]

The three classes of human character and their attitude towards God.

This long quotation implies that the highest attitude towards God, which corresponds with the highest conception of him, could perhaps be more rightly called Adoration than Love. But it also shows that in the wildest onset of his allegorical fervour Philo retained a shrewd power of penetration into human motive and character. For a mystic not to reject utterly an impure worship of God, but to value it at its proper worth, and to realise its possible effects for good, indicates a worldly wisdom, in the best sense of the word, of which we might hardly have thought that Philo was capable.

At the same time, he is quite sound and prophetic on the relation

[1] II. 18-20.

of outward form to true religion. Not that he wishes to break from "forms." On the contrary. He is a strong conservative, in spite of his finding the true meaning of every ritual command in some wonderful spiritual interpretation. The grounds of his conservatism are peculiar and interesting. They are introduced in the following way: He is enumerating the Divine blessings to Abraham, the fourth of which, he says, is good repute (τὸ μεγαλώνυμον, Gen. xii. 2). He explains it thus: "If to be good is noble, to seem good is profitable. Truth is better than reputation, but happiness consists in their union. For there are many thousands [a true Philonic exaggeration, which he would be the first to repudiate in the next page] who are purely and unselfishly devoted to virtue, and admire its native beauty, but who, having no care for their reputation among the multitude are much attacked; though truly good, they are thought wicked. . . . . To whom, then, God has granted both to be and to seem good, he is truly happy and truly renowned (μεγαλώνυμος). And we must have a great care for reputation, as a matter of great importance and of much value, for our social and bodily life (ὁ μετὰ σώματος βίος). And almost all can secure it, who are well content not to disturb established customs, but diligently preserve the constitution of their own country.[1] For there are some who, looking upon the written laws as symbols of intellectual things, lay great stress on these, but neglect the former. Such men I would blame for their levity (εὐχέρεια). For they ought to give good heed to both—to the accurate investigation of the unseen meaning, but also to the blameless observance of the visible letter. But now as if they were living by themselves in a desert, and were souls without bodies, and knew nothing of city or village or house or intercourse with men, they despise all that seems valuable to the many, and search for bare and naked truth as it is in itself. Such people the sacred Scripture teaches to give good heed to a good reputation, and to abolish none of those customs which greater and more inspired men than we instituted in the

Philo on religious forms. The spirit and the letter.

---

[1] The Conservative and the Reformer may each cite Philo to their own advantage. For the former, besides the passage in the text, we have I. 393, where it is said that Moses often calls a man young, not referring to his age, but to show his disposition, that he loves innovation (νεωτεροποιία). When the Israelites want to "innovate" (νεωτερίζειν), they are given the name of foolish and childish youth (I. 394; cp. 395). On the other hand, we find him saying, "God teaches those who are lovers of old and fabulous times, and who do not realise his rapid and timeless power; he urges them to take to heart what is young and growing and flourishing, that they may not, by being nurtured on old fictions, which the ages have handed down to man's deception, hold false opinions, but that,

past. For because the seventh day teaches us symbolically concerning the power of the uncreated God, and the inactivity of the creature, we must not therefore abolish its ordinances, so as to light a fire, or till the ground, or bear a burden, or prosecute a lawsuit, or demand the restoration of a deposit, or exact the repayment of a loan, or do any other thing, which on week-days is allowed. Because the festivals are symbols of spiritual joy and of our gratitude to God, we must not therefore give up the fixed assemblies at the proper seasons of the year. Nor because circumcision symbolises the excision of all lusts and passions, and the destruction of the impious opinion, according to which the mind imagines that it is itself capable of production [our old friend, *οἴησις*] must we therefore abolish the law of fleshly circumcision. We should have to neglect the service of the Temple, and a thousand other things, if we were to restrict ourselves only to the allegorical or symbolic sense. That sense resembles the soul, the other sense the body ; just as we must be careful of the body, as the house of the soul, so must we give heed to the letter of the written laws. For only when these are faithfully observed will the inner meaning, of which they are the symbols, become more clearly realised, and, at the same time, the blame and accusation of the multitude will be avoided."[1]

The relation of ritual to religion.

Nevertheless, on the proper relation of ritual to religion Philo is not afraid of speaking out. "If a man practises ablutions and purifications, but defiles his mind while he cleanses his body ; or if, through his wealth, he founds a temple at a large outlay and expense ; or if he offers hecatombs and sacrifices oxen without number, or adorns the shrine with rich ornaments, or gives endless timber and cunningly wrought work, more precious than silver or gold—let him none the more be called religious (*εὐσεβής*). For he has wandered far from the path of religion, mistaking ritual (*θρησκεία*) for holiness (*ὁσιότης*), and attempting to bribe the In-

receiving from God, who is ever young and fresh, new and good things in all abundance, they may be taught to think nothing old that is with him and nothing wholly past, but all begotten and subsisting out of time" (I. 178). Again, he makes Lot's wife symbolise custom (*συνήθεια*), the enemy of truth, which, when anyone attempts to lead it forward, lags behind, and looks around at its old and familiar ways, and like a lifeless pillar of stone, remains behind in their midst" (I. 382). Elsewhere he says, "They who have received their notions of God's existence rather by habit (*ἔθει*) than reason, from those who brought them up, are pious by a kind of good guess, and their religion is mingled with fear (*δεισιδαιμονίᾳ τὴν εὐσέβειαν ἐγχαράξαντες*)" (II. 414).

[1] I. 450, 451 ; cp. Friedlander's most able and suggestive brochure, *Zur Entstehungsgeschichte des Christenthums* (p. 151), for the religious importance of this passage.

corruptible, and to flatter him whom none can flatter. God welcomes genuine service, and that is the service of a soul that offers the bare and simple sacrifice of truth, but from false service, the mere display of material wealth, he turns away."[1] Elsewhere, he says, "Let those who seek to show honour and gratitude to God, cleanse themselves of sin, washing away all that defiles life in word and thought and deed. For it is folly that while a man is forbidden to enter the Temple unless he has washed and cleansed his body, he should pray and sacrifice with a soiled and sullied mind. Shall the lifeless body not touch a building of lifeless wood and stone, unless it be piously washed and purified, and will any man with impure soul, and with no intention to repent, dare to approach the most pure God?[2] Philo is at the most laborious, and obviously at the most unsuccessful pains to point out that the entire sacrificial system of the Pentateuch is a very network of spiritual meanings. "The only true sacrifice is the piety of a God-loving soul."[3] "The grateful soul of the wise is the true altar of God."[4] "God regards as the true sacrifice, not the animal, but the mind and willingness of the worshipper."[5] "God takes no delight, even if hecatombs are offered to him. For though all things are his, he needs nothing. He takes delight in minds that love him, and in holy men, from whom he gladly receives barley cakes and cheapest offerings as if they were most precious, and indeed prefers them. And even if they bring nothing visible at all, yet, bringing themselves in all the fulness of perfected virtue, they offer the fairest sacrifice to God. They honour God their Saviour and Benefactor by gratitude and hymns, the latter through their vocal organs, the former (without tongue and mouth) through the bare soul going forth and pouring out its spiritual invocations that the Divine ear alone can hear."[6]

You can only speak of the *service* of God "with a difference." For God, unlike a human master, has no needs. To that Lord you can only render the service of a mind that loves him.[7] "It is not possible to show true gratitude to God, as 'the many' suppose, by means of offerings and sacrifices; for the whole world would not be a sufficient temple for his

The praise of God.

[1] I. 195. [2] I. 273 *fin.*, 274 *init.*

[3] II. 151, 241, 666, 680; I. 668, 683. [4] II. 255.

[5] *Ibid.* The teaching of the Hebrew prophets and of the Stoics on this subject is identical, and Philo could draw from either. *E.g.* cp. Seneca *De Benef.* I. 6; "Non est beneficium ipsum quod numeratur aut traditur. sicut ne in victimis quidem, licet opimæ sint auroque præfulgeant, deorum est honor, sed pia ac recta voluntate venerantium. Itaque boni etiam farre ac fitilla religiosi sunt, mali rursus non effugiunt impietatem, quamvis aras sanguine multo cruentaverint."

[6] II. 254 (*αὐτοὺς φέροντες πλήρωμα καλοκἀγαθίας τελειότατον*). [7] I. 202.

honour. We must employ praises and hymns, and not even those which the created voice can chant, but those with which the invisible and most pure mind may resound in song. There is an old story, invented by the sages, and handed down by memory from age to age. . . . . They say that, when God had finished the world, he asked one of the angels if aught were wanting on land or in sea, in air or in heaven. The angel answered that all was perfect and complete. One thing only he desired—speech, to praise God's works, or to recount, rather than to praise, the exceeding wonderfulness of all things made, even of the smallest and the least. For the due recital of God's works would be their most adequate praise, seeing that they needed no addition of ornament, but possessed in the sincerity of truth the most perfect laud. And the Father approved the angel's words, and not long afterwards appeared the race gifted with the muses and with song. This is the ancient story; and, in accord with it, I say that it is God's peculiar work to benefit, and the creatures' work to give him thanks. They can offer him no other return; for anything that they might desire to give him in requital for what they have received is the property, not of him who would give, but of the Creator of all. Realising, then, that we can make but one contribution to the honour of God, gratitude in thanksgiving, let us offer this always and everywhere, by speech and by writing, and let us never make an end of his praise, both in poems and in prose. So shall the Creator and his world be honoured with song and without it, and in every form of music and of speech; for God, as some one said, is the noblest of causes, the world the most perfect of all created things."[1]

Heaven and Man.

One more passage on this subject is, perhaps, worthy of quotation. It is a parallel to a famous saying of Kant: "Of the works of creation two things are holy—heaven, which immortal and blessed natures pervade, and the mind of man, which is a fragment of the Divine. . . . Not unreasonably, methinks, have both of them been called praiseworthy; for it is these two, heaven and mind, which are able to show forth (ἐκτραγῳδεῖν) praises and hymns which bless and honour the Father and Creator. Man has received this glorious distinction above all other animals to worship God, and heaven is ever making melody with the perfect harmony and music of the movements of the spheres. If the sound thereof could reach our ears, ungovernable love would overcome us, wild desires and insatiable yearnings. We should refrain from all life's necessaries, and be nourished no longer as mortals by food and drink through our throats, but, like those about to become immortal, through our ears by inspired strains of perfect music."[2]

---

[1] I. 348. [2] I. 625, 626 *init.*

With this high conception of God's worship, there runs in Philo's philosophy an equally high conception of faith. It has been carefully analysed by Schlatter in his long-winded book *Der Glaube im neuen Testament* (Leiden, 1885).[1] He points out well that, to Philo, faith is not the condition or beginning of virtue, but its goal. In its fulness it is one of the characteristics of the perfect man.[2] A believing sinner is to Philo a contradiction in terms. Secondly, faith is not opposed to knowledge: the more you know an object the more you can trust it.[3] And faith involves trust. Thirdly, faith in the Creator implies, as its correlative, unfaith in the creation (γένεσις); faith in God implies unfaith in self, πίστις is the opposite of οἴησις, a conception to which all other things in Philo's ethical and religious philosophy seem to return. A few quotations will explain Philo's doctrine more clearly.

Philo's conception of Faith.

Faith is the queen of the virtues. It is the special quality and merit of the patriarch Abraham, and the famous verse in Genesis, "And he believed in God, and God counted it to him for righteousness," is as great a favourite with Philo as with Paul. That it was counted as righteousness is no marvel to Philo, for it is no easy thing and implies the very virtues which constitute in themselves, to our philosopher, the essence of righteousness. "The only true and firm good is faith in God. Faith is the comfort of life, the fulfilment of good hope, the dearth of evil, the fulness of good, the abandonment of misfortune, the knowledge of piety, the portion of happiness, the improvement of the soul that is stayed upon the Cause of all, who *can* do everything, but *wills* to do the best." All "external and sensible things" are slippery and untrustworthy. "It is most true to say that he who believes in them disbelieves in God, while he who disbelieves in them believes in him."[4] Confidence and faith are closely identified. He asks, "How can anyone believe in God?" The answer is: If he learns that all other things are unstable, and that God alone is stable (ἄτρεπτος).[5] Faith in God implies mistrust in the created and untrustworthy world.[6] For the only absolutely trustworthy (πιστός) Being is God. Next to him would come a friend of God, like Moses, who was found faithful (πιστός) in all God's house.[7] Abraham, who first abandoned a false pride (τύφος) in the power and validity of man's unassisted senses and mind, and "passed over" to "truth," received faith as the prize of virtue. "He who

[1] Pp. 83-105. Schlatter is, of course, anxious to prove that Philo's conception of faith is much lower than Paul's, and he falls into, at least, one serious error.

[2] Schlatter, p. 91.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 92.

[4] II. 39.

[5] I. 82 *fin.*

[6] ἡ πρὸς τὸν θεὸν πίστις, ἡ πρὸς τὸ γεννητὸν ἀπιστία. I. 609.

[7] I. 128 *init.*

truly believes and trusts in God, mistrusts all things that are created and corruptible, beginning with those powers within which are wont to be puffed up, his reason and his sense."[1] As faith is the prize, so too, it may be, as it were, given back to God its giver, as a most fair and blameless offering.[2] It is expressed in gratitude, not for what is passed, but for all that lies hidden in the future. Faith is shown in trust.[3] The fullest faith, the most entire confidence. πίστις creates παρρησία.[4] But the confidence is tempered with respect (εὐλαβεία).[5] Faith brings men near to God; they cleave to him through piety and faith.[6] Faith, then, is the "most perfect virtue." Nor was it unwisely added that Abraham's faith was reckoned to him as righteousness, for true faith is no easy thing. "It is not easy to believe in God alone without the addition of aught beside, because of our affinity to those mortal things to which we are bound fast. They persuade us to trust in money and reputation and power and friends, and in health and strength of body, and in many other things; to cleanse our minds of these; to distrust the created world, which is wholly untrustworthy; to trust in God alone, who is solely and truly to be trusted—this is the work of a great and heavenly intelligence, which is no longer ensnared and enticed by any mortal thing."[7] But this faith, which leads men to love God and obey him and cleave to him abidingly, is not, as I said before, opposed to knowledge. On the contrary, it involves, as Schlatter points out, a distinctly intellectual element. The better you know God—and this is the object of all philosophy—the better you can believe in him. When Moses asked God to reveal to him the fulness of his nature, the granting of his request was impossible. But the request itself, so far from implying any want of faith in the asker, was prompted by a desire to establish it beyond the possibility of doubt.[8] The difficulty which we see here was not perceived by Philo. *Because* we do not fully understand God, *therefore* we believe in him. But, according to Philo, we only so far believe in him as we understand him. That which we realise, we trust. Abraham who, first of men, possessed a stable and secure conception (ὑπόληψις) of God was also the first man who believed in him.[9]

If the service of God brings with it a perfect faith, it also includes a perfect freedom. The famous phrase of the great Collect, "In whose service is perfect freedom," would be spoken from the heart of Philo. And it is curious to find in him a fusion of the Stoic conception of freedom as the prerogative of the wise man with the religious idea

The service of God is perfect freedom.

---

[1] II. 412. [2] I. 154. [3] I. 442; cp. 409.
[4] I. 475, 339; Schlatter, p. 77. [5] I. 477.
[6] I. 456. [7] I. 485. [8] I. 228. [9] II. 442.

of freedom as rooted in complete dependence upon God.[1] It is also interesting to see how he works in the conception with his orthodox Judaism, according to which virtue so largely consists in the fulfilment of a series of commands.

The canon is laid down quite briefly in the following question and answer: "What is the surest freedom? The service of the only and wise God."[2] Such a service brings with it a peculiar joy and confidence.[3] "Nothing so completely liberates the mind as to become a servant and suppliant of God." "For God is at once gracious, even without supplication, to those who humble and abase themselves, and are not puffed up by pride and self-conceit (οἴησις). This is deliverance; this entire freedom of the soul."[4] True freedom is the opposite of οἴησις, to which by a side-wind we once more return.

The perfect man needs no command from without to do the good. But as the laws of the Pentateuch are the expression of absolute wisdom, the perfect man fulfils them by the inner law of his own being. In this way the antinomy is solved. "The perfect man is impelled by himself to virtuous deeds; the man under training (ἀσκητής) is impelled to them by reason, which suggests to him what he ought to do."[5] Alluding to the verse in Genesis, where it says that Abraham kept "God's commandments, statutes, and laws," Philo observes that he was not taught to do so by books, but moved thereto by the unwritten law of his own nature. And he ends his treatise on the life of Abraham thus: "Such was the life of the founder and captain of the nation—a life, as some will say, according to law, but, as my argument has proved, itself a law and unwritten ordinance."[6]

Again, the service of God is sought for itself, and its rewards are spiritual. It will be remembered that the reward of friendship is reserved for those who worship God for his own sake.[7] "The good man seeks the day for the day's sake, light for light's sake, and the good for the sake of the good and for no other thing. For this is the Divine Law, to honour virtue for itself."[8] The name of Issachar is a symbol of the reward which is given for noble deeds; but perhaps, Philo adds, "The deed itself is its own complete reward."[9] The three

The service of God is its own reward.

---

[1] Seneca also says: "In regno nati sumus: deo parere libertas est." *De Vita Beata* XV. *fin.*

[2] I. 419. [3] I. 474. [4] I. 534 *fin.*

[5] I. 115 *fin.*; cp. I. 62: "The perfect man has no need of command, prohibition, or exhortation." [6] II. 40.

[7] II. 20. [8] I. 120.

[9] I. 663. Cp. Epictetus *Diss.* III. 24-51. ἔπαθλον οὖν οὐδέν; σὺ δὲ ζητεῖς ἔπαθλον ἀνδρὶ ἀγαθῷ μεῖζον τοῦ καλὰ πράττειν; cp. Seneca, *De Benef.* iv. 12.

great spiritual "prizes" are faith, pure joy, and the vision of God.[1] In one of his essays upon the Ten Commandments he pauses at the end of his exposition of the fifth "word" to say: "The punishments which attend the transgression of the first five commandments have been clearly stated. But the rewards which attend their observance, though the law has not mentioned them in definite enactment, have been indicated metaphorically. Not to think there are 'other Gods,' not to make idols, not to swear falsely, need no external reward. The mere practice of these commands is itself a complete and most perfect guerdon. For what could delight a lover of truth more than to cleave to the one God and to be devoted to his service purely and without guile? . . . . . For wisdom is the prize of wisdom, and justice and all the other virtues are their own rewards. And truth, the leader and the fairest of the virtues (ὁσιότητες), is still more its own object and its own reward, for it gives bliss to those who have it, and to their children and descendants after them a well-being that cannot be taken away. . . . . Similarly let him who honours his parents not seek any further reward. For if he reflect he will find in the honouring the reward." But suddenly, as it were, remembering the letter of the Decalogue in this particular command, Philo makes this curious qualification to his own doctrine. "Nevertheless, since the fifth commandment is less great than the first four, for they are concerned with what is Divine, but this commandment with what is mortal," God has added to it a prize. The more glorious the subject-matter of a command, the less need for external reward.[2]

With two or three more characteristics of Philo's conception of the highest life, this Florilegium, already over long and I fear tediously diffuse, may be brought to a close.

Hope.

It is at once Hebraic and Hellenic that the good life should be hopeful. To Philo hope is the seed of which faith is the fruit. It, therefore, occupies a lower stage. Hope is the most characteristic quality of the human soul. Man is the only creature who is εὐελπις. The definition of our composite nature is a mortal and rational animal, but Moses' definition of man is "that disposition (διάθεσις) of a living soul which hopes in the true God. For the true birth of man was from the moment when this hope began. For he who has no hope in God, has no share in rational nature."[3] "Hope has been set by nature as a doorkeeper at the gates of the queenly virtues within; no man may approach them who has not done homage to hope."[4] In another long panegyric on hope it is called "the fountain of all lives" (ἡ πηγὴ τῶν βίων), the stimulus to merchant

[1] II. 412.
[2] *De Parentibus Colendis*, chap. xi.
[3] I. 218.
[4] II. 3.

and sailor and statesman and athlete alike ; and, as its highest praise, it is said to induce the lovers of virtue to study philosophy, "rightly deeming that they will thereby perceive the true nature of all that is, and will accomplish whatever may tend to the consummate union of both the 'practical' and the 'contemplative' life, whereto if a man attains he is straightway blessed." [1] Holy and praiseworthy is the man of good hopes : ἅγιος δὲ καὶ ἐπαίνετος ὁ εὔελπις.[2]

A second characteristic of the perfect nature on which Philo lays great and frequent stress, is typified and symbolised in Isaac. It is joy.

Joy.

Laughter is the meaning of Isaac's name, and joy is his peculiar grace. Isaac represents that highest virtue, which is given by nature without a struggle, and its "prize" is joy. His name is the emblem of his mind. For "laughter" is the bodily emblem of the invisible joy of the mind. Laughter is the ideal (ἐνδιάθετος) son of God. Joy is the best and fairest of the happy states by which the soul is wholly filled with cheerfulness, and rejoices in God the Father and Creator of all.[3] Joy differs *toto cœlo* from pleasure.[4] "True and genuine joy (χαρά) is only found in the virtues of the soul. The wise man rejoices only in himself, not in his environment. But what is 'in himself' are the virtues of the mind, of which it is proper to be proud ; his environment is his bodily health or his riches, to boast of which is not permissible."[5] Joy, he elsewhere says, "has this peculiar quality. Other good things have their own activity, but joy is a good both common to others and peculiar to itself, for joy is superadded to all other good things."[6]

Philo makes a most characteristic use of a verse in Genesis where, at the promise of Isaac's birth, Abraham is said "to fall upon his face and laugh." "He fell not from God, but from himself. He stood near to the changeless God : he fell from his self-conceit."[7] "It was indeed natural that his mind should have been swollen and raised up by such a promise. But Abraham, convicting us who are wont to boast at trifles, 'fell on his face and laughed in his soul.' His face was solemn, but he smiled in his mind, where great and unmixed joy had come to dwell. And every wise man who receives a good greater than he had anticipated

---

[1] II. 410. [2] II. 3. [3] II. 413 ; I. 598, 215.

[4] It would, perhaps, be better to translate ἡδονή by "lust." Cp. Seneca *Ep.* LX. *ad fin.* : Gaudium hoc (*i.e.*, of the wise man) non nascitur nisi ex virtutum conscientia. Non potest gaudere nisi fortis, nisi justus, nisi temperans.

[5] I. 217. Cp. I. 130. A momentary slip. To boast of the virtues of one's mind is surely rank οἴησις. Philo probably followed a Stoic model too closely.

[6] I. 104. One is reminded of Aristotle's description of pleasure as ἐπιγινόμενόν τι τέλος. [7] I. 605.

will, like Abraham, fall down and laugh together. That he falls down is a proof of his humility, in that he despairs of his own mortal nothingness; that he laughs is a confirmation of his piety, in that he regards God as the cause of every good and gracious thing. Let the creature then fall down and be sad of face in accordance with his nature; for of himself he is unstable and insecure. But let him be raised up again by God and laugh. For God alone is his support and his joy." [1]

A third—and for us the last—characteristic of the noble life is peace. For true peace is the prerogative of God and of the worshipper of God. "No man can be at peace who does not truly serve the only Being that is wholly exempt from war and abides for ever in eternal peace." [2] **Peace.**

"Peace is the leader of the divine powers, so that the sight of peace and the sight of God are one and the same, for God alone is true and veritable peace, but all creation is constant war." [3] True peace is, therefore, internal, the archetype of outward peace as between State and State.[4] No man can bestow it, for it is a divine work.[5] Rest in God and so secure it.[6]

It is on these high generalities of the ideal life, that Philo is wont to dwell, and in these he most excels; in ethics neither student nor preacher will gather much from his pages. Some of his few good things in this department are to be found in the *Fragments*, but the genuineness of all of them is not above suspicion.[7] I quote two or three, on Forgiveness. **Forgiveness.**

"If you ask pardon for your sins, do you also forgive those who have trespassed against you. For remission is granted for remission, and reconcilement with your slave secures deliverance from the divine anger." [8] "Pardon is wont to beget repentance." [9] "Behave to your servants as you pray that God may behave to you. For as we hear them, so shall we be heard, and as we regard them so shall we be regarded. Let us then show pity for pity, so that we may receive back like for like." [10]

---

[1] I. 602. [2] I. 368. [3] I. 692. [4] I. 678.

[5] II. 129, 671. Epictetus, too, speaks of the higher peace: *οὐχὶ κεκηρυγμένην ὑπὸ Καίσαρος, ἀλλ' ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ κεκηρυγμένην διὰ τοῦ λόγου. Diss.* III. 13, 12. [6] I. 572.

[7] As Dr. Drummond kindly pointed out to me, the very "Johannine" fragment, II. 649 *fin.*, is doubtful, because where St. John says *κόσμος*, Philo says *γένεσις*. It runs: *ἀμήχανον συνυπάρχειν τὴν πρὸς κόσμον ἀγάπην τῇ πρὸς τὸν θεὸν ἀγάπῃ, ὡς ἀμήχανον συνυπάρχειν ἀλλήλοις φῶς καὶ σκότος.* But, on the other hand, compare Rendel Harris's *Fragments*, p. 7. [8] II. 670.

[9] II. 672, *συγγνώμη μετάνοιαν πέφυκε γεννᾶν.* [10] II. 672 *init.*

A careful and thorough student of Philo could probably put together a long list of striking sayings—happy oases in wastes of rhetoric. I will only, however, mention two or three of them in haphazard order It would be interesting to find out how many are original.

Happy phrases.

He speaks of the mind as "the soul of the soul"; of love as "the guide of wisdom"; of folly as "an immortal evil, which is always dying, but is never dead."[1] "Into the mouth there enter food and drink, the perishable food of a perishable body; out of it issue words, immortal laws of an immortal soul, by which rational life is guided."[2] He bids us lead the mind as up a "flight of stairs" to the Cause of all,[3] and reminds us that we may be aided by a threefold light "the memory of the past, the active sense of the present, and the hope of the future."[4] "It is not the possessions of the wicked, but all that he lacks, which are the glory and abundance of the good."[5] "This is the definition of greatness, to be near to God, or near to that to which God is near."[6]

It is not the purpose of this Florilegium to say anything of Philo from a distinctively Jewish point of view, or to quote any passages from his works dealing specifically with the Jewish religion and race. On this subject he has his views and his value; but his real importance lies elsewhere. Some noteworthy conceptions and facts may, however, be gained from him even here. For example: the notion of the Jewish race as the priesthood for humanity (II. 15, 104); the wide diffusion of their laws (II. 127, 141); the worship in the Temple and in the synagogues (II. 223, 168); the observance of the Sabbath (II. 282, 630). One of the most interesting passages is that in which he speaks of the relation of the Jews to the countries in which they dwell. It is highly coloured for the occasion, but even in Philo's age it was probably not without many grains of truth. "One country cannot contain all the Jews because of their large number; for which reason they are spread over most parts of Asia and Europe, both on the mainland and on islands. They regard Jerusalem, in which lies the Holy Temple of the Most High God, as their mother city; but the various countries in which their fathers, grandfathers and ancestors have dwelt they regard as their fatherlands, for in them they were born and bred."[7]

The highest kinship is a common faith.

Most suggestive and valuable of all is his treatment of proselytism. At the close of my article on the Fourth Gospel (J. Q. R., October, 1894) I quoted his fine saying on the higher kinship which transcends

---

[1] *νοῦν, ψυχῆς τινα ψυχήν*, I. 15; *ἔρωτι σοφίας ποδηγετοῦντι*, I. 16; *κακὸν ἀθάνατόν ἐστιν ἀφοσύνη, τὴν μὲν κατὰ τὸ τεθνάναι τελευτὴν οὐχ ὑπομένουσα, τὴν δὲ κατὰ τὸ ἀποθνήσκειν πάντα ἐνδεχομένη τὸν αἰώνα*, I. 225 *init.*

[2] I. 29, based on Plato, *Timæus*, 75 E, which Philo refers to.

[3] I. 247 *init.* [4] II. 460. [5] I. 548. [6] I. 445 *init.* [7] II. 524.

the kinship of blood. No less fine is the following :—*Ἔστω γὰρ ἡμῖν μία οἰκειότης καὶ φιλίας ἓν σύμβολον, ἡ πρὸς θεὸν ἀρεσκεία καὶ τὸ πάντα λέγειν τε καὶ πράττειν ὑπὲρ εὐσεβείας.*[1] "Let there be one bond of affection and one password of friendship, devotion to God, making piety the motive of every word and deed." [2] And this : *Φίλτρον γὰρ ἀνυσιμώτατον καὶ δεσμὸς ἄλυτος εὐνοίας ἑνωτικῆς, ἡ τοῦ ἑνὸς θεοῦ τιμή.* "For the most potent love charm and the indissoluble bond of good-will that makes for unity, is the worship of the one God." [3]

* * * * * * *

There shall be no moral to wind up my Florilegium. *Καί μοι δοκοῦσιν οἱ μαθόντες λέγειν μεμαθηκέναι καὶ ἡσυχάζειν, τῆς αὐτῆς δυνάμεως περιποιούσης ἑκάτερον.*[4]

C. G. Montefiore.

---

[1] Cp. II. 219, 258, 259, 325, 362, 365, 392, 405, 406, 433, 438 *fin.*, 677. The treatise, *De Nobilitate*, according to Massebieau, should follow immediately on the *De Pœnitentia*. "Dans ce traité, si étonnant de la part d'un Juif, Philon s'élève (avec une énergie qui rappelle le mot de Jean Baptiste à ceux qui se glorifiaient d'avoir Abraham pour père), contre ceux de ses concitoyens qui prétendaient que la naissance des prosélytes les empêchait, quelle que fût d'ailleurs leur virtu d'avoir part aux privilèges du peuple du Dieu."—*Le Classement des Œuvres de Philon*, p. 53.

[2] II. 259.

[3] II. 219 (reading, with Mangey, *ἑνωτικῆς* for MS. *ἐρωτικῆς*).

[4] I. 211.

[I desire to mention my great indebtedness to my friend Mr. P. E. Matheson, Fellow of New College, Oxford, for revising the whole of this essay both in the MS. and in proof.]

CRITICAL NOTICES.

The Ethiopic Version of the Hebrew Book of Jubilees, edited from four Manuscripts, and critically revised through a continuous comparison of the Massoretic and Samaritan texts, and the Greek, Syriac, Vulgate, and Ethiopic Versions of the Pentateuch, and further emended and restored in accordance with the Hebrew, Syriac, Greek, and Latin Fragments of this Book, which are here published in full. By R. H. Charles, M.A. (Oxford, at the University Press).

MR. CHARLES is to be congratulated on the appearance of his beautifully printed text of the Book of Jubilees. Readers of the JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW will be aware that this edition is the outcome of long and profound study ; and of this the serried ranks of critical notes will convince even those readers who know no Aethiopic, while those who are acquainted with that language will gladly testify to the excellence of Mr. Charles's scholarship. To the latter class of readers it will be a satisfaction to see that, in spite of the strange mortality that raged among Aethiopic scholars last year, able writers are still left in this somewhat out-of-the-way field of learning. And all into whose studies the Book of Jubilees is likely to come, will find it of the greatest convenience to have all the materials for the restoration of this *Apocryphon* so carefully collected and so methodically arranged.

Most readers will regret the depreciatory tone which Mr. Charles has adopted towards the work of his predecessor Dillmann. This tone is both impolitic and unjust. Impolitic, because there is no name more highly reverenced among Orientalists than Dillmann's, and most of those who know any Aethiopic owe it to his writings ; and, moreover, the world has not yet had a year to lament his loss. Unjust, because more cannot be expected from a book than it professes to give. When a text of real value is to be published for the first time, the most important matter is that it should be done quickly. Dillmann employed for this purpose the MSS. that were at his disposal, which he used with faithfulness and skill. A later editor is without doubt bound to search for an elaborate critical apparatus, which is what Rönsch and, since him, Mr. Charles have done. Yet the new editor will probably be thought by many to have overrated the improvement which he has been able to effect in the text by the use of material which Dillmann either

neglected or had no access to. He has introduced not a few better readings, and some quite felicitous emendations; but the difference between the two recensions is not thorough-going. This appears even from the fact that the new text is still an *eclectic* one—it follows no one source to the exclusion of any other. It is natural that Mr. Charles should overrate the improvement, for the collation of Aethiopic MSS. is ordinarily so fruitless in results, that new readings of consequence are hailed with very peculiar delight. Moreover, Bishop Earle says somewhere that a scholar who has filled up from conjecture a small *lacuna* in a text, thinks the words he has introduced the most important in the book. Had the difference, however, been far more to Dillmann's disadvantage than it really is, Mr. Charles should still have given a complete record of Dillmann's readings in his notes; the absence of this we regard as the most serious defect in his book; and it is probable that those reviewers who have in consequence of it to collate the two texts will take vengeance.

Some controversy will be aroused by his treatment of the materials which, as has been already said, every one will be glad to see collected in one place. It might be thought to be no part of the editor's duty to correct mistakes committed by the original translators; Mr. Charles, however, thinks otherwise, as appears from the treatment of both the Latin and Aethiopic texts in xv. 26, where we are told in the note that *usque in diem* is a primitive error for *in die*, being caused by the confusion of two Hebrew letters, but find that the editor has inserted *in die* by conjecture in both texts! In vii. 10, "Noah woke from his sleep," of the MSS., is altered to "woke from his wine," on the authority of Gen. ix. 24. Happily this form of revision of the text has not been carried through consistently.

How to deal with the Latin and Aethiopic texts where they differ (their general agreement is extraordinary) is a problem to which different answers may be given. Most scholars would have *corrected* the one from the other only in cases where the difference is obviously due to miswriting. Such a case occurs in ii. 2, where *qalat* (noises) is very rightly written for *qalayat* (abysses), after the Greek (noises). Where the cause of the discrepancy is not obvious it should certainly be noted, but to alter one text to suit the other is surely rash. This charge of rashness Mr. Charles will not in any case escape; but it is strangely varied with timidity. In xvi. 28, he does not venture to correct *semen eius cum ipso* into *post ipsum* with the Aethiopic, although the source of this mistranslation is perfectly clear, but relegates the observation to a note; yet in xix. 3, *non indignans* is substituted in the text for *pusillianimus* of the MS.! The curious reader will find many similar puzzles, and his ingenuity will be taxed to make out the threefold system of brackets with which the Latin text is studded.

Mr. Charles does not differ from his predecessors in thinking that the Hebrew text of Genesis may here and there be corrected from the Jubilees, but the ore (to use the language of miners) seems to the present writer very low grade. In the first place, the Aethiopic MSS. are interpolated from or under the influence of the Aethiopic version or versions of the Bible ; it is one of the merits of Mr. Charles's book that he proves this in the case especially of the MS. called A. In the second place, the old Greek translation of the Jubilees was without doubt influenced by the LXX. When, therefore, the Jubilees' text confirms the LXX., how can it be regarded as an independent witness ? "We shall now," says the editor in section viii. of his preface, "give a list of readings in the Massoretic text, which should be corrected into accord with the readings attested by such great authorities as the Sam., LXX., Jub., Syr., Vulg." The first witness called does not respond ; for in Genesis viii. 19, Mr. Charles's emendation coupling הרמש with רומש(ה), is very probably right, but it is not the reading of the text of the Jubilees which he has published (v. 32, note 29). With regard to the rest, while the trouble he has taken in sorting the textual affinities of the book deserves recognition, it may be doubted whether the Jubilees has in any case the authority of a MS. For only those compilations and versions which are painfully literal have any such authority. Now the author of this book certainly had no particular scruple about altering, when the fancy took him, the text of Genesis which he reproduced or incorporated.

However, the present writer is tired of finding fault with a work which very few scholars, either here or abroad, would have been able to produce, and which is certain to be for a long period the standard work on the subject with which it deals. He will conclude therefore with the hope that unlike most of the Anecdota Oxoniensia, this Anecdoton may prove a source of profit to the Clarendon Press, and that its author may find leisure and opportunity to do yet further services to the literature of Abyssinia.

D. S. Margoliouth.

Via, Veritas, Vita ; Christianity in its most simple and intelligible form. The Hibbert Lectures, 1894, by James Drummond, D.D. (Williams and Norgate.)

The last of the Hibbert Lectures is in some ways the most characteristic of the series. The previous volumes, of an unequal but high average of merit, dealt with the *rationale* of the chief historic religions. Dr. Drummond rationalises Christianity, reduces it as it were to its lowest terms, in a mathematical sense, and attempts to show how, when thus

denuded of dogma, it conforms to the requirements of Natural Religion and Absolute Ethics. It is appropriate to add in this place, that incidentally, although he does not know it, his Christianity, so far as it has the authority of its Founder, approaches very near to Judaism, even to the Judaism of the Pharisee.

I may best illustrate this statement by going through the plan of the book. The first Lecture deals with the *Quellen.* Christianity, it is argued, is not to be confined to the explicit teaching of Jesus, but embraces the total specific effect of his life. By putting his position in this form Dr. Drummond is enabled to make a qualified use of John's Gospel. He ingeniously argues that the writer of that remarkable *Tendenz-Roman* often interprets the spirit of Jesus more fully than the Synoptic Gospels, which he, like all his school, regards as alone historical. This is an ingenious method of getting over the *crux* of New Testament criticism : but carried out to its logical conclusion it would lead to the High Church position. If John, why not Augustine, Aquinas ? Why not Hooker, and Laud, and Pusey ? So far as the documents go, historic Christianity is more the creation of Paul and the unknown writer of John than of the historical Jesus as known from the Synoptics. If so, Jesus was rather the central figure than the central fact in Christianity as developed in history.

The next two Lectures deal with the Bible, the early Christian and the modern view of its authority. Here the attempt is made to make of Jesus the earliest rationalist, and not without some success. One cannot help feeling how Dr. Drummond's position might have been strengthened if he had a fuller knowledge of the contemporary Jewish view of the authority and the inspiration of Scripture. But here again the reflection occurs, how little effect the views of Jesus, if Dr. Drummond gives the right interpretation of them, have had upon the Church.

These chapters, I may add, are rendered valuable by an *éloge* of the Bible regarded as a source of spiritual elevation. Dr. Drummond has also an ingenious suggestion as to the value of parts of the Bible which the development of the moral sense has left far behind us ethically. Joshua and Esther might not be good examples for the grown up man, but they may develop courage and strenuousness in the growing boy. He omits to observe, however, that so far as the Bible has been operative in forming new types of human character, it has worked mainly through the Old Testament. It was the Old Testament, not the New, that gave a moral backbone to the Reformation.

With the fourth lecture Dr. Drummond enters upon his more specific subject. This deals with the important topic of the Kingdom of God. It is to be regretted in this connection that Dr. Drummond had not before him Mr. Schechter's admirable exposition of the Rabbinic ideas on

this subject (JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, VI., 640 *seq.*). Schürer, to whom he has to trust, is by no means satisfactory when dealing with the views of the "Pharisees," owing to his antipathetic attitude. Dr. Drummond would perhaps have learnt that, in his views upon the Kingdom of God, Jesus made no advance on the current conceptions of the rabbis, though here, as usual, he gave them crisp and memorable expression. Dr. Drummond has in this chapter the usual remarks about the formalism and legalism of the Scribes and Pharisees to which the Kingdom of God as preached by Jesus was to be so novel and marked a contrast. Yet he quotes the answer of the Scribe in Mark xii. 28, without seeing its significant bearing upon his statements. If a typical Scribe could express the fundamental principles of the Kingdom in such a way that Jesus could accept it as expressing his own views, where could have been the novelty of those conceptions? Nor has Dr. Drummond considered the bearing of the *Didache* on this incident. Dr. Taylor has suggested, and the high authority of Prof. Harnack has carried out the suggestion, that the *Didache* is merely a Christianised expansion of a Jewish catechism on "The Two Ways" of life and death. Prof. Harnack has gone further, and from the various redactions of the *Didache* has restored the earlier portions, at least, of the Jewish original. Now in the opening passage of this is contained the Scribe's answer in the form in which it is given in Luke x. 27, where the same incident is given as in the passage from Mark. It is clear from the context that some written authority is referred to, since Jesus asks the Scribe: "How readest thou?" If my interpretation of this passage is correct, "The Two Ways" was known to Jesus.[1]

There is another passage made use of in this lecture, in which it would have been well if Dr. Drummond had taken account of recent Jewish research. M. Halévy has, with great ingenuity and plausibility, argued in the *Revue des Etudes Juives*, iv. 289, that the good Samaritan was not a Samaritan at all. In New Testament times, and down to the present day, the Jews have been divided into three hereditary classes, Priests, Levites, and Israelites. The division is referred to in the later Psalms, *e.g.*, cxxxv. 19, 20. It is retained to the present day in a few religious distinctions between the descendants of Aaron, of Levi, and of Israel. Thus Jews are "called up" to the Law in an order of precedence settled by their assumed descent. Derenbourg has suggested that the great Sanhedrim of seventy-one members was composed of three smaller ones, each of twenty-three, taken from these three sections, with the addition of a president and vice-president to make up the larger number. Now the only time that Jesus refers to a Levite is in the

[1] The Beatitudes also would be from this point of view merely an extension of the doctrine of "The Two Ways."

so-called parable of the Good Samaritan, where it could have no meaning apart from the traditional three classes. Jesus begins with the Cohen or Priest, goes on to the Levite, and we cannot help seeing, with M. Halévy, that he finished with the typical specimen of the third class, the Israelite.[1] M. Halévy adds that the frequent journeys of a "Samaritan" between Jerusalem and Jericho would be impossible. The point is an important one in two ways: if established, it would do away with any claim of Jesus to any greater Universalism than the Jews of the time, and, besides, would confirm the impression that his antagonism was directed against the sacerdotal class, who finally caused his death, rather than against the Pharisees, with whom he had so much in common, that it is almost impossible to distinguish them.

Similarly in the next lecture Dr. Drummond is only enabled to talk of the Christian doctrine of God by ignoring the Jewish. It is true that he gives (pp. 173-5) all the passages in the Old Testament in which God is expressly spoken of as the Father, but he contends that the relation is "used in reference to the nation or its representative rather than its individual members." Whatever may have been the case in Old Testament times, the early Jewish ritual shows that by the time of Jesus, the relation had become closely individual. Similarly with the doctrine of God's love and human responsibility ample parallels might be given from Rabbinic sources for the ethical "Christian" position with regard to them. On the other hand, it is fair to say that the concentration and the apt expression of these views by Jesus are unique in the history of Israel, or indeed of the world. Again, in the next two lectures dealing with ethics Dr. Drummond also proceeds by the method of contrast. He contrasts the externality of legalism with the inwardness of true morality, but passages could be quoted showing that the rabbis were almost equally alive to the dangers to which their system was liable, and like them it was against the excesses to which legalism might lead rather than against the legalism itself that Jesus protested. So far as Christianity is against legalism it is the child of Paul, not of Jesus. But the truth is, that so necessary is some form of legalism for human society, that the moment the Church became differentiated from the Synagogue it was forced to reinstate a legalism of its own. Here, as elsewhere, the doctrines of Jesus were merely supplementary to those of Judaism. It has been by a true instinct the Church has always bound up together the New Testament as a sort of appendix to the Old. Both the race and the individual have first to be strengthened by the law of righteousness before either can attain to freedom.

[1] When the antagonism of Church and Synagogue arose, it was easy to substitute Samaritan, who was a typical Israelite in another sense. The early Church always favoured the Samaritans, somewhat as the Czars favour the Karaites.

If this be so, it follows that Dr. Drummond's title is unjustified. It is indeed derived from one of those utterances which "John" puts in the mouth of Jesus, and has thereby given him that air of arrogance which repels the Jewish reader. Dr. Drummond notices the charge, and has an ingenious defence against it. If a man is thinking, not of himself, but of the truths he teaches, he may use, without offence, the grandiose sayings which John put in the mouth of Jesus. If that were so, he should make it clear that he is speaking of the truths, not of himself, and the text would run, *Doctrina mea, via veritas vita.* Still less was the more egotistical form justified if, as Jews contend, whatever truth Jesus had to teach was supplementary and derivative, not comprehensive and original. God is righteousness—the teaching of the Old Testament—is a more fundamental truth than God is Love. True freedom must be based upon Law and order. The Christian life is not a complete life; whenever the attempt has been made to realise it the result has been fantastic. Even with regard to corporal acts of charity it cannot be said that the results of practical Christianity have been altogether satisfactory. Many persons are seriously of opinion that "Philanthropy" has done, and is doing more harm than good. The battle of life is a battle, say what we will; retreat seems the only Christian method of warfare. After the fight is over there is work enough for love; during the fight all that we can ask for is strict justice. The antagonism of the Old Testament and the New, so far as it exists, can only be overcome in a similar way to that between individualism and socialism. Individualism has to develop the energy and resourcefulness of human character; Socialism has to mitigate the resulting inequalities.

Curiously enough, in their practical effects the functions of Judaism and Christianity are in an opposite direction to that indicated just now. The Christian scheme is individualistic in tendency, the Jewish was largely socialistic. The primary care of the Christian is his own soul, that of the Jew, his own nation. Here indeed is the most striking influence of Jesus. His own strong individuality, which takes such an arrogant form in the *logia* of John, has impressed itself upon his followers and given almost an anti-social bias to their lives. It was by this means that he brought a sword into the world and not peace. It was by his own want of interest in his nation that he brought about his death, and it was from the unpatriotic attitude of his early followers that the original schism between church and synagogue was caused.

In his final lecture, Dr. Drummond deals with the central problem of Christianity in a very suggestive, but not a very convincing manner. His problem is to find the motive force of Christianity, and he traces it in the first place to the generalising power of Jesus as a moral teacher, and in the second place to the mystic attraction of his personality, as exemplifying the divine sonship. According to him, Jesus was a kind

of Newton in moral philosophy, and by simplifying the law of life, made it more attractive and efficacious. He has here a passage which sums up his claims for Christianity, and may therefore be somewhat closely scrutinised.

"But that the faith contained something startlingly novel and revolutionary is evinced by the almost universal hatred with which it was regarded. And, indeed, it drove its ploughshare through the Jewish vineyard, and laid its axe to the old tree of heathen superstition. To step forth from the ancient enclosure, and feel that Jew and Gentile alike were members of the great family of God; to renounce the sanguinary and exclusive worship of the temple in Jerusalem, and offer up spiritual sacrifices to the Father of all in the temple of the universe; to lay aside the venerable Law, which had been the hedge of monotheism and morality against the assaults of idolatry and sin, and to substitute for it a spirit within the heart, which might seem to the outsider an excuse for every kind of subjective caprice, though to the believer it expressed the immutable mind of God—this was indeed a momentous change, and the idea of Divine sonship which brought it about was quick and powerful, alike from its newness and its grandeur."

The curious criterion, that the novelty of a creed is proven by the hatred which it arouses, is scarcely borne out by experience, which rather shows that the most internecine quarrels in religious matters, are between those who differ the least. But let us examine these novelties *seriatim*. Malachi had surely anticipated Jesus on the universal fatherhood of God in the passage quoted by Dr. Drummond, p. 175, and the divine sonship (of all men) is but a corollary. The fall of Jerusalem caused the Rabbis to adopt the fine principle that prayer is the substitute for sacrifice, without any prompting from Jesus and his followers, who seem to have acquiesced in the Temple sacrifices while they lasted. It was Paul, not Jesus, who "laid aside the venerable law" after a struggle which showed that Jesus' immediate followers were just as much attached to it as the most rigid Pharisee. Again, therefore, we are led to the conclusion, that so far as Christianity differs from Judaism it cannot claim the authority of Jesus.

It is only in his last pages that Prof. Drummond comes to the real problem. The ideal personality of a mystic Christ is the real differentia of Christianity from other religions. A real personality, like the Jesus of the Synoptic Gospels, could not be made into an ideal for all humanity. He himself was conditioned by the historic circumstances of his time, and those who would follow him would be limited to his authentic acts and utterances. But into the ideal figure of the Christ as created by Paul and John, each generation of men could read their own ideals, and have done so. The historic problem of Christianity is to trace how this purely ideal figure of Christ became attached to the name and life of

the Jewish peasant of Galilee. Dr. Drummond has some interesting passages on the influence of Philo in preparing the matrix for the new ideal, and there is no one better qualified than he to deal with this subject. One would have liked to have seen him also treat of its relation with the analogous conception of the Jewish Messiah, which he has also made the subject of special study. It is clear that the next stage of theological investigation must be both to separate and to deal separately with the historic Jesus of the Synoptic Gospels, and the ideal Christ or Christs of Paul and John. Dr. Drummond has every qualification for dealing with the latter subject.

JOSEPH JACOBS.

Zur Entstehungsgeschichte des Christenthums. Von MAX FRIEDLANDER. Wien : 1894.

THE following is an analysis of the contents of this important work :—

Chapter I.—"Die Göttliche Mittelkraft." The Jewish idea of God was purified by contact in the schools of Alexandria with Greek philosophy, especially with Platonism. Anthropomorphic ideas were discarded, and the Logos introduced as intermediary between God, who is the author of good alone, and matter, which is transitory and evil. In the earlier period of Alexandrine Judaism, the Schechina, or δόξα θεοῦ, was regarded as such a divine intermediary power ; and the Wisdom of God was similarly conceived.

Justin Martyr depends for his explanation of the distinction between the Father and the Son on this Alexandrine philosophy when he says that God before creation produced out of himself a self-conscious power (δύναμίν τινα λογικήν) called the Holy Spirit, the glory of the Lord, δόξα κυρίου, and identical with the Son, with Wisdom, with an angel, with God, with Lord, and with the Word. This power issued from God without loss to him, just as the word issues from the human mind without loss to it or diminution of it.

The Book of Sirach, though a Palestinian work and originally written in Hebrew, is coloured by Alexandrine thought in its representation of Wisdom as a power mediating God with man and with the world. The Book of the Pseudo-Solomon, which is earlier than Philo, is still more definite ; and Origen identified with the only-born Son and with the Logos the Wisdom which, according to that book, is ἀτμις τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ δυνάμεως καὶ ἀπορροία τῆς τοῦ παντοκράτορος δόξης εἰλικρινής. This

breath, said Origen, is something real and objective ; is Christ ; is "the Power and Wisdom of God," to use Paul's phrase.

This hypostatising of Wisdom as a real person numerically distinct from God is first found in Justin Martyr. The identification of her with the Word, however, begins in Pseudo-Solomon, and is completed in Philo. The same conception of a power mediating man and the world with God appears in the fragments of Aristobulus and in the letter of Aristeas. In Philo, however, the conception of Sophia gradually recedes, and its place is taken by the masculine Logos. He is Lord of the Divine Powers, through him God made and maintains the world ; he is the Shadow of God, throned at his right hand and interpreting his behests. This Logos includes in itself the goodness of God, by which the world was made, and the might of God, by which it is ruled.

But the Logos also mediates between God and man. He atones and pleads for man with God, is our High Priest. Like Wisdom (according to Pseudo-Solomon), so the word was aforetime with Abraham, Jacob, and Moses ; appeared to the latter in the burning bush, and was the pillar of cloud in the wilderness. He is sent by the Father to mankind, and rejoices in his mission.

As to the independent personality of the Word, Philo is not quite consistent. His statements often imply a person distinct from the Father, yet he was unconscious that such statements prejudiced his monotheism. It is a narrow thread, indeed, by which his Logos hangs from God ; but the separation thereof as a "second God" was only completed in Christianity.[1] Thus Justin asserts the Son to be one Essence with the Father ; but he is a distinct person, and numerically separate.

The references in the Synoptic Gospels to the "Divine Power" are due to Alexandrine influence ; which is still more apparent in Paul, who saw in Christ a pre-existent power and wisdom of God. The same influence is yet more definite and clear in John's Gospel and in the works of early Fathers, such as Clement of Alexandria, Theophilus of Antioch, Athanasius, etc.

Gnostic Christianity is equally to be referred to Alexandrine Judaism, and was in some forms as old as the Apostles, *e.g.*, as presented in the episode of Simon Magus. Just as some held Simon to be the Power of God, so others held Melchizedek to have been, Jesus being merely the successor of the latter.

Friedländer sums up thus :—Speculation in Jerusalem was in Jesus' day closely bound up with speculation in Alexandria. Jerusalem supplied the Revealed Law, Alexandria an allegorical account of it in accordance with methods of Greek philosophy, which reacted on Judæa itself.

---

[1] We must observe, however, that Philo calls the Λόγος a δεύτερος θεός.

Jerusalem taught the Messiah doctrine, Alexandria that of the Divine Dynamis or Power. In Judæa the idea of a bodily resurrection was uppermost, in Alexandria that of a spiritual resurrection only.

Chapter II.—"Pharisäer und Am-haarez." There was a revolt on the part of the Am-haarez, or country party of Palestine, against the Pharisees, who insisted on innumerable ceremonies and rites as essential to holiness, which the humbler classes could not perform. The latter also, being in constant and liberalising contact with Greeks and Gentiles, learned to despise the righteousness of the Pharisees, especially of that hypocritical class of them against whom the denunciations of the Gospels are levelled. The antagonism was increased by the contempt of the Pharisees for the poor as unclean, a contempt which finds expression even in Hillel, who declared that "an Am-haarez cannot be holy." The *Assumptio Mosis* is a work written soon after, if not before, the destruction of the Temple by Titus, and is a cry raised in behalf of the country people against the domination of the Pharisees, who are described in it as "homines dolosi, sibi placentes, ficti in omnibus suis," "whose leaven is hypocrisy." In the Gospels we see Jesus as the champion of the religiously-despised and oppressed country people, combating the formalism of the Pharisees, who "shut up the Kingdom of Heaven against men." Josephus himself testifies that the Pharisees imposed on the people many prescriptions not to be found in the Mosaic Law; that they were ever intriguing in order to have the control of affairs in their own hands, and to keep the people in a religious and spiritual nonage. The Talmud itself (*Sota*, 22*b*) acquaints us with the hypocrisy and ambitious intrigues of a certain class of Pharisees, and elsewhere terms them "queruli et falaces, celantes se ne possint cognosci, impii in scelere, pleni et iniquitate . . . et manus eorum et mentes immunda tractabunt et os eorum loquetur ingentia et superdicent: noli (tu me) tangere, ne inquines me." In the reign of Agrippa I. the influence of the worldly and ambitious class of Pharisees culminated. Reading between the lines of Josephus, one can see that Agrippa was a whited sepulchre of the worst description, and that the better and more spiritually-minded Pharisees of the time also felt him to be such.

To the time immediately succeeding the death of Agrippa I. (44 A.D.), belong the denunciations of the Pharisees in Matthew's Gospel; and they form the earliest stratum of the Gospel teaching, since in them Jesus is not yet represented as having broken with the Pharisaic observances (Matt. xxiii. 2, 3, and 23). In the last passage Jesus insists on the duty of observing the weightier matters of the law, judgment, mercy, and faith, without, however, neglecting to pay tithe of mint and anise and cummin. In strong contrast with the conservatism of these passages stand others (Matt. xv., foll., and ix. 14-18), which reveal a complete breach with the teaching and observances of the

Pharisees. Once thus begun, the progress of religious reform could not be arrested, and before long the Sabbath itself was assailed (Matt. xii. 8 ; Mark ii. 27 ; Luke vi. 5). In their conservatism the vigorous denunciations of the *Assumptio Mosis* (chap. vii.) seem to belong to the same age as those of Matt. chap. xxiii., and to proceed from the same stratum of opinion, viz., from literary members of the Am-haarez, who recoiled from the vice, hypocrisy and intrigues of certain Pharisees, but had not yet repudiated the body of Pharisaic doctrines and observances.

Chap. III. Der Therapeutismus. The treatise *De Vita Contemplativa* was not written by Philo, yet in his age, and by an immediate successor and imitator. The religious community described in that treatise consisted of heretical Alexandrine Jews who had carried the allegorisation of the Scripture so far as to discard and reject altogether the literal fulfilment of its precepts. They thus went beyond the standpoint of Philo and of the Allegorist school of which he is the chief surviving representative. For Philo always insisted on the literal fulfilment of the Mosaic precepts, though they all had for him a secondary or moral meaning. But the Therapeutæ seem to have broken altogether with the Temple services and sacrifices of Jerusalem. Friedländer supposes that those passages in which Philo complains of the Allegorists, who went so far as to disregard the Sabbath, neglect circumcision and in other ways repudiate the letter of the law, are really aimed at the Therapeutæ. Another reason why Philo cannot have himself written the treatise is that in his undisputed works he blames those who, in youth, forsake the practical life and retire into the cloister. At the same time Friedländer realises how thoroughly the treatise in question belongs to Philo's age, how interpenetrated it is with the ascetic and allegorist influences which everywhere assert themselves in Philo's writings ; so that it is, as it were, " bone of his bone, and flesh of his flesh." He therefore supposes that it was written immediately after Philo's death, and intercalated among his works after the treatise *That every good man is free.* For in this treatise Philo had eulogised the Essenes, but had here, as in all his other works, passed over the Therapeutæ in a studied silence. In their renunciation of property, says Friedländer, the Therapeutæ resembled the early Christians, and therefore Eusebius was right in finding a resemblance between them and the " Apostolic men " of his own age, and also of the first Christian epoch.

Friedländer then sketches out the asceticism of the Therapeutæ, and shows from Philo's works that it was a most characteristic product of Alexandrine Judaism. Their ideal was mortification of the flesh and consequent purification of the soul, in order that it may *see* God. Friedländer also shows that the ideal of female virginity, inculcated and practised by the Therapeutæ, quite accords with the general tone of Philo's works on the subject. He also proves that the statement that the Therapeutæ were found in many parts of the inhabited world, but

had their headquarters in Alexandria, is fully borne out by what we know of the diffusion of the Jews during the first century.

In such a religious community the narrowing and exclusive ceremonial of Judaism would have been relegated to the background, as something which hindered the approach of Gentile converts to the truth. "Of national Judaism, hardly a trace is left among the Therapeutæ. They honour the Sabbath and other Jewish feasts ; but these are only Jewish in name. The meaning ascribed to them is alien, philosophical, as repellent to an orthodox Jew as it was attractive to a Gentile in search of a purer cult than that of Paganism." In this respect the Therapeutæ went beyond the Essenes, who, while repudiating the Temple sacrifices, yet sent their offerings thereto, and observed the outward forms of the Jewish religion. Hence Philo extols the Essenes to heaven, but censures the Therapeutæ, when he cannot ignore them.

Chapter IV.—Der Essenismus. The Essenes were not Chassidim, were not a stricter sect of Pharisees, the residue of the anti-Greek Hasmonæan movement, condemning themselves to isolation in order to maintain their ceremonial purity of life and diet. On the contrary, they were the pioneers and outposts upon Jewish soil of the ascetic and allegorising, yet in temper, more liberal and gentilising Judaism of Alexandria. They lived apart because they spoke Greek from the first. Their rejection of bloody sacrifices and of marriage, their allegorising of Scripture, attested by Philo, were Alexandrine traits, inexplicable if we regard them, with Lucius and Hilgenfeld, as the extreme right of the Pharisee sect. Just because they only spoke Greek the Talmud ignores them. For the Maccabæan movement was directed against Greek cults, and not against the use of the Greek tongue in Judæa. The use of this tongue was widely diffused among the Am-haarez or *basso-popolo* of Judæa, whose cause, as that of "the lost sheep of the House of Israel," Jesus championed against the ceremonial righteousness of the Pharisees. Of this popular party the Essenes had long been the leaders when Jesus came on the scene.

Friedländer quotes Josephus and the Talmud in proof that in many parts of Palestine Greek was the only language of the Jews. He points out that in Jerusalem itself 500 of Gamaliel's disciples talked Greek, and that the passage in Acts xxii. 2, where we read that Paul quieted the mob by addressing them in Hebrew, proves that the mob habitually spoke not Hebrew, but Greek. Otherwise Hebrew from a man accused of violating the law and of bringing Greeks into the Temple would not have arrested their attention.[1] That the entire early literature of Christianity

[1] F.'s argument is untenable ; for in chap. xxi. 37 the chief captain having arrested Paul and so saved him from the violence of the mob says to Paul, "Canst thou speak Greek?" implying that all around him were,

is Greek, is an additional proof of its common, daily and widespread use in Palestine.

Essenism then was the outcome of a missionary activity in Judæa by the Greek Jews of Alexandria. Its adherents kept their doctrines secret, because they were an outpost of Jewish Hellenism on foreign and hostile soil. In Alexandria they would have openly proclaimed the same tenets in the market-place. They were a propagandist sect in spite of their seclusion, and their constant travels mentioned by Josephus had a missionary aim. In the career of John the Baptist, who was one of them, their activity first comes to light for us; and he comes before us as the spokesman and champion of the Am-haarez against the spurious piety of the Pharisees. Had the Essenes not been Greek or Alexandrine in their language and influence, Josephus would not have troubled himself to assure us (*Bell. Jud.*, II. viii. 2) that they were Jews by race (Ἰουδαῖοι μὲν γένος ὄντες).

Friedländer points to many characteristics of the Essenes as essentially Alexandrine in origin, *e.g.*, their repudiation of animal sacrifices; their teaching of the immortality of the soul and of the sinfulness of the body, the prison of the soul; their faith that God is author of good alone, and not also of evil; their doctrine of creation and agencies mediating God with nature; their use of allegory; the axe (ἀξινάριον) worn by their novices. The latter custom Friedländer most happily and ingeniously parallels and explains from Philo, *Leg. Alleg.*, p. 117, in a way which makes it practically certain that Philo was acquainted with the inner symbolic teaching and discipline of the Essenes, and is here alluding to it—a point which it is of some importance to ascertain.

From the differing statements of Philo—in one place that the Essenes were in number 4,000, in another that they were μύριοι—Friedländer rightly infers that though there were only 4,000 who were of the highest grade (τελεῖοι), there were innumerable adherents of the sect up and down Palestine; and these adherents were the seed-ground of nascent Christianity, as Eusebius believed. The points of resemblance between the Essenes and the new-born religion cannot be otherwise explained. The common objection that the Essenes were recluses of the desert, whereas Christianity burrowed in populous centres has no weight; for Josephus testifies that Essenes often filled positions of authority, and Philo avers that they taught in their community οἰκονομίαν and πολιτείαν. Josephus also attests that they lived in many cities, and were constantly travelling. Their only possible motive in travelling was to preach and propagate their ideas.

---

and had been, uttering their cry of "Away with him," in Hebrew or Aramaic. Similarly the *Acts of Pilate* prove that the multitude of Jerusalem when they welcomed Jesus cried, Hosanna, etc., in Hebrew and not in Greek.

John the Baptist was such an Essene missionary, and was, as we can infer from the grudging tone assumed towards him in the fourth Gospel, the real founder of the Christian religion. He was regarded (Luke iii. 15) by his disciples as the true Messiah, and his baptism lingered on for many years in rivalry with that of Jesus. Josephus himself (*Antiq.* XVIII. v. 2) bears witness to the great and important part played by John the Baptist as a teacher "of virtue, of justice towards men, of holiness towards God," the three cardinal virtues—according to Philo—of Essenism. The circumstance that Jesus fled when he heard the news of John's beheadal proves the truth of Josephus' statement, that Herod was actuated by fear of John's influence with the masses.

The Essenes were imbued with Messianic faith, and this brought them—men of peace though they were, and imbued with a belief in the duty of passive obedience, and persuaded that all authority is a gift from heaven—into conflict with the Roman government. For this belief according to Josephus, was the underlying reason of the great war which ended with the sack of Jerusalem by Titus. This catastrophe was a deathblow to their sect.

The Essenes are the "Chizonim," or heretical outsiders of the Talmud, who, for their repudiation of animal sacrifices, were excluded from the temple. Their use of the Greek tongue, their ascetic eschewal of marriage, and lastly their allegorising teaching, rendered them doubly heretical in the eyes of the Pharisees, to whom they cannot therefore be assimilated.

Chapter V.—Alexandria and Jerusalem. Alexandrine Judaism was a mixture of Mosaism and Greek philosophy. Philosophic ideas were discovered as *ὑπονοίαι*, underlying the letter of the Old Testament, and then the Greek philosophers, Plato and others, were said to have derived their wisdom from Moses. Such philosophic Judaism soon broke away from the Pharisaic legalism of Judæa, and established its own temple of Onias in Egypt, with a priesthood of its own. Its relation to Palestinian orthodoxy was exactly similar to that of Paul's Gentile gospel to the gospel of the circumcision. It spread from Alexandria to Judæa, and established its schools and synagogues in Jerusalem itself. Of the the revolt of this more liberal and spiritualised Mosaism against the literalism and the ceremonialism of the Pharisees, who excommunicated it as heresy, Christianity was the firstfruits. It was the rallying-point in Palestine of the poor and humble, who, slave-like, talked and read Greek, and could not endure the heavy burdens which the Pharisees strove to bind upon them. Christianity was a "vulgar Hellenism," and attests its origin in its use and retention from the first of the Septuagint. It arose out of the Jewish Diaspora, as the writings of Philo prove ; for in them we find foreshadowed in broad but clear outlines the Christianity which was to be, whether friendly or inimical to the Mosaic Law.

Philo was himself conservative, and advocated the literal observance of the precepts, which he yet really valued only for the moral meanings which he read into them. But his writings attest that many of his countrymen threw the letter to the winds, and sat loose to the observance of the most vital parts of the code, to circumcision, to the Sabbath, to the feasts and fasts of Judaism (*De Migr. Abr.*, I. 450). We thus know that long before Paul there was a lax Judaism, hostile to the law, and that nothing was wanting to the rise of Jewish Christianity, save the appeal to the personal authority of a Christ sent from heaven to supersede the law with the freedom of the spirit.

It was the freer Greek Judaism of Alexandria which everywhere attracted the Gentiles, and it was spread broadcast by regular missionaries or even by Jewish merchants travelling primarily for gain (Josephus *Antiq.*, XX. ii. 4). The Pharisees followed in the steps of these more liberal propagandists, and tried to bring their converts into a stricter conformity with the Mosaic law, *e.g.*, to submit to circumcision.

A time came (alluded to in Luke xii. 2-5) when the more liberal Judaism of the Essenes, hitherto kept secret, was preached and revealed to the people of Palestine. John the Baptist was the agent of this revelation. His teaching was essentially Essenic. There was less of the Essene asceticism about the teaching of his successor, Jesus of Nazareth, but the latter was more vehement in his assaults on the Pharisees, more free-thinking in his attitude towards the Mosaic law, which he taught men to fulfil in an Hellenic and anti-Pharisaic spirit (Matt. v. 20; cp. Paul, Rom. iii. 31). He did not openly break with the law, however, or he would never have been acclaimed as the Messiah. His great achievement was to free the people from the burden of Pharisaic formalism, from the soul-slaying traditions of men. In this spirit he spoke the words: "Come unto me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest." Christianity, then, was a product of the Diaspora, and Friedländer concludes by pointing out the Hellenist antecedents of many of its earliest teachers, of Stephen, Barnabas, John, Mark, Paul, Apollos, the author of the letter to the Hebrews, etc.

Such is the gist of a very suggestive book. Its chapters are really essays on their respective subjects, and of them Chs. I. and II. are the most successful, because here the writer treads on firm ground throughout. His view of Therapeutism in Ch. III. is at fault. He is right in rejecting the view of Lucius, who pretends that the *De Vita Contemplativa* is a late third or early fourth century panegyric of Christian monachism, and in ascribing it to Philo's age and circle. But his reasons for denying the authorship to Philo himself are insufficient; for it is not true that the Therapeutæ were heretical Jews any more than was Philo himself. The treatise *D. V. C.*, descriptive of them, indeed says that they looked upon the *νομοθεσία* of Moses as a *ζῷον*,

the body of which consists of the ῥητάι διατάξεις or literal precepts, but of which the soul (ψυχή) is the unseen reason (ἀόρατος νοῦς) which lurks underneath the sentences (λέξεις), and that in their Scriptural exercises they set themselves to bring out and exhibit the beautiful conceptions symbolised in the names (*or* words). It is true that elsewhere (*De Migr. Abr.*, 1. 450) Philo in making a similar comparison of the letter to the body, and of the allegorical sense to the soul of a ζῷον, condemns those who forget and reject the body in their enthusiasm for the soul, and go so far as to light fire and trade on the Sabbath, neglect circumcision and the Jewish feasts. The passage in the *D. V. C.*, however, does not even hint that the Therapeutæ, because they allegorised the Law, therefore neglected its literal fulfilment in any respect. As I have pointed out in the testimonia to the passage in my recent edition of the *D. V. C.*, similar descriptions of the relation of the letter to the spirit of the Law occur in other works of Philo, and their occurrence quite forbids Friedländer's inference. It is a fact that the allegorising activity of the Therapeutæ, as described in the *D. V. C.*, in no way differs from the same activity as described and warmly eulogised and defended everywhere else in the genuine works of Philo.

Friedländer's statement that the Therapeutæ sat loose to the Jewish feasts and to the Temple system of Jerusalem is equally unfounded. Their careful and *legal* observance of the Sabbath and of the Pentecostal feast is described at great length, and also their reverence for the shewbread and Levitical service of the Temple at Jerusalem (I. p. 484, 30). They ate, says Philo, at their Pentecostal meal leavened bread, out of reverence for the shewbread (δι' αἰδῶ τῆς ἀνακειμένης ἐν τῷ ἁγίῳ προνάῳ ἱερᾶς τραπέζης) and in order not to trench on the privileges of the sons of Zadok. "It is befitting," we read, "that the simplest and purest food should be awarded to the highest rank of the priests as a reward for their service (λειτουργίας), whereas the others (*e.g.* Therapeutæ) must aspire to a *like* portion, but abstain from the *same*, in order that their superiors may keep their privilege."

The philological affinities of the *D. V. C.* with the rest of Philo's works equally preclude the supposition that it is only an imitation. For example, we find in its brief compass some twenty rare words which occur nowhere else in Greek literature except in Philo. Nor is the enthusiastic tone of the treatise towards the ascetics it describes inconsistent with Philo's advice given in the *De Profugis* and elsewhere not to retire to the cloister before the age of fifty. The perfect (τελεῖοι) among the Therapeutæ may have been all over that age. The treatise is not sufficiently explicit on the point for us even to feel sure that the novices in the system were young men ; we only read that youth and age were relative not to years, but to

knowledge less or more profound of the holy Scriptures. If Philo wrote so warmly of the Essenes who repudiated the Temple sacrifices, why may we not suppose that he wrote the description of the Therapeutæ, of whom no single heretical trait is reported therein? As for the allegorical explanations of the Sabbath and Pentecost given in the *D. V. C.*, we meet with exactly the same explanations of them in many other writings of Philo.

Chapter IV. — Friedländer's contention that the Essenes spoke Greek is not well supported. In favour of it is a fact related by Philo, but passed over by Friedländer, that they *called* their meeting-houses *Synagogues* (συναγωγαί); but this is far from conclusive. Nor do I see how Jesus, who thought that it is not meats which defile a man, but evil qualities, and who came eating and drinking with publicans and sinners, can have been a product of the Essene discipline and beliefs. For Josephus relates that an Essene expelled from the order died of hunger, because, like a Brahmin, he could not eat of any food save that which his fellows in the order had prepared. It is certain therefore that their συσσίτια were ordained to preserve unimpaired their ceremonial purity, and were wholly different in kind and purpose to the miscellaneous common meals of the early Christians. This objection Friedländer ignores, as also another, viz., that an Essene of the highest order was polluted by the mere touch of one of a lower grade. Such a custom has a very unchristian and Pharisaic air, and goes far to confirm the view that the Essenes were the extreme right of Pharisaism. It is not even certain that the Essenes rejected animal sacrifice for Alexandrine or Pythagorean reasons. It may have been in order to preserve their own ceremonial purity. Friedländer's equation therefore of the earliest Christianity with Essenism is very uncertain.

Thus Chapters III. and IV. need reconsideration, yet the general aim of the book is right, and Friedländer does good service in calling attention to the Alexandrine factor in early Christianity, and to the manner in which the religion originally arose out of the revolt of the common people, leavened with Hellenism, against the Pharisees.

FRED. C. CONYBEARE.

NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS.

A THIRD SYSTEM OF SYMBOLS FOR THE HEBREW VOWELS AND ACCENTS.

DR. NEUBAUER, in his "Literary Gleanings, XII." (JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, No. 26, p. 361, *sqq.*) calls attention to various kinds of abbreviations which were in use among the Jews of the Middle Ages. Incidentally reference is made to two fragments of Bible texts found lately in Egypt, and acquired by the Bodleian Library, as showing a different kind of shorthand writing, and eight lines are given as an example of what these fragments contain. At first the reader is bewildered, not knowing what to understand by the disconnected letters and the strange points and lines. A closer examination, however, and a minute comparison with the Biblical text, discloses the most important results, *that we have here a new, hitherto unknown system of signs for vowels and accents.* I am only sorry that not more of the text has been published, as there is some doubt in a few cases as to the correctness of the number and position of the points. An inspection of the whole fragments may perhaps modify a little my view, but not to a great extent. Dr. Neubauer was good enough to copy for me three more verses, all that I asked for. The following tables will show the value of each of these signs, and their equivalent in the ordinary system of vowels and accents in our Hebrew books:—

A.—VOWELS.

	Their form		How often each of these signs occurs in the 11 verses.
	in the Ordinary System.	in the Fragments.	
Kamets			21
Pathach			25
Segol			4
Chirek			4
Cholem	 or		7
Shurek	 or		4
Tsere			6

B.—ACCENTS.

	Their form in the Ordinary System.	Their form in the Fragments.	How often each of these signs occurs in the 11 verses.
Rebia	אֵ	אֵ	5
Gershaim ...	אֵׄ	אֵ	1
Zakef Katan ...	אֵ֔	אֵ֔	4
Tipcha	אֵ֕	אֵ֕	17
Tebhir	אֵ֖	אֵ֖	5
Pashta	אֵ֙	אֵ֙ or אֵ֗	9 and 2
Yethib	אֵ֚	אֵ֚	1
Munach & Mahpach	אֵ֣	אֵ֣ or אֵ֫	6
Darga	אֵ֤	אֵ֤	2
Mercha	אֵ֥	אֵ֥	9
Zakef gadol ...	אֵ֑	אֵ֑	1
Pesik	אֵ׀	אֵ֞	2
Makkef	אֵ־	אֵ־	5

There is no sign for *silluk*, nor for *athnaᶜh*, unless the extra mark over the פ in רִצְפָּה (8th verse) be meant for this accent. *Dagesh* and *rafeh* are not marked.

The vowels and accents agree, on the whole, with the text in the ordinary editions of the Bible, with the following exceptions: the fragments have בְּמֶלְקָחַיִם, טְמֵא and יִרְאֵת, instead of בְּמֶלְקָחַיִם, טְמֵא־ and יִרְאַת (8th, 7th, and 11th verses).

It appears strange that one symbol should represent a vowel and an accent: *Shurek* and *pashta;* whilst, on the other hand, one accent, *pashta*, is represented by two different signs, according as it precedes *mahpach*, or follows it. I think that a difference existed, and was marked by a slight variation in the position or the size of the points. Old age, may to some extent have obliterated these distinctions by reducing the size and the number of points, by turning small strokes into dots, and breaking up small lines into points; time seems to have attacked also the letters, and made some of them appear in a different garb. In the 1st verse—in the text published *l. c.*—*e. g.* time has changed, I conjecture, בֵּ into בֵ, the first ק in the 6th into ק, ה in the 5th into ח, deprived מ and the third כ in the 7th verse of their accents, and is perhaps the cause that ת (1st

verse and 6th) is read for דֶ, ח for ד (in the 5th and 8th), and that *munach* is reduced in some cases to a simple vertical line.

The text of these fragments seems to have been intended as a help for readers in the Synagogue or learners in the schools, enabling them to read in accordance with the traditional pronunciation and modulation, and at the same time warning against mistakes likely to be made, especially by beginners, in the reading of texts without vowel-points and accents; *e.g.* the *kamets* of *vav* in וָאראה (3rd verse), וָשית (9th and 10th), is pointed out in order that the *vav* should not be read with *sheva*, and, *vice versâ*, the sheva in לְאֶחד is to prevent the reading of the *lamed* with *kamets*. *Mercha* and *tipcha* are marked most frequently, because they are very easily mistaken the one for the other.

A careful examination of the text—for the facilitating of which I add the text in full—proves that, from this point of view, the writer of the fragments has selected the syllables most judiciously.

*** The larger letters with the points and strokes are those contained in the fragments, the smaller ones I added in order to illustrate the relation of the fragments to the Biblical text.

1 הֲוי מגיעי בַּיִת בבית שדֶה בשדה יקריבו עַד אפס מקום
וְהוֹשַׁבְתֶּם לבדכֶם בקרב הארץ

2 באזני יי צבאות אִם־לֹא בתים רַבִּים לשמה יהיו גדלים
וטובים מֵאֵין יוֹשב ׃

3 בשנת־מוֹת המלך עזיהו וָאראה את אדני יֹשֵׁב על כִּסֵּא
רָם וְנִשָּׂא ושוליו מְלֵאים את הַהיכל

4 שרפים עמדים ׃ ממַּעל לו שֵׁש כנפים שֵׁש כנפים לְאחד
בשְׁתַּים ׃ יכסה פניו ובשְׁתַּים יכסֶה רגליו ובשתים
יעופף

5 וקָרָא זֶה אל זֶה ואמַר קָדוֹשׁ קָדוֹשׁ קָדוֹשׁ יי צבאות
מְלֹא כל הארץ כבודו

6 וינָּעוּ אַמות הספים מקול הקוֹרא והבַּיִת יִמָּלא עשן

7 וָאֹמַר אוי־לי כי נדמֵּיתי כִּי אִישׁ טְמא שפתַּים אנכי
ובתְוך עַם־טמא שפתים אנכי ישב כִּי אֶת־המלך יי
צבאות ראו עיני

8 וַיִּעַף אֵלַי אֶחָד מִן הַשְּׂרָפִים וּבְיָדוֹ רִצְפָּה בְּמֶלְקָחַיִם
לָקַח מֵעַל הַמִּזְבֵּחַ

9 וַיִּגַּע עַל פִּי וַיֹּאמֶר הִנֵּה נָגַע זֶה עַל־שְׂפָתֶיךָ וְסַר עֲוֹנֶךָ
וְחַטָּאתְךָ תְכֻפָּר

10 בַּחֲצִים וּבַקֶּשֶׁת יָבֹא שָׁמָּה כִּי־שִׁמָּיר וְשַׁיִת תִּהְיֶה כָּל הָאָרֶץ

11 וְכָל הֶהָרִים אֲשֶׁר בְּמַעְדֵּר יֵעָדְרוּן לֹא תָבֹוא שָׁמָּה יִרְאַת
שָׁמִיר וְשַׁיִת וְהָיָה לְמִשְׁלַח שׁוֹר וּלְמִרְמַס שֶׂה

Dr. Neubauer communicated to me the following solution suggested by Dr. Simonsen, of Copenhagen. He considers the letters in these fragments as Masoretic mnemonics, and believes that the letters in the 1st verse indicate the passages of the Bible in which בשדה (without article) occurs, and those of the 3rd verse the passages in Isaiah containing ישב without *vav*, viz. 1st verse עחשתכ = נעברה (Num. xx. 17), חברו (in a similar context, *ib.* 21, 22), שדה (Isa. v. 8), רות (Ruth ii. 8), כלתה (*ib.* ii. 22). 3rd verse: ושסר נשללה = ו of ישב חסר (wanting): אדני (Isa. vi. 1), שפתים (*ib.* vi. 5), אל (*ib.* x. 24), לפקוד (*ib.* xxvi. 21), ה (*ib.* xxxvii. 16). No notice has been taken in this attempt of the points and strokes with which the letters are provided.

In conclusion, a query on p. 272 of the last number of the JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW may here be answered. Domninus contains the two words דָּם "blood," and נִיעַ "spitting" (comp. *Aruch*, s.v. כח ii.).

M. FRIEDLANDER.

P.S.—Whilst the above was in the hands of the printer, Dr. Neubauer, with his usual courtesy, sent me a photograph of four pages of these fragments, containing Isa. v. 8 to vii. 10, and xlv. 20 to xlviii. 11. I am thus enabled to add a few notes to the above, and sincerely thank the authorities of the Bodleian Library for their kindness.

1.—There is no special sign for *sheva*, whether simple or compound; a *segol* corresponds to the *sheva mobile* of our editions; before *chirek* or before *yod* the *sheva mobile* is replaced by *chirek*, and by *pathach* before a guttural with *pathach*. The compound *sheva* is represented by the simple vowel contained in the compound *sheva*. There is only one sign for both the long and the short *kamets*.

2.—*Dagesh*, both *forte* and *lene*, are marked by placing a semicircle over the letter in this position: בְּ. The absence of *dagesh* or *mappik* is marked thus: בְּ. Only ה with *dagesh* has the ordinary form (הּ).

3.—The letters selected from each word are not always those that have the accent; in some cases even the letters provided with accents are not the accented syllables. The sign for *dagesh* is sometimes placed on the letter before that which is doubled.

4.—A word with two accents is divided by a hyphen in the middle of the word.

5.—ס takes the place of שׂ, the latter being marked by a dot inside the letter on the right (שׂ). The א in ובאו (xlv. 20) has the mark for *rafeh* (וּבָאֹ). It is possible that the semicircle indicates in this case the absence of the vowel וּ, and ובא is here without the plural ending ו, like יבוא, xlv. 24.

6.—The beginning of a *sedra* is marked by a marginal ס, vi. 13, and xlvii. 6, unless the letter marks the pronunciation of שׂ occurring in the same line.

7.—To the above-mentioned *variæ lectiones* the following may be added:—v. 16, נִקְדָּשׁ; 20, הָוֹי; 27, לֹא־; סְרוֹךְ; 28, קַשְׁתָּתִיו; vi. 5, כִּי אֶת־הַמֶּלֶךְ; 6, בְּמֶלְחַמִים; vii. 6, טֶב אַל; xlv. 20, וָבֹא (?); 24, הַנִּחָרִים; xlvi. 5, תְּדַמְּיוּנִי; xlvii. 7, לֹא־; 10, שׁוֹבָתָה; 14, לַחְמָם; xlviii. 9, אֶחְמָם.

STUDIES IN THE BOOK OF JEREMIAH.

I.—The Narratives.

The structure and arrangement of the mingled narratives and prophecies which occupy so large a portion of the book of Jeremiah, afford the student a problem at once fascinating and perplexing. These episodes are carefully dated; they are furnished with editorial introductions, detailing with some particularity the occasions to which they refer; and yet they present a sequence which is utterly without order. Or rather, while in some parts of the book there is an approach to chronological succession, in others it is apparently set at nought. A complete explanation of these inconsistencies is not now attainable, but we can see that they are in great measure due to the insertion in a framework belonging to the reign of Jehoiakim of materials of the age of Zedekiah, or of a still later date, at points which may have been determined by accident or convenience, by the circumstances under which these materials came to the hands of Jeremiah's editors, or by the physical structure of the manuscript which lay before them.

The key to the general arrangement of the book is to be found in a comparison of ch. xxv. with ch. xxxvi. I cannot accept the hypothesis which supposes that ch. xxv. is itself the whole of what Jeremiah dictated to Baruch. To adopt this view we must disregard or alter the text of ch. xxxvi. without any solid ground for so doing. According to that document the original roll of the fourth year of Jehoiakim contained all the prophecies of Jeremiah antecedent to that date, "against Israel, and against Judah, and against all the nations." The prophecies against Israel and Judah are to be sought, in so far as they have been preserved to us, and with whatever additions, mutilations and transpositions, in chapters i.—xxiv. To these the first part of ch. xxv. supplies a recapitulation and conclusion. Those directed against the nations must be sought, with similar reserves, in chapters xlvi.—li. To them the latter part of ch. xxv. originally supplied an impressive introduction. The Septuagint version makes of it an epilogue.

Possibly Jer. i.—xxv. in its earliest form may have been circulated separately, without the prophecies against the nations; or perhaps these were regarded as forming an appendix. In either case, a supplement consisting mainly of narratives, and including, we may suppose, chapters xxvi., xxxv., xxxvi., all of which relate to events that occurred in the reign of Jehoiakim, was at some time appended to ch. xxv. Chapter xxvi. narrates the utterance of the prophecy which is more fully preserved in ch. vii. The writer clearly belonged to the circle of Jeremiah, and was well acquainted with the circumstances to which he refers. In xxxv. 3 the prophet is himself the narrator; but in verses 18, 19, we have another hand.

Chapter xxxvi. must either have been written by Baruch, or by some one intimately associated with him. It may have been followed at one time by what is now ch. xlv. But at this point I must express a grave doubt as to the authenticity of the promises given to Jonadab in xxxv. 18, 19, to Baruch in xlv., and to Ebed-Melech in xxxix. 15—18, while I shall presently have occasion to question that of the narrative relating to the last-named worthy in xxxviii. 6—13. A reference to Dr. K. Kohler's article on "The Pre-Talmudic Haggada" (JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, V., especially pp. 418, 419), and to that of Mr. A. P. Bender, headed, "Death, Burial, and Mourning" (*Ib.*, VI., p. 341, art. 6, and p. 343, art. 5, 10), will not only exhibit the position of these persons in early legends, but will suggest a possible motive for the insertion of the alleged promises. Abed-Melech was identified with Baruch (Kohler, *sup. cit.*, 419), and Baruch it would seem with Jonadab (Bender, p. 343, art. 10). The two identifications are of course incompatible, though they may perhaps serve to show that the connection between the passages under considera-

tion was early recognised. When, however, we read that "Jonadab ben Rechab, and Jabez the grandson of Jehuda, . . . are the real heroes of the Essene schools, the founders and continuators of the Nazirite customs from the *earliest ages*, as may be learned from Pliny and Philo" (Kohler, p. 418), and that "as such they occur in the very oldest Midrash traditions," it is impossible to refrain from putting the query, whether the promises to Jonadab, Baruch, and Ebed-Melech, are not in reality promises to the Essenes, or their forerunners? Even the value of the moral and religious lesson conveyed in ch. xlv. suggests a purpose of edification rather than a narrative of fact. If we adopt this supposition, we are not obliged to assume that the three passages under discussion are of later date than the reference to the "families of scribes which dwelt at Jabez," in 1 Chron. ii. 55, iv. 9, 10. To the same age I would ascribe the narrative in Jer. xxxii. 6—27, 36, 43, 44; and if at this period "the priests that were in Anathoth in the land of Benjamin" (Jer. i. 1*b*, where the Septuagint reads ὃς κατῴκει—Cheyne) claimed to *inherit* from the prophet, a motive for its insertion is not far to seek. The case supposed would be parallel to that of the celebrated History of Croyland. If the reference to the priests in Jer. i. 1 is due to the same band, it may still be possible that the father of Jeremiah was the discoverer, or author, of Deuteronomy. It is difficult to think of Jeremiah in the priestly character. (See especially vii. 21—23.) But such passages as xvii. 26, xxxii. 17—23, and xxxiii. 11, point to a priestly editor of the book which bears his name, at a date posterior to that of the second Jeremiah (who wrote the original words of xxxiii. 12, 13). The same late and imitative editor may also be responsible for interpolations in xxx., xxxi., and l., li.; perhaps even for the ascription of those chapters to the son of Hilkiah. The connection between the scribes of Jabez and the "house of Rechab," implied in 1 Chron. ii. 55 *ad fin.*, must not be overlooked. Equally noteworthy is the part assigned to Baruch in Jer. xxxii. 6—16. May we trace in xlv. 3—5, and xxxix. 16—18 a reference to the captivity under Artaxerxes Ochus?

Like chapters xxvi., xxxv., xxxvi., ch. xxiv. represents an addition to the original collection of prophecies contained in the chapters which precede it. But it belongs to the reign of Zedekiah. The prophet speaks in his own person; but the first verse has appended to it the usual editorial introduction ("After that . . . . to Babylon"); and it is at least possible that the text of verses 6, 7 has undergone expansion. A mass of narratives and prophecies, belonging, as far as they are genuine, to Zedekiah's reign, at present intervenes between ch. xxvi. and ch. xxxv. It would be a better arrangement if ch. xxvii. were placed immediately after ch. xxiv. The position which it now

occupies may be due either to the blunder in the editorial date (verse 1) or to the general character of its predictions leading to its association with chapters xxv. and xxvi. In verses 2, 12, 16, and again in xxviii. 1, Jeremiah speaks in the first person. In xxviii. 5, *seq.*, we have another narrator. But in this case I cannot doubt the authenticity of the narrative. The same hand has perhaps transmitted to us the prophetic epistle which, with extensive interpolations, is preserved in xxix. 4—23, the response in verses 26—28, and Jeremiah's reply in verses 31, 32. The only genuine portions of xxx.—xxxiii., viz., xxxii. 28—35 and xxxiii. 4, 5, belong, according to the editorial introductions, to the period of Jeremiah's imprisonment during the final siege (xxxvii. 11, *seq.*). Chapter xxxiv. also will require to be considered in connection with those events.

If the eloquence of the prophet, his force of moral indignation, his passion, and his pathos were to be represented by a single example, we might well make choice of ch. xxii. Verses 10—12, alluding to the lamentations for the death of Josiah, and also to the captivity of Shallum or Jehoahaz, must have been written shortly after the accession of Jehoiakim. Verses 1—9 may belong to the same period, and verse 9 appears to refer to the reaction against the influence of Deuteronomy which probably marked this reign. The tremendous denunciation addressed to Jehoiakim in verses 13—19, and clearly arising out of a special occasion, must belong to a time when the character of the king and the nature of his government had too plainly declared themselves. Verses 1—12 may have been included in the first, verses 13—19 in the second roll (xxxvi. 32). Verses 20—30 belong to the brief reign of Coniah or Jehoiachin. (How far xxiii. 1—8 may be genuine I cannot confidently determine, but not, I think, beyond verse 4 at the farthest.) To this chapter of warning and judgment relating to Zedekiah's predecessors, has been prefixed a chapter belonging, it would seem, to the close of his reign. The concluding section (11—14) reads like a *résumé* of earlier utterances.

The preaching of Jeremiah was consistent, uniform, and, if you will, monotonous, with the monotony of gloom broken only by glimpses of hope which became yet more rare and transient, as the prophet watched with a broken heart the moral deterioration of his people, and the downfall of the State; uttering meanwhile with passionate earnestness but one repeated message, and that, he knew, in vain. No doubt similar occasions recurred, and were met with the same warnings. Yet if we possessed a more critical text of his prophecies, or a more systematic record of their delivery, it is probable that many apparent repetitions would disappear.

Chapter xxxvii. offers for the first time something like a continuous narrative, attached in the manner of a supplement to ch. xxxvi., and

extending after a fashion to xliv. But it is easy to demonstrate that this narrative is of the nature of a compilation from materials previously existing. After a connecting link in verses 1 and 2, there follows a passage which offers an interesting parallel both to xxi. 1—10, and xxxiv. 1—7, 21, 22. A detailed comparison may prove instructive. None of these passages is expressed in the first person, though of course Jeremiah may have placed on record the words which he uttered. Both xxi. and xxxiv. begin with the usual title, "The word which came unto Jeremiah from Jahveh." Chapter xxi. continues: "When king Zedekiah sent unto him Pashhur, the son of Malchiah, and Zephaniah, the son of Maaseiah the priest, saying, Inquire, I pray thee, of Jahveh for us," etc. In xxxvii. 3 we read. "And Zedekiah the king sent Jehucal the son of Shelemiah, and Zephaniah, the son of Maaseiah the priest, to the prophet Jeremiah, saying, "Pray now unto Jahveh our God for us." But the actual "word of Jahveh" in verse 7 informs us that the king of Judah sent to *enquire*, in agreement with xxi. 2. The occasion of the request is stated rather vaguely and unnecessarily in xxi. 2; "for Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, maketh war against us." It would seem from the reply (xxi. 4) that the siege was actually in progress. Zedekiah (verse 2) hoped that it might be raised. According to xxxvii. 4, 5, an editorial parenthesis, and according to the text of the oracle, *Ibid.* verses 7—10, the siege was really raised for a while, and it was during this interval that the oracle in question was delivered. But of this there is no mention in ch. xxi. On the other hand, the last two verses of ch. xxxiv. agree with ch. xxxvii. in referring to the departure and predicting the return of the Chaldeans (so xxxvii.; in xxxiv., "the king of Babylon's army"). The occasion of the prophet's utterance recorded in xxxiv. 2—5, is stated twice over, vaguely after the title in verse 1; more briefly, but with the knowledge of a contemporary, in verse 7. There is, however, no proof that verses 2—5 belong to the same date with 13—22.

Of the passages under discussion, each has something peculiar to itself. Chapter xxi. is the most general in character, and the most appalling. It alone contains the counsel of desertion, which is quoted in xxxviii. 2, 3=xxi. 9, 10. Chapter xxxvii. 7—10, predicts in striking terms the resumption of the siege. Chapter xxxiv. 2—6, is essentially a personal assurance given, it may be privately, but at all events directly, by Jeremiah himself to Zedekiah. The promise in verse 5 is hardly to be reconciled with the language of xxi. 7. There is evidently intended a contrast with the threat in xxii. 18 and 19. It is curious to compare the latter with 2 Kings xxiv. 6 (2 Chr. xxxvi. 8 LXX., *vide* Q P.B.), and the former with Jer. lii. 11 (2 Kings xxv. 7 *omits*). In ch. xxxiv., verses 21, 22 contain nothing original, but if

they are really an integral part of the text, they serve to show that the covenant of emancipation, suggested, we may suppose, by the necessities of defence, was set at nought on the departure of the invading army. A curious parallel may be found in *The Athenæum* for December 2nd, 1893, in a review of *The Rise of our East African Empire*, by Captain Lugard. "Writing," says the reviewer, "of the edicts issued by the Zanzibar sultans under our pressure, Capt. Lugard tells us of 'the issue of a series of high-sounding edicts calculated to ameliorate the position of the slave *if enforced* . . . The last . . . was issued on August 1st, 1890. . . This edict, had it ever been really put into execution, would not only have *immediately* improved the position of the slave, but in course of time would have practically put an end to domestic slavery, and that without prejudice to the vested rights and claims of owners. It was, however, largely superseded by a secret proclamation dated twenty days later, which annulled some of its most important clauses; nor am I aware that even the remainder of the Act has ever been put into force effectively, so that any single slave has gained his freedom in respect of it.'"

Upon the whole I conclude that the three oracles preserved in xxi. 1—10, xxxiv. 1—7, and xxxvii. 3—10 are in their most essential features authentic and independent. The narratives which we have next to consider, which relate the arrest and imprisonment of Jeremiah, his interview with Zedekiah, and consignment to a milder custody, in which he is detained until the city is taken, and his fortunes at the fall of Jerusalem, present much greater difficulties. According to xxxviii. 1—5, the motive for his arrest was furnished by "the words that Jeremiah spake unto all the people," recommending desertion (verses 2, 3, as in xxi. 8—10). This, as we have already seen, was during the first part of the siege, and it is plain that up to this moment the prophet was free (cf. xxxvii. 4 and xxxvi. 5—6). His arrest was effected during the interval that followed the temporary raising of the siege. According to xxxvii. 11, he was himself suspected of desertion. This may have been merely a pretext. The princes to whom, both in xxxvii. and xxxviii., the imprisonment of Jeremiah is attributed, did not perhaps venture to punish him for words spoken in his prophetic character (cf. xxvi. 16—19). In xxxviii. 1 the moving spirits include Pashhur, the son of Malchiah, and Jucal the son of Shelemiah, who had respectively received the oracles in xxi. 3—10 (here quoted) and xxxvii. 6—10. Zephaniah, the son of Maaseiah the priest, who had been present on both these occasions, was, we know from xxix. 29, a friend to Jeremiah. Accordingly he is not here named. I have little doubt that the narrative in xxxviii. 1—5 should be followed immediately by that in xxxvii. 11—16, and this in turn by xxxviii. 14—28. Both the latter passages agree in

stating or implying that Jeremiah was imprisoned "in the house of Jonathan the scribe." I suspect that the text of xxxvii. 16 is the result of an attempt to reconcile this fact with the statement contained in the story of Ebed-Melech (xxxviii. 6—13), that the prophet was cast into "the dungeon of Malchiah, the king's son." In xxxvii. 16 we should perhaps read simply: "When Jeremiah had remained there many days, then Zedekiah, the king, sent," etc., as in xxxviii. 14. In ch. xxxvii., verses 17—21 are merely an inferior version of xxxviii. 14—28. Both begin and end with the same words, and the latter feature is shared by the story of Ebed-Melech, a plain indication that the three passages are not consecutive, but alternative. It may be observed that there is no necessary inconsistency between the topography of xxxvii. 17 and that of xxxviii. 14. The whole subject may be illustrated by reference to Ezek. xliii. 8 and Neh. iii. 25. Cf. Jer. xxxii. 2. It was at this crisis of Israel's history that the imprisoned prophet poured forth the dreadful threatenings imperfectly preserved in xxxii. 28—35 and xxxiii. 4, 5. The editorial parenthesis in xxxii. 2—5 ignores the real cause of his imprisonment.

Of his final release we have again two conflicting narratives. One which is perhaps of a piece with xxxviii. 14—28 originally ran as follows (so Driver, *Introd. Old Testament*, p. 248):—"And it came to pass when Jerusalem was taken, that all the princes of the king of Babylon came in, and sat in the middle gate [I omit the repeated enumeration]. And they sent and took Jeremiah out of the court of the guard, and committed him unto Gedaliah the son of Ahikam, the son of Shaphan, that he should carry him home: so he dwelt among the people."

This is plausible. That Jeremiah had consistently counselled submission and even desertion, and had suffered imprisonment on that account, was a fact which might well have come to the knowledge of the Chaldean authorities, and have procured for him that favourable treatment which he had himself promised to others (xxi. 8, 9, and xxxviii. 17, 20). We owe it to the prophet to remember that, in his view, resistance to the Chaldeans meant resistance to the will, the purpose, and the servants of Jahveh.

A later editor has inserted in the text of ch. xxxix. two long parentheses (verses 1, 2, and 4—10) based on the general narrative which is preserved in lii. 4—16. Either the same, or perhaps an earlier writer, provides a second account of Jeremiah's release, which may be traced in verses 11, 12, and xl. 2—6. The first clause of xxxix. 13 is the result of an attempt to combine the two accounts. I do not rely upon the omission of verses 4—13 in the Septuagint, which may be due to ὁμοιοτέλευτον. In a former article on *The Second Jeremiah*, I supposed xl. 1 to be a general title to the follow-

ing chapters (Cheyne on Jer. i. 3), but on closer study I am led to adopt the view that it is the title of a lost prophecy (Cheyne on xl. 1). It has the usual editorial parenthesis, giving a more probable account of Jeremiah's fate on the fall of Jerusalem than either of those already discussed. It may have supplied a basis for the second of these, which is otherwise, I fear, fictitious. All three accounts agree that Jeremiah was liberated by the Chaldeans; it may well be supposed, from the motives above suggested. It was probably anticipated that his influence would be, as in fact it was, exerted to promote submission, peace, and order, in the conquered country.

It might not unreasonably be expected that an analysis of the elements of this complex book would disclose some trace of a contemporary so much in sympathy with the teaching of the prophet as was the compiler of the Book of Kings. Accordingly, we find in the last chapter of Jeremiah (lii. 1—27) an historical narrative of a general character which has served as the basis of that in 2 Kings xxiv. 18—xxv. 21. The latter is indeed a mere abridgment of the former. One or two of its omissions, *e.g.*, the reference to Zedekiah's life-long imprisonment in Jer. lii. 11 (cf. 2 Kings xxv. 7, Jer. xxxii. 5, and xxxiv. 5), and that to "*the twelve brazen bulls that were under* the bases which King Solomon had made for the house of Jehovah" (Jer. lii. 20; cf. 2 Kings xxv. 16), are perhaps not merely due to the desire for brevity.

2 Kings xxv. 23—26 is based on the full and vivid narrative which begins at Jer. xl. 7, especially xl. 7—9, xli. 1—3, 18 ("because of the Chaldeans; for they were afraid of them"); xlii. 1 ("all the captains of the forces . . . and all the people, from the least even unto the greatest"); xliii. 7 ("and they came into the land of Egypt"). This narrative, like that just discussed, is of a general character, and contains, from xl. 7 to xli. 18, no reference to Jeremiah at all, not even in xli. 10, where it would have been natural to name him among "the residue of the people that were in Mizpah." Plainly, it was not originally designed for its present place in the book of Jeremiah. More probably it was intended as a sequel to the history of which we have the natural conclusion in lii. 27. A connecting link is to be found in 2 Kings xxv. 22, and it is to be observed that the statement there contained is pre-supposed by Jer. xxxix. 14, xl. 5, 7, 11, and xli. 2, 18. The concluding paragraphs of Jer. lii. (verses 28—30, and 31—34) are clearly of the nature of addenda. Verses 28—30 are omitted in the Septuagint and in the book of Kings.

Chapters xl.—xliv. form in the main a narrative of the settlement in Egypt. The redundant style and hortatory tone of this history are not more noticeable than its double purpose, namely, to discourage the Egyptian settlement, and to restrain the idolatries

practised in it. I cannot help asking whether in Isaiah xix. 18 *seq.* (especially verse 19), we have a memorial of this colony from an opposite point of view.

In xl.—xliv., as in xxxvi., we must admit the influence, though we cannot tell the hand, of Baruch, the son of Neriah. After the brief episode relating to him in ch. xlv., follow, in the Hebrew text, the two prophecies against Egypt, which are thus appropriately placed in the neighbourhood of xl.—xliv. Canon Cheyne (*Pulpit Comm.* on xxxii.) has called attention to the parallel between the purchase narrated in that chapter, and a similar incident in Livy xxvi. 11. I do not know whether any one has pointed out the curious resemblance between the language of xlvi. 22, and that of Livy xxi. 22 (the dream of Hannibal): "Tum vidisse post sese *serpentem* mira magnitudine *cum ingenti arborum ac virgultorum strage* ferri, ac post insequi cum fragore cœli nimbum. Tum, quæ moles ea quidve prodigii esset, quærentem audisse, *vastitatem Italiæ esse;* pergeret porro ire nec ultra inquireret sineretque fata in occulto esse." The last words remind one of the obscure clause in verse 23, "for it cannot be searched." On verse 20 a classical friend suggests the story of Io.

From chapters xl. 7—xliv. it would appear that the documents which formed the basis of this book, so far as they were the work of either Jeremiah or Baruch, and had escaped destruction in the successive misfortunes which befell the prophet, must have existed for a while in Egypt. On the other hand, there may well have been among the captivity of Jehoiachin, as well as among the later exiles in Babylonia, persons such as Ezekiel possessing copies of the famous Roll, and also of such later utterances as ch. xxiv. and the letters in xxix. Remote as were these two colonies from one another, we may perhaps infer from Is. xix. 23 the probability of occasional communication between them. Lastly, the interpolations which I have ascribed to the Second Jeremiah, seem to be addressed to the exiles in Babylonia from the ruins of Jerusalem (xxxi. 8; l. 5; li. 50, 51). Out of such diverse elements has the book of Jeremiah been built up. I shall conclude this paper by putting, with much diffidence, the query, whether in the freedom of the Septuagint version from certain interpolations, some of which at least were made in the interest of the exiles in Chaldea, and would doubtless enjoy currency at Jerusalem after the Return, we may trace the influence of an Egyptian recension of the original text? (Cf. Cheyne on xlvi. 15 and 17.)

ADDENDUM.—Sir Henry Howorth's recent advocacy of the text of the LXX. induces me to observe that, so far as the question can be decided by the evidence of subject-matter and arrangement,

the four omissions of xxx. 10, 11 ; xxxiii. 14—26 ; xxxix. 4—13 ; and li. 44—49 ; appear to be due in the two former cases to intentional and mistaken correction, in the two latter to carelessness and ὁμοιοτέλευτον, and by no means to the transmission of an earlier and purer text. They do not accord with any stage of its composition. Even the omission of xxix. 16-20 ("Babylon . . . Babylon") may be due to accident. Are these verses less genuine than vv. 10-14 ?

II.—Chapters L., LI.

When writing on the Second Jeremiah, in the Jewish Quarterly Review for January, I was tempted to abandon the problem of which I now hope to offer an approximate solution. The key to the riddle of these chapters is, I think, to be found (1) in excising from the text passages analogous to the interpolations in ch. xlviii., and due to a copyist who pleased himself by padding it with mechanical imitations, or rather plagiarisms ; and (2) in recognising that certain portions of these chapters have suffered such exceptional displacement as can only be accounted for on the supposition that the text is derived from the fragments of a torn manuscript. With these qualifications there is perhaps no sufficient reason why the whole, of course excepting li. 59—64, should not be ascribed to a single hand, namely, that of the Second Jeremiah.

If we strike out as spurious l. 39—46, li. 15—19, 36*b*, 37, 43, 47, 48, 52, 53, perhaps 55*a*, and certainly 58*b*, the remainder, with the possible exceptions of li. 41, 54, will furnish us with a text, disordered indeed, but substantially genuine. In l. 2, however, the latter clauses of the verse ("her images are put to shame, her idols are dismayed"), clearly intended as a substitute for those which immediately precede them, are doubtless due to the same hand which in li. 47, 52 has effected a similar improvement on the model afforded by li. 44, acting in both cases in a literal accordance with the precept of Ex. xxiii. 13. I have previously suggested that this verse should run simply—

"Declare ye among the nations, and publish, and conceal not : Babylon is taken, Bel is put to shame, Merodach is dismayed."

The words, "Set up a standard," may be derived from the commencement of another section, and I suppose their insertion may have led to the repetition of the verb "publish." This verse is the commencement of a long passage (concerned mainly with denunciations against Babylon), which I shall denote by the letter A, and which, with three interruptions, extends from l. 2 to verse 32. Two of these interruptions, viz., verses 4—7 and 17—20, are properly consecutive parts of a single complete and beautiful utterance, which may with propriety be appended to verse 32, or to the similar and probably cognate promises in verses 33, 34. The place of verses 4—7 I propose to fill by the insertion of verses 35—38, which, as the text

stands, are manifestly torn from their context. It is possible that 4—7 and 35—38 should simply exchange their respective positions in the present text. We need have little hesitation in replacing verses 17—20 by li. 20—23, when we observe that the latter passage is connected by many points of contact with l. 21—25, and with no other part of either chapter. On similar grounds l. 28 may be prefixed to li. 10. I would group together l. 4—7, 17—20, 33, 34 and li. 5, to form a second section, B, concerned mainly with promises to Israel. The letter C I reserve to indicate the spurious element in l. 39—46, etc. D will stand for the section which begins at li. 1 and terminates at verse 26. Besides the removal of verse 5 and the insertion of l. 28 before verse 10, I would suggest that the first two clauses of verse 11 should be transferred to verse 12, reading as follows :—

" Make sharp the arrows ; hold firm the shields ; set up a standard against the walls of Babylon.

" Make the watch strong, set the watchmen, prepare the ambushes.

" For the LORD hath both devised and done that which he spake concerning the inhabitants of Babylon."

The removal of verses 15—19 and 20—23 leaves an *hiatus* which cannot be filled up until we have examined the concluding portions of the chapter. At verse 27 begins a new section (E), concluding with verse 33 (cf. Is. xiii. 22), which should, I think, be preceded by 58*a*, omitting the introductory formula, " Thus saith the LORD of hosts." These words may have been prefixed to 58*a* when, as I suppose, by some accident of transcription or injury to the MS., that sentence became separated from verse 32.

I use the letter F to indicate the original conclusion of the prophecy which, I think, consisted of verses 45, 46, 49—51, 34—36*a*, 44,[1] *in that order*. This section is clearly related to B. The verses which remain to be accounted for, I propose to arrange as follows, employing them to fill up the *hiatus* in D, after li. 14.

" (54) The sound of a cry from Babylon, and of great destruction from the land of the Chaldeans ! (41) How is Sheshach taken, and the praise of the whole earth surprised ! How is Babylon become a desolation among the nations ! (42) The sea is come up upon Babylon : she is covered with the multitude of the waves thereof. (55*b*) And their waves roar like many waters, the noise of their voice is uttered : (56) For the spoiler is come upon her, even upon Babylon, and her mighty men are taken, their bows are broken in pieces : for the LORD is a God of recompences, he shall surely requite. (57*a*) And I will make drunk her princes and her wise men, her governors and her deputies, and her mighty men ; (39*a*) when they

[1] Omitting the last clause of verse 44.

are heated, I will make their feast, and I will make them drunken that they may rejoice. (38) They shall roar together like young lions; they shall growl as lions' whelps. (40) I will bring them down like lambs to the slaughter, like rams with he-goats. (57*b*) And they shall sleep a perpetual sleep and not wake, saith the king, whose name is the LORD of hosts."

I need not transcribe verses 24—26, which I suppose should follow the foregoing passage. But a few words are necessary in justification of such a rearrangement. After verse 14 we naturally expect some fuller description of the shout raised by the invaders upon their entry into the city. I find it in verses 54, 41, 42, and 55*b*. Before verse 24 we seek predictions of vengeance, expressed in the person of Jahveh. These are to be found in verses 57*a*, 39*a*, 38, 40, 57*b*. The link between these two elements is supplied by verse 56. The genuineness of verse 54 (cf. xlviii. 3), and verse 41 (cf. xxv. 26), is very questionable, but I have inserted both verses, and connected them together, on account of their parallelism with l. 22, 23. If they are spurious, then verse 14 might be followed immediately by the grand image of verse 42, the comparison of invasion to inundation (contrast verse 13, "O thou that dwellest upon many waters," and cf. Isaiah xxviii. 17), so appropriate to the plains of Shinar. It is impossible to deny the glaring discrepancy between 42 and 43, which latter verse I regard as spurious. Compare in verse 53 the absurd application to the level site of Babylon of imagery originally applied to the rocky fastness of Petra (xlix. 16=Obad. 4). In 55*a*, the first words involve unnecessary repetition, while the clause, "destroyeth out of her the great voice," whatever it may mean, is strangely out of harmony with the image of tumult in 55*b*. On the other hand, the connection of 55*b* with verse 42 is unmistakable. Equally so is that between 57 and 39. Nor will any one familiar with the style of the prophets hesitate to admit that 40 should be placed in direct juxtaposition with 38. A somewhat simpler arrangement than that adopted above would be as follows, 57 (*a* and *b*), 39*a*, 38, 40. It is possible that this group of verses should come after, instead of preceding verse 24, which would then be brought into immediate connection with verse 56. So in like manner it may be questioned whether li. 20—23 should precede or follow l. 21. But in general I have limited myself to what appeared the *least* amount of transposition required by the sense. In both chapters the passages which I have inserted in positions from which other passages are removed, are as a rule of about the same length with those which they replace. One curious result of these transpositions and omissions is to reduce the two chapters of the prophecy nearly to an equality in number of verses (ch. l.=Title+A+B = 1+30+11 = 42 verses. Chapter li.=D+E+F=26+8+9

=43 verses *approximately*. If we omit the title in ch. l., and in li. verses 54 and 41 already discussed, each chapter will contain 41 verses ; or, inserting title and colophon, " Thus far are the words of Jeremiah," 42). Another result is to impart to their contents a certain degree of symmetry, each commencing with threatenings against Babylon, and closing with a section of words of comfort to Israel.

There seems little reason to suppose that this prophecy *in its original form* was the work of a period later than B.C. 536, or of a hand subsequent to the writer of Isaiah xiii. In particular the eschatological tone of that chapter, the weird, supernatural accompaniments of " the day of Jahveh," in which Isaiah xiii. accords with Jeremiah iv. 23—26, appear to me to suggest a later, not an earlier date, than that of Jeremiah l., li. in which these elements are wholly absent. In the present number of the JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW I have touched upon the possibility that all three passages are the work of one author. Equally remarkable is the absence in Jeremiah l., li. (omitting interpolations) of any clear trace of the influence of the true Second Isaiah, the principal source of Isaiah xl.—lxii. This points, I think, to an earlier date than that of chapters xxx., xxxi. in which such traces are abundant, unless, indeed, we suppose that the earlier portions of those chapters in which these references are concentrated, have undergone extensive interpolation, perhaps at the hand of the compiler of l. 39—46.

In taking leave for a while of the book of Jeremiah, I may be allowed to repeat the wish which I began by expressing, that someone more competent than myself would grapple with the questions which I have only raised because, while they are still unsolved, the structure, history, and contents of this book must remain in great measure unintelligible. On the other hand a complete outline of the process by which the book of Jeremiah attained its present form, and of its relation to the books of Lamentations, Baruch, and the Epistle of Jeremiah, would furnish an epitome or specimen of the history of the text and canon of the Hebrew Scriptures.

GREY HUBERT SKIPWITH.

NOTE.—On comparing 1 Sam. ii. 36, and 1 Kings ii. 26, 27, 35, together with Robertson Smith's Note, O.T.J.C., 2nd ed. p. 266, it seems not improbable that Anathoth, perhaps after the death of Abiathar, may have passed into the possession of the rival house. In this case Jeremiah's connection with the spot would be a consequence of his being the son of the High Priest Hilkiah. I cannot put down my pen without a word of sorrow for the great scholar and teacher whose *Prophets of Israel* first enabled me to understand the Bible.

The Jewish Quarterly Review.

JULY, 1895.

THE PRE-TALMUDIC HAGGADA.

II.

C.—The Apocalypse of Abraham and its Kindred.

Mr. Montague Rhodes James has the merit of having made the theological world for the first time familiar with the "Testament of Abraham," which he published in two versions of the Greek original, with a most valuable critical and literary introduction and notes.[1] But it is quite surprising that the learned editor scarcely considered the probability of the Jewish origin and character of the Apocryphon, which, in spite of the few traces of Christian hands mentioned on page 50f, naturally suggests itself to the Jewish reader. The conception is so entirely Jewish, and so cosmopolitan in form and spirit, that we do not hesitate to accord this Apocryphon a rank equalling the Book of Tobit, not to say the Book of Jonah. The fact that the story is presented as a romance and that its chronology does not at all tally with the Bible, speaks rather in favour of high antiquity and against the supposition that the work is to be attributed to a Christian author of the second century, to which Mr. James inclines.

[1] *Text and Studies, Contributions to Biblical and Patristic Literature*, ed. by J. Armitage Robinson. Vol. II., No. 2. *The Testament of Abraham*, by Montague Rhodes James, with Appendix by W. E. Barnes. Cambridge University Press, 1892.

"Abraham the just, the beloved friend of God, the friend of strangers"—thus the story begins—now reached the full measure of years allotted to him—995 years!—when God sent his archangel, Michael, to him to prepare him for the last journey. And here we are forthwith introduced into the hospitable tent Abraham had pitched under the Oak of Mamre with a view to the four "high roads beneath to welcome the rich and the poor, kings and beggars, kinsmen and strangers as guests." This feature—prominent also in the life of Job as pictured in the "*Testament of Job*," and in the Midrash *Aboth d. R. Nathan*, ed. Schechter 33f—occurs throughout the Midrash and Talmud (*Sota* 10, *B. Metzia* 86b, *B. Bathra* 16, *Targ. Jerush.* Gen. xxi. 33, and *Beresh. Rabba*, § 49 and 54, and in Hieronymus IV., p. 583, quoted by Chastel *Stud. Christl. Barmherzigkeit*, note 44). It was the Jewish (Essene) system of propaganda still practised by the great mystic Ishmael ben Elisha in the time of Hadrian (*Aboth d. R. Nathan*, ed. Schechter, § 38, 114) and later on adopted by the Christian monks. It finds its significant illustration in a tradition preserved by Philo ("Monarchy," i. 7, ed. Mangey, ii. 220). Speaking of *proselytes*—גרים—who "come over" from the *path of darkness* and folly to the path of light and truth—he makes Moses enjoin the people not to let these men who have renounced their country, their kindred and friends, for the sake of joining the true religion, remain destitute altogether of cities, homes, and friendships, but to have *places of refuge* always ready to receive them. Compare with this Philo's Fragments, note to Exod. xxii. 19 (ed. Mangey, ii. 667) and *Targum Jerushalmi* to Deut. xxiii. 16 (and Exodus xl. 6). We arrive here at the very root of proselytism developing from the hospitium offered to the גר —the stranger.

But Abraham—to continue our story—is, like a true Essene, an agriculturist, and Michael, the archangel, finds him in the field superintending the ploughing. Abraham is struck with the sun-like splendour of the warrior in whose

garb the angel appears; and, like a true nobleman, offers his guest one of his horses from the stable to ride home with him. But the angel persistently refuses, and they walk together, when suddenly the huge tamarisk-tree with its three hundred (and thirty-one=אשל) branches whispers to Abraham, as he passes, the secret that—this seems to be the meaning of the hopelessly corrupt passage—the "thrice holy God is about to summon him to himself to be among those that love him" (the just in Paradise; see *Sabb.* 88*b*. and *Targum* to Judges v. 31). Isaac had in the meantime informed his mother Sarah—who, by a sort of anachronism, still lives—of the arrival of a guest of superhuman appearance, and now hastens, as usual, to bring water to his father to wash the feet of the stranger, when the presentiment that this was to be the last time he would perform the sacred act, made Abraham cry bitterly, whereupon Isaac also wept. The archangel, too, shed tears, and behold, they turned into pearls, which Abraham was quick to take and hide under his cloak. At once the guest-chamber is arranged in a manner to suit the royal visitor, yet, before they sit down at the sumptuous table, the archangel leaves the room and rises in the twinkling of the eye up to heaven to join the praises of the ministering angels assembled before the throne of God at the time of sunset, and then, prostrating himself before God, says: "I cannot bring the sad message of death to the righteous man whose likeness is not found on earth." But God tells him to sit down and eat with Abraham, as some spirit would do the eating for him, and then a dream would come upon Isaac, which he, the archangel, should interpret for Abraham, thus to bring him the tidings. Accordingly, the angel sits down to eat, and Abraham offers the benediction, the angel joining. Isaac's dream during the night disturbs him so much as to cause him to rouse all from sleep, and the cry also reaches Sarah in her room. At once Sarah recognises the angel as one of the three heavenly visitors who had announced the birth of Isaac, and on that occasion

had wrought the miracle of having the calf that had been served as meat come to life again and run back to its mother to take suck from her.[1] But Abraham, on hearing the message of the angel, refuses to follow. In this perplexity the archangel Michael again goes up to heaven for advice, and, on returning, tells Abraham in the name of God that none of the offspring of Adam, neither prophet nor ruler, ever escaped death. The reader certainly misses here an allusion to Enoch, but it appears that he, too, was believed to have migrated from the earth to the heavenly paradise, as Abraham was now expected to do while following the archangel. "The angel of death," says God, "shall not strike thee with his sword nor with disease, for, when once the angel of death is given permission to strike, God himself no longer interferes. (Cf. ביון שנתן רשות למשחית.) Michael, my captain, is to lead thee hence." Whereupon Abraham asks one favour yet of God (*Mechiltha Ba.* 11). He wishes "to be allowed to see the inhabited world and the entire heavenly order of things while yet alive, so as to depart thereafter in peace." The wish is granted. "Whatever he tells thee to do, do for him, for he is my friend," says God, and at his bidding Michael takes the heavenly chariot with the fiery Cherubim surrounded by sixty angels, and rides with Abraham upon a cloud high above the earth, so that with one single glance he can overlook all the doings of men. All the scenes of earthly existence, all the grief and gladness, all the weal and woe of human life, Abraham now surveys in one instant with tender sympathy, rejoicing with the one and sorrowing with the other. But when he sees all the havoc that is done everywhere by

[1] This story, known in Mohammedan folklore, was known also in Essene circles, and is alluded to in the *Zohar*, Chaye Sarah, p. 127*b*, cf. Yalkut Reubeni Vayera, the calf showing Abraham the road to the cave of Machpelah, where the patriarchs lead their immortal life. Compare also F. Mannhardt, *Germanische Mythen*, p. 57-74. Liebrecht, *Gervasius*, p. 47 and 158, the story of *Hatim Tai*, the generous host and his horse, in Liebrecht's *Dunlop*, p. 519; and also the *unbroken bones of Jesus*, John xix. 33 36.

murderous swords and slanderous tongues, and how the peace of households and nations is destroyed by acts of violence and crime of all kind, he is seized with wrath. Beholding robbers ready to commit murder, he exclaims: "O Lord, let wild beasts of the forests come and devour these!" And no sooner was the word spoken than the wild beasts came out of the forest and devoured the murderers. On seeing men and women committing adultery, he cried out: "O Lord, let the earth open her mouth and swallow these up!" and behold, the houses tumbled over the violators of the marriage-vow and buried them under their ruins. And again he sees thieves digging holes through storehouses and carrying off the goods, and he prays: "O Lord, let fire fall from heaven and consume these!" and immediately fire falls upon the thieves and consumes them.

But instantly a voice from heaven stopped them in their ride; God says to the archangel: "Turn back lest Abraham by his wrath destroy all my creatures. *For behold, Abraham did not sin, and therefore has no pity on sinners. Yet I, who am the Maker of the world, do not wish to destroy a single creature of mine, but defer the death of the sinner, until he repent and live. Go, therefore, and show unto Abraham the judgments and retributions behind the Eastern gate of heaven, that he may have compassion on the souls of those sinners whom he killed in his wrath.*"

With these words of incomparable beauty and grandeur, the like of which have never been uttered by any prophet or preacher since the days of Ezekiel, and which lie at the root of the tenderest sayings of the silver-tongued teacher of Nazareth, God sends Abraham with the archangel Michael to view Paradise and Hell.

A grand scene now opens before the gaze of the patriarch. *Two roads,* one *wide* and one *narrow,* stretch on either side, ending at two gates correspondingly large and small, and a large procession of souls is led by angels along the former, and a few walk along the other; and before the two gates Adam, a man of wondrous figure, sits on a golden throne,

weeping and tearing his hair in distress at the sight of the multitude going through the wide gate, and again smiling and exulting at the sight of the few entering the narrow gate. "For the one leads to destruction, the other to eternal bliss, and against seven thousand that walk on the road of perdition, there is hardly one soul that walks on the path of righteousness without blemish to find salvation."

The writer, probably himself entranced as he opens his vision, continues, as if relating in the name of Abraham: "While I was still speaking, behold, there were two angels of fiery face and fierce looks, who drove before them ten thousand souls through the wide gate to perdition, while a single soul was led by one angel. Following the many through the gate, we beheld a man of marvellous stature and sun-like appearance, resembling a son of God sitting on a throne of crystal, and before him stood a table of crystal inlaid with chrysolith and beryl"—the reading of the corrupt text is conjectural!—"with a scroll of six cubits' length and ten cubits' width, while two angels held paper and ink and pen in their hands; and on the other side sat one angel of light with a pair of scales in his hand, and one angel of fire of relentless mien, holding a vessel with fire to probe the sinners. The man upon the throne judged the souls that approached, and pronounced their fate, the two angels opposite weighing and testing them, and the two other angels recording the verdict, the one the righteous acts and the other the sins." "This, O holy Abraham," says the heavenly captain Michael, "is the judgment and the retribution." The one that pronounces the judgment is the first saintly martyr, Abel, the son of Adam. "*Man shall be judged by man*" (cp. Genesis ix. 6, and *Targ. Jerush.*), saith God; "therefore the power was given to him until the time when God himself will come and give the final judgment, which is everlasting and unchangeable. For each man having sprung forth from the first created, all are first judged here by his son, and after the second appearance of the great Ruler to"—I adopt here

at once the reading suggested by the context in place of the Christianised version of the text"—*the twelve tribes of Israel*, all breath and all creation will be judged by the great Ruler, the God of all. Then the end hath come, and awful is the verdict, and no one can undo it." And as to the archangel who holds the scales of justice, this is *Dokiel* (accurate weigher=דוקיאל), and the one who holds the probing fire that is *Purael* (the chastiser from πυρ=fire, or=פורענאל, from פורען, punishment). Further the vision does not lead. By the true inspiration of art we are spared the shocking sight of agony and horror in the torture-chambers of hell, and likewise the spectacle of revels in paradisaical life which appeal only to the senses, although we might have expected some such revelations. We are still in touch with the lofty, prophetic spirit, if, instead of all that, we are called to witness the following striking scene: The single soul, under the guidance of the one angel mentioned before, is brought before Abel, the great judge, who now says: "Open for me the scroll here, and give account of the sins of this soul!" whereupon the angels find the number and weight of both the sins and the righteous deeds of the soul to be exactly alike. Forthwith the soul is neither handed over to chastisement nor to salvation, but put into the middle state—בינוני, as is the Talmudical term for the one who is neither צדיק nor רשע. And when inquiring after the reason, Abraham is told by his heavenly guide: "Because the judge here can neither condemn her for her sins nor grant her salvation for her righteous acts, she must remain here until God, the Judge of all, comes at the end of time and decides her fate." "What can be done for that poor soul?" asks Abraham, compassionately. "If she would but possess a single righteous deed above her sins, she would enter salvation," replied the archangel. "*Then let us offer a prayer* on her behalf, and see whether God will hear us," said Abraham, and fell on his knees, the archangel joining him; and when they rose from their supplication, behold, the soul was no longer in the middle state (the

Purgatory). "She has been saved through thy righteous prayer," said the angel to Abraham. A light-encircled angel had brought her into Paradise, whereupon Abraham exclaimed: "I give praise to the name of God the Most High, and to his mercy, to which there is no bound." Compare the Kaddish: יהא שמיה רבא מברך לעלם.

But this very act of kindness and of soul-saving grace brought, with all the keener pangs of remorse, the memory of those souls whom his wrath had killed before, back to his mind, and he invoked God amid tears to forgive him his sins and to restore those persons to life again; and God granted him forgiveness, and restored the dead to life, so that those criminals might meet their due punishment there.

It is time to make mention also of the second version of our text, which is both shorter and more recent. There Enoch, "the writer of righteousness, the teacher of heaven and earth," appears at the side of Abel, the judge, as the one who writes down the verdict, and Cherubim hold the scrolls and unroll them before these judges. Then there is first the soul of a woman introduced who had murdered her own daughter, but declared herself to be guiltless, when the scrolls unfolded showed her to have committed adultery with the husband of her daughter and then to have killed her, and many other crimes she had committed. And as they were read, she cried: "Woe to me! I have forgotten all these sins, but they are not forgotten here," and then she is handed over to the torturing demons. We observe here a progress, to be sure, towards the view of the latter Apocalypses; but we fail to find the least trace of Christian ideas, far less of New Testament influences. On the contrary, the Jewish idea of strict justice pervades, until Abraham, the same who pleaded for the living sinners of Sodom, also feels compassion for that one unredeemed soul, and his prayer rescues her. Christ has no place there, neither as a judge in the nether world, as the first Christians took him to be, nor as an atoning high priest who obtains

mercy for the sinner by his vicarious sacrifice. In fact, it is easy to show that the Abraham of our Apocalypse has not a tinge of either Christian or of late Rabbinical colour about him. He represents the *cosmopolitan humanity of the Jews of the Ptolemean period*, just as the Book of Aristeas does, for which, strangely enough, the historiographer Graetz has no place except as a stupid forgery.

But before examining the main tenor and tendency of our Apocalypse, we must follow the patriarch to his blissful end. Abraham's hours are numbered. He manifests the same reluctance to depart this life, as does Moses in the Midrash. He persists in refusing to follow Michael to heaven, and the archangel comes complaining before God, saying: "I dare not touch him, because he is Thy friend, *and there is none like him on earth except Job, the marvellous man.*" This occasional reference to the heathen saint Job is altogether remarkable, as it points to a very old conception *intentionally* refuted in Talmud and Midrash, all of which place Job beneath Abraham (compare the passages referred to above), but maintained with great emphasis in the *Testament of Job*, a work of equal age and equal merit to ours, as will be shown later on, and in the Apocalypse of Paul, the sources of which are decidedly Jewish and pre-Christian. Finally, the angel of death, simply called *Θάνατος*, is sent to take the soul of Abraham. "Thou whose name is bitterness and ferocity, the brazen-faced, and the evil-eyed—עזזאל and עין רע—cast aside thy terrific aspect and impurity ('stench' of Ahriman in the Avesta), and appear in the garb of an angel of light, exhaling the beauty and perfume of Paradise." Exactly so does Satan appear in the garb of an angel of light to Adam in the Book of Adam, to which Paul refers in 2 Cor. xi. 14. Consequently Abraham goes to meet him and welcome him as guest, taking him to be Michael, the archangel; and the angel of death approaches him bowing, and says: "Peace upon thee, O righteous soul, friend of the Most High, who received holy angels as guests under his hospitable roof!" (cf.

Epistle to the Hebrews xiii. 2, and similar Midrashic expressions passim). But when the patriarch, full of admiration for his guest, asks after his land and destination, the angel of death says: "I am the bitter cup of death," an allusion to the name of *Samael* סם המות. Abraham first hesitates to believe that one so beautiful could be Death, then bids him leave his house; and, when this is of no avail, resorts, like Moses in the similar Moses Apocalypse, after true Essene fashion, to exorcism. By invoking the name of the deathless God he desires him to disclose to him all the secrets of death. He is told that his own virtue and righteousness became a crown of light upon the head of the angel of death, to make him appear like a divine messenger of peace, while to sinners he appears in utmost terror, bitterness, and unbearable odour of impurity. Abraham, desirous to behold Death in his most terrific sight, then arms himself with the *magic power of the holy name* of God, and tells Death to show himself in all his bitterness and cruelty. With seven fiery heads of dragons, and fourteen different aspects, one more ferocious than the other, Death now unmasks himself before him, so that at his very breath seven thousand children die in the neighbourhood, while Abraham swoons away in a fright. At the prayer of Abraham, in which even the angel of death joined, the children were restored again to life, and Abraham praises God on high.

Finally Abraham yielded, promising to give up his soul to the archangel Michael; but asked first for an explanation of the seven dragon heads, and the fourteen aspects of death, which the angel of death gives, while referring to the different modes of death men undergo. In the meantime exhaustion sets in, and, while clasping the hands of Abraham, the angel of death lures away his soul. And instantly Michael comes down from heaven with a multitude of angels to carry the precious soul upward. His body is put in heaven-spun linen, and anointed with paradisaical incense, and after three days buried *under the*

tree of Mamre. The soul, however, is amidst hymns and praises to the thrice holy God, carried up by the angels and placed before the throne of God, where Abraham prostrated himself before his Eternal Father, and God the Father says: "Carry my friend Abraham into Paradise to the dwellings of my righteous ones, the abodes of my holy ones, where there is neither labour, nor mourning, nor grief, but peace, and joy, and life without end."

It is very likely that the original work had here a brief description of the bliss of the Paradise, which is altogether wanting in our Apocalypse. The mention of the bosom of Isaac and Jacob at the entrance of Abraham into Paradise is a blunder too gross for the original author. The entire end of the book, which closes with an exhortation to imitate the hospitality of Abraham and the Christian Doxology, seems to betray a Christian hand. Still the whole Requiem idea with the presentation of the soul to God, and the reception of the same in Paradise, must have emanated from the Jewish *Essenes.* For, according to Mone (*Lat. und Griech. Messen,* p. 23f), the formula remained down to the third century: "In *the bosom of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob our fathers,*" which goes back to the second pre-Christian century, as is seen from 4 Mac. xiii.; also James, in his notes to our book, p. 129, quotes at least one formula: "In sinibus Abrahæ, Isaac, et Jacob *patriarchorum tuorum,*" which corresponds with אבותינו.

At any rate, the omission of Christ as the lamb, as the first-born son of God, the Word, or as the Judge, excludes a Christian authorship. A still stronger argument against the Christian authorship of our Apocalypse is offered by the manner in which Death is introduced. He is the ancient angel of death as we find him in the Books of Chronicles, with a few Persian and Babylonian traits attached, but this "world-destroyer" is simply a natural power without the malignity of the Ahrimanian Satan, and altogether free from the inherence of sin. He is the personification of physical evil with its

fourteen forms of death and seventy-two forms of disease (cp. *Apoc. of Moses*, or *Adam-book;* and the Avestas' 99,999 diseases of Ahriman), but not of moral evil, as in the Gnostic system of Paul and his followers, or predecessors. He is an agent, not a counterpart of God and of the principle of goodness.

Neither does Adam, as portrayed here, make the impression of being in need of a redeeming Christ to rescue him from the curse of the first sin. Abel, his son, too, is but beginning to claim especial reverence for his martyrdom. "The blood of Abel" is not yet rendered an object of sanctification or sacrament, as it became in the Books of Adam and Enoch, and in circles related to early Christianity. Our Apocalypse is from beginning to end *Jewish*. And in all probability the *Moses Apoc.*, the Midrash on Moses' departure (Jellinek, *Beth Ham.*, I. 115-129; cp. *Sifre Bam.*, 136, and *Deb.*, 338 and 354-57), has drawn material from the one now before us. (See also *Mech. Amalek* II.)

In the Moses Apocalypse the prophet is also shown the whole earth, Paradise and Hell, being lifted up by Metatron (*Mithra*), who often takes the places of the ἀρχιστράτηγος, "the captain of the heavenly host," the archangel Michael, who drives Abraham around the world in the cherubim chariot. The same is told of Enoch (*Book of Enoch*, lxx. 2). Dillmann compares it to Elijah's ascent in 2 Kings ii. 12. Still Elijah only rode up to heaven, but did not view Paradise and Hell, as Enoch and Abraham did, to see the first-created ones, the righteous ones of old. We cannot but think here of the sun-chariot of *Mithra*, which played a prominent part in the mystic practices of the Persians, the Mandæans or Gnostics, and Neoplatonists (S. Windischman, *Zoroastr. Stud.*, 309-312; Reville, *Religion of Rome under the Severi*, Germ. Trans., 89, 144, 161, 181; *Philostratus Apollonius*, III. 15; Rhode, *Griech. Roman.* 180*f*). We have here the "mystery of the מעשה מרכבה," "the practical use of the divine chariot," about which the oldest Rabbinical traditions, *Hagiga* 13-14, *Shir Hash. Rabba* ad צואדך

בחרוזים, and the *Hekhaloth* in Jellinek's *Beth Hamidrash* II., XVI.*ff.*, p. 64, and the Kabbalists, the יורדי מרכבה, speak so characteristically as of an actual miracle-working power. Cp. מטטראמולין the *Midrash* and *Hekhaloth.* Let us not forget that in the Adam Book (*Apoc. of Moses*) God rides in the *cherub-wagon* when appearing to Adam, and all the mystics are actually described as riding through the air on the celestial ὄχημα. So does Alexander the Great when carried by cherub-like eagles, and the earth beneath appears to him like a ball, and the sea like a pot, as he looks down from above (*Jerush. Aboda Zara,* III. 1). And now we learn from the cuneiform documents that this heavenly ride upon the eagle to look down upon earth and heaven from immeasurable heights, and then to reach Hades—in other words, the flight upon the cherub up to heaven and down to hell—goes back to the giant *Etan,* of hoary Babylonian antiquity (see Harper in *Delitzsch and Haupt's Beitr.* II. 2, pp. 391*ff.*). We need not be surprised, then, to find the ride down to Hades by Seth, or Sithil, the son of Adam, in the Mandæan lore. Ancient mythology becomes mysticism to a latter age. This is the key to the מעשה מרכבה, and the Essenes were the keepers of this lore—these נסתרות. Strange that when addressing his disciples on the Mount of Olives, through the opened heavens, invoking the Holy Spirit upon them, Christ also uses the word הנסתרות (this is the *Anetharath*) in the Bartholomean Apocalypse given by Tischendorf, *Apocalyps Apocryph.* p. 25.

The Midrash has not only preserved the memory of Abraham's ride above the vault of heaven (cp. also *Ber. Rabb.* 82: אמר רש[ב]ל(קיש) האבות הן הן המרכבה העלה אותו למעלה מכיפת הרקיע, *Beresch. Rabba,* § 48), but tells us expressly, with especial reference also to Moses *Mechiltha Amalek* 2, and without reference to Moses *Bereschith Rabba* 62, that, in order to have the righteous ones die in peace, God discloses to them previous to their death the secrets of the world to come while they are yet alive. The Midrash

continues mentioning Rabbis who saw Paradise and their own reward there before dying (Cf. Midrash *Shocher Tob*, Psalm xi.; at the close the vision of the dying Essene martyr יוסי בן יועזר). No doubt, then, there existed a Midrash פטירת אברהם, and probably also a פטירת יצחק ויעקב as well as a פטירת משה, if not in writing, at least as an oral Haggada (cf. Jellinek, *B. Hammidrash*, V. 50 and VI. xxxviii. And this is our Apocalypse. It is the work of an *Essene*. This is shown by its whole angelology and eschatology. And need we further proof that Abraham was endowed with all the virtues of an *Essene?* In his conversation with the angel of death, we have seen him using the holy name of God as a charm. That he ate his meat in priestly purity like an Essene (*B. Metzia*, 87*a*) was pointed out by Baer (*Leben Abr.*, p. 208). That he taught his children from Keturah the use of magic art by the names of the angels of evil, מסר לחם שם הטומאה (*Sanhedrin*, 91*a*) is also an Essene trait. And the very fact that the Kabbalistic book ספר יצירה was attributed to Abraham shows that, like Moses, he formed the centre of mystic lore. In fact, Enoch and Abraham are as far back as 140 before the Christian era, praised by Eupolemos as teachers of astrology, who had learned all about the stars from angels, which tradition throws some light upon the age of our Apocalyptic literature (Euseb. *Praep. Evang.*, IX. 17*f*).

On the other hand we know, from both the New Testament and the Jewish writings (Luke xvi. 13; *Kiddushin* 72*b*; and 4 Mac. xiii.), that "to sit in the lap of Abraham" means to enjoy the bliss of Paradise. Hence Abraham became a prominent figure there, as soon as Adam, Abel, and Enoch had stepped into the background; that is, when the seal of circumcision had become the pledge of life, and Abraham had to acknowledge the circumcised as his own at the gate (*Beresh. Rabba*, 48; *Shemoth Rabba*, 19; *Erubin*, 19*a*). For the cosmopolitan view of heaven and hell taken in our Apocalypse was narrowed down to sectarian Judaism in the Talmudical age, which tended, more or less,

to belittle the piety of Job and Enoch, and to behold in Adam the progenitor of a sinful race. This latter view, exhibited already in IV. Esra, grew into large proportions in Pauline Christianity, so that the poison of sin זוהמא של נחש (*Jebamoth*, 103*b*), worked, in consequence, less mischief in the Jewish dogma regarding the צדיקי אומות העולם than it did in the Church.

Let us now take a glance at the Paradise and Hell of the Talmudists, and see how they compare with our Apocalypse and with those of Peter and Paul. It is Joshua ben Levi, of the third Christian century, who, like Abraham, held previous to his death a conversation with the angel of death, God having given the angel of death the same instructions he had given the angel Michael regarding Abraham: "Do for him whatever he wishes," and who was privileged, like him, to see both *Paradise and Hell*, a description of which is given in the treatise bearing his name (see Jellinek's *Beth Hammidrash*, II. xviii., and 48-53; cf. I. 147-149). Zunz, it is true, finds this treatise to be of a very recent date (*S. Gottesd. Vortr.*, 179); but R. Joshua ben Levi appears throughout the Talmudical and Midrashic literature as the chief recorder of eschatological lore, as will be seen in the following, and his *Paradise* and *Inferno* have their analogies everywhere in the tradition (see *Midr. Konen*, Jellinek, *Beth Hammidrash*, II. 28-32, in תסכת גן עדן. III. 131-140, 67-76, v. 42-51 and 172*f*, and elsewhere).

At Gehenna's gate Joshua ben Levi saw (ib. I. 148, cf. Exodus Rabba, § 40) persons hung up by their noses, others by their hands some by their tongues, some by their eyelids and feet, women by their breasts. At one place men were devoured by worms that die not: at another, coals of fire burnt up their inner parts. Some ate dust that broke their teeth—they had lived on stolen goods; and others were cast from flames into ice, and back again. Each sin had its own chastising angel, the three deadly sins mentioned being adultery, insulting a fellow-man in public, and abusing

the name of God. All the faces were *black*, and in the very midst of their suffering the Jewish sinners would declare God to be a just Judge, and be rescued after twelve months, while the heathen, failing to do so, would have their punishment renewed every six months. From Friday eve to the close of Sabbath, however, the fires of Gehenna are cooled down, and they themselves find a cooling place between two mountains of snow. Gan Eden he describes (II. 92) as a city with two gates of carbuncle, above which sixty myriads of angels, with faces like the firmament, stand with crowns of gold and precious stones, and with myrtle-wreaths in their hands, to welcome each righteous man as he enters, and lead him to his tent, where wine and honey from the world's beginning are spread before him on costly tables. Four rivers—one of wine, one of honey, one of balsam, and one of oil—flow through the city, where is light eternal and the beauty of continual rejuvenation, the soul going ever anew through the three ages of childhood, manhood, and venerable old age. Trees of all kinds surround the Tree of Life, exhaling wondrous perfume, and *seven* partitions there are for the various classes. About these seven partitions of the city of Paradise we learn (II. 28) that the *first*, made of cedar-wood, harbors the proselytes under the captainship of Obadiah the prophet (probably originally Abedmelech the Ethiopian, *see* JEWISH QUARTERLY, V. 417) ; the *second*, made of silver, contains the *repentant* sinners, under Manasseh's leadership; the *third*, made of gold, and precious stones, with the Tree of Life in the centre, and the patriarchs, the twelve sons of Jacob, David, and Solomon, and all the rulers of the ages under its shade, Kilab the son of David (cf. *B. Bathra*, 17*a*; *Derech Eretz Zutta* I.) being the leader, while Moses and Aaron perform the function of teachers, all being seated on golden thrones, there singing the praise of God. The *fourth* department, built of olive-wood, is inhabited by the multitude of those sons of Israel whose lives were made as bitter by oppression as is the olive-tree, yet gave

forth pure light. The *fifth* department, built of onyx and jasper, was that in which both Messiahs, the son of David and the son of Joseph, dwelt in company with Elijah. About the sixth and seventh the Midrash Conen is silent, most likely because, according to the Persian system there were originally but three, with the fifth (or fourth) as the inmost part, and only the Babylonian or Mandæan system had *seven*. Compare also Wolf, *Muhammedanische Eschatologie*, pp. 167-197.

Gehenna, according to the same tradition (page 30), also has but *three* large gates, under the rule of *Kipud*, of Neged sagiel (?) and of Samael, but *seven* departments, in the lowest of which Elisha ben Abuyah, the Gnostic, אחר, is placed; in the sixth, the idolater Micah; in the fifth, Ahab; in the fourth, Jeroboam; in the third, Korah; in the second, Absalom; for the first the name is omitted, but all except *Acher* are said to be released.

This seems to prove that the Midrash belongs to the age of Gnosticism. It is, therefore, quite possible that the tradition given as Elijah's communication to *R. Simeon ben Jochai* (Cod. III. 67*ff.*) goes back to that great mystic, from whose son Eliezer, Joshua ben Levi probably derived his lore. Among these נסתרות we can at least verify a very important one as Simon ben Jochai's teaching, and trace it far back to pre-Christian Essenism, *Sifre Debarim*, 10*a*, 47 (cf. Midrash *Shocher Tob*, Psalms xii. 6, seven heavens and seven hells). R. Simeon ben Jochai teaches that there are *seven* classes of righteous ones, who will see God's majesty in the world to come: first, "his loving ones are like the *sun;* the next class like the *moon;* the third like the *firmament;* the fourth like the *stars;* the fifth like the *lightning;* the sixth like the *lilies;* and the seventh like the golden candlestick with the olive-trees about it." Now, it is remarkable that the Biblical expression, ואהביו כצאת השמש (Judges v. 31), is not only in the Talmud constantly—(see *B. Bathra*, 8*b;* *Joma*, 23*a;* Targ. Jerus., and *Sifre* ibid.)—applied to the foremost in piety; but the

New Testament writers use it as a well-accepted term. See James i. 12: "The Lord has promised [*the crown of life*] to those *who love* him," and 2 Tim. iv. 8: "The Lord, the righteous judge, shall on that day give the crown of righteousness not only unto me, but unto all *who love* his presence" *πάσι τοις ἠγαπηκόσι τὴν ἐπιφάνειαν αὐτοῦ.* Resh—who, by the bye, in his very instructive work on the *Agrapha*, construes an original Hebrew Gospel *upon the false premise* that the apostolic quotations are *Christ's sayings*, while, in fact, they are *pre-Christian*, and *chiefly Essene expressions*, to a large extent *traceable also through Talmudic and Hellenistic Judaism!*—fails to see the Biblical allusion (page 253). Likewise must our New Testament exegetes fail to understand the words of the apostle in 1 Cor. xv. 40*ff*, where Paul, speaking of the *σώματα ἐπουράνια*, in contrast to the *σώματα ἐπίγεια*, says, "Different is the *δόξα* of the *sun* from that of the *moon* and that of the *stars*, for each star differs from the others in *δόξα*. And so is the resurrection of the dead. The generation of Adam is earthly, that of the Messiah heavenly." The apostle evidently alludes to the different classes of the just in Paradise, ranking in degree and in light by their very *faces*, as mentioned by Simon ben Jochai.

How old and constant this tradition was—and this constancy necessitates a class of mystics reaching up to high antiquity!—may also be learned from the following:—In 1 Cor. ii. 9, Paul quotes as sacred writing (*καθὼς γέγραπται*), "Eye hath not seen and ear not heard, nor hath it entered the heart of any man what God hath prepared for those who love him." Resh (*Agrapha*, page 154*ff*, cf. 281), shows that the words עין לא ראתה, Isaiah lxiv. 3, and lxv. 17, could not have been meant by the apostle, but that an Elijah Apocalypse existed, containing the quoted verse, which he claims to be based upon a specific Christ-saying, although the same verse occurs in different forms elsewhere. The fact is that the Isaianic verse, עין לא ראתה occurs regularly in the apocalyptic

description of the bliss of the righteous in Paradise. (See *Berachoth*, 34*b*, sayings of R. Joshua ben Levi and R. Jochanan—both derived their Eschatology from Simon ben Jochai; and the treatise on Gan Eden in Jellinek's *B. Hammidrash*).

But we are in a position to give some information about the origin of the glories of "sun," "moon," and "stars" belonging to the souls in Paradise. The Persian book, *Ardai Viraf* (ed. and transl. by Haugh and West), the contents of which go back to the time of Plato and Pythagoras, also introduces a righteous man taking a glance at heaven and hell; and there heaven and hell are presented according to the original Aryan division into the *three* grades of good or bad *thoughts*, *words*, and *actions*, and an uppermost heaven, full of light, for the *good God Ahuramazda* with those souls that are godly, and an undermost and darkest hell for the bad spirit *Ahriman* and his evil associates. The three divisions of heaven bear the characteristic names of stations of the *sun*, of the *moon*, and of the *stars;* and above that of the sun, the highest of these, there is the dwelling-place of Ahuramazda, the seat of the Endless Lights, "the House of Song," mentioned already in the oldest Zoroastrian hymns. There are the same rivers of oil and the wine of the new life (a drink from the stream of forgetfulness, יין המשומר), and the perfume of wondrous power with the miraculous trees and the life-bestowing ox (Bundahish, XIX. 13)=Behemoth, as meat for the righteous, and also the same modes of punishment of the wicked, as described in the Apocalypse of Peter and Paul, and in the Jewish treatises on Gehenna, only far more systematically arranged in the Persian system than in any of these. No one familiar with the Avesta literature, from the reports of Theopompus and Plutarch to the vision of Viraf and all the Pahlavi Texts, as translated by West, can read of the wicked in the Peter Apocalypse, how they are hung up by their tongues, breasts, and heads, etc., without feeling certain that the Persian

conception (if not the Hindoo (Brahmin) one given in Book XIV., of the Pre-Buddhistic Epic Mahabharata) is the original and the Christian is a copy. But between these stand the Jewish Essenes. They certainly wrote the Sibylline books, and of these the second book, verses 260-270, has an indisputable Jewish character. They are the prophetical warning to the idolatrous *heathen*, the pederasts, adulterers, and *usurers!* There is the original "gnashing of the teeth" of those in Gehenna, Sibyll. Book VIII. 350; II. 306, "the fire" and "the worms," and the "wailing" of Matt. xiii. 42 and 50, which expression goes back to Judith xvi. 17. Consequently, when a tradition in the name of R. [Joshua ben] Levi, in *Shir Hashirim Rabba* to v. 15, and *Vayikra Rabb.* § 25, says that as those that live in concubinage with their servants are "hung up by their heads in Gehenna"—exactly as the adulterers are hung up by their heads in the Peter Apocalypse—and the Rabbinical saying is based on Psalm lxviii. 22, while the Midrash and Targ. Jonath. show the entire Psalm applied to the Two Roads of Life and Death Eternal, Heaven and Hell!—we see at once that the Christian Apocalypse offers only *borrowed* views and traditions. In fact, we possess a remarkable vision of an Essene, חסיד, of the time of Simon ben Shetach, a century before the rise of Christianity, according to which the departed Essene brother enjoys, under the shade of the trees of Paradise, the bliss of the streams of life, while the son of a publican nearly suffers the agonies of Tantalus, standing in the midst of water, yet unable to quench his thirst (compare *Visio Pauli*, by Brandes, page 28, and St. Perpetua VII.) and a saintly woman, Miriam, the daughter of Eli (the high priest), is at times hedged in under the reeds [of the Styx river] or hung up by her breasts, because her fasts had often the air of hypocrisy (see *Jerush. Hagiga* II. 1). Compare also the thirteen streams of Balsam which R. Abbahu saw flowing for him to drink from in Paradise

(*Beresh. Rabb.* § 62), and the burning filth in the mouth of the blasphemers (*Gittin* 57*a*) with the Apocalyptic pictures. Josephus is undoubtedly right when comparing the Paradise and Hell of the Essenes with the Greek Elysium and Hades (*Jewish Wars*, II. viii. 11). But we must not overlook the fact that Plato himself has his description of the Great Judgment in the Nether-world and the two roads leading to Paradise and Hell, the one to the right consisting of seven grades of light—one brighter than the other with a beautiful meadow in the midst, and the other, to the left, of torture chambers, with a "bellowing" beast in the deep, and the "wailing" of the punished ones filling the dark places, derived from the vision of "Er the Pamphylian, the son of Armenios, whose soul came back from the other world and narrated all these things." And this *Er* is identified by Clemens of Alexandria with *Zoroaster*. Compare Plato's *Republic* X., ch. 13 ff., with Clemens Alexandr. *Strom.* V. 14. He is, if not in name, certainly in the main feature identical with Viraf, the Persian saint. Likewise do the names of the judges in Hades, Rhadamanthus and Minos, point to a pre-Hellenic source, the one being Cretan or Semitic, the other the Egyptian god Ra-d'amenthes, "Sun of the Nether-world"; and while the weighing of the souls on the scales before the judgment-seat, found also in the Avesta, has the air of Egyptian thought, the maidens that assist in the judgment, according to the Platonic portraiture, or those that receive the soul at the gate or bridge in the shape of *Virtue* or *Sin* personified, have the original character of Aryan and Teuton Valkyries, and are still found sculptured on the Lykian monuments at Xanthos as soul-carrying *harpies*. In other words, the question of the origin of these *Orphic* conceptions of Hell and Heaven is far more complicated than our theologians or philologists imagine.[1] Egypt and Persia, India and Babylonia must

[1] Including A. Dieterich, whose classic work, *Nekyia*, Leipzig, 1893, is full of interesting facts, but labours under the mistake that the Orphic mysteries can be explained without a study of Babylonia, India, and Ancient Egypt, in short of Semitic origins.

have had an exchange of views regarding these matters ages before the Greeks made the acquaintance of either. The rôle of Judge of the Nether-world ascribed, then, by our Abraham Apocalypse to Adam's son Abel—corresponding with the Jama (Yima) of the Aryans, or with the son of Kayomarth of the Avesta (compare the *Seth* or Sitil of the Mandæans)—refers us to the age of Ptolemean syncretism, in which the Jews (Essenes) took a conspicuous part. The probability is that *Enoch* as Judge or Recorder of the last day, like Hermes (=Tot), Anubis and Mithra, belongs to a later stage, and the Messiah's officiating as judge at the resurrection like Soschiosch to a still later one.

It would lead too far were we to point out single parallels between the Persian and the Jewish Christian *Inferno* with its Wolf (*Kapod Minochird* 27-50 the same as קפוד, *Beth Hammidrash*, II. 30), its *Lake of Tears* (in *Arda Viraf* and עמק הבכא or Mayan Bochim, *Erubin* 19*a*; *Beth Hammidrash*, II. 147, I. 132), and its בהמות (cf. *Visio Pauli*, by Brandes, p. 26), the Leviathan and Ur of the Mandæans upon whose horns the earth rests corresponding with "the Tartaruchos" and "Themeluchos" of the Christian Apocalypse and the *Paradise* with its rivers and trees, its crowns of glory, and golden thrones for the just. It is the *Purgatory* or middle state, in which the soul with merits equal to her sins must stay, that our Apocalpyse has derived from the Persian system (see *Sacred Books of the East*, West Pahlavi Texts, I. 294), and we find already the schools of Shammai and Hillel—that is the generation preceding the Christian era—in dispute over these בינונים (see *Tosifta Sanhedrin*, xiii. 3, *Babli Rosh Hashana*, 16*b*). The *Shammaites* divide men into *three* classes: the wicked ones, the just and those whose sins and good deeds are even—שקולים—the first being at once sent down to Gehenna, the second at once admitted into life eternal, and the third are *tested by fire*. Here we have the same idea of δοκιμάζειν, which forms so prominent a part in the Epistles of Paul as well as in our Apocalypse,

and is based in our Tosefta on Zachariah xiii. 9, והבאתי את השלישית באש וצרפתים ובחנתים. Here the proving by fire is emphasised (cf. *Hagiga* 27*a*). It is probably not too bold to discern the identical names of the proving angels mentioned in our Abraham-Apocalypse in דלקיאל and פרעואל also in the old *Gan Eden* treatise bearing the name of the old Shammaite mystic, R. Eliezer b. Hyrcanos, *B. Hammid.* v. 42-51, in which Abraham and Isaac sit as judges at the gate in place of Adam and Abel in the Abrahamic vision. Against the Shammaites the *Hillelites* maintain that God will have compassion on the middle class and turn the *scale* in favour of mercy. The idea of having the scales of judgment turned toward the side of righteousness in our disposition towards our fellow-man, הוה דן את כל אדם לכף זכות זכות, which occurs in the saying of Joshua ben Parachia 130 B.C.E., shows how old the conception is. *This is exactly the view taken in our Apocalypse.* It is the cosmopolitan spirit of non-Palestinian or Hellenistic Judaism which prevails in the school of Hillel, and made them declare: טוב לאדם שנברא—"Man with all his shortcomings is not lost," while the Shammaites held the opposite view: טוב לאדם שלא נברא משנברא—"It would be better for man in his sinfulness had he not been born" (*Erubin* 13*b*).

The idea of divine mercy is emphasised in our Apocalypse to such an extent that the Christian Apocalypses of Paul, John, and Esdra could not well adopt it without dealing a blow to the intermediating power of Christ. Therefore, they lay all stress on the justice of suffering, sun, moon, and stars, earth and sea becoming accusers of man's sinfulness before the throne of God, while the apostles and saints appear "more merciful than God the Father of all; until Christ, we presume, releases the imprisoned ones. The main power of Abraham, however, is manifested in his *prayer* for the unfortunate inhabitants of Gehenna. His intercession for the soul he sees held by the angel in the Purgatory is a specimen of what he shall do after having entered Paradise. He will always be the מלאך מליץ. This

is the idea underlying our Apocalypse. And on it the *Kaddish* or *Mass* for the dead rests.

In all the Infernos of the Jews or Christians the cry is heard: "O God, righteous is thy judgment!" (see *Peter Apocalypse*, p. 10; *Paul Apoc.*, pp. 316-18; *Erubin*, 19*a*; *Taanith*, 11*b*; *Sifre Haazinn*, 307, צדוק הדין, cf. *Psalms of Solomon*, ii. 16 and viii. 7; 2 Macc. vii. 38, and xii. 41.) In life, justice—מדה כנגד מדה—is not always executed. All the more must the world to come bring about the relentless avenging of wrong, and an exact system of retribution. Still, even the gates of hell are not shut against the power of mercy when the divine justice of the punishment is humbly acknowledged by the sufferers themselves. "When the dwellers of Gehenna chant forth their *Amen* at the time when the holy name of God is praised by the congregation in justification of God's ways, the doors of hell yield, and angels carry them in white robes into Paradise on the last day." This is the teaching of R. Eliezer b. Hyrcanos, the great mystic, the last great authority on Essene lore, in *Eliahu Zutta*, ch. xx., and R. Joshua b. Levi, the pupil's pupil of R. Simon b. Jochai, who was the pupil's pupil of *R. Eliezer* has the following remarkable saying, *Sabbath*, 119*b*.—כל העונה אמן בכל כרחו קורעין לו גזר דינו כל·····פותחין לו שערי גן עדן, "Whosoever chants the *Amen* of the *Kaddish* with full force will have his verdict of condemnation repealed and the gates of Paradise opened for him" (cf. *Sanhedrin*, 91*b*, R. J. b. Levi, כל האומר שירה בעה"ז זוכה ואומרה לעה"ב; cf. also Midrash *Shocher Tob*, Ps. xxxi. 8, and Ps. lxxxiv. 3). It is undoubtedly due also to the *Sabbath* song of the Essene saints at their sacred banquets that the wicked in hell (see *Pesiktha Rabbathi*, 23) were granted a respite on that day from Friday eve to the close of the Sabbath under songs of Amen and Halleluyah, wherefore *Joshua ben Levi*, in the name of Bar Kappara, pupil of S. b. J., finds the three Sabbath meals to be a safeguard against Gehenna sufferings (*Sabbath*, 118*a*). Of course, the

Christian writer of the *Paul Apocalypse* (see Brandes' *Visio Pauli*) had to claim the same respite for the Christian inhabitants of hell on a Sunday instead, as Grand Rabbin Levy in the *Revue des Etudes Juives* suggested. But did not he, as well as the writers of the Christian *Esdra* and of the *Peter Apocalypse*, betray his dependence on Jewish sources in many other ways?

The Acheron, or Acherusian Lake, mentioned as the great river of Hades in Greek mythology, most probably of Semitic origin, found also in the *Sibyll. B.* I., 302, II., 341, appears in the Syriac version of *Paul Apoc.* as the lake *Εὐχαριστεία*, a rather awkward metamorphosis. The Hebrew words for the forms of hymns, *Th^{e}hillatha Tushbechatha w^{e} Nechmatha*, were manifestly no longer understood by the Christian compiler. See Tischendorf, *Apocr. Apoc.* (p. 56). The punishment for disturbance of the devotion during church service is mentioned alike in the Arabian *Moses Apocalypse* (Jellinek, *Beth Hammidrash* I. XIX.), and in the *Paul Apocalypse*, III., 40, a late interpolation). A difficult passage in the newly-discovered *Peter Apocalypse* seems also to find its explanation by recurrence to a Hebrew original. Speaking of the murderers that fall a prey to the evil reptiles of hell, the *Apocalypse* says: "There were set upon them worms like clouds of darkness," v. 10, *ἐπέκειντο δὲ αὐτοῖς σκώληκες ὥσπερ νέφελαι σκότους*. Harnack confesses his inability to explain this strange simile. As soon, however, as we think of בן הנפילים, and compare the נפילי תהום, a Leviathan-like monster so huge that God, in order to show him to Moses, must shake the ocean, *Shemoth Rabba*, § 15, we have the matter cleared up. But then even the Petrine Apocalypse must have been copied from a Jewish original. And, in fact, no Christian writer would have inflicted so terrible a punishment upon the worshipper of idols as is that of being roasted and burned up like the idol itself. Both he and the Sibylline poet, II., 260-347—whose reference to the Behemoth and Leviathan, v. 292, whose tortures for

the usurers, v. 269, and whose three rivers of Paradise with the emphasis of *equality of all* in the participation of bliss: "no slavery, nor poverty, nor riches, nor tyranny," show him to have been an Essene Jew—had older Jewish descriptions as *models*.[1]

The grand topic of the *Divina Comedia*—to sum up our inquiry—occupied the minds of the Jewish Essenes long before the Church took hold of it. The entire view taken of the relation of Judaism to the Church by Zunz and all his followers is, to my mind, utterly false. Before David, the son of Jesse, was placed by the Pauline Apocalyptic in the centre of Paradise as singer of the Hallelujah Psalms, the Essenes had placed their cup of wine into his hands to sing the praise of God at the great banquet of the just (compare *Pauli Apoc.* iii. 30 with *Pesachim* 119*b*). But the New Year's Day, in its character of annual Day of Divine Judgment, turned the mind of the Jew more and more away from prying into the secrets of the hereafter, leaving the subject to the few mystics who maintained the ancient lore, whereas with the Church the question of salvation and doom grew ever of higher moment.

Far, then, from being, as Zunz believed, borrowed from the Church, the Jewish Kaddish, with all the legends connected with it, forms the echo of the last *Amen* of Essene worship, in which the strains of the Orphic song, the Gathas of the Aryan priest and monk, and the Hallelujahs of the ancient Levite, united in praising the Thrice Holy One who dwells unseen above the Cherubim, yet is sought after by all.

K. KOHLER.

---

[1] I will add here that the name of Atarlimos given in the Arabian Testament of Abraham (p. 138) to Death is אנדרלמלסיא equal to *ἀνδροληψια*; see Jastrow's *Dictionary*, s.v., which, like Death הורגת רעים וטובים, *Vayikra Rabb.* § 23, and the Demon Bedargon in *Eisenmenger*, II. 436, mentioned p. 57, is פודגרא, equal to Podagra.

THE PHILOSOPHICAL ASPECTS OF THE DOCTRINE OF DIVINE INCARNATION.

THE idea of a God incarnate, that is to say, of a divine being who becomes man, assuming not the human form only as a mere apparition might, but condescending to be born and inherit human flesh and blood, is not peculiar to Christianity; but is I believe widespread in other religions also, notably in those of India. I shall however, confine the scope of this essay to an inquiry into the history and development of the Christian belief alone. For this is, after all, that which interests and most closely touches ourselves. A preponderance of educated people in Europe and America believe that Jesus of Nazareth was God as well as man. But no one seriously believes in the Indian tales of divine incarnations. These might be curious as illustrating a stray feature here or there of the fabric of beliefs built up by Christian thinkers and witnesses, but are otherwise worthless save to the students of anthropology.

I confine myself, therefore, to the Christian idea and belief. And what is this? First as to the name. In the Latin fathers the word used is *Incarnatio*, which implies that the Word became *Flesh*, as John says in his Gospel. But the Greek fathers, Athanasius for instance, used a slightly different term, ἐνανθρώπησις, which has never passed into our idiom. This term signifies that the Word became man and dwelt among us, according to the other half of John's statement.

Secondly, as to the content of the idea expressed in this twofold manner in the eastern and western halves of the Christian world. I do not know that a better exposition of the meaning of the belief can be given than that which we have in Athanasius: περὶ τῆς ἐνανθρωπήσεως τοῦ λόγου καὶ τῆς διὰ σώματος πρὸς ἡμᾶς ἐπιφανείας αὐτοῦ, "about the

becoming man of the Word and about the manifestation of him to us by means of body." Of this treatise I will quote a few lines (Migne *Patrol. Gr.*, § 17, xxv. 125):

"For let us not suppose that the Word was shut up and enclosed in the body (of Jesus). Nor was it in a body in such wise that it was not elsewhere as well. Still less did it move that body, but leave the universe empty of its energy and providence. On the contrary, strange as it may seem, being the Word, he (*i.e.* Jesus) was not contained in anything, but rather himself contained all things. Just as the Word being in the whole of creation, is an essence outside the whole, yet is in all things through his Powers, controlling and ordering all things, enfolding with his providence all in all, and making alive each and all at once, comprehending the whole world, yet not comprehended therein, but existing in his entirety and always in his Father alone: so also the Word being in his human body, and himself making it alive as you would suppose, made alive the whole world at the same time; and continued to be in all things and outside the whole. And although he was recognised from his body through its works, yet he did not cease to be manifest at the same time in the energy and activity of the universe. Now the soul has the faculty of seeing by means of its reasonings even what is outside its own body; not however of acting (or energising) outside its own body, or of moving by its presence things away from it. At least a man has never been known to move and alter the position of bodies afar off simply by reflection on them in his mind. Nor because a man should sit in his own house and reason concerning the heavenly bodies, would he therefore be already moving the sun and turning round the heaven. But he only sees them move and become, without being able to bring about all that.

"The Word of God however, did not exist in the man in this way. For he was not bound up with his body, but rather himself held and governed that body; so that he was in it and in all things both at once, and was outside reality,

and was at rest in the Father alone. And herein lay the miracle, that he was living with us as a man, and at the same time as Word was vivifying all things, and as Son was with the Father. Wherefore he himself suffered nothing when the Virgin bore him, nor was polluted because he was in a body. Nay, rather he hallowed his body."

This extract I think fairly represents the combination in one real person, Jesus of Nazareth, of merely human characteristics along with the superhuman and divine prerogatives of creating and sustaining the material universe, his own body included.

Now we have to ask where did such an idea as this come from, and what was its history, if it had one?

But first I must be allowed to separate the two elements in it. There is the particular human element in it, the historical man, Jesus, of whom, however, in the above extract we get no details. Secondly, there is the universal and metaphysical conception of a Word of God, who made and controls the world, but is also capable of manifesting himself in human form and of intervening in the affairs of men.

We all know that the conception of a Messiahship was much older than Christianity. It was an idea which held the minds of the Jews for centuries before the advent of Jesus, and had received various fillings, more or less spiritual, according to the class of aspirants whose national hope was summed up in the name. Christianity was originally merely the faith of those Jews who recognised in Jesus the Messiah or Christ that was to be; and the earliest Christian books, like the Gospels, and Acts, and the bulk of the writings of Justin Martyr, were composed with the aim of proving that Jesus fulfilled the Old Testament prophecies appropriated to the Messiah, and that therefore he was the Messiah.

Now the idea of a Divine Word was shaped and elaborated long before Jesus was born, no less than that of the Messiahship, and so equally admits of being separated from the

historical man Jesus, and of being examined apart. Moreover, it is on the whole a distinctly philosophical conception, and so merits the attention of the Aristotelian Society.

In the works of Philo, an Alexandrine Jew who was born about B.C. 20, and died about A.D. 43, or ten years after the crucifixion, we are fortunate in having inherited a mass of writings, prior to, and so independent of, Christianity, of which the Logos is the constant theme. They are an almost inexhaustible mine of information about how the Jews, especially the Greek Jews, conceived of the Logos or Word of God in a pre-Christian age. In the Pœmandres, ascribed to the mythical Hermes Trismegistus, we have also a pagan work written under Jewish influence, dealing largely with the same topic. The date of this book cannot be precisely fixed, but it was certainly not written under Christian influence; and the resemblance of its tone and thought to much of Philo is so great that we cannot doubt but that it is the work of a kindred and contemporary, but pagan, school of Alexandrine thinkers. Both Philo's works and the Pœmandres have been preserved to us by the Christian Church; whose early writers, like Lactantius at the end of the third century, boldly claimed Hermes as a Christian writer. Philo's works, not being anonymous, could not so easily be claimed as Christian; and accordingly the early Christian fathers merely borrowed wholesale his words and thoughts, while they suppressed his name. Sometimes, however, they pretended that he was really a Christian in Jewish disguise, and termed him a follower of the Apostles.

The following are the leading thoughts of the Pœmandres or Shepherd of men.

The Father of all things, God, is *Nous*. He is life and light; neither male nor female, but both at once. He is the Archetypal idea that pre-exists of infinite beginning.

He brought forth by Logos another *nous* that is creative This latter is God of fire and of spirit, out of which he created seven controllers, as they may be called, that sur-

round in circles the sensible world; and their control is called Fate.

This Logos and the creative *Nous* are of one substance, and are therefore united. So united, the creative *Nous* turns round its own creatures in a cycle of movement never ending and fresh-beginning.

The holy, luminous Logos issuing from *Nous*, which is God the Father, is Son of God. That which in each of us sees and hears, is the Logos of the Lord. The union of this Logos and of *Nous*, the divine Father, is Life.

Here we seem to have a gradation of three divine beings: *α*. Supreme *Nous*, which is God the Father. *β*. The holy and luminous Logos, which is Son of God. *γ*. The creative *Nous*. It is the two latter, whose respective functions in the work of creation are somewhat obscurely indicated, which are one and consubstantial.

The word ὁμοουσία, here used for consubstantiality, reappears at the time of the Council of Nice in a sense not quite the same, but yet akin to that in which Hermes used it. As against the Arians, who said that the Word was only of like substance (ὁμοιούσιος) with God the Father, the Nicene fathers decided that he was ὁμοούσιος, of the same substance.

We must next give a brief outline of Philo's doctrine of the Logos.

God the Father is an inscrutable being, that can only apprehend himself; and cannot possibly be the object of another's contemplation. We can only know *that* he is; not *what* he is. For he is without quality (ἄποιος), and we cannot predicate any attributes of him at all. No category is good enough for him. We do not even know his true name. In a sense we cannot even say that he is one; for he is not a first in relation to whom there can be a second. For all number is younger than the universe, but he is older than the universe, of which he is creator. Philo shrinks even from predicating goodness of God, because he is above the good, even as he is more

ancient than the monad and purer than the One. His favourite appellation for God is therefore the true Being, τὸ ὄντως ὄν. He, of course, took his philosophical language from the early Greek schools, especially the Eleatic. But in so insisting on the unconditionedness of God he was also protesting against the anthropomorphism not only of the Greeks, but of the Hebrew Scriptures as well.

Needless to say, Philo never for long sustains himself in this *Ding-an-sich* conception of God. He has to connect with God the sensible universe and man; and in the Logos or Word and Reason of God he found ready to hand an intermediary agency to connect the changeless and eternal pure Being with the world which becomes.

The initial step in his doctrine of the Creation of the World is a negation of his agnostic attitude, and is borrowed from Plato. It is this. God is self-sufficing, therefore he did not cause the universe to be because he wanted it, but because he is good and desired to extend and communicate, to externalise (if I may use the word) his own inherent goodness.

The next step is also borrowed from Plato's Timaeus, wherein we read (p. 28) that the world's artificer being good, looked to the changeless and eternal, and not to a created pattern in creating the world. This eternal and changeless archetype of the sensible world is a being separable from the Father, with a life of its own, and is itself divine. As the original of the universe it comprises in itself all intelligible beings, just as its copy, the world, comprises in itself us and all other visible creatures. I think so much may be said of Plato's archetypal world, without entering into the many obscurities of his reasoning.

According to Philo, God, in creating the world, looked to a similar eternal pattern. He prefigured in the calm depths of his reason, in all its details, the world which was to be. This divine plan or prefigurement of all things material Philo calls the intelligible universe, Cosmos

Noetos. Of it the material universe is the copy, including just as many sensible kinds as the pattern does intelligible kinds.

Thus the foundation of Philo's speculation is that idle distinction between two orders of being, an ideal and real, of which one is a mere double of the other, which was the keynote of New Platonism, and still haunts our schools of philosophy. One or the other order is a mere mirage.

This ideal or intelligible Cosmos, says Philo, is not in space or time, for these only arise out of and along with the material world. It exists in the consciousness of the all-wise God, as an idea of ideas, *ἰδέα ἰδεῶν*. It is no other than the Logos or thought of God as already engaged in the work of creating. The meaning of the phrase *ἰδέα ἰδεῶν* used of the Logos is this. God as pure being cannot enter into relations with indefinite and turbid matter (*De Sacrif.* 13, p. 261). So he employed bodiless powers, properly called ideas (*ἰδέαι*), in order that each kind of reality should acquire its befitting form. The same transparent device is used to account for evil and reconcile it with omnipotence. The tendency to evil in the rational or self-conscious soul is due to the fact that God left the arrangement of this part to subordinate powers.[1]

Out of the ideas or immaterial agencies the *Cosmos noetos*, itself immaterial, is constructed, an invisible counterpart of the visible world.[2] As the all in all of these unseen powers, which he also often calls *λόγοι* (words), *ψυχαὶ* (souls), and angels, the supreme word or Logos is the idea of ideas.

Another favourite way of speaking with Philo is to say that[3] the true or absolute Being has in himself two supreme and primal powers, viz., goodness and authority. In his goodness he created all things, in his power he governs the things so created. The Logos or Word is the union in him of these two aspects or powers. For by reason of and

[1] *De Conf. Ling.*, 35, p. 432. [2] *Ibid.*, 34, p. 431.
[3] *De Cherub.*, 9, p. 143.

through his Logos God is both ruler and good. As pure being, God is called the Father. As creative goodness, he is called God. As ruling creation by his providence, he is called Lord. The Logos is sometimes represented also as not the mere union in the Father of goodness and authority, but as above and between these two, and so identical with the Supreme Being. This threefold Godhead Philo more than once calls a trinity in unity and unity in trinity.[1] But the unity of God is declared to be a higher truth than his trinity. The former is apprehended in the ecstasy of the great mysteries by the thoroughly purged soul. The threefold aspect of the one God is apprehended in the lesser mysteries, and is but a provisional standpoint correlative with a certain weakness of spiritual vision on the part of the faithful.

There is a difference between Philo's Trinity and the Christian, in that in his the Logos comprises, as it were, both the second and the third person. Both Trinities agree in putting the Father first, and then his only son, the Logos, who is also God. Perhaps the functions ascribed in Christian theology to the third person, the Holy Spirit, are not the same as the ἐξουσία, rule or authority, in virtue of which the Supreme Being, according to Philo, is called Lord, κύριος. Still there is this resemblance, that the Son in leaving the world leaves the control of all things to the Holy Spirit. We must also not forget that the clear distinction between the Word and the Holy Spirit is late in Christian theology, and that the early fathers, like Justin, confuse them.

The real distinction between Philo's Trinity and the Christian Trinity is that Christians are taught to regard the latter as a step in advance, a truth newly revealed in Christianity; whereas Philo looks on it as an elementary grade of belief, to be surmounted as soon as the soul is truly purified. With him to *see* God as one, is a higher thing than to see him as three.

[1] *Qu. in Gen.*, iv. 2, pp. 242, 251; *De Abr.*, 24, p. 19.

The question whether Philo regarded the Logos, 1, as a person, 2, as divine, is of interest for the historian of dogma. A general examination of the numerous passages in which he writes about the Logos, leaves no doubt on the mind that he did both.

That the Logos was a person is clear, from the quasi-humanity which Philo ascribes to him. The Logos is the archetypal man and pattern of humanity, whom God made in his own image (Gen. i. 26), to be distinguished from the man who was afterwards formed out of the dust of the ground (Gen. ii. 7). The latter, the earthy man, γηινός, is only a copy of the former, who is the heavenly Adam. This spiritual Adam, who is God's word, is relatively without matter, ἀϋλώτερος, of a purer and finer consistency than the earthy Adam,[1] is pure reason without passions καθαρὸς νοῦς. The earthy man has quality, is an object of sense (αἰσθητός), is composite of soul and body. But the heavenly man made in God's image is as it were an idea, or a kind, or a seal, palpable to reason only, without body, neither male nor female, incorruptible in his nature.[2] He is the man of God, ἄνθρωπος θεοῦ. He remained with God, whereas the earthy Adam was expelled from the Garden.

Such are the human lineaments of the Logos or Word of God, and the devotion and reverence manifested by Philo for this ideal man proves more clearly than anything else that he believed in his personality and will. "To his most ancient word[3] hath the Father who begat all things given this singular privilege, of standing on the borderland and separating that which has come to be from its maker. But the same Word is intercessor[4] for mortality that ever frets and pines for the imperishable, is envoy of the sovereign to the subject. And in this privilege so bestowed, the Word finds his glory, and expressly tells of the same when he says, 'And I stood betwixt the Lord

[1] Cp. Paul ad Cor. I. xv. 47.
[2] *De Mundi Op.*, 46, 1-32.
[3] *Q. R. D. H.*, 42, p. 541.
[4] Cp. Paul ad Tim. I. ii. 5.

and you.' For he is neither unbegotten as if he were God, nor yet begotten as are ye, but is in the mean between these two extremes." Here we are reminded of the "Son of God, begotten not made," of the creeds.

The Word is "the Eldest Son of the Father, the first-born, oldest of the angels, the archangel under many names";[1] he is both identical with the σοφία or wisdom of God, and her son, begotten of her by God the Father. He is the shadow of God, and second God, δεύτερος θεός.[2]

"Our true high priest," he says elsewhere,[3] "is no mere man, but the divine Word, who is free from all sin, not voluntary only, but involuntary as well."

Such words imply a personal conception of the Word. Yet, more so, such words as the following, written as a commentary on Deut. xiv. 1: "Ye are sons of the Lord God." "Even[4] though no one hitherto has proved worthy to be called Son of God, yet may each of us strive to wear the garb of and array ourselves like the first-born Word, the eldest of the angels. . . Though we have not yet become fit to be considered Sons of God, yet we may become sons of his eternal image, of the most holy Word."

Such devout feeling as Philo clearly entertained for the Word makes it clear that he regarded him as no mere abstraction but as a personal will. He even calls him the Paraclete or advocate.[5] "The priest who sacrifices to the Father of the universe must employ as his advocate his Son, who hath perfect virtue, in order to win remission of sins and a supply of God's most bounteous blessings." So John in his Gospel, by implication, calls Christ the Paraclete.

And as we have seen, the Word[6] is himself the "high priest of God, and ministers, not only in the more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, of the universe, but in the

[1] *Leg. Alleg.*, III. 61, p. 121; *De Conf. Ling.* 28, p. 427; *De Agric.* 12, p. 308; Fragment ap. Euseb. *Pr. Ev.*, vii. 13, p. 625.

[2] *Leg. Alleg.*, I. 19, p. 106. [3] *De Prof.*, I. 562.

[4] *De Conf. Ling.*, 1, 427. [5] *Vita Mos.* 14, 2, 156.

[6] *De Somn.*, 1, 653, 22; cp. Hebr. ix. 11.

temple of the rational soul (λογικὴ ψυχή). Of this divine high priest, the Jewish high priest offering up his country's prayers and sacrifices is the sensible image."

But the Word,[1] besides abiding with the Father, rules the universe and holds all things together in a bond of peace and love. In one striking passage he is even identified with the sensible Cosmos, which he created and watches over; the *natura naturata* being here spoken of as if it were the *natura naturans*, the sensible manifestation as if it were the invisible agency. The κόσμος αἰσθητός is therefore called the only well-loved Son of God.[2] Elsewhere the Cosmos is called the seamless raiment of the divine Word (*De Prof.* 20, I. 562).

But the particular mission of the divine Word as ideal man is to mankind; and accordingly, beside his rôle of mediator and intercessor, he abides in the purified soul, and is father of all good counsels. In this sense we must interpret the many passages where the Word is called the bread of the soul,[3] the true manna which came down from heaven, never-failing like the dew, and encircling and refreshing the entire earth. His language in such passages is like that of John vi. 51: "I am the living bread, which came down out of heaven: if any man eat of this bread he shall live for ever." Elsewhere,[4] Philo entreats us "to draw nigh unto the Word, for in him we win a vision, with the purified and quickened eye of the soul, of God himself. And this vision is the food of the soul, is the true source of immortality." So St. John (Evang. xiv. 6, 9), wrote afterwards: "I am the way, the truth and the life; no man cometh to the Father but by me. . . He that hath seen me, hath seen the Father."

And just as John says (Ev. vi. 33), "He that believeth on me shall never thirst," so Philo[5] pronounces the Word to be the "Cup-bearer of God, the herald of peace, the

---

[1] *Qu. in Exod.* II., § 118.
[2] *De Strict.* 1, 361.
[3] *E.g., Leg. Alleg.* 1, 120.
[4] *Qu. in Exod.* ii. 39.
[5] *De Somn.*, 27, I., 683.

truly great high-priest, who takes from God the cups of grace and blessing, and extends them to us in turn. And the full libation of peace which he so pours out is himself, and we drink him, the Word, pure and unmixed, and are drunk with him."

Philo declares[1] that it is by an economy, and, in order to bring the dullards of sense to repentance through fear and to a better mind, that the Scriptures represent God, not indeed as a particular individual, yet as a man with face and hands and feet, mouth and voice, feelings of anger and wrath, even with weapons; and as going in and coming forth, and moving up and down among men. Such representations are for the carnally-minded, who cannot conceive of God as an immaterial and incorporeal spirit.

But though Philo shrank from the more extreme anthropomorphism of his contemporaries, he did not restrict the ministrations of the Word to mystic visitations of souls freed from the body, in the course of which, he says, "God reveals himself as he is, conversing as a friend with friends." The Word, he declares, does actually intervene as an angel in the form of man in human affairs. Thus it was the Word which called to Adam in the Garden; Abraham entertained the Word unawares, and the three men who appeared to him were holy and divine natures, a triple φαντασία of the God who is "a Three in One." So it was the Word which appeared to Jacob, to Moses in the burning bush. The pillar of cloud and fire was the Word made manifest. In these cases and in many similar ones the Word became an angel of human form, without any loss of or prejudice to its own divinity (οὐ μεταβαλών). Philo makes[2] the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah a text from which to preach his belief "That God descends and visits our earthly system, in order to help the virtuous and provide them with a refuge, and at the same time to send destruction on his enemies."

Sometimes Philo explains the same incident, *e.g.*, the visit

[1] *De Somn.*, I., 655.

[2] *De Somn.*, I., 633.

of the three strangers to Abraham, at one moment as a visit of angels, at the next as a manifestation or *epiphany* of the Word; and he wavers between the two views. It was, he says, a miracle for immaterial spirits to assume the human form and appearance; and to create in Abraham the φαντασία of being hungry, when they hunger not; and of eating and drinking, when they neither eat nor drink.

This is as near as Philo comes to the idea of an ἐνανθρώπησις of the Word. He says, indeed, that it would be easier for God to become man, than for man to become God; but in these words he wishes to imply that either alternative is unheard of and impossible. The notion of an *Incarnation*, of the Word becoming flesh, would doubtless have shocked him as profane, as it has ever shocked the Jewish and truly monotheistic mind.

But it must be owned that the cleavage in the monotheistic idea, which afterwards reached such an acute form in the age of Athanasius, had already begun in Philo and his school. Between man and the supreme unknowable God there is interposed a second being, himself divine and, in a unique manner, Son of God. This being is mediator between man and God, is the ideal of humanity, free from sin, whom men are in their conduct to imitate. Standing half-way between the eternal and the perishable, he reveals the Father to us, and as our true high-priest intercedes with him for our sins.

This is the side of the Logos doctrine which best accords with a human personality, and it was probably because of these quasi-human elements of the conception that the Logos-ship was in the first instance attributed to an historical person, Jesus of Nazareth. This man had already been hailed by his followers as the Messiah, and, no doubt, himself laid claim to be that Messiah. But the Messiahship was, after all, a human dignity only; for the Christ was, according to current Jewish ideas, to be a man of men, and not in any way divine or on an equality with God.

It is no time now to inquire why, or how, or when, Jesus was first recognised, not only as Jewish Messiah, but as the Word of God—a much wider, more universal and less Jewishly national conception than that of Messiah. It may be that the mere force of his personality, as it sufficed to convince Jews who looked for the Messiah, that he was whom they sought, so also sufficed to persuade the Greek Jews, in whom the Messianic aspirations were faint, but in whom the faith in the Logos was strong and vivid, that he was the realisation in flesh and blood of their ideal high-priest and mediator.

But a difficulty occurs here to the mind. The epiphanies of the Logos among men were true epiphanies, *i.e.*, had an apparitional character. The human forms in which and through which the Word visited and spoke to the Israelites of old were not made of flesh and blood, and neither ate nor drank, except in semblance. How then could the life of Jesus, a man of flesh and blood, who came eating and drinking, be assimilated to this activity of the Logos ?

I believe myself that more than one intellectual tendency of the age facilitated this result, which to our mind to-day seems so impossible. There was first a wide-spread belief which, as we know from Philo, penetrated into Jewish Greek circles, that the soul pre-existed before birth, and that a man born in one age may be re-born in another. Strictly Hebrew believers thought that Elijah was thus to reappear on earth and precede the Messiah, and by the time of Justin Martyr (140 A.D.), Christians argued that John the Baptist was no other than Elijah, born a second time. The popular mind in Syria and Asia was also thoroughly persuaded that men could rise from the dead and live again. Thus an impostor could persuade thousands that he was Nero risen again, and the first idea of Herod when he heard of Jesus was that he was John the Baptist risen from the dead. Thus the notion of men, not merely human nor quite divine, living among men a life half real and half phantasmal, must have been a very familiar one

in the first century, just as mediums and mahatmas are becoming a familiar reality in some modern circles.

Here I have touched upon one class of conditions, or analogies, which may have helped people to recognise in Jesus the Logos. But what more than anything else made the transition in belief both possible and easy was the resurrection of Jesus. His multitudinous apparitions, spectre-like in their suddenness, not only to the Twelve, but to five hundred persons at once, must have led those who heard of them, and who heard the Gospel of the Resurrection preached by Paul and others, to believe that the whole manner of the appearance and activity of Jesus was exceptional and superhuman, like that of the Logos in its epiphanies of old. The very application to Jesus of the word "epiphany," which Philo uses of the apparitions of the Logos, is a proof of this. Nor must we forget that, although Philo shrank from attributing to the Logos and to God hands and feet, mouth and voice, feelings of anger, and comings in and goings forth, yet the mass of his contemporaries did so, as he himself declares. As for the Gentiles, to whom the Gospel rapidly spread, they were familiar from childhood with the idea of gods disguising themselves as men, and walking about the world avenging wrong and rewarding virtue. Philo himself more than once passes an encomium on such beliefs, and quotes[1] with approval Homer's lines about the gods likening themselves to men. Paul the apostle, in his enthusiasm for the risen and apparitional Jesus, knew little, and cared to know less, about the real man Jesus. Hence he boasted[2] that he neither received his Gospel from men who knew Jesus, nor was taught it, but acquired it by direct revelation. He therefore conferred not with flesh and blood, *i.e.*, with the Apostles at Jerusalem, who had known Jesus "in the flesh," but retired to the desert of Arabia, in order to excogitate his Gospel.[3] As Dr. Martineau puts it: "In Paul's love for Christ there was nothing retrospective—no

[1] *De Somn.* I. 655. [2] Gal. i. 12. [3] Gal. ii. 6.

personal image, no memory of moving incidents and startling words, no regret even that he had missed all contact with such a sacred life."

It was, then, the human aspects of the Logos-ship that first led the Hellenised followers of Jesus to invest him with that dignity, and the exclusive stress laid on the Resurrection helped the process. But the identification, once begun, tended also to its own completion. The Word, besides his human aspects, under which, taken apart, he bore some resemblance to the ideal wise man of the Stoics, was also eternal, divine, God and Lord, creator and sustainer of the entire world. If Jesus was the Word, then he had to be all this as well. With the investiture, therefore, of Jesus with the Logos-ship, began Christian theology; the whole history of which is that of the gradual superimposition on the primitive Messianic belief in Jesus of the more abstract and universal conception. The eternal and pre-existent Word ever more and more usurps the place of the historical man, Jesus. Now, the balance of speculation sways in the direction of his humanity; now, in that of his being God. For a long time it was ill-kept, and in Arius and his party the humanist view made a last stand. But after his fall in the fourth century, abstractions and logomachy gained a final victory. The Logos scheme, as it can be deduced from Philo's works, is the basis of the Nicene Creed. Chrysostom fondly imagined his creed to be a final victory of Jesus over Greek thought, and so exclaimed, σεσίγηκεν ὁ πολλὰ λῃρήσας Πλάτων.[1] Yet immediately behind his Nicene shibboleth stood Philo, and behind Philo stood the contemned Greek philosopher. It was really Plato who had triumphed over Jesus, and Plato on the least fruitful side of his speculation.

I have noticed that already in Paul the apparitional and risen Jesus is beginning to drive into the background the real man of flesh and blood. This process of turning Jesus into a phantom both aided and was aided by the ascription

[1] *Comm. in Acta Apostol.*

to him of the Logos-ship. The Logos, in its epiphanies, neither ate nor drank, still less was it corruptible flesh. Rather it was, to use Philo's description, an ὄψις θειοτέρα ἢ κατ' ἀνθρωπίνην φύσιν—a vision too divine to be human in its nature (2, 436). Therefore, when the convert of Antioch or Ephesus heard that the Logos had been manifested in Judæa in Jesus, he rushed to the conclusion that Jesus was not of flesh and blood, but a mere φάσμα; that he did not really suffer and die, but only pretended to; that his whole life before his crucifixion was not less apparitional in its nature than his life after his resurrection.

This Docetism, as it was called, was the earliest of Christian heresies, and the very words of the prelude of John's Gospel, "The Word was made flesh," are a challenge to those who held it. Equally so are the passages in John's Epistles[1] anathematising as anti-Christ those who denied that Jesus Christ was come in the flesh. The letters of Ignatius teem with denunciations of it, and reveal to us what we should expect, namely, that it was peculiarly the heresy of Jewish Christians. All the second century fathers denounce it in turn.

Nor did this heresy fail to tincture even orthodox opinion. The verses of Luke, xxii. 43, 44, were cut out of most orthodox copies of the Gospels, for how could Jesus, the power and glory of God, need an angel to fortify his courage, or how could he be in agony and sweat blood? These verses were afterwards the stronghold of the Arians, but were repudiated by Athanasius and his school. Even an orthodox Church like the Armenian believes that Jesus was not liable to evacuations, and that he did not digest his food. For digestion is a sort of corruption, and his body was incorruptible from the womb. Athanasius believed that the body of Jesus was exempt from sickness, from weakness of all kinds, especially natural decay, and the common lot of death. This he held was the reason why Jesus died on the cross, that is by violence. In the

[1] 1 John iv. 3; 2 John 7.

course of nature he could never have died at all. All such opinions are semi-Docetic, an encroachment of the Divine, but phantasmal, Logos-substance on the flesh-and-blood humanity of Jesus.

To the same class of influence must be ascribed the miraculous birth of Jesus, a belief which though it may have first originated in the same way as the exactly similar but much more ancient belief about Plato, was yet in its development and dogmatic definition controlled by and adjusted to the belief that he was the Logos. Philo had written[1] that the Word had parents incorruptible and most pure : for his sire, God, the father of all things; for his mother, Sophia, by whom all things came into being. Now Sophia was also, according to Philo's myth, eternally a virgin, although the mother of the Logos. This philosophic myth of Alexandria probably lies behind the story of the miraculous birth.

And in the subsequent developments of the belief the Logos influence is equally marked. Plutarch says that the Egyptians saw in the cat, which was popularly supposed to be impregnated through the ears, a symbol of the generation of the Word or Logos, which is also conceived through the ears. Hence the early fathers believed that the Virgin Mary conceived through her ears. Philo had said[2] that the Father sows his intelligible rays (*ἀκτῖνας νοητάς*) into the God-loving souls of women who, filled with desire not of mortal, but of immortal offspring, and anxious to live with Sophia, have vowed themselves to perpetual virginity. Such souls bring forth without intercourse with human husbands, *ἄνευ ἐπιμιξίας*. In conformity with the above, the early fathers[3] held that Jesus the Word, was generated of the Soul of the Virgin, which was midway between her flesh and God. "Her *soul* came between, and in the secret citadel of the rational spirit, received the Word of God." In early Eastern pictures of the Annunciation, golden rays fall from heaven and enter into the Virgin's soul through her ears.

[1] *De Prof.*, 20, p. 562. [2] *D. V. C.* [3] Rufinus, *Ad Symbol.*

And it harmonises well with this view, that in the very primitive Gospel according to the Hebrews, Jesus speaks of the Holy Spirit, not of Mary, as his mother. The Holy Spirit is another name for the wisdom, Sophia or Episteme, of God. In the lectionaries of the West, there has ever been assigned to the feast of the Virgin Mary, the lesson from Prov. viii. 22 about Sophia, which begins :—" The Lord possessed me in the beginning of his ways." Philo long before had based on the same lesson his philosophic myth that the Word was born of the ever-virgin Sophia and of God.

Some heretics, however, refused to admit that Jesus had been born at all. So Marcion cut out of Luke the chapters in which the birth of Christ is narrated ; and Mark's Gospel plunges at once *in medias res*, altogether ignoring the earthly birth and parentage of Jesus.

The recognition, however, of Jesus as the Logos, if, on the one hand, it caused a heresy which nearly engulfed the nascent Church, on the other hand provided Christianity with a systematic theology which it could not have had otherwise. The Gospel of John is the earliest Christian document in which the view is formulated, and must have been written partly to supply a history of Jesus' ministry written from the new point of view, partly to check the Docetic view of Jesus already current. The conception of Jesus as the Logos, so clearly formulated in the proem, is somewhat unequally sustained in the rest of the book ; still it seems to underlie such language as is used of or put into the mouth of Jesus, iii. 13 ; iii. 18 ; iii. 31 ; iii. 35, 36 ; iv. 14 ; v. 17-22 ; v. 26, 27 ; v. 36, 37 ; v. 40 ; vi. 27 ; vi. 31-35 ; vi. 38-41 ; vi. 46-51 ; vi. 57, 58 ; vi. 62 ; viii. 12 ; viii 19 ; viii. 42 ; viii. 58 ; x. 17, 18 ; x. 30 ; x. 33 ; x. 36 ; xi. 25 ; xii. 45 ; xiv. 6-10 ; xiv. 16 ; xv. 24 ; xvi. 15 ; xvi. 27, 28 ; xvii. 3-5 ; xvii. 11 ; xvii. 24 ; xx. 28. Some of these passages no doubt are equally compatible with the Messianic faith in Jesus, which the writer of the Gospel clearly had along with his more Hellenistic apprehension of him as the Logos. Some

of them might also be set down as mere pietism and reverence for a great teacher, who speaking with authority[1] and not as the Scribes, himself claimed to be a heaven-sent prophet and Messiah. But after making all deductions, there remain a considerable number of passages in this Gospel, as compared with the Synoptics, in writing which the author evidently wished to bring it home to his readers that Jesus was the Word. He must also have addressed an audience as familiar with the notion of the Word as ordinary Jews were with the notion of the Messiah. For he nowhere explains to his readers what it meant, or how they were to understand it; but plunges curtly into the matter with the declaration, firstly, that the Word was God and Creator, and, secondly, that the Word thus divine was made flesh and dwelt among us in the person of Jesus of Nazareth. Nor do we hear anything of the creative activity of the Word except in chap. i. verses 3 and 10. The rest of the Gospel is chiefly aimed to show how the Logos incarnate revealed God the Father to mankind. This was also a main function of Philo's Logos; but Philo, with more liberality of mind and greater width of horizon, realised that the Word is always, and has always been, revealing God to man, not only in the sensible world, but in the hearts of Jew and Gentile alike. That the Logos should restrict the period of his revelation to the three years' ministry of a single Rabbi, however august, would have seemed to Philo an unwarrantable limitation of the activity and goodness thereof.

Recent orthodox critics have minimised as much as they can the connection between the Alexandrine doctrine of the Logos, as Philo presents it, and the Johannean; and have argued that John derived his conception from a Palestinian form of the belief in the Logos. Yet the traces of a similar doctrine held in Palestine are faint, and the Targums in which they occur are not, like Philo's works, demonstrably prior to Christianity. These critics therefore appear to me

[1] Matt. vii. 29.

to turn aside from a beaten track where one's footing is clear, in order to grope along dubious and obscure byways.

One result, and an important one, of the identification of Jesus with the Logos was to separate the latter from God the Father, and hypostatise him more definitely than Philo had done. For in the individual man Jesus the Word was brought down to earth and severed from the Godhead in a way palpable to man's senses. In being thus brought down to earth and humanised, the Word or Divine Son also tended to be subordinated to the Father. Thus some ante-Nicene writers barely recognised the pre-existence of the Son before he was born of the Virgin Mary; others overlooked his co-eternity with the Father, which was nearly the same error. Others, again, forgot his equality and sameness of substance with the Father. All these were test-conditions of orthodoxy in the Nicene age; and the Logos doctrine as presented in Philo fulfils them all so easily as it does, because in him the pattern is, as it were, still laid up in Heaven, is still an ideal and so far abstract. No attempt has yet been made to adjust it to a concrete human personality.

Hence it is that few or none of the ante-Nicene writers were orthodox, and Petavius, the learned Jesuit, wrote a large folio to demonstrate that there were no thoroughly orthodox fathers at all before the beginning of the fourth century, when the Nicene Council ascertained and fixed for ever the true dogmatic scheme. The creed then formulated, so far as touches the bare Logos-aspect of Jesus Christ, is one which may with a little industry be collected from Philo's works; and this proves conclusively that the Alexandrine conception was really regulative of the whole subsequent course of religious speculation.

I have remarked that Athanasius himself could hardly maintain the Philonean Logos scheme in its integrity without trembling on the verge of Docetism; and doubtless the Docetic heretics of the first and second century were as sound in regard to the consubstantiality and pre-existence of the Word as they were unsound in regard to its real incar-

nation. It is a tribute to their strength that ἐνανθρώπησις ever remained the Greek word for the ἐπιδημία or sojourning of the Word on earth, whereas *incarnatio* is a Latin word for which the Greeks had no exact equivalent. The term ἐνανθρώπησις is no less compatible with a Docetic than with an orthodox view of that sojourning.

Such a see-saw of views was of course really due to this, that in Jesus Christ, God and man, the human and divine, were, after all, but mechanically juxtaposed. Neither the one nor the other aspect was properly thought out; so that there was no real synthesis, and one or the other was continually being obscured. The Nicene and the Athanasian Creeds were brave attempts to balance these unstable elements, and so far as mere phrases can go, succeeded in doing so. For the Catholic Church instinctively set itself to hold all parties together as much as it could. Thus a reader of the Synoptics might set most store by the flesh and blood reality of Jesus; but he must not deny his divine aspect as the pre-existent and eternal Word. A reader of John might value most this same divine aspect; but must be careful, in doing so, not to evaporate the human body of Jesus into a phantom. Your respect for the individuality of Jesus was very well so long as it only led you to affirm that the Word was a person (πρόσωπον) distinct from the Father. But you became a heretic if you went farther and regarded the Word as not co-eternal and consubstantial, or as in any other respect inferior to God the Father. But you might also go too far in this direction; and affirm that since Jesus Christ was one with the Father, therefore the Father also suffered and died on the cross. But if you did, you became a Patri-passianist and an object of anathema.

Nothing is more admirable than the comprehensive firmness with which the Church held together in one creed all these antagonistic and ill-assorted schools, or rather tendencies of thought; giving to each a clause in the whole, but checking it by anathema the moment it ventured to kick over the traces. For no one of these opposing lines

of thought could be consistently held or carried out to its logical result without extruding some other equally necessary element of the scheme. It was exactly as if we should first excommunicate all who declared space to be infinite, and then all who declared it to be finite, and should end by erecting a comprehensive dogma that space is finite and infinite both at once.

F. C. CONYBEARE.

A SPECIMEN OF A COMMENTARY AND COLLATED TEXT OF THE TARGUM TO THE PROPHETS.

NAHUM.

COMPARED with the Targum Onkelos to the Pentateuch, the so-called Targum of Jonathan ben Uziel to the Prophets, has been very much neglected by scholars and students. The modern printed editions of this Targum abound in errors, whilst, as far as could be ascertained, no English translation of the Targum to any of the prophetical books has yet appeared.

The following is an attempt to supply this deficiency. The short book of Nahum has been selected as a specimen of what is needed for all the prophetical books. The Massoretic text (edited by S. Baer) is here placed side by side with the Targum, the translation of each being subjoined. Thus, at sight, the variations between the original and the Aramaic Version can be noted. From this Book of Nahum, examples can be drawn of the especial characteristics of the Targum, as described by Luzzato, Deutsch, Frankel, Dr. N. M. Adler, and A. Berliner. It will also be observed, that in this book, the Targumic renderings frequently resemble those of similar Hebrew phrases in the Pentateuch, the dialect being identical.

In order to arrive at an accurate text, the edition of the Targum in Walton's *Polyglot* (London, 1656) has been here reprinted and collated with five MSS. and several printed editions. Three MSS. in the British Museum, a MS. from the Bodleian at Oxford, and one from the Montefiore College, Ramsgate, have been carefully examined. The MSS. of Oxford and Ramsgate are the only copies of the Targum to the Prophets contained in these libraries, and I beg to acknowledge gratefully the courteous assistance rendered me by Dr. Neubauer at Oxford, and Drs. Gaster and Hirschfeld at Ramsgate.

I have termed these MSS. respectively:—

MS.[1]. Of the 13th century. British Museum. Add. 26879 (*v.*, Margoliouth, *Descriptive List*, p. 17).

MS.[2]. A.D. 1475. British Museum. Or. 2211, from Yemen, frequently agrees with Lagarde's text (L).

MS.[3]. Of the 17th century. British Museum. Or. 1474 from Yemen; appears to have been copied from MS.[2].

O. Of the 15th century. Bodleian Library, Oxford; Opp. Add. 76 (in Dr. Neubauer's Catalogue, No. 69); frequently agrees with MS.[1] and CM.

CM. A.D. 1487. Montefiore College, Ramsgate. Codex Montefiore, No. 116. Was formerly the property of S. D. Luzzato, who describes it in Geiger's *Zeitschrift*, vol. V., 1844, p. 132, and in אגרות ש"ד"ל, p. 742.

MS.[1], MS.[2], O. and CM. are older than the earliest printed text extant, and are younger only than Lagarde's edition. None of these MSS. appear to have been known to Frankel, Deutsch, Levy, Cornill (Stade's *Zeitschrift*, 1887), or Taylor ("Micah," 1891).

The printed texts used are as follows:—

L. The *Codex Reuchlinianus*, said to be of 1105 A.D., edited by Paul de Lagarde. Not altogether reliable.

B. Bomberg's *Rabbinical Bible*. Editio Princeps, Venice, 1517. (Copied in the main by Buxtorf's *Rabbinical Bible*, Basel, 1619.)

Ant. The *Royal or Antwerp Polyglot*, 1570. (All references to this edition are taken from Stade's *Zeitschrift*, 1887, part II., p. 199.)

Warsaw. *Mikraoth Gedoloth*, Warsaw, 1866.

I have carefully punctuated the Targum, following in the lines of Levy (*Chald. Wört. über die Targumim*). Walton's punctuation contains several errors. MS.[1] and L, are unpointed; the other MSS. and printed texts vary considerably in their punctuation and are unreliable.

The only matter upon which I have not laid stress in collating the MSS. and printed texts, is the presence of the letter Yod (י) in a large number of words, where it does not affect the sense. The Yod abounds especially in O., CM. and L. Thus לאיתפרעא, מיניך, ואינבליניך, אישתא, otherwise written לאתפרעא, מניך, ואנבלניך, אשתא.

There still remains the task of collecting and collating stray quotations from this Targum that are to be met with in writings of the thirteenth and later centuries—a work that is also required for the text of the Jerusalem Talmud.

תרגום יונתן׳	Massoretic Text.
א	א
1 מְטַל כָּס [1]דִּלְוָט לְאַשְׁקָאָה יַת נַיְנְוֵה [2]מִלְקַדְמִין אִתְנַבִּי עֲלַהּ יוֹנָה בַּר אֲמִתַּי [3]נְבִיָא דְמִנַּת חֶפֶר וְתָבַת מֵחוֹבָהָא וּכְדוֹ דְאוֹסִיפַת לְמִחְטֵי [4]תָּב וְאִתְנַבִּי עֲלַהּ נָחוּם [5]מִבֵּית קוֹשִׁי [6]כְּמָא דִכְתִיב בְּסִפְרָא חָדִין :	1 מַשָּׂא נִינְוֵה סֵפֶר חֲזוֹן נַחוּם הָאֶלְקוֹשִׁי :
2 אֱלָהָא [1]דְּנָן וּפוּרְעָן יי מַתְפְּרַע יי וְסַגִּי חֵילָא קֳדָמוֹהִי עֲתִיד יי [2]לְאִתְפְּרַע מִסַּנְאֵי עַמֵּיהּ וּבַרְגַז חָסִין [3]מִבַּעֲלֵי דְבָבוֹהִי :	2 אֵל קַנּוֹא וְנֹקֵם יְהוָה נֹקֵם יְהוָה וּבַעַל חֵמָה נֹקֵם יְהוָה לְצָרָיו וְנוֹטֵר הוּא לְאוֹיְבָיו :
3 יי מַרְחִיק רְגַז וְסַגִּי חֵילָא קֳדָמוֹהִי [1]עֲתִיד יי לְאִתְפְּרַע[1] וּסְלַח לְדָתָיְבִין [2]לְאוֹרַיְתָא וְלִדְלָא תָיְבִין	3 יְהוָה אֶרֶךְ אַפַּיִם וּגְדוֹל־כֹּחַ וְנַקֵּה לֹא יְנַקֶּה יְהוָה בְּסוּפָה וּבִשְׂעָרָה דַּרְכּוֹ וְעָנָן אֲבַק רַגְלָיו :

Notes on the Text of the Targum.

I. 1.—[1] MS.[1] and CM., דלווט. B., דילוט. [2] O., דמלקדמין.
[3] MS.[1] and CM. omit. Walton regards the word as doubtful, and prints *Propheta* in italics. [4] CM., למיחטי איתנבי עלה.
[5] O., CM., דמבית. [6] O., כמה.
2.—[1] MS.[1], L., דאין; MS.[2], B., דיין; O., דאין דיין.
[2] MS.[1], L., B. O., CM., לאיתפרעא.
[3] MS.[1], מבעל דבוהי, probably a slip for מבעלי; O., מבעלי דבבא.
3.—[1-1] MS.[1], MS.[2], MS.[3], L., Ant., O., CM., omit. Walton prints the Latin rendering in italics; hence, the phrase, probably having crept into the text from the preceding verse, should be deleted.
[2] MS.[2], MS.[3], L., O., CM., לאוריתיה, as in T. to Exod. xxxiv. 7.

Notes on the Version of the Targum.

I.—1. משא, similarly rendered in Isaiah xiii. 1; xv. 1; xvii. 1; xxi. 11, 13, especially where the enemies of Israel are denounced. [Otherwise, *e.g.*, Is. xiv. 28; xxi. 1; Hab. i. 1, rendered by מטל נבואתא.] The T. takes משא in the sense of "*load* of punishment."

TRANSLATION OF TARGUM.

CHAPTER I.

1. The lifting-up of the cup of staggering to give Nineveh to drink thereof — concerning which city, Jonah the son of Amittai, [the prophet] of Gath-Hepher had aforetime uttered prophecy, and it repented of its sins: and when it continued to sin again, he departed thence; and Nahum of Beth-Koshî prophesied against it, as it is written in this book:—

2. God is a judge, and an avenger is the Lord. The Lord taketh vengeance, and great is the power in his presence. Hereafter, the Lord will take his vengeance upon the haters of his people, and, in mighty wrath, upon his enemies.

3. The Lord keepeth far his anger: and great is the power in his presence. [Hereafter the Lord will take his vengeance.]

ENGLISH REVISED VERSION.

CHAPTER I.

1. The burden of Nineveh. The book of the vision of Nahum the Elkoshite.

2. The Lord is a jealous God and avengeth; the Lord avengeth and is full of wrath; the Lord taketh vengeance on his adversaries, and he reserveth *wrath* for his enemies.

3. The Lord is slow to anger, and great in power, and will by no means clear *the guilty:* the Lord hath his way in the whirl-

---

The phrase כם דלוט is the T. to בום התרעלה, to Is. li. 17; cp. Cheyne's note *i.l.* Jonah prophesied against Nineveh, *c.* 860 B.C.; Nahum *c.* 710 B.C.

Abarbanel (Commentary, *i.l.*) finds the reason of the amplified Targum in the name אלקושי (from לקש, "to come after, succeed," cp. מלקוש), hence "the one who comes later."

2. Note the milder epithets employed by the T. with reference to the Deity, than in the text. (Upon these and other features of the T., cp. Deutsch, in Smith's *Dict. of the Bible*, Vol. III., and *Literary Remains;* Frankel, *Zu dem Targum der Propheten*, 1872, p. 23.)

קנוא.—T., "Judge." In Exod. xx. 5, and xxxiv. 14. T. renders by קנא. Cp. also Josh. xxiv. 19, where for אל קנוא T. has אל קנא.

נקם.—T. varies by פורען and מתפרע.

ובעל חמה.— T., "great is the power in his presence." Cp. v. 3, where same T. given to גדל כח. The words of the T., וברגז חסין, at the end of this verse, may allude to ובעל חמה. In Prov. xxix. 22, speaking of man, בעל ח', T. נברא חמתנא; חמה, T., usually פורענותא (*e.g.*, Is. lix. 18), or רוגז (*e.g.*, Jer. iv. 4).

לצריו.—T., *sc.* "of his people"; an anthropomorphism, with which cp. *Midrash Rabba, Genesis*, 55, § 3.

ונוטר left untranslated. T., וברגז חסין belongs to previous part of the sentence.

לָא מְזַפֵּי יי [3]בְּעַלְעוֹלָא וּבְרוּחַ
מְדַבַּר עֲנַן אַמְטְתָּא כַּבֵּשׁ חֶדְמוֹהִי :

4 [1]דִּנְזִיף בְּיַמָּא וּמְיַבֵּשׁ לֵיהּ וְכָל
[2]נְהַרְוָתָא מַחְרִיב [3]יְצְדֵי מַתְנָן
וְכַרְמֶלָא [4]וְאִילְנֵי לִבְנָן[4] נָתַרוּ :

5 טוּרַיָּא זָעוּ מִן חֶדְמוֹהִי וְרָמְתָא
אִתְפְּרַקָא וַחֲרוֹבַת אַרְעָא מִן
חֶדְמוֹהִי וְתֵבֵל וְכָל דְּיָתְבִין בָּהּ :

6 [1]כַּד אִתְגְּלִי [2]בְּרַחְמָתָא לְמִתַּן
אוֹרַיְתָא לְעַמֵּיהּ כֵּן זְעַ עַלְמָא
מִן חֶדְמוֹהִי בְּכֵן כַּד [3]אִתְגְּלִי בְּרִגַּז
[4]לְאִתְפְּרַע מִסַּנְאֵי עַמֵּיהּ חֶדֶם
פּוּרְעָנוּתֵיהּ [5]מַן יְקוּם וּמַן יְסוֹבַר

4 גּוֹעֵר בַּיָּם וַיַּבְּשֵׁהוּ וְכָל
הַנְּהָרוֹת הֶחֱרִיב אֻמְלַל בָּשָׁן וְכַרְמֶל
וּפֶרַח לְבָנוֹן אֻמְלָל :

5 הָרִים רָעֲשׁוּ מִמֶּנּוּ וְהַגְּבָעוֹת
הִתְמוֹגָגוּ וַתִּשָּׂא הָאָרֶץ מִפָּנָיו וְתֵבֵל
וְכָל־יוֹשְׁבֵי בָהּ :

6 לִפְנֵי זַעְמוֹ מִי יַעֲמֹוד וּמִי יָקוּם
בַּחֲרוֹן אַפּוֹ חֲמָתוֹ נִתְּכָה כָאֵשׁ
וְהַצֻּרִים נִתְּצוּ מִמֶּנּוּ :

---

[3] MS.[1] MS.[2] MS.[3] L., O., CM., בעלעול.

4.—[1] CM., נזיף. [2] MS.[1], נהרוותהא; MS.[2], L., B., O., CM. נהרוותא.

[3] O., יצדי. [4-4] MS.[1], ואילי מתנן ולבנן.

5.—Accidentally omitted in CM. The first Hebrew word הרים is given, but the Targum is that of v. 6.

6.—[1] MS.[2], MS.[3], L., O., אם כד. [2] Ant., ברחמנותה; CM., ברחמתיה.

[3] MS.[2], MS.[3], L., יתגלי.

[4] MS.[1], MS.[2], MS.[3], L., CM., לאתפרעא. In O., בכן יתגלי ברגז לאיתפרעא is added by a later hand. The original is obliterated. [5] MS.[1], מאן.

---

3. ארך אפים.—T., מרחיק רגז, so always; cp. Exod. xxxiv. 6, and נתינה לגר, *i.l.*

ונקה לא ינקה.—Cp. T. to Exod. xxxiv. 7; Numb. xiv. 18, and גר לגר, *i.l.* The T. separates the words, and amplifies. The same rendering is given in *Shebuoth*, p. 39*a*.

דרכו.—T., מדבר, as though it were a verb.

אבק.—T., כובש, also taken as a verb, "he subdues," or "spreads out, prepares." *Vide* Levy, *Chald. Wört.*, *s.v.* In 2 Sam. xxii. 10, the same T. given for ערפל תחת רגליו.

רגליו.—T., anthropomorphism.

4. בשן.—T. always מתנן. So Peshito, מתנין. According to Levy, מתנן = בותנן, Batanea. Cp. Frankel, *Zu dem T.*, p. 26; O. Strauss, *Nahumi de Nino Vaticinium*, p. 17.

TARGUM.

Them that turn to the Law, he will pardon; and them that do not turn to the Law, he will not hold guiltless. The Lord goeth in the storm and in the wind; and the cloud of thick darkness he subdueth before him.

4. For he rebuketh the sea, and maketh it dry, and drieth up all the rivers: desolate is Mathnan, and Carmel: and the trees of Lebanon languish.

5. The mountains quake from his presence, and the hills are broken asunder. The earth is laid waste from his presence; yea, the world and all that dwell therein.

6. When he revealed himself in love to give the Law unto his people, the world was moved from before him. Even so, when he revealeth himself in wrath to take his vengeance upon the haters of his people, before his chastisement who can stand, and

REVISED VERSION.

wind and in the storm, and the clouds are the dust of his feet.

4. He rebuketh the sea, and maketh it dry, and drieth up all the rivers: Bashan languisheth, and Carmel, and the flower of Lebanon languisheth.

5. The mountains quake at him, and the hills melt; and the earth is upheaved at his presence, yea, the world, and all that dwell therein.

6. Who can stand before his indignation? and who can abide in the fierceness of his anger? his fury is poured out like fire, and the rocks are broken asunder by him.

אומלל.—Cp. T. to Ps. vi. 3, where T. חלש; cf. also T. to Is. xxxiii. 9.

5. התמגגו.—T. אתפרקא. So Peshito, אתפרקי. In Amos ix. 13, for הגבעות התמוגגנה—T., רמתא יתפלחן, and Peshito, נתבסמן.—נמוגו of Exod. xv. 15, T., אתברו.

ותשא.—T., וחרובת, as though = ותשם, or ותשאה [A. V., "burned"; R. V., "upheaved"]. Warsaw prints וחרוכת, "and is burnt." Cp. Is. ix. 18, where T. to נעתם is חרוכת, whilst Kimchi (in ed. Bomberg, 1517) reads חרובת. Cf. also Joel ii. 10; רגזה, T., חרובת.

6. The description of the Divine manifestation of power applied to the scene of the Revelation on Sinai; so also Judges v. 4; Hab. iii. 3.

זעמו.—T. פורענותיה. Usually (*e.g.*, Isa. x. 8, 25; Ezek. xxii. 24) לוט. Cp. Psalm lxxviii. 49, T. חריכותא.

חרון אפו.—T. באב' רוגזיה. Cp. Eccles. vii. 3. Usually (*e.g.*, Numb. xxv. 4; *ib.*, xxxii. 14; 1 Sam. xxviii. 18) תקוף רוגזיה.

ממסי.—Cp. Malachi iii. 2.

[6]בְּאַבְאָשׁוּת [7]רוּגְזִיהּ [8]רוּגְזִיהּ
כְּאֶשְׁתָּא מַמְסִי וְטִינָרַיָּא [9]אִתְפְּרָקָן
מִן קֳדָמוֹהִי :

7 טָב יי לְיִשְׂרָאֵל לְאִסְתַּמְכָא 7 טוֹב יְהוָה לְמָעוֹז בְּיוֹם צָרָה
עֲלוֹהִי בְּעִדַּן עָקָא וּגְלֵי קֳדָמוֹהִי וְיֹדֵעַ חֹסֵי בוֹ :
[1]דְּרַחֲמוֹהִי עַל מֵימְרֵיהּ :

8 וּבְרַגַּז חָסִין וּבְחֵמָא תַּקִּיפָא 8 וּבְשֶׁטֶף עֹבֵר כָּלָה יַעֲשֶׂה
גְּמִירָא [1]יַעְבֵּיד עִם עַמְמַיָּא[1] דְּקָמוּ מְקוֹמָהּ וְאוֹיְבָיו יְרַדֵּף־חֹשֶׁךְ :
[2]וְאַחֲרִיבוּ יַת [3]בֵּית מַקְדְּשָׁא [4]דַּיי
וּבַעֲלֵי דְּבָבוֹהִי יְמַסַּר לְגֵהִנָּם :

9 עַמְמַיָּא דְּבַזּוּ יַת יִשְׂרָאֵל [1]מָא 9 מַה־תַּחְשְׁבוּן אֶל־יְהוָה כָּלָה
אַתּוּן חָשְׁבִין קֳדָם יי גְּמִירָא [2]הִיא הוּא עֹשֶׂה לֹא־תָקוּם פַּעֲמַיִם צָרָה :
עֲתִיד [3]לְמֶעְבַּד עִמְּכוֹן[3] לָא תִתְקַיַּם
עֲלֵיכוֹן [4]בְּבֵית יִשְׂרָאֵל תַּרְתֵּין
זִמְנִין [5]רְוַח בָּתַר עָקָא[5] :

10 אֲרֵי שְׁלְטוֹנֵי עַמְמַיָּא דְּבַזּוּ יַת 10 כִּי עַד־סִירִים סְבֻכִים וּכְסָבְאָם
[1]בֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל וּכְמָא דְּטַעַן [2]בְּחַמְרָא סְבוּאִים אֻכְּלוּ כְּקַשׁ יָבֵשׁ מָלֵא :
[3]כֵּן אַטְעִיאוּנּוּן שֻׁצְיָאוּנּוּן [4]כְּמָא

---

[6] M.S.[1], באבאש. The stroke ' denoting the abbreviation, probably omitted.
[7] M.S.[2], חמתיה ; Ant., חמתה. [8] O. omits, in commencing new column.
[9] MS.[1], MS.[2], MS.[3], L., O., CM., אתפרקו.
7.—[1] CM., דמתרחצין.
8.—[1-1] MS., יעביד עממיא ; Ant., יעביד לכל עממיא.
[2] MS.[2], MS.[3], ואחריבו לגמירא. [3] CM. omits.
[4] MS.[2], MS.[3], O., CM., omit.
9.—[1] O., מה. [2] MS.[1], MS.[2], L., O., CM., הוא.
[3-3] MS.[2], לאתפרעא מנכון.
[4] MS.[1], O., דבית ; L., בית ; Ant., בבית. [5-5] Ant. omits.
10.—O., ארי שלטוניא דבזו ית ישראל וכמה. [1] CM. omits.
[2] MS., בחמר. [3] L., O., omit. [4] CM., וכמא.

---

7. This and the succeeding verses plainly indicate the meaning of the prophet, by distinctly mentioning Israel and Nineveh. Cp. Frankel, p. 29, and notes by Keil, Henderson and Kleinert, in their respective commentaries, *i.l.*

TARGUM.

who can endure in the fierceness of his wrath? His fury maketh to melt like fire, and the rocks are broken asunder before him.

7. The Lord is good unto Israel, a support whereon to rely in the time of trouble; and plainly revealed before him are they that trust in his word.

8. And in mighty wrath, and in fierce indignation, he will make an end of the nations that have arisen and destroyed the Temple of the Lord; and his enemies he will deliver to the Gehinnom.

9. Ye peoples, who have despoiled Israel, what think ye before the Lord? An end he will hereafter make of you. There will not arise for you, as for the house of Israel, enlargement following twice after affliction.

10. For the rulers of the nations who have despoiled the house of Israel, when they erred through wine, have likewise erred and brought destruction upon

REVISED VERSION.

7. The Lord is good, a strong hold in the day of trouble; and he knoweth them that put their trust in him.

8. But with an overrunning flood he will make a full end of the place thereof, and will pursue his enemies into darkness.

9. What do ye imagine against the Lord? he will make a full end: affliction shall not rise up the second time.

10. For though they be like tangled thorns, and be drenched as it were in their drink, they shall be devoured utterly as dry stubble.

טוב ה'.—T. adds לישראל. Adopted from Psalm lxxiii. 1—אך טוב לישראל אלהים.

למעוז.—T. לאמ' עלוהי. More usually (*e.g.*, Ps. xxxvii. 39; *ib.*, xliii. 2), עושן. גלי קד' and על מימריה, anthropomorphic.

8. ובש' עובר.—T. amplifies figuratively.

מקומה.—T. renders מקום as "the sacred place, the Temple." Cf. Jer. xvii. 12, and Kimchi, *i.l.*; also Ps. cxxxii. 5, מקום, T. אתר למבני בית מקדשא, and Zephaniah iii. 7, מעונה, T., מדוריהון מארעא בית שכנתי. Cf. also *Midrash Rabba, Genesis*, 68, § 10. The rendering עם עמ' דקמו appears to take מקומה as a Po'el form of קום. Cp. Vollers', *Das Dodekapropheton der Alexandriner*, Halle, 1880, p. 11. Cp. Jerome, *i.l.*, "Verbum *macoma*, quod nos interpretati sumus *loci ejus*, omnes in duas orationis partes diviserunt, ut *ma* in præpositionem *de* verterent, id est *ἀπὸ coma* surgentes interpretarentur." Cf. LXX., *τοὺς ἐπεγειρομένους*.

ירדף חשך.—T. ימסר לניהנם. Cp. Ps. lxxxviii. 13, where חשך, T., חשך נהנם.

9. A continuation of the idea originated in מקומה of previous verse.

דִמְשֵׁצְיָא אֶשְׁתָּא בְקַשָּׁא וְבִישָׁא
סַגִּי :

11 [1]מִגֵּיהּ נִיגְוֵד נְפַק מַלְכָּא
דְחָשִׁיב עַל [2]עַמֵּיהּ [3]דַּיי [4]בִּישָׁא
[5]דְמִלַּהּ מֵלַהּ דְרַשַּׁע[5] :

11 מִפְּנֵי נָגַד חֹשֵׁב עַל-יְהוָה
רָעָה יֹעֵץ בְּלִיָּעַל :

12 כְּדֵנָן אֲמַר יי אִם יְהוֹן שַׁלְמִין
[1]בְּעִיצָּה וְסַגִּיאִין בְּאִתְמְנִיוּתָא
עַמְמַיָּא דְמִתְפַּנְּשִׁין לְאָעָקָא לִיהּ
יְרוּשְׁלֵם וְיִגְוֹזוּן [2]יַת [3]דִּגְלָת וְיִעְבְּרוּן
[4]יַת פְּרָת וְיֵיתוֹן לְעַנָּיוּתֵיהּ
[5]וּדְשַׁעְבַּדְתֵּיהּ לָא אֲשַׁעְבְּדֶנָּךְ עוֹד :

12 כֹּה | אָמַר יְהוָה אִם-שְׁלֵמִים
וְכֵן רַבִּים וְכֵן נָגֹזוּ וְעָבַר וְעִנִּיתִךְ
לֹא אֲעַנֶּךָּ עוֹד :

13 וּכְעַן אֶתְבַּר נִיר עַמְמַיָּא
מִצַּוְּרֵיכוֹן [1]וַחֲנַקְיכוֹן [2]אַפְסִיק :

13 וְעַתָּה אֶשְׁבֹּר מֹטֵהוּ מֵעָלֶיךָ
וּמוֹסְרֹתַיִךְ אֲנַתֵּק :

14 וְכַּקִּיד עֲלָךְ יי יַת מַלְכָּא
דְאַתּוּר וְלָא יְהֵי [1]דְּכַרְן מִשְׁמָךְ

14 וְצִוָּה עָלֶיךָ יְהוָה לֹא-יִזָּרַע
מִשְׁמְךָ עוֹד מִבֵּית אֱלֹהֶיךָ אַכְרִית

11.—[1] CM., ממך, Hebraism. [2] O., עמא. [3] MS.[1] omits.
[4] O., CM., בישן. [5-5] MS.[2], מליך מילך מלך דרשע ; MS.[3], מליך מילך ברשע.
12.—[1] MS.[2], MS.[3], L., בעיצא. [2] MS.[3], על. [3] CM., ריגלין.
[4] MS., על. [5] Levy, *Chal. W.*, II. p. 502, ושעבדתיך.
13.—[1] MS.[1], וחנקיהון. [2] L., CM., איפסוק.
14.—[1] MS., MS.[2], דוכרון ; L., O., CM., דוכרן.

---

10. סירים.—T., שלטני, reads שָׂרִים. So Peshito, לשלטניהון. Cp. *Midrash Rabba*, *Genesis* 56, § 6, where שָׂרִים is also used. Newcome (*Minor Prophets*, p. 193) adopts שׂרים, as the correct reading of the text. Vollers, p. 12, suggests that (like the LXX., *θεμέλιος*) T. and Peshito read יסודים, and compares Ezek. xxx. 4, taking יסודות as figurative for "Magnaten, Träger des Staatstums." But in Ezek., the T. renders literally אושותהא. In Isa. xxxiv. 13, T. סירין.

סבכום.—T. דבזו ; reads כסחים, from כסח, "to cut off."

יבש מלא.—T. takes מלא as adverb qualifying יבש. So Ewald, *Heb. Gram.*, § 279*a*, Kleinert, Henderson and Rowland Williams (*Hebrew Prophets, Assy-*

TARGUM.	REVISED VERSION.
themselves, even as fire consumeth stubble that is exceedingly dry.	
11. From thee, O Nineveh, hath gone forth a king, who imagineth evil against the people of the Lord,—who hath devised an evil device.	11. There is one gone forth out of thee, that imagineth evil against the Lord, that counselleth wickedness.
12. Thus saith the Lord: Though perfect in counsel, and many in number be the nations who gather together against thee, O Jerusalem, to distress thee: and though they pass over the Tigris and traverse the Euphrates to come to afflict thee, — even though I have before afflicted thee, I will afflict thee no more.	12. Thus saith the Lord: Though they be in full strength, and likewise many, even so shall they be cut down, and he shall pass away. Though I have afflicted thee, I will afflict thee no more.
13. And now will I break the yoke of the nations from your necks, and your bonds I will burst in sunder.	13. And now will I break his yoke from off thee, and will burst thy bonds in sunder.
14. And the Lord will give commandment concerning thee, O King of Assyria, and there shall be no more remembrance of thy name: out of the house	14. And the Lord hath given commandment concerning thee, that no more of thy name be sown; out of the house of thy gods will I cut off the graven

rian Empire, p. 439. Cp. Pusey (*Minor Prophets*, note on p. 377), Orelli, *M. Prophets*, p. 227), Strauss, *ib.*, p. 33.

11. T. adds "Nineveh," as is understood in all the commentaries.

מלכא, *i.e.*, Sennacherib. *V.* Rashi, and Williams, p. 440.

על ה'.—T. softens by על עמיה דה'.

12. T. amplifies. *V.* Rashi and Frankel, p. 30.

שלמים.—T., "perfect." So Henderson, Keil and Kleinert. R. V., "in full strength." A. V., "quiet." Cp. נתינה לגר to Gen. xxxiii. 18.

נגוזר.—T., ויגוזון. "Cut off," or "traverse," the דגלת (Tigris)=the Hiddekel of Gen. ii. 14; cp. נ' לגר, *i. l.*

ועמתך.—T. refers to Jerusalem; so also Williams, Henderson, Keil, Kleinert and Strauss. Cp. Jerome, *Comm. in Naum* (ed. Migne), p. 1240. Abarbanel, Ewald and Hitzig refer to Assyrians.

13. מטהו.—T., *sc.* "of the nations."

14. עלך.—T., *sc.* "King of Assyria." So all commentaries.

יזרע.—T. reads יזכר—יהי דכרן.

אלהיך—T., טעותך, "idols." Cp. נתינה לגר to Exod. xx. 3.

[2]עוד מִבֵּית טַעֲוָתָךְ אַשְׁמִיד צְלֵם וּמַסֵּכָה אֶעֱשֶׂה קִבְרְךָ כִּי קַלּוֹתָ :
וּמַהְתֻּכָא תַּמָּן אֲשַׁוִּי [3]קִבְרָךְ אֲרֵי[3] קַלִּילָא דָּא [4]חֲדָמָי :

ב

1 הָא עַל טוּרֵי [1]אַרְעָא דְיִשְׂרָאֵל רַגְלֵי [2]מְבַשַּׂר מַשְׁמַע [3]שְׁלָם חוֹגִי יְהוּדָה חַגֵּךְ שַׁלֵּימִי נִדְרֵךְ אֲרֵי לָא יוֹסְפוּן עוֹד [4]דְיַעְדּוּן בִּיךְ רַשִׁיעִין כּוּלְהוֹן אִשְׁתֵּצִיאוּ :

2 דַּחֲוֹו סָלְקִין וּמְתַבְּרִין עַל אַרְעֵיךְ צָרִין עֲלָךְ בִּצְוָר מְקַיְמִין [1]סַכְוָאִין עַל [2]אוּרְחָתָךְ תַּקְפִי חֲדַל חַפְּיֵי חֵיל לַחֲדָא :

3 אֲרֵי אָתֵיב יי [1]תּוּקְפֵיהּ [2]לְיַעֲקֹב רְבוּתֵיהּ לְיִשְׂרָאֵל אֲרֵי בַּזּוּנוּן בָּזְזִין וְקָרְנֵי תּוּשְׁבַּחְתְּהוֹן חַבִּילוּ :

ב

1 הִנֵּה עַל־הֶהָרִים רַגְלֵי מְבַשֵּׂר מַשְׁמִיעַ שָׁלוֹם חָגֵּי יְהוּדָה חַגֵּיךְ שַׁלְּמִי נְדָרֶיךְ כִּי לֹא יוֹסִיף עוֹד לַעֲבָרְךְ בְּלִיַּעַל כֻּלֹּה נִכְרַת :

2 עָלָה מֵפִיץ עַל־פָּנַיִךְ נָצוֹר מְצוּרָה צְפֵה־דָרֶךְ חַזֵּק מָתְנַיִם אַמֵּץ כֹּחַ מְאֹד :

3 כִּי שָׁב יְהוָה אֶת־גְּאוֹן יַעֲקֹב כִּגְאוֹן יִשְׂרָאֵל כִּי בְקָקוּם בּוֹקְקִים וְזְמוֹרֵיהֶם שִׁחֵתוּ :

---

[2] CM., ומבית. [3–3] O. omits. [4] O., קדם יי.
II. 1.—[1] Ant. omits. [2] O., CM., מבשר.
[3] MS.[2], שלמא. [4] MS.[2], דיעברון.
2.—[1] CM., סכון.
[2] MS.[1], ארעך; MS.[2], MS.[3], L., O., אורחתיך; B., אורח אורחתך; CM., ארעיך.
3.—[1] O., תוקפיה תוקפיה. [2] MS.[1], דיעקב.

תמן.—*Sc.* In the temple of thy gods, referring to the murder of Sennacherib, 2 Kings xix. 37. *V.* Rashi. Cp. Orelli, p. 228; Strauss, p. 43, and Jerome, *i.l.*

קלות.—T. reads קל זה. Job xl. 4, קלותי, T. אזדלדלית. Cp. Strauss, p. 44.

II.—1. The T., like the Massoretic Text, makes this verse the first of chapter ii., unlike the LXX., A. V. and R. V. With the T. of this verse cp. that to Isaiah lii. 17, from which this verse in Nahum appears to have been copied.

2. מפיץ.—T., מתבדרין; נפץ, in the sense of "to spread, scatter"; so Henderson. נצור and צפה, T. renders as perfects of the plural number, thus changing the subjects to the verb from Judah to the enemies.

TARGUM.

of thy idols will I cut off the graven image and the molten image: there I will set thy grave, for this is a light thing before me.

REVISED VERSION.

image and the molten image; I will make thy grave; for thou art vile.

CHAPTER II.

1. Behold, upon the mountains of Israel, the feet of him that bringeth tidings, that publisheth peace! Keep thy feasts, O Judah, perform thy vows, for the wicked shall no more pass through thee: all of them are destroyed,

2. Who come up and spread themselves over thy land: they distress thee with siege: they establish watches by the way: they are strong in neck, exceedingly mighty in power.

3. For the Lord has restored his might unto Jacob, his excellency to Israel; for the emptiers have emptied them out, and have spoiled the cities of their ornaments.

CHAPTER II.

1. Behold, upon the mountains the feet of him that bringeth good tidings, that publisheth peace! Keep thy feasts, O Judah, perform thy vows, for the wicked one shall no more pass through thee: he is utterly cut off.

2. He that dasheth in pieces is come up before thy face: keep the munition, watch the way, make thy loins strong, fortify thy power mightily.

3. For the Lord bringeth again the excellency of Jacob, as the excellency of Israel: for the emptiers have emptied them out, and marred their vine branches.

על פניך.—T., *sc.* of Judah; so Henderson, following Rashi and Kimchi; cp. Strauss, p. 51. Abarbanel upholds this view, but most of the commentators refer the pronoun to Nineveh.

נצור מצורה.—T. צירין עלך בציר, taking צור in the sense of "siege." In Isa. xxix. 3, מצורות, T., מליתא.

חזק מתנים.—T. reads חָזָק. קדל usually given for ערף. Cp. T. to Gen. xlix. 8; whilst מתנים usually = חרצא; cp. T. to Deut. xxxiii. 11, and *infra* ii. 11.

אמץ.—T. reads אַמְּיִין, Adjective.

3. שָׁב.—T., אתיב. So R. V. A. V. renders "has turned away," following the LXX., *ἀπέστρεψε*. Cp. Keil and Williams.

כנאון. T. omits the כ.

וזמוריהם.—For this paraphrase of the T. cp. Kimchi, *i. l.*

4 תְּרֵיסֵי גִבָּרֵיהוֹן מְסַפְּקִין גַּבְרֵי
עֲבָדֵי חֲרָבָא לְבִישִׁין [1]דְּזָהֲרִיתָא
בְּאֶשְׁתָּא פִּילֵי [2]רְתִיכֵיהוֹן זְמִינִין
[3]לְיוֹם קְשׁוּטְדָהוֹן [4]וְרַבָּנֵי מַשְׁרְיָתְהוֹן
[5]מְסַרְבְּלִין בְּצִבְעוֹנִין :

4 מָגֵן גִּבּוֹרֵיהוּ מְאָדָּם אַנְשֵׁי־חָיִל
מְתֻלָּעִים בְּאֵשׁ־פְּלָדֹת הָרֶכֶב בְּיוֹם
הֲכִינוֹ וְהַבְּרֹשִׁים הָרְעָלוּ :

5 בְּשׁוּקָיָא [1]מִשְׁתַּגְשְׁגִין רְתִיכַיָּא
קָל נְקוּשׁ זְנֵיהוֹן מִשְׁתְּמַע בִּרְחוֹבֵי
[2]קִרְוָיָא חֶזְוֵיהוֹן כְּבָעוֹרִין [3]כְּבַרְקִין
[4]טְרִידִין :

5 בְּחוּצוֹת יִתְהוֹלָלוּ הָרֶכֶב
יִשְׁתַּקְשְׁקוּן בָּרְחֹבוֹת מַרְאֵיהֶן
כַּלַּפִּידִים כַּבָּרָקִים יְרוֹצָצוּ :

6 [1]וְיַמִּין [2]רַבָּנֵי מַשְׁרְיָתְהוֹן
יִתְקְלוּן בְּמַהֲכֵיהוֹן יוֹחִין יִכְּבְּשׁוּן
[3]שׁוּרָא [4]יִבְנוֹן מִגְדָּלַיָּא :

6 יִזְכֹּר אַדִּירָיו יִכָּשְׁלוּ בַּהֲלָכָתָם
יְמַהֲרוּ חוֹמָתָהּ וְהֻכַן הַסֹּכֵךְ :

7 גְּשָׁרֵי [1]נְהַרְוָתָא [2]אִתְפְּסָקָא
וּמַלְכָּא בְּהֵיכְלֵיהּ זָע :

7 שַׁעֲרֵי הַנְּהָרוֹת נִפְתָּחוּ וְהַהֵיכָל
נָמוֹג :

4.—[1] CM., זהוריתא. [2] CM. omits. [3] CM., ביום.
[4] CM., ורישי. [5] MS.[1], מסרבלון.
5.—MS.[4], משתגשן (error for משתגשן); MS.[2], משתגשין; MS.[3], O., CM., משתגשן. [2] MS.[2], קריא; L., קיריה; O., קיריא.
[3] MS.[1], כבריזין (Rashi, in same MS., repeats the T. as כברקין).
[4] Levy, *Chal. W.*, I. p. 318, דטרידין, so Buxtorf.
6.—[1] MS.[1], יזכרי ימנון. [2] MS.[2], ריש; MS[3]., רישי. [3] O., שוריא.
[4] MS.[1], MS.[2], MS.[3], Ant., CM., O., ויבנון.
7.—[1] CM., נהרוותא. [2] MS.[1], אתפסיקו; L., איתפתחא; O., איתפסקו; CM., איתפסיקו.

---

4. אנשי חיל.—T., ג' עבדי קרבא, "warriors"; so also Henderson and Kleinert (the R. V., Keil and Strauss render "brave men"). Cp. 1 Sam. xiv. 52, בן חיל, T., גבר עבד קרב.

פלדות.—T., פילי, "torches." So A. V., Ibn Ezra, Abarbanel and Kimchi. Cf. Peshito, בלמפידא דנורא. Rashi prefers the rendering "steel," as the R. V. and many commentators. Cp. Pusey, p. 372, Strauss, p. 59, Ewald, *i. l.*, Vollers, p. 14.

והברושים.—T., ורבני משרית הון. Reads, והראשים (?). LXX., Peshito, Arabic and Vulgate read והפרשים. Abarbanel defends the T., by taking והברושים figuratively: אפשר לפרשו משל על האנשים הגדולים על המלכים והשרים שהם רמים במעלתם כברושים.

הרעלו.—T., מסר' בצבעונין. According to Rashi, the T. derives its rendering from the phrase in *Sabbath*, p. 65*a*, ערביות יוצאות רעולות, "wrapped in a mantle." Vide *Aruch*, *s.v.*, ערב, and Levy, *s.v.*, רעל. In Isa. iii. 19, T. for והרעלות is וחניסנסיא.

TARGUM.

4. The shields of their mighty men are dyed red: the men who wage war are clothed in scarlet: flaming with fire are the torches of their chariots: prepared are they for the day of their glory: and the nobles of their camps are clothed in coloured raiment.

5. In the streets, the chariots rage furiously: the noise of the clanging of their weapons is heard in the broad ways of the cities; their appearance is like torches, as lightnings hurled forth.

6. They appoint the leaders of their armies: they stumble in their ways: they hasten, they tread on the walls, and they build up towers.

7. The bridges of the rivers are opened: and the king trembles in his palace;

REVISED VERSION.

4. The shield of his mighty men is made red, the valiant men are in scarlet; the chariots flash with steel in the day of his preparation, and the spears are shaken terribly.

5. The chariots rage in the streets, they justle one against another in the broad ways: the appearance of them is like torches, they run like the lightnings.

6. He remembereth his worthies: they stumble in their march; they make haste to the wall thereof, and the mantelet is prepared.

7. The gates of the rivers are opened, and the palace is dissolved.

---

5. ישתקשקון.—T., קל ניקוש זיניהון (Abarbanel reads קל נשוק זיניהם). Rashi traces the version of the T. to such phrases as והשיקו (Joel ii. 24; T., *i. l.*, ויטופון), and כמשק (Is. xxxiii. 4; T., *i.l.* כמא דאזן). But, in each of these cases, it will be noticed that the T. has no connection, as Rashi assumes, with לשון השמעת קול ("making a noise"), (cf., however, Rashi to Is. xxxiii. 4, where he explains כמשק by לשון נהם). The T. evidently here takes שוקק in the sense of "making a noise," and refers the noise not to the "chariots," as in the text, but to the weapons of the warriors. Cp. Prov. xxviii. 15, שוקק, T., ודובא מצריה, and Rashi, *i. l.*

כברקים יר'.—T., כברקין טרידין, Rashi translates the T., "as terrifying lightnings." But cf. Levy, *s.v.*, טרד, "wie geschleuderte Blitze." Cp. LXX., *διατρέχουσαι*, and Peshito, רהטין. Buxtorf's *Chaldee Lexicon* (ed. by Fischer), *s.v.* טרד quotes this passage as כברקין דטרידין, "sicut fulgura expulsa," *i.l.*, "discurrentia, commota."

6. יזכור.—T., ימנון. Cp. Henderson, *i.l.*

אדיריו—T., רבני מש'. Cp. 2 Chron. xxiii. 20, where the word והאדירים is next to שרי המאות.

ימהרו ח'.—T. amplifies the idea.

והכן הסכך—T., יבנוו מגדליא. The T. takes הסכך in the sense of "that which is covered," *e.g.*, a tower. The sing. הסכך rendered in the plural by T., "so frequently," *e.g.*, ii. 4. מגן, T., תריסי; ii. 12, מעון, T., מדורי; iii. 2, מרכבה, T., רתיכין. Cf. Frankel, p. 16.

7. שערי.—T. נישרי, Cp. Strauss, p. 68, *sqq.*

נפתחו.—T. אתפסקא (most readings): reading נפסקו. L. is the most exact reading. Cp. Gen. vii. 11. נפתחו.—T. אתפתחו.

והיכל.—T., "The *King* in his palace," as a contrast to מלכתא of the next verse.

8 וּמַלְכְּתָא יְתֵבַת [1]צִבְיָא בְּגַלְיָא
[2]נְפַקַת וְאַמְהָתָהָא מַדְבְּרָן [3]אָזְלָן
בַּתְרָהָא [4]מְנַהֲמָן כְּקָל [5]יוֹנִים מְטַרְקָן
עַל לִבֵּיהוֹן :

8 וְהַצַּב גִּלְתָה הָעֲלָתָה וְאַמְהוֹתֶיהָ
מְנַהֲגוֹת כְּקוֹל יוֹנִים מִתְפָּפֹת עַל־
לִבְבֵהֶן :

9 וְנִינְוֵה כְּבֵית פְּנִישַׁת מַיָא
מִיּוֹמֵי קֶדֶם הִיא וְאִנּוּן [1]עֲרַקוּ קוּמוּ
קוּמוּ וְלֵית [2]דְּמַפְנֵי לְמֶקֶם :

9 וְנִינְוֵה כְּבְרֵכַת־מַיִם מֵימֵי הֵיא
וְהֵמָּה נָסִים עָמְדוּ עֲמֹדוּ וְאֵין
מַפְנֶה :

10 בּוּזוּ כַסְפָּא בוּזוּ דַּהֲבָא וְלֵית
[1]סוֹף לְאוֹצָרַיָא סְפוּ [2]מִכָּל מָנֵי
חֶמְדָתָא :

10 בּוּזוּ כֶסֶף בְּזוּ זָהָב וְאֵין קָצֶה
לַתְּכוּנָה כָּבֵד מִכָּל כְּלֵי חֶמְדָּה :

11 [1]בְּזִיזָא וּמְתְבַּזְזָא וּפְתִיחַ
תַּרְעָא לְסַנְאָה וְלֵב מְסָי וְנִקּוּשׁ
רְכוּבִין וְזִיוּעַ [2]בְּכָל חַרְצִין וְאַפֵּי
כֻּלְּהוֹן אִתְחַפְיוּ אִכְּרוּם אוּפָמִין
פְּקִדְרָא :

11 בּוּקָה וּמְבוּקָה וּמְבֻלָּקָה וְלֵב
נָמֵס וּפֶק בִּרְכַּיִם וְחַלְחָלָה בְּכָל־
מָתְנַיִם וּפְנֵי כֻלָּם קִבְּצוּ פָּאֹרוּר :

8.—[1] MS.[1], CM., ציריא; O., צירא. [2] MS.[1], omits. [3] L., ואזלן; O., נייח אזלן. [4] MS.[1], CM., נהמן. [5] CM., יונין.

9.—[1] MS.[1], CM. ערקין. [2] MS.[1], MS.[2], MS.[3], O., CM., דמתפני.

10.—[1] MS[1]., בסוף. [2] L., O., כל.

11.—[1] MS.[1], CM., ביזא; MS.[2], ביזא וביזא; MS.[3], בזיזא ובזיזא. [2] MS.[2], MS.[3], omit.

---

8. והצב.—T. ומלכתא, derived, according to Rashi, from Psalm xlv. 10, נצבה שגל, "the queen sitteth," hence a queen is הֻצַּב, "one who is caused to sit." The only objection to this derivation is that we should have expected the fem. form הֻצָּבָה. Luther and Ewald, like R. V., take the word as the name of the Queen of Nineveh, Huzzab, thus almost agreeing with the T. Newcome (*Minor Prophets*, p. 195) says: "Chaldee has צבא, "ministrans," which suggests the reading of והצבא, "and the host." This is altogether erroneous. Cp. Levy, *s.v.* The reading צירא, found in three early MSS., may be rendered "in distress."

גלתה העלתה.—T. reads בעגלה עלתה בגולה. Cf. Abarbanel. Levy, *C. W.*, I., p. 142, suggests בְּגָלְיָא, "openly."

מנהגות.—T. מדברן אזלן בת' מנהמן. Two meanings combined, taking the word—(1) from נהג, "to lead," and (2) from הגה, "to utter sounds." Upon this combination of renderings in the T., cp. Deutsch, *Lit. Remains*, p. 351, *sq.* and נתינה לגר to Gen. iii. 21. With rendering of the T. cp. A. V., "lead," R. V., "mourn."

TARGUM.

8. And the queen sitting in a litter among the exiles goeth forth; and her maidens led forth, go after her, murmuring as with the voice of doves, striking upon their breasts.

9. And Nineveh is as a place where waters gather together from the days of old: and they flee away: Stand, stand, they cry, and there is none who turneth to stand still.

10. Take ye the spoil of silver, take the spoil of gold, for there is no end to the treasures: make an end of all pleasant furniture.

11. She is spoiled and ruined: and the gate is open to the enemy: and the heart melteth, and the knees smite together, and trembling is in all the limbs: and the faces of all of them become covered with blackness, black as an oven.

REVISED VERSION.

8. And Huzzab is uncovered, she is carried away, and her handmaids mourn as with the voice of doves, tabering upon their breasts.

9. But Nineveh hath been from of old like a pool of water; yet they flee away: Stand, stand, *they cry;* but none looketh back.

10. Take ye the spoil of silver, take the spoil of gold; for there is none end of the store, the glory of all pleasant furniture.

11. She is empty, and void, and waste: and the heart melteth, and the knees smite together, and anguish is in all loins, and the faces of them all are waxed pale.

---

9. כבריכת.—T. כבית כנישת. In 2 Sam. ii. 13, T. gives for בריכה, בריכתא. מימי.—T. is literal, and differs from LXX., which reads מֵימֵי, "waters." Verses 9—12 are given as a direct quotation in Josephus *Antiq.* IX. xi. 3; but they appear to be a kind of Targumic paraphrase, agreeing neither with the Masoretic text nor any known Version.

10. לתכונה.—T. לאוצריא. For explanation *v.* Rashi, similarly rendered by Vulgate and Luther. Cp. R. V. and Henderson.

כבד.—T. ספו; cf. Rashi, who derives it from the Talmudic sense of "sweeping away," hence "ended." כבוד would be an infinitive in an imperative sense. Abarbanel opposes this rendering.

11. ומבלקה.—T. ופתיח תרעא לסנ'; cf. Rashi, cp. also Peshito, מתרעתא, from תרע, "to throw open," "to tear apart," *v.* Vollers, p. 17. Cp. Isa. xxiv. 1, נבולקה, T. ומסר לה לסנאה; and Kimchi, *i. l.*, who connects it with an Arabic root, signifying "to open the gate." Cp. Gesenius *Thesaurus*, *s.v.*, בלק [root = "to open"].

קבצו פאכור.—T. אתחפיאו אב' אוב' כקדירא. Similarly rendered to the same words in Joel ii. 6. In Jer. viii. 21, קדרתי, T. אתחפיאו אפי אכרום אוכמין כקדרא. The T. combines two ideas: פאר, "paleness," "brightness" (rendered by all the ancient versions "blackness") and פרור, "a pot." Cp. LXX., ὡς πρόσκαυμα χύτρας; Peshito, אכרום איך שוחרא דקדרא; Vulgate, "sicut nigredo ollæ"; Josephus, *l.c.*, μέλαιναι τελέως; Luther, "bleich sehen, wie ein Topf." Note the difference of rendering between A. V., "blackness," and R. V., "waxed pale." Cp. Schmoller to Joel, *i. l.*, Rashi and Kimchi, Strauss, p. 80; Frankel, pp. 39, 40.

12 אָן מְדוֹרֵי מַלְכַיָּא וּבֵית
מֵישְׁרֵי שִׁלְטוֹנַיָּא אֲתַר דַּהֲווֹ אָזְלִין
מַלְכָּא [1]תַּפְּן [2]בְּנִיהוֹן שָׁבְקִין הָא
כְּאַרְיָא דְשָׁרֵי עַל צֵידֵיהּ לְרוּחָצָן
וְלֵית דְּמָנִיד :

12 אַיֵּהּ מְעוֹן אֲרָיוֹת וּמִרְעֵה הַוּא
לַכְּפִירִים אֲשֶׁר הָלַךְ אַרְיֵה לָבִיא
שָׁם גּוּר אַרְיֵה וְאֵין מַחֲרִיד :

13 מַלְכָּא מְיַתַּן חֲטוֹף לְנָשֵׁיהוֹן
[1]וּבְזָיָא לִבְנֵיהוֹן [2]וּמְמַלְּן [3]אוֹצָרֵיהוֹן
חֲטוֹף וּבְרַנְתֵּיהוֹן בְּזָא :

13 אַרְיֵה טֹרֵף בְּדֵי גֻּרְיָתָיו וּמְחַנֵּק
לְלִבְאֹתָיו וַיְמַלֵּא־טֶרֶף חֻרָיו וּמְעֹנָתָיו
טְרֵפָה :

14 [1]הָא אֲנָא [1]שָׁלַח רוּגְזִי עֲלָךְ
אֲמַר יי צְבָאוֹת וַאֲדֵלִיק בְּאֶשְׁתָּא
[2]רְתִיכָךְ [3]וְכַפְּרָנָךְ [4]תִּקְטוֹל חַרְבָּא
וַאֲשֵׁצִי מֵאַרְעָא סְחוֹרְתִיךְ וְלָא
יִשְׁתְּמַע עוֹד קַל אִזְּנָךְ :

14 הִנְנִי אֵלַיִךְ נְאֻם יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת
וְהִבְעַרְתִּי בֶּעָשָׁן רִכְבָּהּ וְכְפִירַיִךְ
תֹּאכַל חָרֶב וְהִכְרַתִּי מֵאֶרֶץ טַרְפֵּךְ
וְלֹא־יִשָּׁמַע עוֹד קוֹל מַלְאָכֶיהָ :

12.—[1] O., לתמן. [2] CM., ובניהון.

13.—[1] O., CM., וביזא. [2] MS.[1], MS.[2], MS.[3], B., CM., ומלן.
[3] MS.[1], ביתהון ; CM., ביתיהון.

14.—[1-1] MS.[2], MS.[3], L., CM., האנא. [2] CM., רתיכה.
[3] MS.[1], MS.[2], MS.[3], O., CM., וישלטונך. [4] O., CM., תקטיל.

---

12. T. paraphrases "lions," etc., as metaphors for kings of Assyria. Cp. Isa. lvi. 9; *ib.*, xxxv. 9; Jer. ii. 15; *v.* Frankel, p. 30. It is noteworthy that an Assyrian emblem of strength, and even of divinity, was a lion. The Man-Lion was the emblem of Nergal, the Assyrian war-god. Cp. Layard and Rawlinson upon the subject.

ומרעה הוא לכפירים.—T. omits הוא.

לביא שם גור אריה.—T. reads כאריה שם גור, לְהָבִיא. Cp. LXX., τοῦ εἰσελθεῖν ἐκεῖ σκυμνον λέοντος ; *Peshito*, למעל לתמן ; Vulg., "ut ingrederetur." T. separates גור אריה. Cp. Frankel, p. 17.

13. ומחנק, טרף.—T. renders as passive participles.

TARGUM.	REVISED VERSION.
12. Where are the dwelling-places of the kings; and the habitations of the rulers? The place where the kings go, there they leave their sons; behold, they are like a lion that crouches upon its prey undaunted, and there is none that scares him away.	12. Where is the den of the lions, and the feeding place of the young lions, where the lion and the lioness walked, the lion's whelp, and none made them afraid?
13. The kings bring the spoil to their consorts, and booty to their children; they fill their storehouses with prey and their palaces with ravin.	13. The lion did tear in pieces enough for his whelps, and strangled for his lionesses, and filled his caves with prey, and his dens with ravin.
14. Behold! I send my anger upon thee, saith the Lord of Hosts; and I will burn thy chariots with fire, and thy chieftains (*see Note*) the sword will slay: I will destroy thy merchandise from the earth, and the voice of thy messengers shall no more be heard.	14. Behold, I am against thee, saith the Lord of hosts, and I will burn her chariots in the smoke, and the sword shall devour thy young lions: and I will cut off thy prey from the earth, and the voice of thy messengers shall no more be heard.

טרף בדי.—T. מיתן חטוף ל'. T. omits the idea of בדי, "sufficient," and takes it as "on behalf of," "for"; cp. Hab. ii. 13, and note in *Speaker's Commentary*. Cp., however, Rashi, בתרגומו מלכים היו מביאים שלל רב עד שהיה די לבני ביתם, and Strauss, p. 84. T. inverts the order of the words.

14. אליך.—T. שלח רוגזי עלך. Cp. T. to Jer. li. 25, and *infra*, iii. 5. Reads עָלַיִךְ, cf. Ezek. xxviii. 22, where הנני עליך ציידן has the same T. Cp. LXX., ἐπὶ σέ. Peshito, עליכי.

בעשן.—T. באשתא. Usually, as Exod. xix. 18; Gen. xv. 17, תננא. Cp. Kimchi and Henderson.

רכבה.—T. "*thy* chariot." LXX., Peshito and Vulg. also use the suffix of the second person.

וכפיריך.—T. וכפרנך; probably this word is employed by the T., owing to its resemblance to the Hebrew word. For the better reading, וישלטונך, see "Notes on Text of T."

מלאכיה.—T. reading correctly מלאכיך; so Luther. Cp. Keil and Henderson.

ג

1 וַי חַרְתָּא [1]אַשְׁדַּת [2]דָּם [3]כּוּלָּהּ
כַּדְבִּין [4]בְּזָא מַלְיָא לָא פָּסִיק קְטוֹל׃
2 קָל פָּרָשׁ [1]מָחָא וְקָל [2]זִיוּעַ
גְּלְגְּלִין וְסוּסָן [3]מְפַגְּכִין וּרְתִיכִין
[4]מְקַפְּצָן׃
3 [1]פָּרָשׁ [2]מַפִּיק [3]וּלְהוּב וְצַלְהוּב
סָנְפִין וְצִחְצוּחַ מוֹרְנָן וְסַגִּי
[4]קְטִילִין וַחֲמוֹן פִּגְרִין [5]לֵית סוֹף
[6]לְקְטִילְיָא [7]יִתְקְלוֹן [8]בְּקְטִילֵהוֹן׃
4 [1]מְפַגְּיוּת אִתְרְגוּשַׁת חַרְתָּא
[2]דְּהִיא כְטָעִיתָא נְפַקַת [2]בְּרָא
שַׁפִּירַת [3]רֵוּוּ יָדָעָא חֲרָשִׁין [4]דְּמָסְרָא
עַמְמַיָּא [5]בְּטַעֲוָתָהָא [6]וּמַלְכְוָתָא
בַּחַרְשָׁתָא׃
5 [1]הָא אֲנָא [1]שָׁלַחְ רוּגְזִי עֲלָךְ
אֲמַר יי צְבָאוֹת וַאֲגָלִי בְּהַתַּת
חוֹבָךְ עַל אַפָּךְ וַאֲחֲזִי [2]עַמְמַיָּא
בַּהַתָּתִיךְ וּמַלְכְוָתָא קָלָנִיךְ׃

ג

1 חַוֵי עִיר דְּמִים כְּלָּהּ כַּחַשׁ פֶּרֶק
מְלֵאָה לָא יָמִישׁ טָרֵף׃
2 קוֹל שׁוֹט וְקוֹל רַעַשׁ אוֹפָן וְסוּס
דֹּהֵר וּמֶרְכָּבָה מְרַקֶּדֶת׃
3 פָּרָשׁ מַעֲלֶה וְלַהַב חֶרֶב וּבְרַק
חֲנִית וְרֹב חָלָל וְכֹבֶד פֶּגֶר וְאֵין
וְאֵן לָהֶם לַגְּוִיָּה יִכָּשְׁלוּ בְּגְוִיָּתָם׃
4 מֵרֹב זְנוּנֵי זוֹנָה טוֹבַת חֵן
בַּעֲלַת כְּשָׁפִים הַמּוֹכֶרֶת גּוֹיִם
בְּזְנוּנֶיהָ וּמִשְׁפָּחוֹת בְּכְשָׁפֶיהָ׃
5 הִנְנִי אֵלַיִךְ נְאֻם יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת
וְגִלֵּיתִי שׁוּלַיִךְ עַל־פָּנָיִךְ וְהַרְאֵיתִי
גּוֹיִם מַעְרֵךְ וּמַמְלָכוֹת קְלוֹנֵךְ׃

III. 1.—[1] MS.[1], O., CM., דאשדת; MS.[2], אשדי.
[2] MS.[2], דם זכי. [3] MS.[1], בולא. [4] MS.[1], CM., וביזא.
2.—[1] MS.[1], CM., מוחי. CM., זיע. [3] Warsaw, מפרנסין.
[4] MS.[3], O., CM., מקפצין.
3.—[1] MS.[1], CM., פרשין. [2] MS.[1], CM., מסקין. Vollers, p. 18, reads מפיק.
[3] MS.[1], CM., להב; MS.[2], MS.[3], L., Ant., O., להוב. [4] CM., קטולין.
[5] MS.[1], MS.[2], MS.[3], L., Ant., O., CM., ולית. [6] CM., לקטוליא.
[7] MS.[1], ותקטלון; L., ויתקלון. [8] MS.[1], בקטיליהון.
4.—[1] MS.[3], מידסגיאות.
[2-2] MS[1]., CM., דהות מטעיאת כנפקת; O., דהות בטעיתא נפקת.
[3] Ant., חן; CM., ריו; O., ריאו.
[4] MS.[1], MS.[2], MS.[3], CM., מסרא; Warsaw, דמברא.
[5] O., בטעותא. [6] MS.[3], ומלכות; O., CM., ומלכוותא.
5.—[1-1], MS.[2], MS.[3], CM., האנא. [2] MS.[1] omits.

III.—1. לא ימיש.—T. לא פסיק. Usually, as Exod. xxxiii. 1, לא עדי.
3. פרש מעלה.—T. "the horseman lifteth up" (*i.e.*, maketh flames to rise, to glow).

TARGUM.

CHAPTER III.

1. Woe to the city that poureth forth blood! It is all full of lies and rapine: murder ceaseth not.

2. The noise of the striking of blows, and the noise of the rattling of wheels, and of prancing horses, and of jumping chariots;

3. The horseman maketh to glow the flames, and the keen swords and the glittering spears; and many are slain: there is a multitude of carcases, and there is no end to the number of the slain: they stumble over their slain.

4. Because of the terrible noise of the city, that like a harlot went forth, beautiful in appearance, learned in magic arts, for she deceiveth the nations through her idols, and kingdoms through her witchcraft.

5. Behold! I send my anger upon thee, saith the Lord of Hosts, and I will discover the shame of thy guilt upon thy face; and I will show the nations thy dishonour, and the kingdoms thy shame.

REVISED VERSION.

CHAPTER III.

1. Woe to the bloody city! it is all full of lies and rapine: the prey departed not.

2. The noise of the whip, and the noise of the rattling of wheels; and pransing horses, and jumping chariots;

3. The horseman mounting, and the flashing sword, and the glittering spear; and a multitude of slain, and a great heap of carcases: and there is none end of the corpses; they stumble upon their corpses:

4. Because of the multitude of the whoredoms of the well favoured harlot, the mistress of witchcrafts, that selleth nations through her whoredoms, and families through her witchcrafts.

5. Behold, I am against thee, saith the Lord of hosts, and I will discover thy skirts upon thy face; and I will shew the nations thy nakedness, and the kingdoms thy shame.

ולהב חרב.—T. ולהוב וצלהוב ס', giving two meanings to להב—(1) "the flames," cp. Levy, *s.v.*, נסק; (2) "brightness." Kimchi appears not to have read in the T. the word פרש, as he says, וי"ת בחסרון מלה מסיק להוב וגו'.

יִכָּשְׁלוּ.—T. יתקלון = יִכָּשְׁלוּ, retaining the כתיב with altered vowels; so Peshito, נתתקלון. LXX. and Vulg. adopt the קרי—וכשלו.

4. מרב זנוני ז'.—T. paraphrases, alluding directly to Nineveh.

טובת חן.—T. שפירת רוו. Cp. Gen. xxix. 17, where יפת תאר, T. שפירא בריוא; and Esther ii. 7, where יפת תאר, T. שפירת רוו.

בעלת כשפים.—T. ידעא חרשין. Cp. 1 Sam. xxviii. 7, בעלת אוב, T. דידעא לאסקא בידין.

המכרת.—T. דמסרא, "betrayeth." Cp. Judg. iii. 8; iv. 2.

בזנוניה.—T. בטעותהא, figuratively "idols"; cp. Levy, *s.v.* טעו. Cp. Ezek. xxiii., throughout; also *ib.*, xvi.

ומשפחות.—T. ומלכותא. Cp. Isa. xxxiv. 1, ולאמים, T. ומלכותא.

5. הנני עלין.—Cp., *supra*, ii. 14.

שוליך.—T. בהתת חובך. Cp. T. to Jer. xiii. 22, 26.

6 וְאַרְמִי עֲלָךְ שִׁקּוּצִין וַאֲנַבְּלֵנִיךְ
וַאֲשׁוּרֵיךְ מְכַעֲרָא לְעֵינֵי [1]כָּל חָזָךְ :

6 וְהִשְׁלַכְתִּי עָלַיִךְ שִׁקֻּצִים
וְנִיבַּלְתִּיךְ וְשַׂמְתִּיךְ כִּרְאִי :

7 וְיֶהֵי כָּל [1]דִּי יְחֲזֵנֵךְ יִתְרַחַק
מִנֵּיךְ וְיֵימַר אִתְבְּזִיַּת נִינְוֵה מַן
יְדֵוִי עֲלָךְ [2]אֵיכָא [3]אַשְׁכַּח [4]מְנַחֲמִין
לָךְ :

7 וְהָיָה כָּל־רֹאַיִךְ יִדֹּד מִמֵּךְ
וְאָמַר שָׁדְדָה נִינְוֵה מִי יָנוּד לָהּ
מֵאַיִן אֲבַקֵּשׁ מְנַחֲמִים לָךְ :

8 [1]הָא אַתְּ [1]טָבָא [2]מֵאַלַכְסַנְדַרְיָא
רַבְּתָא [3]דְּיָתְבָא בֵּינֵי נַהֲרָוָתָא [4]מַיָּא
[5]סְחוֹר סְחוֹר לָהּ [6]דְּשׁוּרָהּ יַמָּא
מַיָּא שׁוּרָהָא[6] :

8 הֲטוֹבָה מִנֹּא אָמוֹן הַיּוֹשֶׁבֶת
בַּיְאוֹרִים מַיִם סָבִיב לָהּ אֲשֶׁר־חֵיל
יָם מַיִם חוֹמָתָהּ :

9 כּוּשׁ [1]סוּמְכָתָהָא וּמִצְרַיִם וְלִית
סוֹף [2]פּוּטָאֵי וְלוּבָאֵי הֲווֹ בְּסָעֲדִיךְ :

9 כּוּשׁ עָצְמָהּ וּמִצְרַיִם וְאֵין קֵצֶה
פּוּט וְלוּבִים הָיוּ בְּעֶזְרָתֵךְ :

6.—[1] MS.[1], עממיא (inserted here in error, instead of in v. 5); O., כלחוך (error for כל חזך).

7.—[1] O., CM., דיחזינך. [2] MS.[1], CM., ואיבא.
[3] MS.[1], יתבע; CM., איתבע. [4] MS.[3], O., דמנחמין.

8.—[1-1] MS[1]., L., CM., האת.
[2] MS[1]., מאלאתסנדריא; O., מאלסכנדריא; CM., מאסכנדרייא (similar to the Arabic "Iskandria").
[3] MS.[1], ריבתא (error for דיתבא?). [4] O., דמייא. [5] MS.[1], omits.
[6-6] MS.[1], דתוקפא ימא מן ימא שורתהא; CM., דתוקפה ימא מי ימה שורה; O., דמקפא ימא מי ימה שורה; MS.[2], L., Ant., דשורה ימא מי ימה שורה; B., דשורה ימא מי ימא שורהא. With B., cp. החלוץ, year 1852, p. 110.

9.—[1] CM., סומכוותה דכוש תקיפין ומצרים ולית; MS.[1], סומכותהא דכוש תקיפין ומצרים ולית סוף פוטא ולובא הוו בסעדיך; MS.[2], L., סומכוותה; MS.[3], סמכותה; Ant., סמכותא; O., סומכוותא. [2] O. omits.

10.—[1] MS.[2], MS.[3], לגלותא.
[2] MS.[3], ידדקון (error for ידקדקון); O., ידקרקון; B., ידקרון.
[3] MS.[2], MS.[3], L., בשישלן; CM., בשישלין; O., בשילשולא.

---

6. כראי.—T. מכערא לע' כל חזך, combines two renderings—(1) "*filth*," cp. Rashi, Kimchi, Ibn Ezra, also Hitzig; (2) "*a gazing-stock*," as LXX., παράδειγμα; Peshito, לחזוא, and most commentators.

7. לה.—T. עלך. So Peshito, עליבי; Vulg. *super te.*

Targum.	Revised Version.
6. And I will cast abominations upon thee, and make thee an accursed thing, and set thee as an abhorred thing before the eyes of all that see thee.	6. And I will cast abominable filth upon thee, and make thee vile, and will set thee as a gazing-stock.
7. And it shall come to pass, that all they that look upon thee shall flee from thee, and say, Nineveh is laid waste: who will bemoan thee? Whence shall I seek comforters for thee?	7. And it shall come to pass, that all they that look upon thee shall flee from thee, and say, Nineveh is laid waste: who will bemoan her? whence shall I seek comforters for thee?
8. Art thou better than Alexandria the Great, that sitteth between the rivers: the waters are round about it; its rampart is the sea; from the seas are its walls.	8. Art thou better than No-amon, that was situate among the rivers, that had the waters round about her; whose rampart was the sea, and her wall was of the sea?
9. Ethiopia (Cush) is her support, and also Egypt; and it was infinite: the people of Put and the Lybians were thy helpers.	9. Ethiopia and Egypt were her strength, and it was infinite; Put and Lubim were thy helpers.

---

8. מנא אמון.—T. מאלכסנדריא רבתא. This rendering is quoted at the beginning of *Midrash Rabba* to *Genesis*; it is adopted by Rashi and Kimchi, upon which see Abarbanel's criticisms, showing the incorrectness of the T.—נא, always rendered (*e.g.*, Jer. xlvi. 25; Ezek. xxx. 14) Alexandria. Cf. *Aruch*, *s.v.*, and Frankel, p. 27.—אמון, T. רבתא. Cf. *Midrash Rabba*, l. c., where אמון is connected with the root אמן, "to rear children." שהיתה אומנת מלכי מצרים (Rashi to Nahum, *i. l.*), hence אל רבתא should be rendered "Alexandria nutrix" (the nurturer of children). Note that Rashi to Jer. xlvi. 25, renders אמון מנא, "La signoria di Alisandra." Vulg., "Alexandria populorum," partly imitated by A. V., "populous No." Upon this, cf. Jerome's Comm. in Naum, *i. l.*), "Hebræus qui me in Scripturis erudivit, ita legi posse asseruit. 'Num melior es quam NO AMON?' et ait, Hebraice *No* dici Alexandriam: Amon autem multitudinem, sive populos [reading המון]. . . . . Non quod eo tempore Alexandria vocaretur, quippe que longo post tempore ab Alexandro Magno Macedonio nomen accepit; sed quia sub nomine primo, *i.e.*, NO, semper Ægypti metropolis fuerit, et abundantissime populis." [*Migne*, Vol. 25, p. 1259]. Cp. Vollers, p. 18.

ביאורים.—T. ביני נהרותא. יאר so rendered in Gen. xli. 1, upon which cp. נתינה לנר.

מים חומתה.—T. (according to many readings) מי ימא = מֵי יָם, cp. Ewald *i. l.*, LXX., ὕδωρ τὰ τείχη αὐτῆς. Vulg., aquæ muri ejus.

10 אַף הִיא [1]בְּגָלוּתָא תְּהַדּ
בְּשִׁבְיָא אַף עֲלִימָתָא יְטָרְפוּן
בְּרֵישׁ כָּל שׁוּקָיָא וְעַל יַקִּירָתָא רְמוֹ
עַדְבִּין וְכָל רַבְרְבָתָא [2]יְהַחְדְּקוֹן
[3]בְּשַׁלְשְׁלָן :

10 גַּם־הִיא לַגֹּלָה תֵּלֵךְ בַּשֶּׁבִי
גַּם עֹלָלֶיהָ יְרֹטְשׁוּ בְּרֹאשׁ כָּל־
חוּצוֹת וְעַל־נִכְבַּדֶּיהָ יַדּוּ גוֹרָל וְכָל־
גְּדוֹלֶיהָ יֻרְתְּקוּ בַּזִּקִּים :

11 אַף [1]אַתְּ [2]דְּמְיָא לְרַוְיָא [3]תְּחֵי
מְסַלְעָמָא אַף אַתְּ תִּבְעֵין סְעִיד
[4]מִבְּעֵל דְּבָבָא[4] :

11 גַּם־אַתְּ תִּשְׁכְּרִי תִּהְיִי נַעֲלָמָה
גַּם־אַתְּ תְּבַקְּשִׁי מָעוֹז מֵאוֹיֵב :

12 כָּל כְּרַכָּךְ דָּמָן [1]לְתֵינִין בַּכִּירָן
דְּאִם [2]יְרַעֲדוּנוּנוּן [3]יִתְּרוּן וְיִשְׁתָּאֲרוּן
בְּחוֹן צְמוּקִין דְּכִשְׁרִין לְמֵיכַל :

12 כָּל־מִבְצָרַיִךְ תְּאֵנִים עִם־
בִּכּוּרִים אִם־יִנּוֹעוּ וְנָפְלוּ עַל־פִּי
אוֹכֵל :

13 הָא עַמֵּךְ חַלָּשִׁין כְּנִשְׁיָא
[1]בְּגַוֵּיךְ לְבַעֲלֵי דְּבָבֵיךְ [2]אִתְפַּתְּחוּ
תַּרְעֵי אַרְעֵיךְ [3]אַכְלַת אֶשְׁתָּא
תּוּקְפֵּיךְ :

13 הִנֵּה עַמֵּךְ נָשִׁים בְּקִרְבֵּךְ
לְאֹיְבַיִךְ פָּתְוֹחַ נִפְתְּחוּ שַׁעֲרֵי אַרְצֵךְ
אָכְלָה אֵשׁ בְּרִיחָיִךְ :

14 מַיָּא בְּצִנְרָא כְּנוּשִׁי [1]לְגַוֵּיךְ
[2]תַּקְפֵי כְּרַכָּךְ אַסְגָּא [3]מְרָוָא וְשַׁעְבִּידִי
בְּטִינָא [4]אִתְקִיפִי בִּנְגָרֵיךְ :

14 מַיִם מָצוֹר שַׁאֲבִי־לָךְ חַזְּקִי
מִבְצָרָיִךְ בְּאִי בַּטִּיט וּרְמְסִי בַּחֹמֶר
חַזְקִי מַלְבֵּן :

11.—[1] CM., ית (error for את). [2] CM., דמא.
[3] MS.[1], תהן ; MS.[2], MS.[3], omit ; O., תהוי. [4-4] L., מבעלי דבבנא.

12.—MS.[1], לתאינן ; O., CM., לתאינין.
[2] MS.[1], ידע מוכוונין ; MS.[2], B., ידעדונונן ; MS.[3], ירעדונונין ; O., ייזעזעונונן ; CM., ירעמונון [3] MS.[1], CM., ויתרון ; O., יתרן.

13.—[1] MS., בגויאך.
[2] MS.[1], איתפחא איתפתיחו ; MS.[2], MS.[3], אתפתחא יתפתחון ; Ant. O., CM., אתפתחא אתפתחו ; Warsaw, אתפחתו.
[3] MS.[1], MS.[2], MS.[3], L., O., CM., שציאת.

14.—[1] MS., O., לך ; MS.[2], MS.[3], CM., ליך.
[2] MS[1]., תקיסי (error for תקיפי) ; CM., תקיפי. [3] CM., שעבידי.
[4] CM., תקיפי כרכך (repeated from earlier in the verse).

---

11. תשכרי.—T. דמיא לרויא. Cp. כשכור (Job xii. 25 ; Ps. cvii. 27). T., היך רויא.

נעלמה.—T. מסלעמא, "destroyed." Cf. Levy, *s.v.*, סלאם ; Calvin, "in nihi-

Targum.	Revised Version.
10. She also went into captivity: she is in exile: her young children were dashed to pieces at the top of all the streets: and they cast lots for her honourable men, and all her great men were confined in chains.	10. Yet was she carried away, she went into captivity: her young children also were dashed in pieces at the top of all the streets: and they cast lots for her honourable men, and all her great men were bound in chains.
11. Thou, also, like a drunkard, shalt be destroyed: thou, also, shalt seek for help because of thine enemy.	11. Thou also shalt be drunken, thou shalt be hid; thou also shalt seek a strong hold because of the enemy.
12. All thy fortresses are like ripe figs: which, if men shake them, fall down; and there remain in them dried clusters that are good to eat.	12. All thy fortresses shall be like fig trees with the first ripe figs: if they be shaken, they fall into the mouth of the eater.
13. Behold! thy people in the midst of thee are as feeble as women: the gates of thy land shall be surely thrown wide open unto thine enemies; fire shall devour thy bars.	13. Behold, thy people in the midst of thee are women; the gates of thy land are set wide open unto thine enemies: the fire hath devoured thy bars.
14. Gather water into thy midst for the siege: strengthen thy fortresses; prepare much clay and tread the mortar; make strong thy buildings.	14. Draw thee water for the siege, strengthen thy fortresses: go into the clay, and tread the mortar, make strong the brick-kiln.

lum redigi"; Kleinert, "thou shalt perish." Cp. Obadiah 16, וישתו ולעו, T., ויישתון ויסתלעמון, and Rashi, *i. l.*, ל' מהומה ושממון. [So also Isa. xxv. 7, ובלע, T., ויסתלעמון]. T. here appears to have thought of Obadiah 16, where after ולעו come the words והיו כלוא היו, hence his rendering "destroyed." Cp. Kimchi and also Keil. [In Ps. xxvi. 4, נעלמים, T., מטמרין לאבאשא].

מעוז.—T. סעיר, "assistance." Not "fortress," as Luther and R. V. render. מעוז, usually in the sense of "fortress," T., תוקפא, (cp. Isa. xvii. 9; Judges vi. 26); in the sense of "assistance," T., עושנא (*e.g.*, Ps. lx. 9; Prov. x. 29, and *supra*, i. 7).

12. על פי אוכל.—T. renders "according to one's eating," *i. e.*, "fit for eating"; similar to לפי, in a phrase like לפי חטף. Cp. T. to Numb. xx. 5.

13. נשים.—T. חלשין כנשיא. So also Isa. xix. 16; Jer. l. 37.

בריחיך.—T., metaphorically, "strength." Usually taken literally, עברין, *e.g.*, Deut. iii. 5; 2 Sam. xxiii. 7.

14. שאבי.—T. כנושי. Usually, *e.g.*, Gen. xxiv. 11, 13, 19, T. מלי.

מלבן.—T. בניניך. Cp. T. to Jer. xliii. 9.

15 לְתַמָּן יִתּוֹן עֲלָךְ עַמְמַיָּא דְּתַקִּיפִין בְּאֶשְׁתָּא וְשֵׁצוּנֵיךְ קָטוֹלִי חַרְבָּא יִתְפַּנְשׁוּן עֲלָךְ [1]מַשְׁרְיָת עַמְמִין [2]דְּסַגִּיאִין [3]כְּזַחֲלָא [4]יִחְפּוֹנֵיךְ כְּקַמְצָא [5]יַחְסְלוּנֵיךְ כְּגוֹבָא :

15 שָׁם תְּאכְלֵךְ אֵשׁ תַּכְרִיתֵךְ חֶרֶב תְּאכְלֵךְ כַּיֶּלֶק הִתְכַּבְּדִי כָּאַרְבֶּה : הִתְכַּבְּדִי כָּאַרְבֶּה :

16 אַסְגֵּת תַּגְּרֵךְ מִכּוֹכְבֵי שְׁמַיָּא [1]הָא כְזַחֲלָא[1] [2]דְּשַׁלַּח וּפָרַח :

16 הִרְבֵּיתְ רְכָלַיִךְ מִכּוֹכְבֵי הַשָּׁמַיִם יֶלֶק פָּשַׁט וַיָּעֹף :

17 הָא טַפָּךְ מְצַלְחֵין כְּגוֹבָא [1]וּטְפָסְרִיךְ כְּגוֹבָאֵי [2]דִּי שָׁרָן [3]בְּכָתְלַיָּא בְיוֹם [4]קְרִיר [5]דְּכַד שְׁמְשָׁא דָּנְחָא עֲלֵיהוֹן [6]מִתְבַּדְּרִין וְלָא [7]אִתְיְדַע [8]אַתְרְחוֹן [9]לְאָן עָרְקִין :

17 מִנְזָרִיךְ כְּאַרְבֶּה וְטַפְסְרַיִךְ כְּגֹבָ֫י גוֹבִי חַחוֹנִים בַּגְּדֵרוֹת בְּיוֹם קָרָח שֶׁמֶשׁ זָרְחָה וְנִבְלָה וְלֹא-נוֹדַע מְקוֹמוֹ אַיֵּם :

18 אִתְבַּרוּ גַּבָּרָךְ מַלְכָּא דְאַתּוּר

18 נָמוּ רֹעֶיךָ מֶלֶךְ אַשּׁוּר

15.—[1] MS.[1], CM., קטולין. [2] MS.[1], CM., סגיאין.
[3] MS.[1], כזוחלין ; CM., כזוחלא. [4] O., יחפיניך.
[5] MS.[1], יחסנונך ; MS.[2], MS.[3], L., B., O., יחסנוניך.
16.—[1-1] MS.[1], MS.[2], CM., כזחלא. [2] B., די שלח.
17.—[1] MS.[2], MS.[3], L., O., וטפסרך ; CM., וטפצריך.
[2] MS.[2], MS.[3], CM., גובי ; O., גוביי.
[3-3] MS[1]., דשריין ; MS.[2], MS.[3], O., CM., דשרן. [4] CM., קריך (error for קריר).
[5] O., דכר. [6] MS.[1], L., Ant., ויתבדרון.
[7] MS.[1], MS.[3], L., Ant., CM., מתידע. [8] O., CM., אתריהון.
[9] MS.[2], MS.[3], O., omit.

---

15. T. renders very freely.

תאכלך.—T. ייתון עלך. Reads יבואו לך (?).

חרב.—T., by metonomy, "those who use the sword." Cp. Jer. v. 12, חרב, T. דקטלין בחרבא.

תאכלך.—T. יתכנשון עלך. Reads again יביאו לך (?).

Targum.	Revised Version.
15. For thither shall come nations against thee, who are as strong as fire: they who kill with the sword shall cut thee off: there shall gather against thee the armies of the nations, who are as many as the cankerworm, who will cover thee like the cankerworm; they will desolate thee as the locusts.	15. There shall the fire devour thee: the sword shall cut thee off, it shall devour thee like the cankerworm; make thyself many as the cankerworm; make thyself many as the locust.
16. Thou hast multiplied thy merchants above the stars of heaven; behold! like a cankerworm, that spreadeth itself forth and flieth away.	16. Thou hast multiplied thy merchants above the stars of heaven: the cankerworm spoileth, and flieth away.
17. Lo! thy blades are flaming like the locust, and thy chieftains like the worm of the locusts, that camp on the walls in the cold day; but when the sun shineth upon them, they scatter, and their place is not known whither they fly.	17. Thy crowned are as the locusts, and thy marshals as the swarms of grasshoppers which camp in the hedges in the cold day, but when the sun ariseth they flee away, and their place is not known where they are.
18. Thy mighty men are bro-	18. Thy shepherds slumber, O

התכבדי, התכבד.—T. renders as imperfect plurals of the third person.

התכבד.—T. יחפוניך. Cp. Rashi, תתכסי בכובד גייסות, "cover thyself with the weight of swarms."

התכבדי.—T. יחסלוניך. Cp. note *supra* ii. 10, "to sweep away, destroy."

ילק.—T. זחלא, or קמצא. In Joel i. 4, ילק, T. פרחא; גזם, T. זחלא. Peshito, both to Joel and here, for ילק has זחלא.

16. ילק.—T. כזחלא = כילק. Cp. *supra*, iii. 15; אש, T. דתקיפין כאשתא.

פשט.—T. דשלח, "spreadeth itself." So Levy, *s.v.*, שלח, and marginal note in R. V. Cf. LXX., ὥρμησε. Vulg., "expansus est. Peshito, שלח ופרח.

17. מנזריך.—T. טסך, lit., "thy strips of metal," hence "blades," or "armour-clad warriors." Cp. Levy, *s.v.*, טסא, "Bleche, d. h. die mit Erzblechen bepanzerten Krieger." Walton renders "laminæ." The T. derives the word from נזר, Exod. xxix. 6.

וטפסריך.—Cp. *T. Jerushalmi* to Deut. xxviii. 12. Cp. Vollers, p. 21. In Jer. li. 27, טפסר, T. עבדי קרבא.

בגדרות.—T. בכתליא. Usually, *e.g.*, Num. xxii. 24, גדרא.

אים.—T. amplifies by rendering לאן ערקין.

18. נמו.—T., stronger expression, אתברו. In Ps. lxxvi. 6, נמו, T. אתנמנמו.

גְּלוֹ עִם מַשְׁרְיָתָךְ אִתְבַּדְּרוּ עֲמָּךְ יִשְׁכְּנוּ אַדִּירֶיךְ נָפְשׁוּ עַמְּךְ עַל-
עַל [1]טוּרַיָּא וְלִית דְּמַכְנֵישׁ׃ חֻפְּרִים וְאֵין מְקַבֵּץ׃

19 לֵית דְּכָאֵב [1]לֵיהּ עַל תַּבְרִיךְ 19 אֵין-כֵּפֶה לְשִׁבְרֵךְ נַחְלָה
[2]מְמַרְעָא מָחָתָךְ כַּל [3]דְּי שְׁמַעוּ מַכָּתֵךְ כָּל ׀ שֹׁמְעֵי שִׁמְעֲךְ תָּקְעוּ
שְׁמַעֲתֵךְ [4]טְפַחוּ יְדֵיהוֹן עֲלָךְ כַּף עָלַיִךְ כִּי עַל-מִי לֹא-עָבְרָה
חַדְיָאוּ אֲרֵי עַל מַן לָא עֲדָת רָעָתֵךְ תָּמִיד׃
[5]מָחַת בִּישְׁתִּיךְ תְּדִירָא׃

18.—[1] O., סוריא.

19.—[1] MS.[2], omits ; MS.[3], לך ; CM., ליך. [2] MS., ממחתא.

[3-3] MS.[1], CM., שמעי שמעך ; MS.[3], שמעי שמעתך ; O., דשמעו.

[4] MS.[1], CM., טפחא.

[5] MS.[1] omits (probably by accident, as עדת is at the end of one column, and בישתך at the beginning of the next).

ישכנו אד׳.—T. גלו עם מש׳, "They dwell, *sc.*, in a distant land" ; T. reads עדריך (?), or as *supra*, ii. 6.

TARGUM.

ken, O king of Assyria; exiled are the men of thine armies: thy people are scattered upon the mountains, and there is none to gather them.

19. There is none who laments thy hurt; thy wound is grievous; all that hear the bruit of thee clap their hands together over thee rejoicing; for upon whom hath not the scourge of thy wickedness passed continually?

REVISED VERSION.

king of Assyria: thy worthies are at rest: thy people are scattered upon the mountains, and there is none to gather them.

19. There is no assuaging of thy hurt; thy wound is grievous: all that hear the bruit of thee clap the hands over thee: for upon whom hath not thy wickedness passed continually?

נפישו.—T. אתבדרו, reads נפצו, as most commentators. Cp. Peshito, אתבדר.

19. אין כהה—T. reads אין כֹּאֵב. Cp. Rashi; Peshito, ולית דכאב לה.

תקעו כף.—T. טפחו ידי עלך חדיאו, "Rejoicing"; so Walton, "lætantes." Cp. Ps. xlvii. 2, תקעו כף, T. תקעו ידא בחדוא.

רעתך.—T. "the effects of thy wickedness." Cp. the rendering of עון (Gen. iv. 13) by "effects of sin," punishment.

MICHAEL ADLER.

THE REFERENCES TO THE "KING" IN THE PSALTER, IN THEIR BEARING ON QUESTIONS OF DATE AND MESSIANIC BELIEF.

THE difficulty in determining the date of the Psalms arises from the absence of decisive historical allusions. There is, it is true, a social and historical background, but it is ill-defined, and, being so, suits, or at least is not manifestly inconsistent with, all that is known of most of the post-exilic and parts of the pre-exilic period. Allusions to the temple as existing only preclude a pre-Solomonic and an exilic origin: persecution and distress were the rule, not the exception, from the close of the seventh century onwards. Much more clearly defined are the literary and theological characteristics of the Psalter; and it is these that will ultimately play the largest part in deciding the question of date; but the conclusiveness of the evidence derived from them becomes clear but slowly, and, from its very nature, affects only the *general period.* Attempts, therefore, to refer particular Psalms to particular events have in the past proved singularly fruitless; save perhaps in one or two exceptional cases, similar attempts in the future are likely to fare no better. Attention at present still needs to be fixed on the more general but far more important questions: Are any of the Psalms pre-exilic? If so, which?

The form of the question is justified by the general agreement of scholars that a majority, larger or smaller, of the Psalms is certainly post-exilic; even Ewald claims only sixty as pre-exilic, and few later scholars have claimed more.

Owing to the insufficiency in most cases of the data afforded by individual Psalms for determining with decisiveness the period to which they belong, all critics of

the Psalter have—of necessity, and therefore justifiably—been more or less governed in their several particular judgments by certain general *præjudicia.* Thus, long after the Davidic authorship of some Psalms attributed in the titles to David was acknowledged to be impossible, it was yet held that since so many were attributed to him, some must be really his. Starting from this *præjudicium,* critics, in the absence of anything directly and manifestly unfavourable to the theory, accepted the slightest favourable data as sufficient proof of Davidic authorship. But lately the validity, or rather the comparative worth, of this *præjudicium* has been increasingly questioned; it is for this reason, and not because of the illegitimacy of the method, that the reference of Psalms to David is doubted or denied. Indeed the absolute necessity of the method as distinguished from its particular application is seen in the light of the briefest sketch of the course of criticism.

The first result of breaking loose from the traditional prejudice was that critical ingenuity ran riot; the same Psalms were, by different scholars, for about equally conclusive reasons, assigned to any period between 1000 and 100 B.C. In this way commentaries on the Psalms became at once tedious and discouraging; tedious on account of the number of theories to be examined, discouraging through the inconclusiveness of the reasoning on which the theory finally accepted was based. Only quite recently has this critical license received a decisive check, and this it has received mainly, as all English students must remember with satisfaction, owing to the work of two English scholars—Professor Cheyne[1] and the late Professor Robertson Smith.[2] Dissimilar, in so many respects, as the contribution to Psalm criticism of these two scholars has been, it is alike in this: both insist that the argument for the date of a particular Psalm is not to be based on the internal evidence afforded by itself alone, but

[1] In his *Origin of the Psalter* (1891).

[2] Most recently in the *Old Testament in the Jewish Church* (1892), ch. vii., and additional note D., pp. 437-440.

that the Psalm must be first grouped, and the date of any individual Psalm be then determined in the light of its association with others with which it is externally or internally connected.[1]

In the result Professor Cheyne, after the collection and investigation of an invaluable mass of detailed evidence, confirmed the conclusion previously reached, apparently on more general grounds, by Reuss and Wellhausen, that the Psalter was the product of the post-exilic period; every Psalm, with the doubtful exception of xviii., he referred to this period. Professor Smith also regarded the great majority of the Psalms as post-exilic, but at the same time decisively assigned some to the pre-exilic period.

Thus the license which followed the abandonment of the traditional prejudice has only been restrained by the establishment of a critical prejudice; and the history of criticism indicates that in the case of any *particular* Psalm two alternatives only are possible—freedom from prejudice resulting in complete scepticism, or guidance by prejudice, based on general considerations, to probable conclusions. In the case of the Psalter even more than elsewhere, literary criticism must content itself with bringing clearly into view the comparative probabilities of competing theories. Everything is to be gained by frankly recognising this; argument as to the date of particular Psalms is only of value between those who approach the question from the

[1] The value of the method so established has been very generally recognised. Kautzsch, *e.g.*, says: "Unleugbar ist, dass durch die Methode Cheynes thatsächlich manche dunkle Stelle aufgehellt und eine weit grössere Einheitlichkeit des Psalters in biblisch-theologischer und ganz besonders auch in *sprachlicher* Hinsicht erwiesen wird, als man bisher einzuräumen geneigt war." See his review of Cheyne's "Origin of the Psalter" in *Theologische Studien und Kritiken*, 1892, pp. 577-589; compare also Budde's review in *Theologische Literaturzeitung* (May 14th, 1892), who especially deserves thanks for correcting the ignorant assertion of certain English critics that Cheyne's work was a mere reproduction of German criticism. The influence of the work of Cheyne and R. Smith in subsequent literature may be seen in Bæthgen's commentary, the most important of recent commentaries, and Beer's excellent study, *Individual- und Gemeinde-Psalmen* (Marburg, 1894).

same general standpoint. For my own part I accept what I have termed the critical prejudice; in other words, in considering the dates of particular Psalms I start from what I consider a sound conclusion, viz., that the Psalter as a whole and in its general spirit is a product of the post-exilic period. The question at issue then is: If any, which Psalms, forming an exception to the general rule, are pre-exilic? The present discussion will be concerned with some of these supposed exceptions. An examination of recent criticism of the Psalter shows that Psalms are referred to the post-exilic period mainly on the ground of their literary and theological characteristics and the *general historical background*, but to the pre-exilic period on the ground of *special historical allusions*, which, it is urged, can be explained by the earlier date alone.

Among these special historical allusions are those to the "King." Of these Dr. Driver, for example, says, "The Psalms alluding to the King will presumably be pre-exilic."[1] Several other recent writers have expressed themselves to the same effect.[2] Now such a conclusion clearly affects, not alone the date, but also the interpretation of the Psalms in question. The validity of the inference as to date depends on the correctness of the assumption that the subject of these Psalms is an actual reigning king of Judah (or Israel), not an ideal, or, to use a more technical phrase, a Messianic king. If these Psalms refer primarily to a reigning monarch, they are Messianic only in the very secondary sense that they depict "the ideal glory of the [contemporary] theocratic king,"[3] and are, in

[1] V. *Introduction*, p. 363. The remark is made directly with reference only to Pss. ii., xx., xxi., xxviii., lxi., lxiii., lxxii.; but the reference to the King, no doubt, largely determines the decision with regard to xviii., lxxxix., and cx., also. The suggestion on p. 360 should, however, also be noticed.

[2] From the reference to the King, Bæthgen infers that xx., xxi., xxviii., xxxiii., xlv., lxi., lxiii., lxxii., are pre-exilic; Kautzsch only makes the inference in the case of xx., xxi., xlv. (*Die Heilige Schrift des A. T.* (*Beilagen*), p. 207).

[3] Driver, *Introduction*, p. 363.

consequence, comparatively unimportant in the history of the development of the Messianic idea. Their Messianic character is something entirely different from that, for example, of the well-known passages in Isaiah, or, to refer to literature of the same class, of the Psalms of Solomon.

In the case, then, of the Psalms which refer to the King, exegesis and criticism are most closely connected; certain exegetical assumptions must largely determine the critical conclusion. Granted that the king be actual, these Psalms are most intelligible if a product of the pre-exilic period; or, again, certain critical assumptions tend to invalidate current exegesis. If these Psalms be post-exilic, some at least cannot be satisfactorily explained of a contemporary ruler. I propose, therefore, (1) to re-examine the nature of the evidence for and against the pre-exilic date of these Psalms; (2) to consider the validity of the exegetical assumption that the king referred to is a contemporary ruler; and then, (3) having made clear the difficulties connected with present methods of criticism and interpretation, to suggest an interpretation which will, in turn, affect the criticism.

I.

Disregarding twenty Psalms[1] in which the king is Yahweh, and three others[2] in which he is clearly a foreign monarch, we still find eleven[3] in which the king is neither Yahweh[4] nor a foreign monarch, but—in most cases clearly,

---

[1] The reference is direct in v., x., xxiv., xxix., xliv., xlvii., xlviii., lxviii., lxxiv., lxxxiv., xcix. (v. Bæthgen on v. 4) xcviii., cxlv., cxlix.; indirect by the use of the verb מלך or the nouns מלכות or מלוכה in xxii., xciii., xcvi., xcvii., ciii., cxlvi.

[2] cv., cxxxv., cxxxvi.

[3] ii., xviii., xx., xxi., xxxiii., xlv., lxi., lxiii., lxxii., lxxxix., cx. In the last case the person addressed, though not termed king, is without doubt kingly.

[4] It is worth noticing that in no single case is the term מלך used in the same psalm of both Yahweh and a Jewish monarch (whether real or ideal). Contrast Ps. Sol. xvii., v. 1, O Lord, thou art our King, henceforth, and even for evermore"; verses 35, 36, "And a righteous king

in others presumably—Jewish. In five[1] of these the king is also explicitly, or, by use of the verb משח, implicitly termed Yahweh's (or God's) Messiah. Yahweh's Messiah is also mentioned in three[2] other Psalms; but the inference[3] that in these Psalms also the Messiah is a king, is anything but certain. The Hebrew usage of the term is sufficiently wide to require the precise meaning to be fixed by the context, and this in these Psalms is so uncertain that, as a matter of fact, the interpretation of the phrase is much disputed. Leaving, for the present, these three Psalms out of account, I turn to the eleven, where the king has been more generally regarded as a contemporary monarch.

In the first place, the distribution of these Psalms over the Psalter, considered in the light of R. Smith's conclusions, creates a presumption against regarding the *whole* group as pre-exilic; but if any[4] of the group be post-exilic,

and taught of God is he that reigneth over them; and there shall be no iniquity in his days in their midst, for all shall be holy, and their king is the Lord Messiah"; v. 38, "The Lord himself is his King."

[1] Directly in ii., xviii., xx., lxxxix.; indirectly in xlv.

[2] xxviii., lxxxiv., cxxxii. The plural משיחי in Ps. cv. 15, is also to be noted.

[3] Made in the case of xxviii. by Driver and Bæthgen. On the other hand, in the case of lxxxiv. Bæthgen questions, and in the case of cxxxii. decides against, the reference of the term to a contemporary monarch. Driver is apparently in equal doubt, for he refers cxxxii. to the post-exilic period; and leaves the date of lxxxiv. an open question.

[4] I would, however, make an exception in the case of xxxiii.; although this appears to me clearly post-exilic, I do not argue that therefore other Psalms referring to the king may equally well be so. For the mode of reference is quite different; in Ps. xxxiii. it is, or may be, purely proverbial. But that Bæthgen argues for the pre-exilic date on the ground of this reference, I should have left the Psalm wholly out of account; his remark "that the Psalm is at all events pre-exilic, is shown by the mention of the king (verse 16), who can only be an Israelitish one," is singularly undiscriminating. Why need the "king" of verse 16 be Israelitish more than the "horse" of verse 17? Again, would Bæthgen maintain that there was a king of Israel when Ecclesiastes was written because of the saying, "The king himself is served by the field" (v. 9). Driver significantly omits Ps. xxxiii. from his list, and, indeed, decisively pronounces it post-exilic (p. 364).

the argument, on the ground of the reference to the king, for the pre-exilic date of the rest, is weakened.

R. Smith's conclusions can, for present purposes, be sufficiently summarised thus:—The Psalter, in its present form, is the result of the last of some nine or ten editorial and redactorial processes which can be still traced. The earliest of these, the formation of the first Davidic hymn-book (Pss. iii.-xli., except xxxiii.), itself falls within the post-exilic period, probably not earlier than the middle of the fifth century. The second great collection (xlii.-lxxxiii.) of Psalms, itself a very composite whole, was certainly later than the first, and probably dates from the fourth century. Yet, later, an appendix (lxxxiv.-lxxxix.) was added to this second collection. The last collection (xc.-cl.) falls certainly later than 330, and almost certainly as late as 150 B.C. In a word, *all collections of Psalms* of which we have any knowledge *are post-exilic.*

From this, it is true, it by no means immediately follows that all Psalms contained in these collections are also post-exilic. Indeed, since there are good reasons for supposing that Psalms were written before the exile, it is, in itself, not unlikely that some pre-exilic Psalms are preserved in the Psalter. Only the burden of proof clearly lies on those who claim as pre-exilic any given Psalm in collections known to be post-exilic. Further it is reasonable to suppose that such pre-exilic Psalms as there may be in the Psalter, will be found, at least for the most part, in the earliest collections. Now how does the case stand with our group of Psalms? Three only are found in the earliest collection, four in the next, one in the appendix to the latter, one in the late and probably Maccabæan collection, and two, now standing in Book I., are without titles, *i.e.*, they would appear to have found their way into none of the collections which precede the final process. If these Psalms were all pre-exilic, why are they distributed through the Psalter as they are?

R. Smith's conclusions thus create a presumption against

regarding the whole of our group as pre-exilic. But carefully considered, they suggest other more or less weighty inferences and presumptions. By fixing the date of the collections, R. Smith directly fixed a downward limit for the composition of individual Psalms; for example, no Psalm in a collection closed about 400 B.C. may be assigned to a later date, except a good case can be made out for supposing it to have been subsequently inserted. Indirectly he also created an upward limit; early hymns once embodied in an authoritative collection were sure of preservation; but the very existence of such a collection would render the continued existence of old hymns not included increasingly precarious; there is, therefore, a certain presumption against hymns belonging to a later collection being much earlier than the date of the next previous collection. Judged thus, the downward limit of date of our eleven Psalms and their probable upward limit may be fixed thus:—

Pss. xviii., xx., xxi., were written not later than about 450-400 B.C.

Pss. xlv., lxi., lxiii., lxxii., lxxxix., are pre-Maccabæan, but probably not pre-exilic.

Pss. ii., xxxiii., cx., were not written later than about 150-120 B.C., and are less probably than the preceding pre-exilic.

The argument from distribution thus renders it improbable that some of these Psalms can refer either to a contemporary monarch of the old kingdom or to a Maccabæan prince, since they are neither so early as the exile nor so late as the Maccabees.

The second difficulty in assigning the whole of these psalms to the pre-exilic period is linguistic. In the case of none can I see anything in the language that favours a pre-exilic as against a post-exilic date, if it once be granted that the majority of the Psalms, including a considerable proportion of those in Books I. and II. are post-exilic. In general style, no doubt, the majority of Psalms in the later

books, especially Books IV. and V. differ from most of those in Books I. and II.; and if we were not compelled, by other arguments than the linguistic, to pronounce many of the Psalms in the first two Books post-exilic, we might regard the two styles as, respectively, characteristic of post-exilic and pre-exilic psalmody. But Dr. Driver is unquestionably right in regarding as post-exilic not merely psalms such as xxv., xxxiii., and xxxiv., which in some respects resemble the type characteristic of the later books, but others in Books I. and II. which do not differ appreciably in general style from those containing references to the king. There is then no good linguistic reason for pronouncing our psalms pre-exilic; on the other hand, several of them present phenomena which favour the hypothesis of post-exilic origin. I refer especially to ii., xlv., lxxii., cx.—Psalms which on the ground of distribution also are probably not pre-exilic and two of which may be Maccabæan. In a less degree the language is unfavourable to the pre-exilic origin of most of the rest. I will not here recapitulate the evidence, to which I have nothing to add; it is presented very impartially by Professor Cheyne.[1]

The third difficulty arises from the ideas and literary affinities of many of these psalms. How uniformly these again point to the post-exilic period (no one, to my knowledge, has yet ventured an argument from them for pre-exilic date) may be seen by reference to Prof. Cheyne's work.

Again avoiding the recapitulation of the evidence, I will in this case discuss with some fulness a single usage. I select it partly because it has hitherto, I believe, escaped notice, and partly because it has a bearing on my suggested

[1] In his *Origin of the Psalter*, especially in the "Linguistic Appendix." But he appears not to discuss an apparently late phrase (דר ודר) common to several of these Psalms; on the phrase, see Driver, *Introduction*, p. 293. In these Psalms it occurs five times—xxxiii. 11; xlv. 18; lxi. 7; lxxxix. 2, 5; elsewhere in the Psalms thirteen times. Outside the Psalter in Deut. xxxii. 7, and in ten exilic or post-exilic passages: Esth. ix. 28; Is. xiii. 20; xxxiv. 17; lviii. 12; lx. 15; lxi. 4; Jer. l. 39; Lam. v. 19; Joel ii. 2; iv. 20.

interpretation of the "King." This usage is the reference to a *plurality of kings;* such references form one of the numerous and striking features common to the Psalms, and Deutero-Isaiah. In order to appreciate this it is necessary to examine the usage throughout the Old Testament. We may at once of course dismiss passages which refer to a plurality of kings clearly defined by the context, such, *e.g.*, as speak of the "Kings of Israel and Judah." What we have to consider is references to "kings" spoken of quite indefinitely, or defined only in the most general way as "kings of the earth," "kings of peoples." These references are numerous, but almost entirely confined to the exilic and post-exilic literature; such earlier references as are found differ from the usage characteristic of Deutero-Isaiah and the Psalter. The pre-exilic references are as follows:—

1. "Hear, O ye kings; hearken, O ye princes," Jud. v. 3. Taken by itself this appears quite general; yet in view of the sharply defined geographical horizon of Jud. v., and the terms of v. 19, "The kings came and fought, then the kings of Canaan fought," the reference must be confined to the kings of Canaan.

2. "Are not my princes all of them kings," Is. x. 8. The usage here is predicative.

3. "I have also given thee ..... riches and honour, so that there shall not be any among the *kings* (בַּמְּלָכִים) like unto thee all thy days," 1 Kings iii. 13.[1]

4. "So king Solomon excelled *all the kings of the earth* in riches and wisdom; and all the kings[2] of the earth sought the presence of Solomon to hear his wisdom," 1 Kings x. 23, 24.[1]

5. "Yea, he (Chaldæa) scoffeth at *kings*, and princes are a derision unto him," Hab. i. 10.

In the last three cases the point of reference is to emphasise *the superiority in rank* of the person or people.

---

[1] These two passages are probably pre-exilic, though of doubtful date.

[2] So read by LXX. in Kings, and by both M. T. and LXX. in Chronicles.

The term used thus as typical of eminence occurs frequently in proverbial expressions—some certainly exilic or post-exilic, others occurring in chapters of Proverbs the dates of which are uncertain, but which are still generally regarded as pre-exilic; this usage is clearest in such a saying as "Seest thou a man diligent in business; he shall stand before *kings*: he shall not stand before *mean men*;" Prov. xxii. 28. Cf. also Prov. xxv. 2, 3; xxxi. 3, 5; Job iii. 14; xxxvi. 7.[1]

If we contrast with such a saying as the last the following from II. Isaiah, "And *nations* shall come to thy light, and *kings* to the brightness of thy rising" (lx. 3), we must feel a difference. "Kings" has become a synonym of "nations," and by both words alike the author is endeavouring to indicate the indefinite distance and extent of his geographical horizon. It is this, and not the idea of rank (which, however, need not necessarily be wholly absent), that he wishes primarily to express. It is, therefore, one of those stylistic characteristics of the writer, the significance of which lies in the close relation between them and his dominating ideas.[2] This term "kings" occurs nine times in II. Isaiah,[3] the real *differentia* of its usage here and in earlier writers consisting in this:—

1. It has become virtually a synonym of terms such as "nations," which are used to indicate universality.

2. The "kings" thus vaguely referred to appear as *contrasted with Israel*—vanquished that Israel may be set free, or subserviently bringing offerings that Israel may be glorified.

The connection of the term "kings" with "nations" is, it is true, found in Jeremiah xxv. 14, xxvii. 7: "For *many nations* and *great kings* shall serve themselves of them" (the

[1] Owing to the absence of a contrasted term, the usage is less striking in Prov. viii. 15; xvi. 12, 13. Job xii. 18 may also be compared.

[2] Cf. the usage of גוים in the same writer; and in this connection cf. G. A. Smith, *Book of Isaiah*, xl.-lxvi., pp. 108-110.

[3] xli. 2; xlv. 1; xlix. 7, 23; lii. 15; lx. 3, 10, 11; lxii. 2.

Chaldæans); but here the "nations" and "kings" are *associated*, not contrasted, with Israel, while the phrase, itself different, "great kings," is not parallel to, but co-ordinate with the other phrase, "many nations." It expresses in Jeremiah a particular thought; in II. Isaiah, as in the Psalter, it betrays a constant background of thought. Similarly in the case of the passages from Kings quoted above: the contrast there is the expression of a particular and definite comparison. If Solomon had to be compared, he could only be compared with the other kings; but in II. Isaiah it expresses a dominant idea—the contrast between Israel and the "kings" and "nations" of the world.

Not only is the usage characteristic of II. Isaiah not found before the exile, but nothing quite like it[1] is found anywhere except in the Psalter. In the Psalms the term "kings" is used, just as in II. Isaiah, six or eight times, and about the same number of times in a slightly different way. Exactly similar to the Deutero-Isaianic usage is that of the term in three of the "king" Psalms:—

Ps. ii. 1, 2.—"Why do the *nations* rage, and the *peoples* imagine a vain thing? The *kings of the earth* set themselves and the rulers take counsel together against Yahweh." (Cf. also vv. 8-10.)

Ps. lxxii. 11.—"All *kings* shall fall down before him, all *nations* shall serve him." (Cf. also v. 10.)

Ps. cx. 5.—"Yahweh at thy right hand shall strike through *kings*, he shall judge among the *nations*."

The term "kings" is used somewhat indefinitely in xlv. 10, and is so far an indication of late date; but the

[1] The nearest parallels in exilic literature are Ezek. xxvii. 35 (cf. also xxvii. 33), but here the reference is to Tyre, and Lam. iv. 12, where the kings and inhabitants of the world are interested in the overthrow of Israel. Less similar are Is. xiv. 9, 18; Ezek. xxvi. 7; xxviii. 17; Jer. l. 51. The most interesting post-exilic usage is that in the "Priestly Code" Gen. xvii. 6, 16; xxxv. 11. Cf. also Is. xxiv. 20; but Ezra ix. 7 is quite dissimilar.

usage is not Deutero-Isaianic.[1] Rather more similar to the Deutero-Isaianic is the usage in lxxxix. 28.

The preceding analysis shows that a well-defined peculiarity of usage common to Deutero-Isaiah and certain Psalms (including three of the "king" Psalms) occurs nowhere else. It is no great inference that these Psalms are dependent on Deutero-Isaiah, or *vice versâ*, and few who have examined the relation between the two books will doubt that the former is the more probable alternative. Judged, then, by the use of the term "kings," Pss. ii., lxxii., cx. must be considered post-exilic. But, of course, the strength of the argument from stylistic and literary affinity depends on the accumulation of facts like the preceding all pointing the same way. Where similar indications of late date may be found I have already indicated.

It will be convenient at this point to summarise, with reference to a single Psalm—the second—the evidence for and against a pre-exilic origin. Against, we have—

1. The absence of title, indicating that it belonged to none of the earlier Psalm collections which preceded the compilation of the Psalter in its present form.

2. The language (cf. Cheyne, *Psalter*, p. 463).[2]

3. The ideas involved; *e.g.*, in the use of "kings" (see above for further evidence; cf. Cheyne, *Psalter*, pp. 238-240).

4. Its great influence, from the "Psalms of Solomon" (68 B.C.) onwards,[3] compared with the absence of all trace of such influence earlier.

---

[1] The other references to a plurality of kings in the Psalter are, xlviii. 5; lxviii. 15, 30; lxxvi. 13; cii. 16; cxix. 46; cxlviii. 11; cxlix. 8. In cv. 14, cxxxv. 10, cxxxvi. 17, 18, the reference is to well-known historical events, but is apparently affected in its terms by the stereotyped parallel.

[2] Of course בַּר in v. 11 is corrupt; but I see no good reason for regarding the Aramaism תִּרְעֵם as a corruption of תִּרְעֲמוּ.

[3] There are no traces of its influence within the Psalter itself, such as we find in the case of some other striking but presumably earlier Psalms, *e.g.*, viii., xviii.; Ps. cx. presents resemblance, but scarcely bears marks of

5. The absence of all early tradition of its connection with any pre-exilic monarch.

To set over against this cumulative evidence for post-exilic date, we have, in favour of earlier origin, simply and solely the reference to the king. Under the circumstances several scholars have not unnaturally been driven to ask whether this does necessarily point another way.

II.

The exegetical assumption, common to those who regard these Psalms as early, and to many who consider them late, is that the "king" is some contemporary ruler. By the latter it has been suggested that this ruler is either a foreign monarch—this is suggested particularly with regard to Pss. xlv. and lxxii.—or a Maccabæan prince. The former alternative seems to me quite improbable; and the latter is questionable in the case of Pss. xviii., xx., xxi., xlv., lxi., lxiii., lxxii., since from their position in the earlier collections, it is very improbable that they were written so late as the second century. I am also far from convinced that a Maccabæan prince would be termed מֶלֶךְ, though I can believe that he might be described as endowed with some kingly functions: in other words, Ps. cx. may refer to a Maccabee, but the rest of these Psalms do not.

But leaving the question of date out of account, there seems to me a strong presumption against the theory that *all* these Psalms, or even most of them, had in view an actual contemporary person. For in no single case is the reference sufficiently clear and exact to have led to any agreement as to who the king is: in Hupfeld-Nowack's commentary, after an examination of various views, a *non-liquet* is wisely pronounced. Only, indeed, in one of these Psalms (xlv.) is there any particularity of detail

---

dependence. On the other hand, we find it quoted in the earliest post-canonical literature—Ps. Sol., xvii. 26 ; it is probably alluded to in Enoch xlviii. 10 ; cv. 2 ; and references to it abound in the New Testament.

whatever; most of the rest, apart from other considerations which may confine the Psalm within certain limits of time, so far as the reference to the king is concerned, might refer equally well to any king from David to Zedekiah or any other Jewish ruler who subsequently bore the title of king. Now this vague and indefinite allusion to actual contemporary persons is, I believe, wholly alien to the Semitic genius, and quite unparalleled in the Old Testament. To appreciate the significance of the vagueness of these Psalms, we need to bear in mind the concreteness of reference in poems such as David's two elegies, where in each case he mentions by name the person he laments; the same definiteness marks Deborah's song; and even in Ezekiel's allegory (c. xix.), although no names are given, the allusion is clear; the same is true of the late apocalyptic literature in which it is manifest when the author has in view a particular person, even though at times it may be difficult to decide who the person is.

Now while this generality of description is never found outside the Psalter with reference to an actual king, it is found in passages descriptive of the Messianic king, and in this case for the very good reason that generality alone was possible. Here, then, is good reason for enquiring whether these Psalms are not closely connected with the Messianic idea.

Another reason for questioning whether these Psalms refer to an actual contemporary ruler arises out of the numerous references to the king's immortality.

In some cases the reference need imply nothing more than the continuity of the king's race; this, *e.g.*, would fairly satisfy the terms of xlv. 6, 17; lxxxix. 29, 30, 37, 38; but it is not naturally suggested in xxi. 4, 6; lxi. 6, 7; lxxii. 5, 7; cx. 4. In these latter cases we must suppose the expressions hyperbolic, or parallels to the beliefs of Assyrians and Egyptians respecting their kings; thus Professor Cheyne says, "The exalted language of Hebrew writers with reference to their kings is now perfectly

explicable by the popular belief in kings as reflections of the divinity"; and, again, "probably a special 'golden mansion' was believed to be in store for worthy kings in heaven."[1] If the king in these Psalms is an actual contemporary, no doubt this is the best explanation, but it is important to observe what considerable assumptions it involves :—

1. We have no proof that this was the "popular belief" in Israel; it is merely an unconfirmed inference from analogous foreign beliefs. It is significant, but scarcely confirmatory, that the only assertions of the divinity or immortality of a king in the Old Testament, are put into the mouths of foreigners with reference to foreign kings; *vide* Is. xiv. 13, 14; Dan. ii. 4.

2. The immortality in most of these passages in the Psalms does not naturally suggest life in a "golden mansion," but continued life on earth.

III.

The aim of the preceding criticism has been to indicate the difficulties in the way of referring (1) the whole of our group of Psalms to the pre-exilic period, and (2) most of the references to the king to any actual person. It is only because these difficulties appear to me considerable, that I venture to suggest quite tentatively and provisionally, an interpretation of "the King" which in its turn has a considerable bearing on the criticism; for, as far as it holds good, the only argument for assigning these Psalms to the pre-exilic period falls away.

My arguments will frequently presuppose, or gain strength from, a general agreement with some conclusions of Professors Cheyne, Smend, and Stade.[2]

---

[1] *Book of Psalms*, Introd. to Ps. xxi., and note on verses 4, 5.

[2] I refer chiefly (1) to Smend's conclusion that even the Psalms spoken in first person singular generally reflect the national rather than the individual consciousness ; see his Essay *Ueber das Ich der Psalmen*, in *Z.A.T.W.*, 1888, pp. 49-147. To a considerable extent this is accepted by Cheyne (*Origin*

In the first instance, for the sake of clearness, I will confine myself to a discussion of Ps. ii., where both the exegetical and the critical difficulties in the way of regarding the king as a pre-exilic monarch culminate. The evidence as to date I have already summarized ; the exegetical difficulty, stated briefly, is the entire absence of any trait of individual personality in the king described.

These difficulties have been so much felt in the case of this Psalm that it has frequently been interpreted simply of the Messianic king ; noticeably so by Bæthgen. But there is still considerable difficulty in regarding the king of Psalm ii. as completely analogous, *e.g.*, to the king in Isaiah's well-known prophecies. There (as in all prophetic references to the Messianic King), the king is sharply distinguished from the people of Jehovah whom he is to rule in righteousness. But here the king is contrasted only with the nations ; of Israel as distinct from him there is no word.

This then suggests that the "king" is no individual, either contemporary or future, but the people of Jehovah as a whole, regarded as representatives to the world at large of Yahweh's sovereign power ; briefly, the whole Psalm is a direct description of a present struggle between the Jewish nation and the world.[1]

In support of this interpretation, I note :—

1. We have in Ps. ii. the usage already discussed by which the term "kings" is used as a virtual synonym of "nations" ; the kings of *v.* 2 are in no clear way distinguished from the "nations" of *v.* 1. The same may be said of the "nations and uttermost parts of the earth" of *v.* 8, the "kings" and "judges of the earth" of *v.* 10. It is a

of the Psalter, especially pp. 261-265), to a limited extent by Driver (*Introduction*, pp. 365-367). (2) To Stade's discussion Die Messianische Hoffnung im Psalter in *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche*, 1892, pp. 369-413.

[1] This closely agrees with the view taken by Beer in the work cited above. I should, however, add that my own conclusions were reached before reading his discussion of the Psalm.

most natural inference that "my king" of *v.* 6, is a synonym for "my nation" or "my people," and that the author no more sharply distinguishes "the king" from "Israel" than the "kings" from "the nations." In other words, the idea of a personal Messiah, and much more of an actual ruler, was far from the writer's thoughts.

2. Smend has shown that in numerous Psalms written in the first person singular, the author speaks not as an individual, but as the nation; *i.e.* the Psalms in question refer to national not personal circumstances. It would therefore be quite in accordance with usage to regard the speaker of *v.* 7, as personating Israel. So regarded the verse is entirely explicable by Hebrew usage; for Israel is Yahweh's son, compare *e.g.* Hos. xi. 1, "When Israel was a child, then I loved him, and called my son out of Egypt," and within the Psalter itself we have a clear instance of nations being said "to be born"[1] in Zion, see lxxxvii. 4-6. It is true that an individual king may also be said to be a "son of Yahweh"; but still the usage of ילד here would remain without complete analogy if the king be an individual.

3. In Deutero-Isaiah, with which the Psalm is connected by the use of the term "Kings," we find close parallels to the usage pre-supposed by the theory. Most characteristic of that prophet is the conception of the "Servant of Yahweh": this certainly at times covers the whole nation, at others it is confined to an ideal section of the nation; possibly, but by no means certainly, it also becomes in some passages[2] individualised. In any case *a term previously used of individuals* is by the prophet most frequently *used of the nation;*

[1] The parallel is slightly obscured in the English versions, since ילדתיך of ii. 11 is rendered "I have begotten thee," but יֻלַּד of lxxxvii. 4-6 by "was born." The distinction between "begetting" and "bearing" is not to be pressed—in this case the word in Ps. ii. would have been הולדתיך. In each case the word is simply a metaphor for "brought into existence."

[2] For references see Driver, *Isaiah: his Life and Times*, p. 175; the following pages contain a succinct account of the Deutero-Isaianic use.

and that because the nation, with its prophetic function to the whole world, corresponds, in the prophet's outlook, to the place of the individual prophet within the nation. I assume a similar usage in the Psalter, viz., that the nation in its relation to the world, corresponding to the king in his relation to the people, is termed "King." In favour of this we have not merely the general analogy just discussed, but the direct suggestion of another passage in the Deutero-Isaiah. In lv. 3-5, the promise is made that "the sure mercies of David" shall become the nation's; in a word the nation as a whole is in future to stand to Yahweh in the place of David; but the particular aspect in which the prophet is then regarding David is "of a witness to the peoples, a leader and commander to the peoples"; and thus the "idea of kingship," though not the term, is transferred to the nation. Thus the general mode of thought assumed by the theory is completely paralleled in II. Isaiah, where also its special development is suggested.

4. But in literature perhaps contemporaneous with the Psalm—the Book of Daniel—we find a yet more exact parallel. With regard to the interpretation of the seventh chapter of Daniel, as in reference to all other matters connected with the Old Testament, whether textual, critical or exegetical, difference of opinion and so far uncertainty prevails. Without arguing the point I will simply remark that as against Riehm[1] and many earlier scholars, I follow, to cite merely two English scholars, Professors Stanton[2] and Bevan[3] in considering that this chapter contains no reference to a personal Messiah. The chapter contains an allegorical representation of Israel's ideal relation to the world: four of the great world empires are represented by four beasts, Israel by the

[1] In *Messianic Prophecy* (Eng. Trans.), p. 193, footnote 3.

[2] In *The Jewish and Christian Messiah*, p. 109 f.

[3] In his *Commentary on Daniel*, pp. 118 f., whence it appears that Jewish commentators for the most part regarded the "Son of Man" as personal, but Ibn Ezra maintained the national interpretation.

"Son of Man." Now of this "Son of Man" we read, "And there was given him dominion, and glory, and a *kingdom*, that all the peoples, nations, and languages should serve him; his dominion is an everlasting dominion which shall not pass away, and his *kingdom* that which shall not be destroyed," *v.* 14. Here then we note that to Israel as a whole a kingdom is given; the nation symbolised by the "Son of Man" actually received what the king of Psalm ii. is promised for the asking, "the nations for his inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for his possession." The interpretation which follows is an equally significant parallel; this runs—These great beasts, which are four, are four *kings*, which shall arise out of the earth. But the saints of the Most High shall receive the kingdom, and possess the kingdom for ever, even for ever and ever," verses 17, 18. Here the "saints of the Most High" correspond to the "Son of Man" in verse 14, and are contrasted with the "four kings"; but the "four kings" are four nations or empires; the fifth empire, the saints of the Most High, might therefore fittingly, in a poetical passage, be termed "king." Lastly, in verse 27—"And the kingdom and the dominion and the greatness of the kingdoms under the whole heaven, shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High; his kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and all dominions shall serve and obey him"—we have the significant change from the plural, "saints of the Most High," to the singular, "his" and "him."

If it be once granted that as II. Isaiah idealises all Israel as "Yahweh's servant," so another may have idealised the nation as Yahweh's king—and I have just stated what appear good reasons for granting this—it seems to me as clear as from the nature of the case is possible that this idealisation is present in Ps. ii.: for the character of the Psalm forbids an explanation such as Daniel gives of the "Son of Man," and its brevity that multiplicity of reference which leaves us in no doubt as to the meaning of the "servant of Yahweh" in II. Isaiah. The assumption is con-

firmed by this consideration—the resemblance of the king in Ps. ii. to different kings to whom it has been supposed to have referred is purely general, very remote and never convincing; the resemblance, on the other hand, to the "Son of Man," or, as otherwise termed, "the saints of the Most High," is both close and essential.

Assuming now that the idealisation of Israel as Yahweh's king existed, I proceed briefly to consider the possibility of interpreting the other "king" Psalms in the light of it.

Ps. lxxii. Most present theories of interpretation are unsatisfactory: consideration of date alone makes it difficult to refer it to the old kingdom; Professor Cheyne, who derives his view from distinguished forerunners — Olshausen, Reuss, and Hitzig—fails to convince me that it is a glorification of Ptolemy Philadelphus; and against both views there are the general exegetical presumptions stated above. The remaining alternatives are to regard it as purely Messianic, *i.e.*, as a prayer for the ruler of the people in the Messianic age [1]; or, as in Ps. ii., to regard the king as an idealisation of the nation. I prefer the latter on this condition—that we may assume for the conception as much flexibility as marks that of the "servant of Yahweh" in Deutero-Isaiah: this is necessitated by verse 4, where the king is, to a certain extent, distinguished from the people; but this is precisely what we find in Deutero-Isaiah, where, in the same passage, the servant is identified with, and distinguished from, Israel; cf. *e.g.*, xlix. 1-6, "Listen, O isles, unto me. . . . . Yahweh hath called me from the womb—and said unto me, Thou art *my servant; Israel,* in whom I will be glorified; and now saith Yahweh that formed me from the womb *to be his servant, to bring Jacob again to him and that Israel may be gathered unto him:* Yea, he saith, It is too light a thing that thou shouldest be my servant to

[1] Cf. R. Smith, *op. cit.*, p. 439, "I am not sure that the ideal picture of Ps. lxxii. requires any historical background. 'Entrust thy judgments to a king, and thy righteousness to a king's son' may very well be a prayer for the re-establishment of the Davidic dynasty under a Messianic king according to prophecy."

raise up the tribes of Jacob—I will also give thee for a light to the Gentiles." I prefer to assume a certain national reference—

(1.) Because of the close connection with Isaiah lx.—a description of the future of Israel. On the other hand, the parallels with Is. ix. 1-6 and xi. 1-11 are noticeable.

(2.) Because there are good reasons for regarding the Psalm as a product of the period after the exile, but before the Maccabees, *i.e.*, of a period when there was no actual king. At such times the conception of a personal Messianic king apparently dies away;[1] but it was precisely at such a time that the Deutero-Isaiah declares the whole nation heir of the "leader and commander" David.

(3.) Because of the parallels to verse 17 *c*, *d*. It is Abraham's seed, Israel as a whole, that is to become proverbial (cf. Gen. xlviii. 20) for prosperity—cf. Gen. xxii. 18; xxvi. 4; xviii. 18 (cf. xii. 3; xxviii. 14). The national character of the object of the sentence is moreover supported by the national character of the subjects[2] of these clauses. The *nations* would more naturally invoke upon themselves the blessing of a nation, than of an individual —the king.

(4.) Because of the reference to immortality in verses 5, 17. These are in complete analogy with many Psalm passages, if they refer to the immortality of the race; they are without analogy in the Old Testament, if they are a hyperbolic expression of a wish for the long life of the king; they are not clearly paralleled in earlier references to the personal Messianic King—not even in Is. ix. 6, 7. Perhaps the suggestion is worth making that the later belief in the immortality of the Messianic King was in-

[1] Cf. Riehm, *Messianic Prophecy*, Part II., especially pp. 179-193.

[2] In clause *c* we ought no doubt to read with the LXX. ויתברכו בו כל משפחות הארץ, so Cheyne, Kautzsch. Otherwise the subject (כל גוים) of clause *d* must be regarded as explaining the unexpressed subject of clause *c*. In any case the individualistic idea expressed by R. V. ("men shall be blessed in him") is not intended by the Hebrew.

fluenced by an erroneous individualistic interpretation of passages such as these, which originally had a national reference.

Pss. lxxxix. and xviii. must be taken in close connection with one another and with Is. lv. 3-5. That they are really associated with one another appears from a comparison of lxxxix. 50, and xviii. 44, with the prophetic passage; both the Psalms, at any rate in their present form, appear to me dependent on the prophecy, and therefore post-exilic. But at this point the question of date must only be discussed in so far as it is influenced by interpretation.

The first part (strictly verses 4, 5, 20-38) of Psalm lxxxix. is a prolix poetical reproduction of the promise made to David in 2 Sam. vii. of the perpetuity of the monarchy in his seed; this being so, it is natural to attempt to explain "the anointed" of verse 39 (Eng. 38), who is cast off and rejected, as a Davidic king. But the description is far more applicable to a people than an individual, and has its parallels[1] in other descriptions of the disasters and distress of the nation. The national character of the Messiah comes out clearly when we refer to verses 51, 52; here Yahveh's anointed=the speaker of the Psalm=the servants[2] of Yahweh, *i.e.*, the nation. In verse 50, "Lord, where are thy former mercies, which thou swarest unto David in thy faithfulness," we have a

[1] Especially in Lamentations. The parallels between Ps. lxxxix. and Lamentations scarcely appear to have gained the attention they deserve. I append some of the more striking: in considering them it must be remembered that, though Lam. i.-iii. are largely spoken in the first person singular, the speaker is the nation. (Cf. Driver, *Introduction*, p. 431)—

With Ps. vv. 2, 3,	cf. Lam. iii. 22-24.	With Ps. 40*b* (the crown)	cf. Lam. v. 16.
„ 34	„ iii. 31.	„ 42ff	„ ii. 15ff.
„ 39	„ iii. 1; v. 22	„ 51, 52	„ v. 1, 2.
„ 39ff	„ i. 12; ii. 5ff.		

[2] Cheyne and some others read with the Pesch., the singular—"My servant." For that there seems no good reason apart from the theory that an individual is being described. The LXX. supports the plural of M. T., which, as the harder reading, should be retained.

tolerably clear appeal to the prophetic promise, "I will make with you an everlasting covenant, the sure mercies of David" (Is. lv. 3). The reference to the Messiah's "youth" in verse 46 in no way precludes a national reference; perhaps rather the reverse, for cf. cxxix. 1 (and lxxi. 17). Of verses 41, 42 (Engl. 40, 41) Professor Cheyne rightly remarks that they "are clearly based on lxxx. 13, [Eng. 12], and refer to the Jewish nation." This being so, there seems little ground for his claim that while the description partly fits the people, "the anointed" of verse 39 refers to "the Davidic king (or rather the Davidic royalty)." Apparently he bases his claim on the reference to the crown in verse 40, but the passage in Lam. v. 16 shows that this would be equally suitable in a description of the people. I conclude, therefore, that this section of the Psalm refers neither to a contemporary king nor to a future Messianic king, but to the Messianic people; the collective term Messiah of verse 39 corresponds to the distributive term saints (verse 20), as "Son of Man" in Dan. vii. 14 to "saints of the Most High."

The only reference to a personal king occurs in verse 19, "Our king belongs to the Holy One of Israel."[1] Possibly the verse belongs to a section which formed no original part of the Psalm; verse 20 certainly connects more naturally with verse 5 than with verse 19.[2] But if the reference is original, it is far from clear that the king is an actual contemporary; even Bæthgen, who claims so many of the "king" Psalms as pre-exilic, convinced by the other evidence that Ps. lxxxix. is post-exilic, interprets the reference thus: "Israel's king, though in the reality wanting, is yet ideally present; because Yahweh has

[1] This rendering of the line seems to me the only legitimate one; מלכנו in clause *b* must be parallel to מגננו in clause *a*. If, following the ancient versions and R. V. marg., we were to render, "Even to the Holy One of Israel, our king," the possibility of a reference to a contemporary monarch wholly disappears; but the rendering is certainly wrong.

[2] Cf. Cheyne on the passage in his commentary.

promised him, he already belongs to Yahweh." In this case the Psalm introduces as a feature in its ideal future a personal king.

Just as in Psalm lxxxix. the author complains (vv. 39-52) that the nation of the present is not experiencing the promised mercies of David, so in Psalm xviii. the author praises God because the promise that the nation shall enjoy the eminence of David has been fulfilled. From one standpoint he speaks in the name of David, from another in that of the nation. Granted this, the Psalm is a satisfactory whole, and we need not have recourse to theories of interpolation, such as are put forward by recent upholders of the Davidic authorship of the Psalm. "David and his seed" (52*c*), on the analogy of Is. lv. 3 5 and Ps. lxxxix, will be Israel, who is termed in one parallel clause Yahweh's Messiah, and in the other "Yahweh's King" (52*a*, *b*). Without discussing the Psalm at length, I will briefly draw attention to the entire absence of anything necessarily personal from the Psalm.

The deliverance and present prosperity are described by a series of figurative or purely general expressions (*e.g.*, *vv.* 17, 18, 20, 29, 30, 35), such as might well be chosen to describe a national deliverance; but, one use of them, unrelieved as they are by a singular particular trait, is not what we should expect in a description of the deliverance of an individual. Bæthgen himself points out several verses which he says would be more suitable in the mouth of the community than in that of "an individual and in particular, David," and supposes these to be due to the overworking for the use of the community of a Davidic triumphal ode composed for a particular occasion. But the fact is, these differ in no essential way from the rest of the Psalm; indications of the particular fortunes of an individual we seek for in vain. Bæthgen apparently finds such indications in verses 44 and 45, for he says, "In favour of Davidic authorship is the following: The poet is a leader and king, who has carried on victorious wars and subdued peoples whom he had hitherto

not known." Undoubtedly if we had in this Psalm the utterance of a Hebrew king concerning his own fortunes, its author would be David; but we have not. Even in verses 44, 45, we have nothing distinctively personal; on the other hand Israel here acknowledges that the promise of Is. lv. 3-5, has been fulfilled. The resemblance between the speaker of the Psalm and the Israel of the prophet is complete, only what the prophet places in the future, the Psalmist places in the past (or present). The parallels are worth noting.

The speaker of the Psalm is "head of the nations," 44*b*;	It follows from Is. lv. 3-5 that *Israel* will be a "leader and commander of the peoples," 4;
receives the service of unknown nations, 44*c*-46,	will receive the service of unknown nations, 5;
owing to God's assistance, 47, 48,	owing to God's assistance, verse 5;
who is loving to his anointed, David and his seed for evermore, verse 52.	who makes with Israel the everlasting covenant, the sure mercies of David.

We are thus left without any reason for treating the Psalm as the account of the fortunes of an individual; there are many indications that the deliverance of the nation is the subject of the poem; some of these are alluded to above. It must suffice to add that the promise (*v.* 50), to praise God *among the nations*, is the promise to fulfil the task of Israel.

Psalms lxi., lxiii. The strangeness of the allusion in these Psalms to the king has been remarked by R. Smith[1]; but I fail to see how his suggestion that the verses containing them are a liturgical addition eases the difficulty; they would in that case presumably refer to a Maccabæan prince; but this would leave us with the difficulty of explaining the term מֶלֶךְ, and also why a liturgical reference to the king should be added in just these Psalms. Certainly the allusion to the king, if he be not identical with the speaker of the Psalms, is, as R. Smith says, unnatural; but if he be identical, it is entirely natural, for the speaker is here unmistakably expressing the national consciousness

[1] *Old Testament in Jewish Church* (Second Edition), p. 438.

and hopes (verses 5, 9), and thus the connection between verses 7 and 8, and verse 9, is clear; if Yahweh will grant the kingly people perpetual life, they will render him perpetual praise.

The national reference is probable, though less manifest, in lxiii.

There is much also in favour of interpreting Psalm xxi. in the same way; it contains nothing of a distinctly personal character—no one will lay stress on the "crown"[1] of verse 3; and the repeated and emphatic references to immortality are entirely in harmony with the thought of the Psalter if the immortality implied be racial, but only to be paralleled from Egyptian and Assyrian ideas, if a quasi-divinity is being attributed to the king.[2]

With some difficulty Psalm xx. might, perhaps, be interpreted likewise; but in this case the date which requires such an interpretation (post-exilic and pre-Maccabæan) needs to be first proved. To explain it of a personal, non-existent and only ideal king is difficult. The alternatives appear to me to identify the king with the nation,[3] or with one of the (latest) pre-exilic kings. Psalm xx. it should in any case be noted, differs from the rest of the "king" Psalms, except xlv., in its greater particularity of detail, and from all except xlv. and cx.[4] in being addressed to the king. To Psalm xlv. the theory of interpretation I have been suggesting, certainly does not apply; it is questionable in the case of Psalm cx.

In three of the four Psalms where the king is termed Yahweh's Messiah, the king most clearly appeared to be the nation (ii., xviii., lxxxix.); in Psalms xxviii. and lxxxiv.

---

[1] Cf. Lam. v. 6, and the note on Ps. lxxxix. and Lamentations above.

[2] Vide *supra*, p. 8.

[3] The allusion in this Psalm to the "king" depends on accepting the reading of the LXX. (cf. R. V. marg.). In that case note that "king" is parallel to "us."

[4] To which we must add Ps. xxi., if verses 9-13 be separated from verse 14, and considered as an address to the king (so Cheyne). Ps. lxxii. 5*a*, is corrupt.

where Yahweh's Messiah, but not the king, is mentioned, there is therefore little reason for finding a personal reference. Note particularly in xxviii. 9, the four terms "people," "anointed," "people," "inheritance"; it is unlikely that the second only is personal, when the other three must be national.[1]

My conclusions can be briefly summed up as follows :—

1. *Exegetical.*—In Pss. ii., lxxii., xviii., lxxxix., xxi., the king referred to is an idealisation of the people in virtue of its sovereign functions, and terms used of the king are only, or most satisfactorily, to be explained by the circumstances, not of an individual monarch, but of the (royal) nation. In Ps. lxi., probably also in Ps. lxiii., the author speaks in the name of the nation, and consequently appropriates the term "king." Possibly Pss. xx. and cx. may be analogously explained. In Ps. xxxiii. the reference is purely proverbial. The interpretation of Ps. xlv. I have left out of account: my own theory is inapplicable to it, and it is difficult to decide between conflicting views.

2. *Critical.*—In these Psalms (including xxviii. and lxxxiv., but with the possible exceptions of xx., xlv., cx.) a contemporary monarch is not alluded to, and the only evidence hitherto adduced in favour of their pre-exilic origin thus falls through. On the other hand, granted the validity of the proposed interpretation, it will, no doubt, be conceded that the reference to the king becomes additional evidence of post-exilic date; it forms a weighty addition to the evidence from ideas. These Psalms are, therefore, post-exilic; but xviii., xxi., xxviii. date from the fifth century; lxi., lxiii., lxxii. are not later than the end of the fourth; lxxxiv. and lxxxix. are pre-Maccabæan; ii. and xxxiii. need not be, and the former probably is not, earlier than the middle of the second century.

Of the two uncertain Psalms, xx. and cx., if they refer to actual contemporary rulers, xx. must be pre-exilic,

[1] Cf. also Hab. iii. 13, where the national character of the Messiah has been most generally recognised.

because, standing in Book I., it cannot be Maccabæan; and cx. will almost certainly be Maccabæan, since language and position render a pre-exilic origin unlikely.

In the case of xlv., position excludes a Maccabæan origin, while position and language, not to speak of ideas, render a pre-exilic origin unlikely.

So far as my interpretation holds good, it serves to confirm (for the period from the exile to the Maccabees) Mr. Montefiore's statement:—"The Messianic king, at any rate, as distinguished from the general and wider conception of the Messianic age, was of comparative insignificance in the Jewish religion,"[1] while at the same time it shows that these Psalms, like so many others, reflect the Messianic hopes and the Messianic consciousness of the people. They are not remotely connected with the Messianic hope as being ideal descriptions of an actual ruler; they are directly Messianic, as being due to the hope and conviction that, through Israel, God will exercise dominion over the world; for, as Professor Stade justly observes, a passage is Messianic, not because it refers to a coming personal deliverer, but in virtue of reference to the kingdom of God.

G. Buchanan Gray.

---

[1] See *Hibbert Lecture*, p. 416.

QIRQISANI, THE KARAITE, AND HIS WORK ON JEWISH SECTS.

FOUR years after Saadyah had published his fundamental *Book of Beliefs and Doctrines* (933 C.E.), a Karaite savant wrote a work which had a similar tendency, namely, to offer some safe guidance amid the numerous religious opinions which were then put forth, and some justification for the application of speculative reasoning to things religious. The name of this Karaite scholar has long been known, Abû Jûsuf Ja'qûb Al-Qirqisânî; but with regard to his work, we now for the first time receive reliable and precise information. For this we are indebted to the scholar who has already done so much towards elucidating obscure points in the domain of older Jewish literature, viz., Abraham Harkavy, of St. Petersburg. There recently appeared in the eighth volume of the transactions of the Imperial Russian Archæological Society a larger work, in the course of which Harkavy published a part of Qirqisânî's treatise in the Arabic original (pp. 279-319), introduced by an exposition and review in Russian (pp. 247-278) of the contents of this text published for the first time. Although I am only partially able to master this introduction, written, as it is, in Russian, I yet undertake to give wider publicity to Harkavy's work, and to reproduce new and important particulars derived from the text of Qirqisânî itself.

Abû Jûsuf Ja'qûb Al-Qirqisânî—so called after Qirqisân or Qurqusân, the ancient Circesium, Karkemish—wrote the said work, as Harkavy pointed out before, in the year 937. He named it *The Book of Lights and the high beacons*

(Kitâb al-anwâr wal-marâqib).[1] It consists of thirteen parts (מקאלה), the contents of which we become acquainted with through Harkavy's Introduction (p. 249). The first part is the portion edited by Harkavy, and will be further discussed later on. The second part, consisting of twenty-eight chapters, demonstrates the duty of Speculative Enquiry with regard to religious matters, and establishes its conclusive power. The third part, in twenty-five chapters, deals with the various adverse religious sects and their views. In sixty-eight chapters the fourth part contains the fundamental principles, leading to the understanding of particular religious statutes. The following parts treat of the religious institutions or precepts themselves in systematic order:—

5th. Concerning Circumcision and the Sabbath (40 chapters);

6th. The nine other Commandments of the Decalogue (104 chapters);

7th. Concerning the New Moon and the First-fruits (21 chapters);

8th. Concerning the Feast of Weeks (15 chapters);

9th. Concerning the Remaining Festivals (24 chapters);

10th. The Laws of Levitical Uncleanliness in man and beast (66 chapters);

11th. On Forbidden Marriages and the Law of the Levirate (31 chapters);

12th. On Forbidden Meats, Dress, and Seeds, and the fringes (42 chapters);

13th. On the Laws of Inheritance (14 chapters).

The above shows that the last nine parts of Qirqisânî's work, to which the first four are a sort of general introduc-

[1] Hadassi mentions a ס' הנצנים of Qirqisânî (*vide* Pinsker, *Lik kadm.* I. 169), but הנצנים is only an erroneous rendering of כתאב אלאנואר, as אנואר in Arabic means "lights" as well as "flowers." The proper rendering would be ס' האורים, as Levi b. Jepheth names the work (*v.* Pinsker, II. 90, 193). The book was briefly quoted as כתאב אלאנואר (without ואלמראקב), *vide* Neubauer, *Aus der Petersburger Bibliothek* (1866), p. 114.

tion, form collectively a *Book of Precepts*, and this may probably be the ספר המצות, attributed to our author. The MS., Or. 2526 of the British Museum, contains the twelfth Maqâla (Part) and portions of the fifth and ninth Maqâla of the ספר המצות (*vide* Margoliouth *Descriptive List*, etc., p. 42); Or. 2578 contain portions of the eleventh and twelfth; Or. 2579 portions of the fifth and sixth parts. Or. 2525 of the British Museum contains "an abstract of the ספר מצוות of Abû Jûsuf Jakûb Al-Kirkisânî" (*v.* Margoliouth, p. 42).

According to information received from Professor Büchler, the MS. contains an explanation of the commandments of the Decalogue; and this would, accordingly be the sixth part of the Kitâb âl-Anwâr. Finally, in Margoliouth's *Catalogue*, we find the contents of Or. 2524 thus: "Two fragments of a ספר מצוות, probably by Jakûb al-Kirkisâni, containing refutations of the Christians, Mohammedans, and of several individual writers." The contents contradict the title *Book of Precepts*. As a matter of fact the title ס' המצוות never appears, as I was informed by Professor Büchler (Vide *Revue des Etudes Juives*, XXVI., 311). It contains a number of chapters (באב), marked as those from the seventh to the twenty-third. Also the end of the sixth chapter is preserved. The sixteenth chapter (אלבאב אל"יו) finds a place in H. Hirschfeld's *Arabic Chrestomathy* (London, 1892), pp. 116-121; and when Dr. Hirschfeld styles the MS. as the *Sefer Hammizvoth of Jaqûb Qirqisânî*, he but follows the designation adopted in the official Catalogue of the British Museum: this was unknown to me at the time I reviewed the said Chrestomathy (*Revue des Etudes Juives*, XXV. 155). M. Hartwig Derenbourg styles the contents of the MS., "Fragments of a כתאב אצול אלדין Karaite en arabe" (*Revue des Etudes Juives*, XXIII. 284), without mentioning Qirqisânî as the author. Now, as we have a means of learning through Harkavy the divisions of Qirqisânî's work, we are in a position to make the statement beyond doubt, that the MS. Or. 2524

of the British Museum contains the greater portion of the third part of the Kitâb al-anwâr (*i.e.*, of the twenty-five chapters of this part, the sixth to the twenty-third). This part is of a polemic nature, and can therefore not properly be styled כתאב אצול אלדין; and yet this description even would be more appropriate for it than that of ספר המצוות. Really, if any part of Qirqisânî's work might be called dogmatic (כ' אצול אלדין), it would rather be the second part, or even the fourth, according to the division given above.

In addition to the Kitâb al-anwâr wal-marâqib, the Imperial Library of St. Petersburg possesses also an exegetic work by Qirqisânî, viz., Kitâb ar-riyâd wal-hadâiq" (כתאב אלריאץ ואלחדאיק), "The Book of Fields and Gardens." It is a commentary upon those portions of the Pentateuch not devoted to the laws, and is consequently supplementary to those portions of the chief work dealing with the laws of the Pentateuch. Harkavy cites (p. 250, note 1) an interesting passage from this work, bearing upon Gen. ix. 27. Qirqisânî there gives an explanation to the words וישכן באהלי שם, which makes them refer to the conversion of the Chazars to Judaism (דלך ראגע אלי אלכזר... אלדין תהודו). The MS., Or. 2492, of the British Museum contains the said portion of this work upon the first two pericopes (*v.* Margoliouth, p. 24; Derenbourg, *Revue des Etudes Juives*, XXIII. 282).

As Harkavy deduces from quotations occurring in the two works which have been preserved, Qirqisânî was also the author of the following works:—Commentaries to Job and Ecclesiastes; a book on the Unity of God (כתאב אלתוחיד); a work on the translation of the Bible (כתאב פי אלקול עלי אלתרגמה).

In the introductory part of his chief work, Qirqisânî gives a survey of the Jewish sects as they existed in ancient times, and also in his own times. This knowledge is now made available to all those acquainted with Arabic by the excellent edition of Harkavy. Much of that which

we read here concerning the various sects and their doctrines has long been known; but even these data acquire a new charm, and further corroboration, when read in the context of an original work devoted exclusively to the subject in question, composed by one who spoke from experience, or who was in a position to obtain his materials from ancient documents now lost. Add to this that Qirqisânî, notwithstanding his Karaite proclivities and consequent prejudice against the Rabbis, makes upon us the impression of an objective compiler and chronicler, who devotes to the subjects he represents a lively interest, and conceals nothing which might be of importance. At the end of the first chapter, (which, by the way, serves as an introduction to the entire work,) he makes the assertion that he has drawn his materials, not alone from the works of his predecessors, but also from his personal experience among the learned societies in which he moved, and, in the case of such meetings as he did not attend, from the verbal reports of its proceedings (ממא בעצה מדון פי כתב מן תקדם ובעצה ממא גרי פי אלמגאלס אלתי חצרתהא ומא אנתהי אליי ממא לם אחצרהא, p. 280, *l.* 23-25).

It is specially interesting to hear what Qirqisânî has to say regarding the remnants of ancient sects extant in his days. The ʿAnanites, says he, are very few, and gradually decreasing. Only about twenty persons are living at Damascus of the adherents of Abû ʿIsâ Isfahânî. Of the Judgânites, only few are extant at Isfâhân (317, 4-7). Not one of the adherents of Ismaîl the ʿOkbarite remains at the present day (317, 3). On the other hand, some of the followers of Meshuje are to be found in ʿOkbara, named after their founder; but among them are no persons of culture or of speculative turn of mind in religious matters (285, 17). The followers of Malik of Ramla are still called Ramlites or Malikites (285, 13); while those of Abû ʿImrân Mûsa Tiflîsî are yet to be found in Tiflis, Armenia (285, 11).

More interesting, however, is the picture which Qirqisânî

unfolds of the conditions existing in his time within the folds of the Karaites themselves. In the last chapter he gives so vivid and drastic a picture of the dissensions reigning among them in matters of greater or minor importance, as regards doctrine and practice, that, did we not know the portraiture proceeded from the pen of Qirqisânî, so zealous a Karaite, we might be inclined to put it down as a lampoon directed by some opponent in the ranks of the Rabbins. He takes occasion to point out their doctrinal and ritual differences as he observed them at different places—in Bagdâd (317, 20; 318, 5; 319, 8); Tuster (317, 23, 26; 319, 10); Basra (318, 25, 34; 319, 10); Persia (318, 25); Chorâsân (319, 2); Gebâl (319, 4); and Syria (319, 1); and he closes the long list of examples illustrative of the differences and doubtfulness existing among Karaites with the following words:—"Things are becoming worse day by day" (ואלאמר כל יום פי זיאדה, 319, 24). In another passage (285, 23) he says in this connection:—"You can scarcely meet two Karaites of one and the same mind in all matters: upon one point or another everyone has an opinion different from that of the rest." It is worthy of note to remark the point to which Qirqisânî once takes the opportunity of referring, namely, the want of attention among the Karaites to the Rabbinic literature—he means the Midrash. "Had the Karaites," he says, "obtained an insight into the flaws and discrepancies which disfigure this branch of literature they would have rendered the task of controversy with the Rabbis a much easier one." "It is only of late," he continues, "that some few among them occupy themselves with the study of that literature, and they soon light upon the weaknesses and contradictions referred to" (296, 3-6. In line 3, instead of אקאוילה, read אקאוילהם).

With remarkable candour does Qirqisânî lash the petty and selfish motives which often prompted the Karaite teachers in the expression of their opinions. In the first chapter, Qirqisânî sketches the character of Daniel al-Dâmegânî, also called Daniel al-Qumisî (אלקומסי), as the

latest founder of a sect. He treats of him specially later on, in the eighteenth chapter. On the one hand he praises him as a person than whom no one was more honest and unreserved in the frank avowal of the results of his speculations in religious matters. He reports of him that he was in the habit of furnishing his followers who possessed copies of his works with verbal instructions concerning alterations which they were to mark in them in the event of any change which his opinions had undergone since the time his works first appeared. But, on the other hand, he reproaches Daniel Qûmisî for his unbounded hatred of the ʿAnanites. At an earlier period, so Qirqisânî relates, he used to style ʿAnan ראש המשכילים; but later on he never spoke of him else than as ראש הכסילים. This, he concludes, is one of the great scourges which is rife among our people, viz., the way they attack and bear hatred against one another. The motive in most instances is jealousy and ambition (ואכתר מא יחמלהם עלי דלך אלחסד וטלב אלריאסה, 280, 21).

In the same introductory chapter,[1] Qirqisânî directs his remarks also against those Karaites, who, like those residing in Tuster (Schuster, the ancient Susa), appear to accept the fundamental principle of Karaism, viz., independent enquiry and research, while in reality they find fault with the rational perception, viz., that of the demonstrative sciences, whether it be in Dialectics or Philosophy.[2] They adopt this course, says Qirqisânî, partly through dulness of the intellect and the difficulty of this sort of speculative enquiry, and partly through their insisting upon the idea that the application of the speculative methods of philosophy to religious matters is fraught with danger to their convictions. Our author cites also the said

[1] The beginning of the chapter, and consequently of the entire work, has, unfortunately, not been preserved.

[2] יעיבון עלי מן נטר פי אלמעקול יעני בשי מן אלעלום אלברהאניה אמא אלנדליה ואמא אלפלספיה (279.15).

Daniel al-Qûmisî as an example of an opponent to rationalism as applied to religion. He decisively combats the idea that reason opposes religious belief, and asks: Are there not many, who are not alone not weakened, but even strengthened in their faith by such knowledge, while many apostatise from their faith and become the worst heretics, who have kept aloof from rationalistic knowledge. Rationalism, says Qirqisânî—and this he wishes to prove in his work—is the foundation upon which every article of faith is based, and from which every knowledge flows (280, 7: אלמעקול אצל יבני עליה כל קול ויסתכרג בה כל עלי).

He proceeds from a similar point of view as Saadyah in his chief philosophical work: and it is a particular worth mentioning, that the same verse, Psalm cxix. 18, with which Saadyah begins his introduction, is employed by Qirqisânî at the end of his introductory chapter (280, 30).

A large portion of Qirqisânî's history of the sects is devoted to polemics against the Rabbins. He regards these as a sect of Jews which sprang up at the time of the Second Temple. The real founder, however, of the school of thought introduced by the Rabbis, was no other than King Jeroboam I. He was "the first who brought dissension into the religious camp, and sowed the seeds of rebellion in Israel," "who altered the precepts of religion, and falsified them." We cannot here reproduce (as it would exceed the limits of this article) the reasoning by means of which Qirqisânî brings out this idea of identifying the principles of Rabbinism, as they appeared to a Karaite, with those of the seceding king, who was by no means an idolator (Vide p. 281, 1—282, 5; 286, 1-5). After giving in the second chapter a survey of the sects afterwards to be dealt with in detail (282, 16—285, 25), Qirqisânî devotes two long chapters (3rd, p. 285-297; 4th, 297-303) to the explanation of the points of difference between Rabbinism and the other Jewish sects. In the former chapter, he enumerates over sixty particulars, mostly of Halacha, in which the tradition of the Rabbis deviates from the proper

explanation of Holy Writ, or in which it contradicts itself. At the head of this list, he places the reproach that the Rabbis in their work *Shiûr Kômâ*, שיעור קומה, represent God as a body (286, 8). A few more of these faults found with the Rabbis are :—that they do not pray the Psalms of David, but prayers composed by themselves, though in beginning their prayers they say, אשר בחר בדוד עבדו ורצה בשירי קדשו;[1] that the Psalms which they do adopt, they do not rehearse as prayers, but in a sitting posture, as though they were reading (286, 22 ; 287, 4); that they bow at the end of their prayer, in the manner of the Christians, to the right and to the left, presumably before the two angels appointed for man (287, 7); that in the prayer מכניסי רחמים they turn to the angels to bring their petitions before God's Throne, resting upon the Scriptural words of Koheleth x. 20 :—ובעל כנפים יגיד דבר and taking " winged ones " to mean angels, according to Isaiah vi. 2 (287, 10). They further explain that the laws of Cleanliness and Uncleanliness are abrogated during the exile, asserting : מיום שחרב בית המקדש אין טמאה ואין טהרה (289, 5); they omit an undoubted duty on the day of Atonement, viz., the saying of the prayer צלאה תמיד[2] in place of the daily morning sacrifice, commencing as they do with the recital of the confession of sin : while, on the other hand, they have made it a duty to repeat at the conclusion of the day an unknown prayer called by them נעילה (294, 10).

In the Fourth Chapter Qirqisânî gives us a similar list of Rabbinic teachings and expressions, but these belong

[1] In that part of the Prayer Book ברוך שאמר, which introduces the Psalms of the Morning Service, it is said : ובשירי דוד עבדך נהלל֫ך. The Benediction quoted by Qirqisânî is one formed after that employed in connection with the Haphtara (אשר בחר בנביאים טובים ורצה בדבריהם). It is a question whether such was actually in use at his time.

[2] *Vide* the same expression, 294, 21 ; what is meant is תפלת שחרית. The prayer in the Liturgy of the Day of Atonement called ת' שחרית, is not regarded by Q. as such, inasmuch as it has included in it the Confession of Sin.

to the Agada. In this chapter he also begins with the book שיעור קומה; then he adduces expressions from the pseud-epigraphic writings אותיות דר' עקיבא and כתבא ישמעאל (=היכלות), and from the Talmud. He reproduces in detail the legends of Rabba b. Nachmani (he consistently puts רבא) taken from *Baba-Mezia* 86*a*, and of Elieser b. Hyrcanus from *B. M.* 59*b*. He criticises most vehemently the Talmudic account of the origin of the Septuagint (*Megilla* 9*a*), which he places side by side with the Christian account. Lastly, he refers to the extraordinary appreciation by the Rabbis of the translation of the Pentateuch by Onkelos (אנקלוס הגר), selecting a few examples of renderings which he considers perfectly absurd, viz., that of Gen. xxviii. 21; xlix. 11; Exod. xii. 48;[1] Deut. xxiii. 18. Qirqisânî does not admit the defence put forth by some Rabbis that such passages of the Agada have to be regarded not as belonging to the general traditions, but as the opinions of individuals, or that they were the expressions of enemies of the Rabbis, which had become incorporated among their own (302, 16).

With apparent delight and avowed tendency does Qirqisânî include within the limits of his picture the well-known differences in matters of ritual, specially between the Palestinian and Babylonian Jews. He adduces this divergence within the folds of Rabbinic Judaism in the matter of religious opinion as a strong argument against the genuineness and truth of Rabbinic tradition, and as a weapon on his side against the reproach, so fondly levelled by the Rabbins at the Karaites, that of want of unanimity and certainty (*vide* 308, 24; 319, 27). According to Qirqisânî, these differences between the Jews of Palestine and Babylon are connected with the ancient feud between the schools of Hillel and Shammai (284, 2), and upon the strength of this assumption he refers, in the list of

[1] He quotes (as a translation of כל משעמד לא : (כל ערל לא יאכל בו יאכל מנה.

the various sects, to the said differences in chronological order in that part (ch. 10), in which we should have expected, according to the introductory survey of the Second Chapter, a mention of the Schools of Hillel and Shammai, concerning whose controversies he also introduces several notices (309, 2-18). He derives his knowledge of these differences between the Palestinian and Babylonian Jews, as he asserts at the end of the chapter dealing with them (311, 15), from the writings of the Rabbis themselves, one of their number having collected them in a separate volume. In the beginning of the Chapter (308, 20) he remarks that these differences amount to about fifty, and enumerates amid polemical expressions, sixteen of them. Of the fifty-five entries of differences found in Joel Müller's treatise,[1] we find quoted by Qirqisânî the following numbers: 3, 6, 7, 9, 11, 15, 16, 17, 18, 23, 31, 40, 41, 51. He includes two numbers which are missing in the sources from which Müller drew his materials.[2]

From what has already been stated, it will easily be seen that Qirqisânî studied with industry, for polemical purposes, the Literature of the Rabbis. In addition to the *Mishna* and *Talmud*, and those works of mystic and pseudepigraphic literature already mentioned, we learn from the text before us of the following works which he cites:—

1. A book, יראת חטא, from which he quotes this expression: "You will have no reward for studying and

---

[1] חלוף מנהגים בין בני בבל לבני ארץ ישראל (reprinted from Jhg. VII. and VIII. of השחר), Vienna, 1878.

[2] In a Hebrew translation the two numbers would have to run thus:— 1. (310, 11), אנשי בבל מתירים לשום את הקדרה אל התנור קודם בוא השבת כדי שתתבשל בשבת ואנשי א"י אוסרים ; 2. (310, 5) אנשי בבל אין מתירים לקדש את האשה בשנה השביעית ואנשי ארץ ישראל מתירים זה. This latter number must undoubtedly be based upon some misunderstanding. In the original there occurred the word בשביעית (=בפירות ש' or בדמי ש'), and Q. thoughtlessly took it to mean בשנה השביעית. Cf. the Commentary משנה למלך on Maimûni's *Mishne Torah, Hilch. Ishûth*, V. 3.

searching the Torah, but only for your searching the teachings of the Rabbis" (248, 10: וקאלוא פי יראת חטא ליס לך אגר אן תקרא ותדרס פי אלתוריה אלא פי גמאר אלרבאנין).

The book is evidently the same that, as Azulai (ed. Benjacob, II. 62*a*) remarks, is referred to by Salomon b. Al-Kabez in his commentary to Ruth i. 21, by the name מס' יראת חטא. Harkavy (p. 298, note 10) is, therefore, wrong in saying it is quite unknown. It is an ethical treatise similar to מס' דרך ארץ. Two MSS. of the Bodleian (No. 120 and 380, vide *Neubauer's Cat.*, Col. 19 and 83) contain the tractate יראת חטא, between the tractates Aboth and Derech Erez. Qirqisânî's citation is a testimony to its age.

2. סדר גיהנם (298, 16), not identical with the מסכת גיהנם (published in Jellinek's *Beth-Hamidrash*, I. 147, 9), for Qirqisânî's quotation is not to be found in the latter.

3. תשובת אחאב, probably an Agadic work based upon the Biblical story of King Ahab's repentance (1 Kings xxi. 27-29). Qirqisânî quotes from this and the aforementioned work the Agada occurring in both, according to which God himself, in Isaiah xxii. 12, makes use of weeping and lamentation. This bold Agadic conception which presents God as weeping over the destruction of his sanctuary, is already met with in older Midrashic writings (Vide *Die Agada der Palästinensischen Amoräer*, I. 145; note 4).

4. An Agadic work known as תלמוד בני רבי (299, 4: אגדה להם תערף בתלמוד בני רבי). He quotes from the same an Agadic passage which, rendered into Hebrew, would probably run thus:—שלשה דברים למד הקב"ה ממשה · אחד במעשה העגל כאשר רצה להשמיד בני ישראל כמו שאמר ועתה הניחה לי ויחר אפי בהם ואכלם אמר משה לפניו ושמעו מצרים כי העלית בכחך וגו' אמר לו הקב"ה החייתני בדבריך שנאמר ואולם חי אני · וחשני במעשה סיחון כשאמר הקב"ה למשה והתגר בו מלחמה לא ישר הדבר בעיני משה ולא עשה מה שצוהו הקב"ה שנאמר ואשלח מלאכים ממדבר קדמות אל סיחון וגו' ומה שעשה ישר בעיני הקב"ה ואמר לו משה

מבטל אני את דברי ואקיים את דבריך וזה שאמר אחר זה כי תקרב אל עיר וגו׳.

The third point, referred to in the opening words, which God learnt from Moses, is missing.

Qirqisânî adds the remark: "I think that this passage is taken from the Talmud" (ואחסב אן הדא אלהול מן אלתלמוד). Perhaps he was thinking of the passage in Berachoth, 32*a*, where we may read almost literally part of the first Agada based on Exod. xxxii. 10 and Numb. xiv. 13, 16, and 21. The second Agada, which brings into connection Deut. xx. 10 and Deut. ii. 24 and 26, is to be found in the Midrash Tanchuma in the frame of a similar three-fold Agada.[1] What the "Talmud of the Sons of Rabbi," as the title of an Agadic work, is to signify, is beyond even conjecture.

5. A work of Hâi, Chief of the College, in which he attributes to R. Jizchak Nappacha, the Palestinian Amora, the rules for fixing the Calendar (293, 5). This work of Hâi the elder (Hâi b. David), is known also to later Karaite writers, beginning with Jepheth b. Ali, as Pinsker has shown (*Likkute Kadmonijoth*, II., 94, 148-151). According to Levi b. Jepheth it was a controversial work against the Karaites.

6. Not from personal observation, but from the relations of others, Qirqisânî was acquainted with a translation made by the same Chief of the College, Hâi. It is said of the latter, that he in conjunction with his father (הו ואבוה, perhaps הו ואכוה, he and his brother) translated the book of ʿAnan from Aramaic into Hebrew מן אלארמאני אלי אלעבראני). The two translators, as we are further told in this remarkable account, had found nothing in ʿAnan for which there was not some support in the teachings of the

---

[1] *Tanch.* שופטים, fine: א״ר לוי שלשה דברים עשה משה והסכים הקב״ה על ידו ׳ ואלו הן..... ואחת בימי סיחון ועוג א״ל הקב״ה לך הלחם עמו סכור אמת המים שלו ומשה לא עשה כן שנאמר ואשלח מלאכים ׳ א״ל הקב״ה חייך עשית כראוי מסכים אני על ידך לפיכך משה מזהיר על ישראל ואומר להם כי תקרב אל עיר להלחם עליה וקראת אליה לשלום. Conf. *Deuteronomium Rabba*, c. V. *fin.*

Rabbins, with the exception of one ordinance concerning the firstborn of cattle. Ultimately they even found this point in the ritual of the Paitan Jannai (פי חזאנה ינאי), 284, 17-22.

7. The ritual of Eleasar (אלעזר פי הזאנתה), *i.e.*, of Kalir, from which Qirqisânî quotes (300, 1-3) a piece belonging to the Liturgy of the Day of Atonement, and beginning לך ארץ ודריה. He cites from it the words וחיד הרמה אשר ברהמ אסורה. This same quotation, probably derived from our author, is to be found several times in *Hadassi (vide* Zunz, *Literaturges. d. Syn. Poesie*, p. 63).

Qirqisânî in one place makes mention by name of a Rabbinic authority (312, 2). I asked—so he relates—Ja'qûb Ibn Ephraim, the Palestinian (אלשאמי): Why do you (Rabbis) attract to yourselves the 'Isavites (the adherents of 'Isa Isfahani) and intermarry with them, seeing that they (as you are well aware) ascribe the prophetic spirit to such individuals as were no prophets, namely, Jesus and Muhammed? His reply was:—Because they do not differ from us in the matter of the Festivals. Harkavy remarks that the person here named, Jacob b. Ephraim, is identical with the man whose Commentary to the T. Sabbath of the Jerusalem Talmud was brought from Palestine to Babylon by Salmon ben Jerucham (Pinsker, II., 14).

The most important authority whom Qirqisânî follows in his account of the sects, is one who, as a philosophical writer, is highly esteemed on the Rabbinic side since Bachja Ibn Pakûda, viz., David Almuqammes (or, as his name was also pronounced Almiqmâs, אלמקמאץ). Concerning this personage, around whom there has gathered some inexplicable mystery, we learn from this work of Qirqisânî the most astounding particulars. In the chapter on Christianity he states that he is indebted for his statements on this subject to the accounts of David b. Merwân Al-Raqqî. He then proceeds: "This person, known by the name of אלמקמץ, was a philosopher. First he was a Jew, and then he be-

came converted in Nisibis to Christianity, under the lead of a man named Nânâ (=Nonnus, *vide* p. 259, note 3). The latter was much esteemed among Christians, as he was a perfect philosopher and practised medicine. David Almuqammeṣ was for many years his pupil, and thus it was that he learnt the principles of Christianity so thoroughly, and distinguished himself in philosophy. Later on he wrote two books concerning the Christians, in which he attacked them; both works are known. He further translated from among their books and commentaries a Commentary upon Genesis, which he termed כתאב אלכליקה (Book of Creation), and also a Commentary upon Koheleth" (306, 16-23). These data impress one with their own historic truth, and we have no reason to doubt their being facts. Qirqisânî seems to have spent some time in Raqqua, David's native place (*V.* Munk, *Mélanges de Philosophie*, p. 474), for he receives information from a scholar of this town concerning some particulars in the ritual of Jerusalem (310, 29: וחכי שיך מן משאיך אלרקה). He could thus have gathered from that place authentic details regarding the life of Almuqammeṣ. With reference to this surname, we have the ingenious suggestion of Harkavy, viz., "the leaper, jumper" (cf. Arabic קמץ, Aram. קמצא, grasshopper, *sauterelle*), this surname having been intended to point to the fact that David changed his religion twice, "jumped" from one to the other, seeing that he was converted to Christianity, and then returned to Judaism. David's Commentary on Genesis, to which reference is made, Harkavy found quoted in a fragment of an anonymous Arabic Commentary on Genesis. It is stated in this fragment (p. 261): "David b. Merwân Al-Raqqî, called Almuqammeṣ, wrote a book in explanation of Genesis, which he translated from the commentaries of the Syrians." The fragment lays stress upon a characteristic of this Commentary on Genesis by David b. Merwân, stating that it is now defective, now unnecessarily prolix.

The work of David b. Merwân, from which Qirqisânî

drew most of the materials for his chapter on Christianity (p. 305-307), he calls in another passage (308-316) כתאב אלצראה, Kitâb-al-Dharâ, Book of Fierce Attack, a characteristic title for a controversial work. He also refers in his accounts of individual sects (304, 9 and 16) to David b. Merwân as his authority, and we may infer that even in those parts in which he does not refer to him specially, he drew from him as his source. The same source supplied in later times (twelfth Century), Jehuda Hadassi with material for Nos. 97 and 98 of his Eshkol Hakkofer on Jewish sects. This account, hitherto regarded as the chief source of information on the subject, can now be controlled and supplemented with the assistance of Qirqisânî.

Qirqisânî sets to work chronologically in his accounts of the Jewish sects, as well in his introductory survey in the second chapter, as in the later chapters devoted to the individual sects. Here follows an enumeration of the various sects in the same order as he mentions them, with details of special interest or such as have been hitherto unknown.[1]

1. The Samaritans, "called by the Jewish people כותים" (282, 16). It is related of them, that to this very day, they revere the memory of Sanballat the Choronite as one of their princes (285, 21). During their prayers they turn to Shilo (303, 11). They reckon the new moon according to a calendar supposed to have been fixed by Jeroboam (עיבור ירבעם, 303, 15). They are divided into two sects, one called כושן, the other דסתאן (Dustân= Dositheos). One of these sects denies the Resurrection. They, having made a few alterations in the text of the Thora, accordingly add in Gen. iv. 8, קום נצא השדה (303, 18-22).

2. The Sadducees ((אלצדוקיה). Zadok, their founder, wrote books against the Rabbanites, without adducing proofs, in behalf of his views which were opposed to those of the Rabbanites (283, 11-13). Boëthus, the other founder,

[1] Concerning the Rabbanites, this has appeared in the foregoing remarks.

taught, as the 'Ananites and all other Karaites, that the Feast of Weeks could only be held on a Sunday (283, 15; 304, 22). The Sadducees prohibited divorce, as Jesus did later (304, 3; 305, 12). They explained (according to the statement of David Almuqammes), the bodily attributes ascribed to God in Holy Writ in their literal signification (304, 9-16).

3. The Magârites (אלמגאריה). They are so called from the fact that their books were found in a cave (מגאר, Hebr. מערה). The "Alexandrine" belongs to them, whose work is known and famous; it is the best of the "Books of the Cave." Then comes a little work called ספר ידוע, also a beautiful book. The remaining works of the Magârites are mostly devoted to idle, senseless talk (283, 18-20). It is said that some of this sect held laughing as prohibited (304, 14). They explain several passages of Scripture in an improbable, senseless (allegorical) manner (304, 15). They insist upon the bodily attributes referred in Scripture to God being taken to have reference to an Angelic Being, to whom even the creation of the world is ascribed (304, 18-21). On this last point, Qirqisânî remarks, they agree with the view expressed by Benjamin Nehâwendi. By the term "Alexandrine" (אלאסכנדראני) we have to understand Philo, as Harkavy rightly assumes (p. 256, etc.). The title of the work ספר ידוע may be read סִ יָדוּע or סִ יַהוּע (p. 257). The phrase "dwellers in caverns" reminds us, says Harkavy, of the Egyptian Therapeutæ. The references to the allegorical explanation of Scripture, and to the angels creating the world (Logos, Demiurgos) agree with the mention of Philo's name in connection with this sect, which, according to Qirqisânî's chronology, sprang up before the rise of Christianity. The existence of an account of Philo and his writings among Jewish circles (which may probably have been drawn from Christian literature, through David Almuqammes) is a highly interesting piece of information in the history of literature, which has become known through Harkavy's edition.

4. Jesus and the Christians. In the chapter on Christianity, Qirqisânî reproduces (as he states in the heading of the chapter) mostly that which he found in the work of David Almuqammes. It is a short sketch containing the chief doctrines, and a few details concerning the history of Christianity, and it also includes a sort of criticism. The religion of the Christians, as at present existing, was introduced and diffused by Paul (פולץ). He ascribed Divinity to Jesus and the prophetic spirit to himself. He denied the necessity for carrying out the commands, and taught that religion consisted in humility (אלתואצע). All animals may be eaten, "from the fly to the elephant" (305, 14-19). The later Christian philosophers (אלמחדתין מן פלאספה אלנצארי) assert, that the religious ordinances were given to the Israelites in Divine wrath. The Israelites chose these ordinances for themselves because they resembled those of the Sabians; while those of the Egyptians, to which those of the Sabians were related, were known to them through their stay in Egypt (306, 4-7). The Nicæan Council, at which 318 bishops were assembled, determined upon precepts which occur neither in the Thora, nor the Gospel, nor in the articles of faith of Peter and Paul (פי קאנון פוטרוס ופולץ), (306, 29-32).

5. The Qar'ites (אלקרעיה), so called because they only made use of vessels fashioned out of gourds (קרע) (283, 28). They reside near the Nile, twenty parasangs from Fostât. According to one writer, they trace their descent to Jochanan b. Kareach (Jer. xliii. 4),[1] who emigrated to Egypt (283, 30). They are said to celebrate the Sunday in addition to the Sabbath, and this is an evidence of their leaning towards Christianity (308, 11). If David Almuqammes be right, that Christianity is based upon the teachings of the Sadducees and the Qar'ites, then the latter must naturally have existed before Christianity (308, 14-18). The exclusive use by them of vessels made

[1] This is also the view of the Karaite lexicographer David b. Abraham (*vide* Pinsker, I. 166).

of gourds is explained by Qirqisânî (308, 2-10) by the assumption that the Qar'ites, like the Samaritans, avoided as unclean contact with other people, and consequently made use of gourd vessels fashioned by themselves. Qirqisânî found particulars concerning this sect in a book which he calls חכאיה אלמקאלאת (308, 14), which, according to Harkavy's ingenious conjecture, is the Kitâb al maqâlât (כתאב אלמקאלאת) of Abû 'Isâ al-Warrâq, from which also Al-Bêrûnî derived many details regarding the Jews (*Revue des Etudes Juives*, XII. 258).

6. Obadja, known by the name Abû 'Isâ Al Isfahânî. He declared himself a prophet in the days of the Chalif Abdulmelik b. Merwân. As the sign of his mission, his adherents regarded the fact which they alleged of his having been an ignorant tailor, who could neither read nor write, and yet composed books and scrolls without his having received instruction from anybody (284, 5-11; 311, 20-23). Relying on Ps. cxix. 164, he prescribed seven prayers daily; upon the strength of a revelation which he said was vouchsafed him, he prohibited the enjoyment of meat and wine, though having no Biblical evidence for it. He regarded the Rabbins as upon the same footing as the prophets, and insisted that he received a command from God to pray according to the prescription of the Rabbis, the Eighteen Benedictions, and the Shema' (311, 23-27). He recognised the prophetic mission of Jesus and Muhammed, and ordered the Gospel and the Korân to be read (312, 5-7).

7. Abû 'Isâ Judgân. His followers call him the Shepherd (אלראעי), *i.e.*, the "Shepherd of the Nation." He is said to have been a disciple of Abû 'Isâ Obadja (Isfahânî), and he also ascribed the spirit of prophecy to himself. His disciples look upon him as the Messiah (284, 12-14; 312, 16), and they await his return (312, 17). The Judganites prohibit meat and wine, and spend much time in praying and fasting. As regards Sabbaths and Festivals, they are but kept as memorials (312, 17-19).

8. ʿÂnan the Exilarch. Qirqisânî enumerates over thirty lessons and precepts, mostly belonging to the Ritual, as those of ʿAnan (312, 23; 313, 30), the first point being an Halacha expressed in Hebrew אין משא אלא בכתף,[1] whereby it is permitted to carry on Sabbath articles of light weight. He states as a last point, that ʿAnan taught the transmigration of souls (אלתנאסך) and is said to have written a work on the subject.[2]

9. Benjamin Al-Nehâwendî. He was well versed in Rabbinic utterances and in the knowledge of Scripture. He is said to have been judge (דיאנא) for many years (285, 1-3). Qirqisânî attributes to Benjamin the second important founder of Karaism, about a dozen instructions, mostly bearing upon Religious Law (314, 3-24). At the head of these stands his well-known doctrine concerning the Demiurgos, which reminds us of Philo's Logos:—"God created an angel which created the entire universe. It is this angel which gave the prophets their commission, which allowed miracles to be performed, and gave commands and prohibitions."

10. Ismaîl al-ʿOkbarî (אלעכברי). He lived in the days of the Chaliph Almuʿtasim billâh (834-842). Most of his utterances border on insanity; nevertheless, he was full of self-admiration, and in his writings disparaged ʿAnan (314, 3). When on the point of death, he is said to have bidden his followers place upon his tomb the words:—רכב ישראל ופרשיו (284, 24-28). He did away with קרי and כתיב and insisted upon the Bible text being read as it is written. This is, however, contrary to what he himself is said to have asserted on several occasions, viz., that there are passages in Scripture which were originally different from what they appear in our present text: *e.g.* Gen. iv. 8, where the words נצא חשדה were added; Ex. xx. 18, where, instead of רואים, there stood originally שומעים;

[1] Perhaps based on Numbers vii. 9, בכתף ישאו.

[2] *Vide* Schreiner, *Der Kalâm in der jüdischen Literatur* (Berlin, 1895), page 66.

in Exod. xvi. 35, where was יאכלו instead of אכלו; in Gen. xlvi. 15 there used to be שלושים ושנים instead of שלושים ושלוש: this is an error of the sacred text (גלט מן אלכתאב 314, 27—315, 7). As regards the first point, Qirqisânî remarks (319, 2) that it was also the custom of some Karaites in Chorâsân to read only according to the Kethib: in the same place (319, 3) he says of other dwellers in Chorâsân, that with regard to the pronunciation of the Tetragrammaton they hold that he who does not pronounce it as it is written (יהוה) but as אדני, is guilty of unbelief.

11. Musâ al-Saʿfrâni (אלזעפראני), known by the name of Abû ʿImrân al-Tiflîsi. He was a contemporary of Benjamin Nehâwendî and Ismaîl ʿOkbarî, and came from Bagdad. His surname he received on account of his having settled in Tiflis, a town of Armenia, where followers of his are yet to be found (283, 8-12). He wrote replies to questions attributed by him to Chiwi (Albalchî) (ולה גואבאת מסאיל ינסבהא אלי חיויה), and also some leaves concerning the permission of enjoying flesh food (315, 21 *sq.*).

12. Malik al-Ramlî lived at Ramla. His followers are still called Ramlites or Malikites (285, 13-14). It is related of him that once during a stay in Jerusalem he swore that upon the altar of this sanctuary the cock was brought as a sacrifice (Cf. Pinsker, II. 84), (315, 23). Neither Malik al-Ramli nor Abû ʿImrân al-Tiflîsi wrote a work upon the precepts, and they differed only in a few minor points from the general body of Karaites (315, 17-19).

13. Mêshawaih (or Mêshuje, מישויה) al-ʿOkbarî lived, as the afore-named Ismaîl, in ʿOkbara (285, 15).[1] His opinions on Ritual Law savour of ignorance. An ʿOkbarite told Qirqisânî that Mêshawaih adopted and spread many of the customs of the Jews living in Gebâl (the Median mountain lands), among whom there exist many unwarranted innovations in the Ritual (316, 1-3). The Qibla

[1] Q. mentions nothing about Mêshawaih having lived in Baalbek, and having, in consequence, borne the name Baalbeki.

(facing at the time of prayer) should according to his opinion, always be to the west, even though in places situated to the west of Palestine, like Egypt and Maghreb, the back instead of the face would thus be turned towards Jerusalem (316, 11, 13).

14. Daniel al-Dâmegânî, known as Al-Qûmisî (אלקומסי), the last one who formulated a special doctrine, wrote a work and found adherents (285, 19, 20).[1] In his view upon angels, he deviates from that held by any of the Israelites (אל ישראל, Rabbanités as well as Karaites). He regards them, namely, not as living, reasoning creatures, entrusted by God with missions as prophets are; but he regards them as bodies, by means of which God produces effects, as fire, clouds, winds, etc. (316, 17-21). He is said to have taught that the obligation to carry out the precepts of religion only begins with the twentieth year of one's life (316, 25). He forbade certain things to be done on Sabbath, as *e.g.*, the washing of the hands with soap (316, 26). He declared as permissible the testimony of Mohammedans with regard to the observance of the New Moon (316, 28).

From the preceding survey we gain an insight into the multitude of Jewish sects, as they presented themselves in a chronologically arranged table to the imagination of Qirqisânî. The perspective from which these sects were viewed is that of a keen Karaite, to whom the large majority of the professors of Judaism appeared but as a sect, which had rebelled against the true principles of the Faith, represented as these were by the Karaites themselves.

In addition to this, small groups which clustered around the peculiar opinions of a certain teacher, are treated as real sects. It is surprising that only a passing reference is made to Chiwi Albalchi, and that he is not spoken of under a special heading. As we learn from Saadyah, he exercised a great influence, and his heretical opinions concerning the Bible had a far different scope from the Bible

[1] *Vide* above, p. 692 concerning him.

criticism—if we may use the term—equally remarkable, of Ismaîl al ʿOkbarî.

I regard it as superfluous to enter into details as to the value of Qirqisânî's work, made accessible to us by Harkavy, for the purposes of correcting and supplementing the accounts of Jewish sects which we have hitherto possessed, and which, in the main, are drawn from the self-same sources.

One thing is certain, the first part of Qirqisânî's *Book of Lights*[1] will have to be consulted as the most important

[1] Harkavy fixed the text upon the basis of two MSS. which mutually supplemented each other. Yet there are *lacunæ*, as both MSS. had them in the same places. The Arabic text is written in Hebrew characters; the Teshdîd sign is nowhere inserted, which, perhaps, would have done no harm here and there. I have found only unimportant printer's errors and other corrigenda, and I herewith place the list at the disposal of the editor and the readers of the book.

Page 279, line 5, *for* באלאמם *read* באלאמה

„ 279, „ 15, „ אלבראניח „ אלברהאניה

„ 280, „ 29, „ גדה „ גודה ?

„ 281, „ 8, „ ידה אד „ ידה אד

„ 281, „ 19, delete one אוהם.

„ 282, „ 5, in place of the words supplied by Harkavy in parentheses, הל קד, supply אפלא קד, or אפלים קד (cf. 301,5).

Page 284, line 10, delete the stop before פאטהר.

„ 284, „ 14, *for* ותלמידה *read* ותלאמידה

„ 285, „ 15, „ מישויה „ מישויה

„ 285, „ 16, „ מע יחכי „ מא יחכי

„ 286, „ 16, „ מ „ מן

„ 288, „ 22, „ אגת „ אגת

„ 289, „ 21, „ גלודה „ גלודה

„ 299, „ 30, „ בית אלמקדם „ בית אלמדרסה

„ 300, „ 24, after חתי, a verb has been omitted, say, שאהדוא.

Page 301, line 27, *for* שינעה *read* שונעה (=שִׁנְעָה, (cf. יובלג, p. 287, 19).

„ 302, „ 22, „ ויכאבר „ ויכאבר (cf. p. 311, 17).

„ 315, „ 21, „ גואבה „ גואבאת (Harkavy writes thus in *Studien und Mittheilungen*, V. 147, note 2).

Page 316, line 17, *for* יתבת *read* יתבת

„ 318, „ 36 „ זכר „ דכר (cf. p. 312, 19).

„ 319, „ 29 „ ולך „ דלך

source of information for this chapter of Jewish History, side by side with, or rather in preference to Jehuda Hadassi, Shahrestâni, and Makrisi. M. Harkavy deserves the thanks of all those who are interested in the history of the age of Saadyah, and of Judæo-Arabic literature in particular. May he have the good fortune to bring to light yet many such jewels out of those treasures of the St. Petersburg Library which are committed to his care and scholarship.

W. BACHER.

Budapest, September, 1894.

THE NINTH MEḤABBERETH OF EMANUELE DA ROMA AND THE TRESOR OF PEIRE DE CORBIAC.

THE encyclopædic literature which flourished in the Middle Ages among the Provençals and Italians, was bound to attract the attention of the Italian Jews, and to find among them imitators.

In the first half of the fifteenth century, *Mosè da Rieti*, renowned as a Jewish physician and also as the author of an imitation of Dante's *Divine Comedy*, forsook the language of his ancestors, and was the first among the Jews to write an entire work in Italian, taking inspiration from the *Tesoro* of Brunetto Latini.[1] A century earlier *Emanuele da Roma*, another imitator of the great Florentine poet, so greatly admired one of these *Tesori* that he composed a work in the same style in Hebrew verse.[2]

Brunetto Latini and the other authors of encyclopædias could not, by their poor and unpolished work, hope to inspire imitators to attain any great excellence. But whatever the imitations may be worth, it is not for that reason less noteworthy that some examples must have been found among the Jews. On the contrary, anyone who studies these works thoroughly, will find in them, firstly, a new

[1] Compare Steinschneider, *Catal. Lugd. Batav. Cod. Scalig.*, 10. I am preparing a short exposition of this manuscript.

[2] Not to speak of all the encyclopædic compilations of Arabic origin (compare Steinschneider, *Die hebr. Uebersetzungen des Mittelalters*, Chapter I.), and of the famous book of Sidrach, whose Hebrew origin is now completely refuted (compare Steinschneider in *Buonarroti of Rome*, 1872, p. 235), it is known that there exists a Hebrew version of the Treatise, *Image du Monde*, by Gautier de Metz, although very probably not reproduced in the original poetic text. (Compare the edition of Amsterdam, 1733, and of Warsaw, 1873, and the articles of Neubauer concerning the translator, in the *Romania*, V., p. 129, and the *Histoire Litteraire de la France*, xxvii. 502).

proof of the ease with which the Jewish race acquires foreign culture; while, further, a strict examination of their derivation may help us to a better knowledge of the learning and intellectual activity of Mosè da Rieti and Emanuele da Roma, two interesting representatives of Italian Judaism.

A study of Emanuele's poem appeared to me, for the above reasons, to be not without interest with especial reference to his peculiar characteristics, and to the ease with which he derives inspiration for his works from those of others. Imitation is peculiar to ancient people, and Emanuele belonged to a race whose youth dates back to the most remote ages. But no one ever imitated so closely the works of others, as did Emanuele.

In studying his works, therefore, not only his poetical, but also his exegetical compositions, it is necessary to remember that we are not concerned with Emanuele alone, but with the many authors, whom he consciously imitated.

But Emanuele has different methods of borrowing his material. Sometimes he takes the central idea from his model, and in treatment he gives it an altogether original impress; at other times he is guilty of a direct and flagrant plagiarism. Thus, for instance, a glaring and impudent plagiarism occurs in his commentary to the "Song of Songs," where Emanuele copies directly *Mosheh Ibn Tibbon*, whom he declares to be his model, and likewise he copies *Ibn Ezra*, whose name he does not even mention.[1] Another imitation, which closely follows the original, is that of Dante's *Divine Comedy*, which appears in his last Meḥabbereth.

Elsewhere Emanuele is able completely to free himself from the fetters of his imitating genius and taking from his models, as I have already said, the central idea, develops it

[1] In this connection compare Salfeld, *Das Hohelied Salomo's bei den jüdischen Erklärern* (Berlin, 1879, p. 89), where, in the front rank, have been placed some short essays by these three commentators.

quite independently, modifies it and imparts to it his own characteristics, so as to render its origin scarcely perceptible. In this manner Emanuele wrote the first part of the Ninth Mehabbereth, in which he sings of the months of the year, drawing his inspiration from a poem by Ḥarizi,[1] and the second part of the same Mehabbereth, which is composed on the model of a Christian poem.

This is the imitation to which I referred in the opening lines of my article, and it consists of a poem of sixty stanzas, each of which contains four rhyming verses.[2]

Let us make, as far as possible, an analysis of this poem, and then try to discover the sources from which it is derived.

The poet describes himself plunged in sleep, when terrifying thoughts of death rise in his slumbering mind. It is not the pain of dying which he dreads, nor the passing into the Unknown World. He is filled with anguish by the thought that his wisdom will not avail him on the day of his death; he is convinced that all will be forgotten "in his tomb and in his rest." Then suddenly his consciousness reasserts itself with fresh vigour, and, instead of lamenting the day of his death, he begins to praise his own virtues, and to rejoice in them. "But I live! I live!" exclaims the poet. "I am wise; I am a prophet; I am strong as a lion, swift as a stag and a roebuck."

Intoxicated with a sense of his own greatness, he wishes to transmit his great name to the latest posterity, and he sings, or rather, dilates upon his gifts and his scientific erudition.[3] His physical and moral qualities, theology and

---

[1] Compare *Tackkemoni von Jehudah al-Charisi*, published by M. Stern, Wien, 1854, p. 9.

[2] Compare *Makamen des Immanuel* (Lemberg, 1870), p. 75.

[3] The line, "I slept, but my heart was awake," with which the poet begins his poem, is taken from the *Song of Songs* (chap. v. verse 2), and has served for the commencement of a poem by Abraham Ibn Ezra, (comp. A. Geiger—*Jüdische Dichtungen der spanischen und italienischen Schule*. Leipzig, 1856, p. 18 of the Hebrew text), and also of two less celebrated poems by other authors (comp. Zunz, *Literaturgesch. der Synag. Poesie*,

ascetism, history and geography, natural philosophy and astronomy, medicine and magic, arts and crafts, language and literature—these are the subjects of Emanuele's poems. But it must not be thought that the poet describes in detail each branch of his learning or each of his talents, or that he states the usefulness and beauty of all the countries which he mentions. He does not attain to this, since the whole poem is merely a catalogue of the lands and kingdoms which he has visited, of the virtues and vices which he possesses, and of the arts and crafts which he knows.

At the commencement of his poem, Emanuele says: "I am wise, I am a prophet . . . .; I am a weaver and an embroiderer; I am a builder and an excavator; I am a weigher and an author; I am a potter and a traveller; I am a prince and a commander, a deceiver, and a cheat . . ." He then enumerates a goodly number of trades,[1] mentioning incidentally some of his virtues and vices; then he passes to his scientific knowledge, which is infinite in its scope; then he enumerates once more his moral qualities, introducing again the names of sciences, arts, and crafts, and concludes with a catalogue of languages and countries. He knows Hebrew, Egyptian, and Arabic; Greek and Idumean; Chaldaic and Aramaic; the language of Media and Assyria, of Persia, and many others. He was born in Rome, but visited Egypt and mighty Ethiopia; he was at Thebes and on Mount Tabor, in Spain and in Palestine.

The poet ends this curious catalogue of the most diverse subjects by signing his name according to the numerical value of the letters which compose it:—"My name is seventy and forty (מ and ע), and a nun joined to a vav (נ-ו), and the ending of my name is El (אל)."

pp. 569 and 588, where the poems of a certain Joseph and Perez Jehil b. Natanel are quoted). As regards the lamentations of Emanuele concerning his death, the idea is common to many of the other poets, and Emanuele himself returns to it many times, especially in the 26th Mecama.

[1] Emanuele makes such an enumeration of trades also in the 27th Mecama (*Topheth va-Eden*), p. 224.

With such a poem the writer "encircled himself as with a crown,"[1] and "set his eyes upon it";[2] but we, who are more prosaic than Emanuele, are forced to agree that though the crown was woven with many flowers, these are faded and withered, having no bright colour nor any sweet perfume. But now it is time to seek the origin of the poem.

He who pays attention to the style adopted by Emanuele in this poem, a style, moreover, of which this is not the only example in his works; he who remembers the easy contrasts, and his curious habit of laying claim to the most diverse moral qualities, to the finest virtues, and to the lowest vices; he who takes all this into account, I say, recalls of necessity the Sicilian poet, Ruggiero Pugliese.

At any rate this was effect which the Emanuele's poem produced on me, inasmuch as, while I perused laboriously that long string of abstract subjects, which follow in endless sequence, I recollected the equally meaningless and strange lines of the Sicilian poet:—

"I am humble and proud; valiant, cowardly and courageous; bold, daring and timorous; I am foolish and wise—sad, gay, and joyous;—generous, avaricious, and suspicious;—courteous, boorish, and jealous; . . . I am poor, rich and indigent; I am healthy and ill; young and old, oppressed, and very often calm." . . . .

These are the lines of Ruggieso Pugliese,[3] but it is evident that the style is the same as that of Emanuele's Hebrew verses.

Ruggiero Pugliese lays claim to the same qualities as

---

[1] Emanuele takes this expression from Job xxxi. 36.

[2] This expression is also found in the Bible, Jeremiah xl. 4; and Genesis xliv. 21.

[3] "Umile sono, ed orgolglioso:—prode, e vile e coragioso:—franco e sicuro e pauroso; e sono folle e sagio,—e dolente e allegro e gioioso:—largo, e scarso e dubitoso:—cortese, e villano e invidioso—. . . . . Povero e rico e disasciato—sono, e fermo e malato:—giovane e veechio, ed agravato—e sano spessamente. . . ." Compare this poem in the collection of D'Ancona and Comparetti: "Le antiche rime volgari secondo la lezione del Cod. Vat. 3793, Vol. I., No. 60."

Emanuele, and introduces into his poem the same foolish contradictions and identic artificial contrasts.

The two poets only differ in this fact, that while Emanuele writes in this strain only now and then, Ruggiero never changes it throughout the poem.

"I am merry," sings Emanuele, "and joyous; I am a pious and a perfect man; I am cruel, and bloodthirsty; I am rich, and shameless; exquisite and delicious; a thief, and an assassin, gentle and greedy; I am a rogue and an oppressor, a deceiver and a liar; I am old and burdened with years, rich and poor; I am a disciple and a teacher; I am appreciated and despised."

I could continue to quote similar passages, but I consider that these are sufficient to show that an analogy exists between the two poets. Is this analogy merely accidental or did Emanuele really imitate the verses of Ruggiero Pugliese?

The resemblance pointed out just now might certainly induce us to believe that the second hypothesis is correct, but, on the other hand, arguments of far greater importance weigh against this conclusion.

The two poets have in common the strangeness, the dulnesses, I should say, of their conceptions; neither of them describes ordinary events, or gives vent to his natural feelings; their poetry is entirely composed of empty words and of artifices. This is their chief point of resemblance; but even this can be easily explained. It has often occurred to men to be moved by the same stimulus to accomplish great works of similar nature, or that both have fallen into the same error in endeavouring to render their works attractive. But this phenomenon is not invariably due to chance only; external conditions have always a certain influence.

Now, to return to our two poets, we find that Ruggiero Pugliese follows the fashion of his times and gives us in his poems the artificiality and mannerism common to writers of his day. Emanuele was also educated in the Provençal school, and was especially influenced by its

Hebrew representatives, into whose writings mannerism and artificiality had in the lapse of time crept; he therefore reproduces in his poetry the grotesqueness of Ruggiero's poem, if indeed it does not entirely pervade it.

It is not possible to deny that Emanuele may have been acquainted with Ruggiero's poems, but the analogy can be explained without this admission. The one is the slave of a school which dominated the world of culture; the other, although living later and belonging to another class of poets, feels its influence nevertheless. This fact certainly accounts for the similarity of style, common love for the unusual and the artificial, for contrasts and play of words.

Otherwise Ruggiero Pugliese offers us in his insipid stanzas a song to his lady. Being a faithful imitator of the Provençal school, like his contemporaries of Frederick II.'s Court, he sings of vague love, aimless, and barren; but he is always a lover. Now this is certainly not the case with Emanuele, who makes no mention of love in his poem, in which he treats of every other subject.

It is the method common to both poets, of claiming a great number of moral virtues and defects, that has led us to suppose that Emanuele imitated Ruggiero. But the Sicilian poet's extravagance is only the result of his intense affection for his lady, while Emanuele's constant self-glorification is merely a poetical deceit. He does not intend to exalt his own virtues when he puts his hand to the lyre. The Prince, his patron, was full of enthusiasm for some lines on the months of the year,[1] and remembered having seen a Christian poem, which described "all the arts, the countries, the kingdoms, the languages, and the sciences." He wished to see such a poem produced by a Jew, and he therefore appealed to Emanuele, who readily complied with his wish.[2] Therefore there can be no

[1] Comp. the first part of the *Ninth Mecama*, which I have already quoted (p. 70).

[2] Comp. the short introduction to his poem (p. 74).

further doubt that Emanuele did not copy the poetry of Ruggiero Pugliese, however, naturally the hypothesis may have arisen.

Let us therefore leave off studying the style, which so resembles that of the Sicilian poet, and let us take, as a starting-point for our investigations, the theme of the poem which he imitated. As a result, we shall have to examine one of those encyclopædic compilations, which, under the title of *Breviaire d'Amour*, or *Tesoro*, or *Image du Monde*, were popular in the Middle Ages amongst scholars.

We have quoted above some works of this kind composed by Jews, and we are not surprised to learn that Emanuele also should have imitated them. His extravagant fancy found in such an imitation ample scope to expand freely, and to use grotesque rhymes and ill-connected words.

But what work, then, served Emanuele for a model ? It is well-known that many encyclopædias circulated freely among the cultured classes during the Middle Ages. Emanuele, however, facilitated the task of reviewers by remarking that the work which he imitated was written in verse, and for my own part I firmly believe that I am right in asserting that the central idea of the Hebrew poem is to be found in the *Trésor* of *Peire de Corbiac.*

This poet was born in Corbiac, of a poor family, and flourished in the first half of the thirteenth century. He is celebrated chiefly for his *Trésor*,[1] a poetical composition of 840 Alexandrines. This would be the work which, according to some critics, inspired Brunetto Latini to write his *Tesoretto.* Corbiac's poem is of a didactic and encyclopædic nature, and affords the author an opportunity of displaying his own scientific knowledge, or, better still, of defining the range of learning attained at that period.

[1] Comp. *Le Trésor de Peire de Corbiac*, published by Dr. Sachs, Brandenburg, 1859.

Pietro de Corbiac commences his poem by invoking the name of Jesus Christ, and praying for heaven's help in his work, and having said a few words concerning his own condition, he enters at once upon his theme.

He tells, first of all, of the mysteries of creation, and of the most salient facts of the Old and of the New Testaments. This narrative, being somewhat prolix, occupies 547 lines—two-thirds, that is, of the whole poem.

Having devoted so much space to the historical portion of his work, the poet declares that he does not consider that which is to follow of less importance; thereupon he sings of the seven liberal arts.

He knows them all perfectly and can give a valuable exposition of each in succession. But this does not suffice; he also knows medicine and surgery, necromancy and mythology, the greatest exploits of the Greeks and Romans, of the French and English.

Such is the principal theme of the simple, unelaborate poem of Peire de Corbiac. The similarity of subject and style, which I have pointed out, is sufficient to convince the reader that Peire's poem may well have served as a model to Emanuele.

The multiplicity of subjects which he treats, the number of problems which he expounds, and the numerous historical facts concerning the different peoples and the various countries which he states, may have been included in the arts and sciences, the languages and countries, which Emanuele admired in the poem, which he may have imitated. But since similar details appear also in other poems of the same kind, let us examine more minutely the basis on which our belief in the intimate connection between the two poets rests.

In the first place there is nothing to disprove the possibility, that Emanuele may have imitated Corbiac's poem. Since it was written about the year 1225, in France, the work could certainly have been known in Italy eighty years afterwards; this is all the more probable, when we

remember the zeal with which such works were studied at that time.

The fact that Emanuele must have been acquainted with a foreign language, if he really imitated Pietro di Corbiac, need not cast a doubt upon the truth of my assertion; for here it can hardly be the question of a foreign language. Indeed, although the *Divina Comedia* was written in Italian, all the Romance languages were so widely known, that any one occupied, like Emanuele, in writing poetry, must have known Provençal, the language, in fact, used by the earlier poets. Likewise he whose critical faculty is biased by strenuous orthodoxy may consider it strange that Emanuele, being so religious, should have been induced to imitate a work, which commences with an invocation to Jesus and Mary, and with an assertion of his allegiance to the doctrine of the Trinity.[1] But such reasoning could only result from ignorance of Emanuele's religious spirit, which was entirely free from intolerance and fanaticism. If then we cannot question the possibility that Emanuele may have imitated Pietro di Corbiac, let us see what are the points of resemblance between the two poets.

Pietro di Corbiac prepares to sing because he wishes to explain his condition to the wise; he wishes to tell them, that although poor in worldly goods he is richer than they, who have money and castles, because he possesses a Treasure richer than silver and gold.

---

[1] Thus the *Tesoro* of Pietro di Corbiac begins:—

Verse 1. "El nom de Jesu Crist qu'es nostre salvamens.
Verse 2. "De Santa Maria, don el pris naissemens . . . .
Verse 38. "Jeu ai ferma cresenza e sai sertanamens,
Verse 39. "Qu' el sanz pair' e'l sanz filz e'l sanz espiramens
Verse 40. "Aquestas tres personas son us Dieus solamens."

Line 1. To "The name of Jesus Christ our Saviour,
Line 2. "of holy Mary, who gave birth to him . . . .
Line 38. "I believe with a perfect faith and know for certain
Line 39. "That the Holy Father, the Holy Son, and the Holy Ghost,
Line 40 "the three perrons, are only one God."

Verse 6. "Farai saber als savis c'om sui de sen manens.
Verse 11. "Non cuges per tot so qu'en ane malemens
"tals pot aver mils marcs, no l vai tan ricamens . . .
Verse 20. "Jeu son pros e gaillarz e viv rics e manens.
"Qu'eu m'ai un ric tesaur amassat maltraens
"qu'es plus pretios, pus cars e pus valens
"que peiras pretiozas ni fis aurs ni argens." . . .[1]

We find similar lines in Emanuele's poem. He wishes to make his character known to the latest posterity, and to the most distant peoples, because "he has a larger portion than his brothers,[2] because his glory rests in leaving behind him a great name.

Continuing to speak of his *Tesoro,* Peire de Corbiac exclaims that nobody will have the power to rob him of it; in truth, during his life-time he will not lose it, nor will death lessen its worth, but its glory will always increase.

Verse 26. "Ni non lo perdrai vivs, neis can serai morens—ni ja non mermara, anz er tos temps creissens."[3]

Well, these verses can but remind us of those of Emanuele in which he laments the necessity of forgetting everything on the day of his death.

Pietro di Corbiac rejoices in the thought that his *Tesoro* will endure to the last moment of his life, and that it will even increase in worth. But such a thought made quite a different impression on Emanuele, who exclaims :—

"I regretted the arrival of my death
"since I would die like any fool.
"And what profit shall I have from my wisdom
"which I shall forget on the day of my death
"during my long sleep within the tomb ;"

and these words, which everybody could think inspired by

[1] Verse 6. "I will make known to the wise how rich I am. . .
Verse 11. "Do not think that I am not well off ;
"he who possesses a thousand marks may not be as rich as I...
Verse 20. "I am valiant and strong, rich and wealthy . . .
"Because I have amassed a rich treasure with difficulty,
"which is more precious, more valuable, more prized
"than precious stones set in gold and silver.

[2] This expression is taken from Genesis xlviii. 22.

[3] Verse 26. "I shall not lose it living, nor even when I die,
Nor will it ever diminish, but it will increase with time.

a profound ascetism, remind me of the most bold verses of the vagrant "Goliardi."

But how much more resemblance there is between Emanuele and Peire de Corbiac in their exposition of the principal theme of their poem than in the passages above quoted.

Peire de Corbiac, wishing to relate to us the story of the Old and of the New Testament, and the history of the Greeks and of the Romans, or wishing to expound some principles of astronomy, or some rules of prosody, contrives to tell us all that he knows. This plan is exactly followed by Emanuele, so that it is no longer possible to deny the derivation of one poem from the other.

Here are some lines of the Provençal poet :—

549. "En totas las vii. ars soi assatz conoissens
"Per Gramatica sai parlar latinamens
"declinar e costruire e far derivamens . . .
554. "Per Dialetica sai arrazonablemens
"a pauzar e respondre e falsar argumens . . .
558. "Per Retorica sai per bels affaitamens
"colorar mas paraulas e dir adautamens . . ."
564. "De Ley ni de Decretz n'ai apres anc granmens . . .
568. "De Muzica sai jeu tot aondozamens. . . .
583. "D'Arismetica sai totz los acordamens
"E sai de las figuras cal comte son rendens. . . .
590. "De Geometria sai tan dels mezuramens . . .
"e sai proar triangle e quadrangl' eissamens [1]

---

[1] 549. "I am very well versed in the seven arts.
"As regards grammar, I can speak correctly,
"Decline, construe and make derivations.
554. "In Dialectics I can reason logically.
"I can answer and defeat arguments.
558. "In Rhetoric I know how by beautiful embellishments,
"To colour my words, and to speak agreeably . . ."
564. "In jurisprudence I have also learned very much."
568. "Of music I know so much . . .
583. "Of Arithmetic I know all the rules
"And how to solve mathematical problems . . .
590. "Of Geometry I know all the measurements
"And I know how to prove a triangle and a quadrangle equal.

598. "D'Astronomia sui tant bos clers eissamens
qu'eu sai ben con tarneia lo sels e'l firmamens. . .
726. "De Fisica sai ieu aissi sometamens. . . .
732. "De Sirurgia no sai ni vuelh sos feramens. . . .
734. "De Nigromancia apris totz los encantamens. . . .[1]

Then he knows the history of the Greeks, and of Troy, of Thebes, Rome, France, England, etc.

750. "Faulas d'auctors sai ieu a miliers et a cens.
824. "Jeu sai chansos, e notas e vers bons e valens
pastorelas apres amorosas plazens. . . ." [2]

All these liberal arts and sciences, of which the Provençal poet speaks, form only a part of his intellectual endowments. Emanuele wishes to appear equally omniscient. Thus, when he is only speaking on subjects treated by the Christian poet, he yet poses as a scholar in all the various branches of learning.

He calls himself a "a magician and a seer, a versifier and a poet," "I am a diviner and a naturalist," he sings, "a theologian. I am a prince and a father of song. I am expert in matter and in the accidents of matter — in radiating lines, both in the circle and in the hemisphere. I understand the sciences, I know the planets, the stars and other celestial bodies. I am learned in geometry. I have a knowledge of nature, of the circle and of the quadrilateral figure, of prophecy and of dreams. I am a logician, well versed in syllogisms and inferences, in demonstrations and in accidents. I am an expert sophist, I understand rain, earthquakes, and clouds. I understand poetry. I am acquainted with the mysteries of the Bible, with the Mishnah and the Gemarrah, with the principles of Sifri and Sifrà."

---

[1] 598. "In Astronomy I am likewise such a good scholar
"That I know as well as the eagle the skies and the heavens...
726. "Of medicine I know all the branches.
732. "Of Surgery I do not know, nor do I wish to know, its cruelties.
734. "Of Necromancy I have learned all its magic.

[2] 750 "The fables of authors I know in their thousands and hundreds.
824. "I know songs, harmony, and good verses,
Pastorals, and pleasing love-songs. . "

It is evident, that Emanuele very much resembles Peire de Corbiac, not only in claiming a knowledge of all the sciences, but also in his manner of treating them.

In fact, not to compare the literary art, which they each manifested in a different degree, we find that the chief difference lies in the fact that Emanuele treats of Jewish as well as of secular subjects. Moreover, Peire de Corbiac enlarges very often upon the minutiæ of each science, and especially of Music and Astronomy; Emanuele, on the contrary, only enumerates them; if he ever enters into details, he does so without order, promiscuously, as it enters in his head. Another point which helps to prove that Emanuele imitated the Provençal poet, is found in their similar way of treating man's moral qualities.

When Peire de Corbiac discusses astronomy, he dwells at length on the influence exercised by the planets on the fortune and character of man. Saturn for example:

(619) "qu' es sobrans mals e frey descrezens . . . .
. . . . nos fa perezos, nuaillos e poignens,
fremiros e escars, e malvaz e tenens." [1]

Wise and cunning Jupiter makes us

(627) ". . . . . enveios, despensans e metens
cobedezos d'onor e seignoreiamens." [2]

Mars, the bold and proud planet, makes us irascible. Venus is

(649) ". . . . . amorosa, alegra e jauzens
genta, clara e blanca, humils e patz fazens." [3]

Mercury, the swift messenger,

(662) " es bons ab los benignes e mals ab los nosens
cest nos fas viassiers e leugieus e burdens . . ." [4]

---

[1] (619) "Who controls evil and unbelievers,
. . . makes us lazy, torpid and lethargic,
Timid and avaricious, cowardly and grasping."

[2] (627) ". . . . envious, profligate and generous
Covetous of honour and majesty."

[3] (649) ". . . gentle, bright and joyous,
pleasant, gay and pure, modest and peace-loving."

[4] (662) ". . . is good to the virtuous and cruel to the wicked
and makes us nimble, frivolous, and playful."

Emanuele, who does not enlarge on the sciences which he mentions, does not touch upon the theory of the influence of planets; but, exaggerating Peire's manner of claiming to possess the knowledge of all the sciences described in his poem, he declares that he also is endowed with all good and bad moral qualities.

Peire de Corbiac is only guilty of this weakness once, towards the end of the poem, when he writes:—

[1] (828) Ni tenc los fols e ls savis, a cascu soi plazens;
E m sai guarar d'enuitz e de deschauzimens . . . .
Ab totz me sai aidar, cavayer e sirvens.
Ab fols passi com puesc, ab savis saviamens. . . . .

The Jewish poet makes a habit of this self-glorification all through his poem, and particularly in those strange lines which I quoted when comparing him to Ruggiero Pugliese, or in the following, which are very similar:—

"For the foolish, I am foolish; for the perverse, I am perverse; for the impious, I am impious. . . . . I am cunning and intelligent; I am formidable and terrible;[2] I have glory and majesty; I am calm on the day of misfortune. . . . . I wage war, and I make peace; I am both thief and truthful; I am compassionate to the merciful and cruel to the wicked."

Several of these expressions are, no doubt, taken from the Bible; but the main idea, that pretension, I mean, to so many different moral qualities, is due to the influence of the Provençal poet.

The idea, for example, on which Emanuele insists, of being foolish with the foolish or good with the good,

[1] (828.) "I associate with the foolish and the wise, and am pleasing to each one;
I know how to keep myself from rivalry and from rudeness . . . .;
I know how to help myself with all, rich and poor.
With the foolish I pass as possible; with the wise as wise."

[2] Comp. Habakkuk i. 7.

although it is certainly found in the Bible,[1] is also the text supplied by Peire de Corbiac.

Emanuele does not appear to imitate when he gives a catalogue of the countries which he has visited, of the languages which he has learned, and of the crafts which he has practised. The list of countries could have a counterpart in the historical portion of Corbiac's poem, where he mentions confusedly the names of many countries, peoples, and kings. This analogy is perhaps too forced to be admitted. Further, as to the languages and crafts, we do not find any traces of their enumeration in the work of Peire de Corbiac.

These facts, however, do not detract from the truth of my assertion.

Because Emanuele has imitated, as I firmly believe, the work of Peire de Corbiac, he need not have made a servile copy of each part.

I have already had occasion to note, that although occasionally Emanuele degenerates from an imitator into a genuine plagiarist, sometimes he achieves original work.

Thus in the work we are now studying, we find that Emanuele, attracted by Corbiac's *Tresor*, wished to imitate it. Being, however, also influenced by other *Tresors*, and carried away by his unbridled imagination, he merely took the central idea from Peire de Corbiac, and enlarging upon it, gave to his work the impress of his own individuality.

It, therefore, cannot be doubted that the work is partly an imitation; unfortunately, however, that portion which is entirely original, does not increase the value and beauty of the whole poem.

Peire de Corbiac, in his *Tresor*, follows the prevailing custom of collecting in a book of small dimensions, all the fragments of human knowledge, which the barbarous

[1] Compare Psalms xviii. 26 and 2 Samuel xxii. 26 : "With the merciful thou shalt show thyself merciful, and with the upright man thou shalt show thyself upright; With the pure thou shalt show thyself pure, and with the froward thou shalt show thyself froward."

Middle Ages had not destroyed, and concentrates in his 800 lines, all the ideas which were then current concerning God, nature and man.

Ignoring the fact that Peire claims the knowledge of all the subjects which he treats, and also the poverty of his poetry, we must admit that all is narrated with a certain method, and that his task of acquainting us with the condition of Science in his age is fully accomplished.

Can as much be said of Emanuele? Certainly not. For in the first place we seek in vain a purpose in his poem, which, as in Corbiac's work, may justify the chaos of subjects so diverse, and whether we examine Emanuele's poem from the Jewish or from the Christian point of view, or from both at the same time, the same lack of purpose is noticeable.

Certainly Emanuele's exaggerated and chaotic catalogue of sciences and doctrines is no index to the learning of his age, neither does it appear to be a didactic poem, although it contains an enumeration of all the good and bad moral qualities; and still less does the foolish catalogue of arts and crafts give us any information. But to continue. I have quoted above some of Emanuele's lines, but they do not run in this sequence in the poem itself. I have been forced to gather them here and there, almost invariably in places where I least expected to light upon them, for all is confusion in the poem; it is merely an entangled mingling of adjectives, an intricate labyrinth of substantives. Thus while Emanuele is intent on displaying his scientific knowledge, he suddenly changes his theme to a list of moral qualities, which he as suddenly deserts to enumerate the crafts which he exercises; then a list follows of virtues and sciences, introduced promiscuously and interspersed with alien subjects, according as caprice dictates, or as the rhyme requires.

Thus all the second part of the ninth mecama is merely a disorderly catalogue, reminding us of the worst passages of Emanuele's twenty-seventh mecama, which is intended

as an imitation of Dante, but is sometimes a long and superficial catalogue of persons met with in hell and in paradise, whose vices and virtues he speaks of in an annoying and exaggerated strain.

Very likely Emanuele wished to testify once again to his great knowledge of Hebrew, and it must be admitted that so far he was successful. But certainly Emanuele's ninth mecama does not give us a very high idea of his poetic sense, or of his artistic talents; and to his laurel wreath will not be added one single leaf by this endless string of disjointed words and tedious rhymes, which follow one the other like a long procession of monks in the uniformity and monotony of their weary tramp.

GUSTAVO SACERDOTE.

Berlin, December, 1894.

CORRECTIONS AND NOTES TO AGADATH SHIR HASHIRIM.

In the corrections and notes to the text of the *Agadath Shir Hashirim*, which has appeared in this Review (Vol. VI., pp. 673-697, and Vol. VII. pp. 145-163), frequent use was made of the following works, which therefore it will be convenient to quote by initials. They are:—

1. MS. De Rossi (in Parma), No. 626, the first five leaves of which contain fragments of our text which have been copied for me by M. Alberto Orvieto, the present Rabbi of Parma. The variations which this MS. offers are marked with F.

2. The *Yalkut Shimoni*, who in his compilations to the *Song of Songs* often made use of the *Agadath Shir Hashirim*. That this *Yalkut* does not always refer to the editions was already recognised by R. Meir Benveniste in his אות אמת. I shall quote this *Yalkut* with the initials YS., giving, when referring to *Shir Hashirim*, the number of the paragraph and the page (of the Frankfort edition). Of course, all these references refer to the second part. To references to other parts of this *Yalkut* the numbers I. or II. will be added, the former including the whole of the Pentateuch, the latter extending over the *Prophets* and the *Hagiographa*.

3 *Yalkut Machiri*, of which we have now the *Yalkut* on Isaiah = YM.Is., printed by Mr. J. Spira (Berlin, 1894); the *Yalkut Machiri* on the Minor Prophets (MS. in the British Museum Harl., 5705) = YM.MP., and the *Yalkut on Psalms* (Oxford MS., Cat. Neubauer, 167) = YM.Ps.

4. The *Midrash Haggadol* to the Pentateuch, MS. in my possession = MH.

5. The Commentary on *Song of Songs* by R. Moses b. Samuel Ibn Tabbon (Lyck, 1874)=MT. In this Commentary passages are occasionally given from בראשית רבה פ' ויצא, which are only to be found in our *Agadath Shir Hashirim*. I must, however, state that the Oxford MS. of this commentary (Cat. Neub.

1278) omits all those passages. They are indeed strange to the whole tendency of this philosophic author.

6. The Midrashim to the Pentateuch, namely, *Genesis Rabbah* = GR., *Exodus Rabbah* = ER., *Leviticus Rabbah* = LR., *Numbers Rabbah* = NR., and *Deuteronomy Rabbah* = DR. To the *Shir Hashirim Rabbah*, which is also called *Midrash Chazitha* I shall refer with CH., giving always chapter and verse and the paragraph within the latter, as in the Wilna edition.

7. *Aboth d'Rabbi Nathan* (ed. Schechter) = ARN.

8. The *Pesikta d'R. Kahana*, ed. Buber = Pesikta K. (or PK.), and the *Pesikta Rabbathi*, ed. Friedmann = Pesikta R. (or PR.).

All the other Midrashim as well as the various tractates of the Babylonian and Jerusalemic Talmudim will be quoted with their full title. The parallels from MSS. will be given in full; with regard to those to be found in printed works, I shall mostly confine myself to the mere reference which the reader is expected to look up. In my struggle after brevity I also left it to the student to supply the references to the quotations from the Scriptures, as well as to correct them, which can be done easily enough by aid of a concordance and a Bible. On the other hand I spared no labour and no trouble to furnish him with ample extracts from MSS. and rare prints which either form parallels to the *Agadath Shir Hashirim*, or may in some way throw light on the nature and the date of this strange composition. I hope that in many cases these parallels will prove helpful towards elucidating our corrupt text, though many a riddle still remains.

L. 1-5. בריותיו—ר"נ, R. Moses Tako, in *Ozar Nechmad*, III. 74, בריש מדרש שה"ש ר' נתן אומ' אף שיר השירים מה"ש אמרוהו המשוררים לפני מ"ה הקב"ה ואומרים ק'ק'ק'. Cp. also below, l. 264. See also יין הרקח The Commentary of R. Eleazar of Worms, ג' שירות כאן בנגד ק'ק'ק'.

L. 5-15. במרומיו—החמה, see CH., III. 11, § 2 and YS., § 980, p. 175 *a*.

L. 15-17. ובמלחמה—ד"א, YS. *ibid.* Cp. CH., II. 2, § 2.

L. 19-18. כנגדן—להקב"ה. See *Sifre*, 134*b*. Cp. below.

L. 20-28. לשלמה—ד"א. For some parallels see *Mishna Yadayim*, III. 5; *Aboth*, III. 17; *Pesikta R.* 59*a*; *Midrash Mishle*

(ed. Buber), 1*a*. R. Isaak סהולה, in his commentary in MS. (Cat. Neubauer, No. 343), ואמר ר"ע אלו לא נתנה תורה דיים היה לישראל בשה"ש וכדי לנהוג את העולם.

L. 29-40. אחד—וגו'. See GR., LXIV. 8, and LVI. 2. The *Midrash Haggadol* has a passage, נלכה עד כה ר' אליעזר אומר לראות מה יהיה בסוף כה שנ' לו כה יהיה זרעך מלמד שהראהו הקב"ה לאברהם מזלו של יצחק ושמו כה שנ' כה יהיה זרעך ויש אומרין מקום מקדש הראהו שנ' ויאמר לו כה אמר לו עתידין כהנים לעמוד מבניך והן פורשין את כפיהן במקום הזה ומברכין את ישראל ' ואמ' כה יהיה זרעך ואמ' בברכת כהנים כה תברכו. Cp. also GR., XLIII. 8.

L. 41-50. משיח—עולמות. See *Midrash Tillim*, XXI. ; cp. *Sukkah*, 52*a*. The passage is corrupt. Perhaps we ought to read in l. 49 ואינן instead of והן.

L. 50-54. אמר לשלמה—ג' שירים. CH. I. 1, § 9 and 11, and also *Pesikta R.*, 58*b*, *seq*. See in particular אותיות דר"ע וכן שיר אחד השירים שנים הרי שיר משולש, after which, as it seemed, followed the ע' שמות. See P. Matatyah Delakrut's Commentary to the שערי אורה, where we read ע' שמות יש לו להק"בה וכנגדן ע' שעות למטטר..... ונתבארו כולם באלפא ביתא הארוך דר"ע ובמדרש שה"ש, Cp. Brüll's Jahrb. I. 224.

L. 55-56. היאך—להקב"ה, see below, l. 82.

L. 57. לאור—הטוב. See GR., III. 6. Cp. *Pesikta R.*, 118*a*, text and notes.

L. 58. המים והרוח וכו'. See Chapters of R. Eliezer, III., and note 31 of Loria's Commentary. Cp. ER., XV. 22.

L. 59-60. שלשה ספרים—משהזקין. CH. I. 1, § 10.

L. 61-77. שלש מעלות—הרוחות, CH., *ibid*. Cp. *Synhedrin*, 20*b*.

L. 77-81. שלשה שירים—עו' הבא, see *Pesikta R.*, 99*a*, and *Midrash Tillim*, LXXXI., and parallels. YS., § 980 in the שלשה פירושים (ed. Constantinople, see Steinschneider's Catalog. Col. 1287). See also commentary to *Song of Songs*, attributed to R. Saadyah.

L. 82. With regard to the literature about שבעים שמות, see Zunz's *Gottesdienstliche Vorträge*, p. 273 (second ed.), note *h*, to which references there are still to be added : R. Tobyah b. Eliezer (see Salfeld p. 137 *seq*.); Barzilai in his commentary to

ומצאנו בקצת נוסחי דאגדתא דשה"ש דמפרש:—ספר יצירה the p. 128, בהוא שבעים שמות של שבח שקרא בהן המקום את ישראל. Cp. *ibid.*, p. 307; YM.Is., 253; YM.Ps. (MS.), 74*a* and 97*a*, MH. I., תניא שבעים שמות להקב"ה וכנגדן שבעים שמות לישראל · ויגש, beg. ר' חיים מוסא and, שבעים שמות לתורה וכנגדן שבעים שמות לירושלים in the *Beth Talmud*, II. 124 (edited by Prof. Dr. Kaufmann.) Cp. Epstein in his edition of the Midrash תדשא, XXVI., note 4.

L. 82-125. שבעים שמות לישראל. In the MH.: ישורון—ובדרכיהם נער בכור רך יחיד ילד אח ריע בן אהוב עבד לעם לאום בת רעיתי בתולה כלה אשת נעורים פרדס מעין ידידים גאולים קדושים ממלכת כהנים משרתים צבאות אלים אדונים עליונים ארץ אישים אדם עדה קהל אילי הצדק יחידים עברים אפרחים אריה נחש אילת זאב שור רם (ראם?) כרם נטע שעשועים אגוז תמרה תפוחים ענבים תאינה רמון זית נחל סגולה יונה צפור בני אל חי עגלה פרה אישון תולעת אם חכמים גבורים צדיקים חסידים ישרים קרובים עמים תמימים. Cp. בעל הטורים to Num. xi. 6. See also *Sifre* 68*a* (פיסקא ט"ו), especially the note of Herr Lector Friedmann: בכ"תי ר' הלל ג' שנקראו אחים ורעים כרם נחלה צאן וכו' וכל לשון חבה מפרש להו באגדת שה"ש דע' שמות נקראו ישראל בכור נער בן יחיד כלה וכו' כדאיתא התם.

L. 125-157. שבעים שמות—בתוכה. See YM.Is., p. 253. MH.: שבעים שמות לירושלים· ירושלים שלם מוריה ה' יראה יבוס גלעד לבנון ציון כסא ה' עיר ה' יפה נוף ירכתי צפון קרית מלך רב כלילת יופי משוש לכל הארץ בעולה חפצי בה אבן מעמסה אפרתה שדה יער מנוחה אריאל הר מועד סף רעל בתולה כלה אשת נעורים רבתי עם שרתי במדינות רבתי בנוים בית תפלה עיר שחוברה לה יחדיו מגדל עדר שגל מצודה גולה וסורה עדן גן אלהים הר דרום מקודשת ידידות דרושה עיר לא נעזבה עקרה מוראה העיר היונה הר גבוה עיר צדק קריה נאמנה ני חזיון דלתות העמים במות נחלה בשן כרמל ה' שמה רמה הר הקודש הר חמוד גבעת הלבנון רחל ארמון טבור הארץ חדרך יער הנגב בהר מרום ישראל שם חדש אשר פי ה' יקבנו.

L. 157-165. שבעים שמות לתורה תורה. MH.: ושבעים—תבואה ראשית קנין חכמה מוסר בינה ערמה דעת מזימה משל מליצה חידה צדק משפט מישרים לקח תחבולות ספר הברית ספר מלחמות ה' יראת ה' טהורה תמימה משיבת נפש נאמנה מחכימת פתי מצדת ישרים משמחי לב

מאירת עינים זהב זכוכית כלילת יופי כסף טובה פנינים לויח חן ענקים אש דרת דבש חלב נופת צופים שמן תורק מגדנים שעשועים שלישים מועצות מתוקים תורי זהב אמת נעימים נחלה עצה עמוקה ארובה רחבה עטרה בתולה כלה אשת נעורים ששון שמחה תאינה חסד תושיה אילת אהבים יעלת חן דדים לחם מים יין עץ חיים יקרה חרוץ תבואה.

YM.Ps. (74*a*) gives the same passage in the name of מדרש, agreeing with our text, except the following variations:—l. 159, reading תחבולה and omitting חידה; l. 160, ספר מלחמות and מחכימת פתי; l. 161, נוצרת and חמוד מזהב; l. 162, וכסף וגזית; l. 163, דדים לחם מים חלב; ll. 164 and 165, שעשועים שלישים עץ חיים ירקרק חרוץ תבואה.

L. 165-195. שבעים—שמות. MH.: שבעים שמות להק"בה עליון ה' אדון אלוה אל אהיה יה שדי צבאות חי אלהים רם ונשא ונשגב ונפלא גדול ועזוז וגבור הוד והדר אדיר נורא ונאמן הצור תמים אמת אש קנא ונוקם ונוטר ובעל חמה צדיק וחסיד טוב וטהור איש שומר קרוב רחוק ראשון אחרון אח גיאה אב אריה רועה נשר תפוח גואל חזק עד שופט גואל חזק עד שופט מלך מסתתר מושיע יוצר קורא בורא רוגע אשכל הכופר עיר קדיש מגדל עז ישר ידיד עתיק צח ואדום חנון רחום צבי עופר האיילים. YM. Ps. (97*a*): שבעים שמות נקראו להקב"ה עליון נשא נשגב נפלא גדול גבור עזוז הוד והדר נורא ישר א ר י ה הצור תמים נאמן וכו' (so in the MS.) שעליון שהוא עליון במרומים · נקרא רם ונשא ונקרא נשגב כי כה אמר ה' רם ונשא · נקרא נשגב שנ' ונשגב ה' לבדו ביום ההוא · נקרא נפלא שנ' לעושה נפלאות גדולות לבדו · נקרא גדול שנאמר גדול אדונינו ורב כח · נקרא גבור שנ' ה' עזוז וגבור · נקרא הוד שנ' הוד והדר לפניו · נקרא נורא שנ' נורא אלהים ממקדשך · נקרא ישר שנ' פקודי ה' ישרים משמחי לב · נקרא אריה שנ' אריה שאג מי לא ירא · נקרא הצור שנ' הצור תמים פעלו ואומ' צורי ולא עולתה בו · נקרא תמים שנ' תורת ה' תמימה · נקרא נאמן שכן הוא אומ' האל הנאמן · נקרא טוב שנא' טוב ה' לכל · נקרא אלהים שבדין ברא שמיא וארעא · ה' מרי שמיא ומרי ארעא · נקרא אדון שהוא אדון על כל ברואיו · נקרא אלוה שהוא אלוה על כל ישראל שהוא תקיף על הכל · נקרא אהיה אשר אהיה שהוא ואין חוץ ממנו · שדי שאין העולם כדאי ביום שברא אותו · נקרא אדיר שנ' אדיר במרום ה' · נקרא בעל מלחמה שנ' ה' איש מלחמה וגו' בעל הטורים, *ibid.* Cp. See also ARN., 50*b* and 51*a*, as well as 53*a* and 54*a* (version II.) and notes.

L. 195-201. שבח—שה"ש ד"א. With regard to these עשר שירות see Epstein's admirable essay in the periodical ממזרח וממערב (pp. 85-89), who, indeed, exhausts the subject. I only add here that the MH. to בשלח agrees with the *Mechilta*, except in the שירה שמינית, where he adds ד"א שירת שלמה דכת' שיר השירים אשר לשלמה (probably after the Targum of the *Song of Songs*). In an anonymous commentary to שה"ש MS (Cat. Neubauer, 268) השירים לית ומלא יו"ד כי יו"ד שירות הן והוזכרו במכילתי' גם במדרש ויכולו לשיר זה למעלה מכולם. Cp. also צרור המור, 152*c*. YM.Ps., p. 276*b*, gives also this passage of עשר שירות in the name of Midrash שה"ש. See also YM.Is., p. 37, for the whole passage. The גנאי in the שיר חבאר is perhaps on account of Moses' death being indicated there, according to the Midrashim. See NR. XIX. 33, and Pseud-Jonathan to Num. xxi. 20. See also the Post Scriptum at the end of these notes.

L. 201-203. נתנה—שיר השירים. See CH. I. 1, § 5: אבל שלמה מלך בן מלך, etc. = CH. I. 2, § 1, תני משום ר' נתן וחכמ' או' מהר סיני, etc.

L. 203-206. ד"א—שיר חדש. See CH. I. 5, § 3. *Mechilta*, 34*b* and parallels.

L. 206-210. מכולם—ד"א נסלתה. See CH. I. 1, § 11. Cp. *Midrash Agadah*, ed. Buber, I., p. 170, which is the nearest parallel.

L. 210-213. לבניו—ד"א. The meaning of the passage is not clear. At any rate we must insert the word ישראל after היו in l. 211. See CH. *ibid.*, והוא מקלסן.

L. 210-224. ויונקים—מנין. See *Tosephtha Sota*, VI. 3, and commentaries (מנחת בכורים). Cp. B. T. *Sotah* 30*b*, and the Tosaphoth, beg. ר' מאיר about the end, and ER. XXIII. 7; YM. Ps. 24*b*, from a Midrash: מנין אתה אומר ששתי שירות אמרו מלאכי המרום אחת בעקידת יצחק····· כבודו אלא אמר הב"ה אין לי כבוד בארץ ואין לי כבוד בשמי מרום אם אין עמי ממליכין אותי בארץ אין לי מלכות כביכול בשמי המרוסהרי ישראל אומרים שמע····· למלאכי השרת והן מקבלין מהם ואומ' בשכמ"לו הרי לנו שירה בעקידת יצחק ואחת על הים כמה שנ'····· השירות הללו אמרו מ ה ה' אדונינו ומה אדיר.....

L. 225-229. מראיך—ישקני. CH. I. 2, § 3.

L. 229-231. התורה—ד"א. YS., § 981 (175*b*), in the name of a Midrash.

L. 231-235. פיהו—ד"א. YS., *ibid.*, R. Tobya b. Eliezer, in his commentary to the *Song of Songs* (MS. Cambridge, Add. 378): ומרוב אהבת ישראל זכר בנשיקה הזאת לפיהו לפי שדרך מלכי מזרח וכוערב להיות נושקין על היד. Cp. Rashi to this verse. Cp. *Berachoth*, 8*b*.

L. 235-236. שונאיהם—אבא. See *Berachoth*, 57*b*, and *Tanchuma*, חוקת, § 20.

L. 237. הירדן—ד"א. The blank is in the MS. Perhaps he alludes to the proximity of Israel with the ארון.

L. 237-240. וחייתם=ד"א. YS., *ibid.*, but shortened.

L. 240-248. כי טובים—דבא. YS. *ibid.*, in the name of a Midrash. The ד"א in l. 243-4 (ביון שנגמל מדדי, etc.) suggests the reading דַּדיך. Cp. R. Eleasar of Worms in the יין הרקח to this verse: כי טובים דודיך מיין קרי ביה דדיך להניק ד"ת.

L. 248-251. דודיך—שאל, *Mishneh Abodah Zarah*, II. 5, etc. See CH. to this part of the verse and parallels.

L. 251-260. מה שהוא—ד"א כי. YS., *ibid.* (end of p. 175*b* and begin. of 175*c*). Some of these explanations in CH., *ibid.*, § 3.

L. 260, 261. סנחריב—ד"א לריח. YS., *ibid.*, Ch. I. 3, § 2, after which our text is to be corrected.

L. 261-263. טובים—ר' דוסתאי. See Jonathan to 1 Kings xviii. 16, וקליף. Cp. *Berachoth*, 10*b*. Perhaps this was also one of the various Derashoth of the words אל הקיר. The last five words in l. 263 seem to be a clerical error.

L. 265-270. עשו—ד"א. YS. *ibid.*, shortened. Cp. the פרק ר' יאשיהו (in Jellinek's *Beth Hamidrash*, V., pp. 112, 113), where this דרשה, as well as the preceding one of R. דוסתאי, are to be found in a much enlarged form. In the יחוסי תנאים ואמוראים (MS. Oxford Cat., Neubauer, No. 2199), I., 140*b*, we read:—ובמדרש שה"ש קורא לר' חדקא הינדקה וכן עשה רב סעדיה החכם זל"ע בתשובות חרוזיו לרשעים כשהזכיר החכמים לשבח הזכיר ר' חדקא כך שם חכם קרופאי והנדקי ברחש לבי לחוקקי וכל' ושמעתי מרבנא שמואל דוד אמי זל"ע כי זה הנבון הוא ר' חדקא וכך הוא במדרש שה"ש שמתחיל ר' נתן אומ' מלאכי השרת אמרוהו לריח שמניך טובים היה ר' הינדקה אומר הרי את למד שריחן של צדיקים יפה שכך מצאתי כתוב שהכיר משה לעצמות יוסף בריח לפיכך הכניסן במחיצתן ואל תתמה שהרי יש בני

אדם שמבחין עצמות לאדם ולבהמה ובין עצמות ישראל וכן אתה מוצא ביצחק כשנשק ליעקב. Cp. Steinschneider, *Ozar Nechmad* II. 31, MS. Cambridge, Add. 394, in the Commentary to the אור ישע (Zunz, *Literaturgeschichte der Synagogalen Poesie*, p. 103):— ר' חדקא א' וכו' שריח הצדיקים ניכר משל רשעים שהכיר משה וכו' שהרי בעוה"ז יש בני אדם מבדילין בין עצמות ישראל לעצמות או"ה וכן ר' מאיר אומ' MH. IV.: ביצחק כשנשק וכו' שהיה ריח ניכר משל עשו טוב ריחן של צדיקים מריח ארון הברית שריח ארון הברית אינו הולך אלא דרך ג' ימים · אבל ריחן שלצדיקים הולך מסוף העולם ועד סופו וכין הוא אומ' וירח את ריח בגדיו ויברכהו מלמד שריחן של צדיקים נודף בחייהן ומנין אפי' במיתתן שנ' ויקח משה את עצמות יוסף עמו · זה תימה גדול · יש לך אדם שהוא מכיר את עצמות אדם מעצמות בהמה עצמות גוי מעצמות ישראל · אמור מעתה כשנכנם משה לקפליטין שלמלכים היה משה מריח ריח ארונו של יוסף כריח העו"הב ואומ' בוודאי אלו עצמות יוסף.

L. 270-273. תורה—ד"א. YS. *ibid.*, offering better readings.

L. 273-282. הלקיש—ד"א, meaning obscure. See *Midrash Tillim*, CXVI. 3, with regard to מלכיות and *Midrash Mishle*, XXX. 27.

L. 283-288. עולמות—ד"א. See YS., *ibid.*; CH., *ibid.*, about the end of the paragraph, פ' ר' יאשיהו (as above), p. 113.

L. 289-294. משכני—מעתה. YS., *ibid.* at the end of § 981.

L. 294-298. נרוצה—ד"א. YS. § 982. See also CH., I. 3, § 3.

L. 298-310. הביאני—לגלגל חמה. See YS., *ibid.* This passage, or part of it, is quoted from the מדרש שה"ש by the following authors: Nachmanides in his שער הגמול (cp. his commentary to Genesis i. 3; R. Simon Duran in his *Magen Aboth* (Leghorn, 1785), 88*b*, and in the commentary to the *Song of Songs*, attributed to Nachmanides (supposed to belong to R. Azriel) I. 3. Cp. R. Menachem of Recanati's *Commentary to the Pentateuch* (Venice, 1523), p. 41*b*, as ואמרו רבותינו. R. Bachaye b. Asher, in כד הקמח, *s. v.* לולב, has also a parallel in the name of the Chapters of R. Eliezer. MT., p. 9*a* and *b*, בראשית רבה ויצא ויטע אלהים גן בעדן. M.H.: הביאנו המלך חדריו אלו חדרי המרכבה ועליו הוא אומ' הביאני המלך חדריו אלו חדרי גן עדן שהן שקולין לחדרי רקיע וג"ע נבראו במאמר אחד וכשם שהרקיע עשוי שורות שורות של כוכבים כך ג"ע עשויה שורות של צדיקים והן מאירין בה ככוכבים ועץ החיים בתוך הגן ר' יהודה אומ' כדרך שהקיטונות האלו פתוחין

לטרקלין כך עין החיים באמצע ג"ע · וכמה הוא עביו ר"מ אומ' ארבע מאות שנה מהלך עין החיים ר' יהודה אומ' מהלך שבע מאות שנה אחרים אומ' מהלך חמש מאות שנה עין החיים ומכוין לגלגל חמה מהלך חמש מאות שנה וכל פילוג מימי בראשית אינן יוצאין אלא מתחתיו. See also Jellinek's *Beth Hammidrash*, III, 194, and Horowitz, הוספה to the *Beth Talmud*, I. Cp. GR., XV. 5, and תדא"ר, c. II.

L. 310-319. לכך—וכסף. YS., *ibid.*, 176*d*. CH. to this part of the verse, § 2.

L. 319-338. הר הזיתים—וכן. See *Pesikta R.*, 102*b* and 103*a* and *b* and parallels. Our text seems to be a combination of the view of R. Levi and that of R. Jochanan R. Joshua b. Levi, and R. Eleasar (בירורה = הנאין והמשובחין). See also *Sifre*, 135*a* and 142*b*. The words from אמתי—הזיתים (l. 337, 338) ought perhaps to be placed after the word ים, in l. 344. YM.MP. 172*a*: נגילה אימתי····· הזיתים כמ"ש ועמדו רגליו על הר הזיתים. Cp. Raimundus, *Pugio Fidei*, 848 (or 661), the same passage from ב"ר ויגש.

L. 338-340. בראשם—ד"א. YS., *ibid.*

L. 340, 341. קש—ד"א, urging נגילה.

L. 341-344. ים—ד"א. Meaning obscure. I can only guess that we have here some corrupt translation of Jonathan to Ezekiel xxxix. 11.

L. 344-350. אחריך—נזכירה. See YS., *ibid.*, shortened. CH., *ibid.*, on this part of the verse. Perhaps we should insert before כשאנו (l. 345) the words ד"א. The first דרשה would then be that the patriarchs are to be preferred to Noah, etc. See also ER., VI. 4.

L. 351-352. אהבוך—יהושוע. There can hardly be any doubt that the sentence refers to R. Akiba. See *Jerushalmi Sotah*, 21*a*, and *Lament. Rabbah* III. (letter ס). Perhaps this י' ב' ר' is identical with יהושע הגרסי. In passing the following from the יחוסי התנאים ואמוראים, III., p. 40*b*, יהושע הגרסי שהיה משרת לה"ע כדאיתא בפ' עושין פסין ובריתא זו עקרה בדרשה דאגדה דעשרת הדברות והתם מסיק דבעיו"הכ הוציאוהו, etc., cp. *Midrash Mishle*, XI. 1, and parallels.

L. 352-355. שהוא מושך····· חכמה שהן—ד"א····· בו ד"א. F., אומרין עליו לג' לילות שעלה משה וכו'. YS., *ibid.* MT. 8*a*, from בראשית רבה. See *Temura*, 16*a*, *Beth Hammidrash* I. 125.

L. 356-361. ד"א—ובניו. F., ד"א····· שמואל בשעה שנ'····· שיהיה ספק למשה ויודע שלא היו בניו כשרים והיה ממנה בניו לשופטים לישראל··· אבל זרים היו במעשה ובשמואל לכך נא' ט' ד' מ' זה היה משה מישרים אהבוך זה היה שמואל ובניו.

L. 361-364. ד"א—וחבריו. F., זה היה בן עזאי. YS., *ibid.*, MT., *ibid.*, who reads ופירש (instead of ופילש), see in the פיוט, beginning מה יפית the phrase באיש עניו בדת פלש. Cp. also *Beth Hammidrash*, V. 97. Cp. מנן אבות II. 18*a*, וכמו שאמרו על ר"ע שנ' עליו הביאני אל בית היין.

L. 365-371. שחורה—המשכן. F., משל····· אביה וניאפה ויצאת והיתה····· התחילו חברותיה מחסות (מחסדות l.) אותה מ' ה' אומרת ·····השמש לא דומה····· אמו כאיור ולא דומה לשהוא יוצא ונתנול ינוח לו במהרה יחזור להיות נאה····· לאומות שחורים אנו במ' הע' ונאים אנו במ' אבותינו דמשכן. YS., *ibid.* See CH., I. 5, § 1, and I. 6, § 3.

L. 371-375. ד"א—בכסף. F., ד"א····· ישראל כשהיו עושין בטיט ובלבנים במצרים····· ד"א בן פלח····· היה עליו במיעוטה. See YS. *ibid.* (on שחורה אני). The passage is also cited in MS. Oxford (Cat. Neubauer, No. 268), p. 267*b*.

L. 375-379. ד"א—מצות. F., ד"א····· כאהלי קדר שאתם רואים אותם שסלק (?שחור) מבחוץ וכי בעורים הם אהלי קדר אלא מה אהלי קדר שהם שסלק (שחור) אדם נכנס בתוכו והרי. See CH. *ibid.* to these words.

L. 379-385. ד"א—מתנאה. F., ד"א····· האוהל הזה כך מתח המקום את הרקיעים האלו או יכול כדרך שאוהל זה אין אדם····· אלא הרבה מותחין····· אותו יכול כך היה המקום ת"ל····· ולא סייעוהו בריה····· שאין יוצא מן האדם מכל המעינות שבו אלא מים סרוחין····· אילו יוצאין, etc. YM., p. 113. Cp. for the last lines ARN., 35*b*, I. and notes.

L. 387-392. בני—יום. F., ד"א····· והנביאים של שקר מנין אתם או'····· שאין המקום נפרע אלא מן הגדול שכן המקום אמר למשה קח····· חשבון עם האיסטרטיות שהיו אפסונותיו כלום אלא דבר קל אלא אני אהרוג את הגד'. See R. Menachem of Recanati's commentary on the Pentateuch, p. 262, where this passage is quoted from the מדרש שה"ש, reading: כשישראל חוט' אין הק"בה ופרע אלא מגדוליה שכן א' הק"בה למ' קח····· מלה"ד למלך····· חשבון עם האסמרטיוטות

שאין אפסנותיו כלום אלא דבר קל אלא אחדוף את הגדולים שלשים ויאמר ה׳ אל משה קח לך ראשי העם את מוצא MH., V. נונר…… בזמן שישראל חוטאין אין הק״בה נפרע אלא מן הראשים שבהן שהרי הק״בה אומ׳ למשה קח את כל ראשי העם והוקע אותם מושלו משל למלך בשר ודם שמרד עליו לגיון אחד וכי מה הנאה לי עם הטורסוס הזה שאין אפסנותו מיקל אלא אעביר את כל הנגידים שהן נוטלין ששים ששים דינר בכל יום. Perhaps we should read הטורנוס instead of הטורסוס. See *Aruch*, *s. v.* טירן, 2.

L. 392-397. הגזילה—שמוני. F., ד״א בני אמי נחרו בי וגו׳ לא היה נפשיכם להיות כותבין…… מצרים והיו כותבים לשני יושבי הקברים וחזרו ישראל להיות כותבין לחמישים ושתים שנה למל׳ של אגושטוס …… למלכותו של אד׳…… למלכותו של אס׳…… והיו שומרין בבורגני הגולה The passage is very corrupt. See *Mechilta*, 61 *a b* and parallels, and also *Seder Olam*, c. XXX. MH., יתרו has: לא זכו למנות לעצמן ימנו למלכיות אחירות שנ׳ בשנת שתים לדריוש ׳ בשנת שלש למלכות נבוכדנצר וכן לשטרות. Perhaps in our text also the words לשני השטרות ought to be corrected into לשני הקברות. The last five words must be corrected after the *Mechilta*, לא רציתם לתקן הדרכים וכו׳ הרי אתם מתקנין את הבורגסין, for which YS. reads הבורגנין. The word כנאן is perhaps a corruption of באי׳. See also CH., I. 6, § 4, לא הייתי משמר משמרת כהונה ולויה.

L. 398-403. הגידה—בעקב. F., היפה כושים וג׳ מה הוציאה אתה יודע מה אני עתיד ליתן בעקב, etc. (l. 403). See CH., I. 7, § 2, and parallels. Cp. also *Sifre*, 52*b*, note 15, the passage given from מדרש שה״ש by R. Hillel II. (in his commentary in MS.), which is not to be found in the editions. The knowledge of this fact I owe to the kindness of my friend Professor Dr. Badt, who communicated it to me in the name of Dr. Israel Lewy of Breslau.

L. 403-409. אמר לו…… ארבעים שנה לקיים. F., אמל—הרועים מה שנ׳ ובני ישראל…… ואף לע״ל המ׳ עושה להם כן לקיים מה שנ׳ ועתה (F. omits the words שהיתה……נשבת, l. 405, 6). See ER. III. 4, CH. *ibid.* § 3, and parallels, *Seder Olam* V. and X., and Pseud-Jonathan Exod. XII. 39, and YS., which form some parallel to our passage. The quotation ועתה שמה וגו׳ (Hosea ii. 17) suggests some Messianic *Derasha* here which is now missing, and to which the Derash of R. Ishmael is opposed. Cp. CH., II. 9, §, 3.

לסוסתי····· זה היתה המריה שנסה .F ,לסוסתי—רבים .L. 410-417 אותם ויבש המים והטיט לא יבש התחילו····· ליבש והטיט אינו יכול ליבש אמ' להם המקום····· שאבדו סוסיו ורכבו של פרעה כך הייתם אתם חייבים ליאבד אלא אני אעשה. YS., § 983 (176*b*). See CH., I. 9, § 4, ARN., p. 49*b*, and parallels. YM.Ps. 307*a*, מד"רש לססתי ברכבי פרעה דמיתך רעייתי זו היה התראה שהמרו ישראל על הים ואיזה היא המראה אלא ניסה אוחם המקום יבש את המים והטיט לא יבש התחילו וכו' סוסיו של פרעה ורוכביו וכו' אתם ליאבד אלא בשביל שמו הגדול שלא יתחלל לכך נאמר וימרו מניין לנו שיבש המקום את המים והטיט לא יבש לקיים מה שנ' דרכת בסוסיך בים מים רבים

ד"א לסוסתי ברכבי פרעה מכאן היה .F ,ד"א—רוח .L. 416-427 ר' מאיר אומ' כשם שיצא פרעה בסוס נקיבה כך הקב"ה הראה אותו בכסא הכבוד בדמות סוסה נקבה שנ' לסוסתי ברכבי פרעה ולמה יצא פרעה בסוסה נקבה אמר פרעה לחיילותיו מי בכל הבהמות שלי קל ארכוב אחרי ישראל א"ל אין בכל הבהמה קל אלא הסוסה שלך מפני שה' כולה צבעונין ולא היה כיוצא בה בעולם לפיכך כל הסוסים הזכרים רצים····· כך אמ' הב"ה למלאכי מרום מי בכל המשמשין לפניך קל אלא הרוח שהיא יוצאת מתחת כנפי הכרובים אף הב"ה נגלה, etc. See CH., I. 9, § 4, *Mechilta*, 33*a*, and parallels (especially *Midrash Tillim*, XVIII. 14).

לאבד שונאי ישראל עמו .ד"א—עמו .L. 427-429. CH. and *Mechilta* ibid. Cp. *ibid.* Targum.

ד"א—רעייתי .F., in quite a different order, as follows:—יהודה בן שמעי או' לפי שיצאו ממצרים בסוסים לכך העמיד המקום עליהם סוסים של אש בים לכך נאמ' לססתי ברכבי פרעה מלמד שנתן המקום אימתן של ישראל על המצרים והיו מכין הפרדות שיחזרו אותן למצרים והגלגלים מושכין אותן בים לכך נאמ' לסוסי ברכבי פר דימיתיך רעייתי ואין דמיתיך אלא דמויות מלמד שבדמיונים נגלה המקום על ישראל כאדם שמדמה את חבירו ואו' אין זה איש פלוני · כך היו ישראל מסתכלין בהקב"ה ומדמין אותו לכך נאמר דימיתיך רעייתי .L. 429-435. See *Mechilta*, 37*a*. Cp. Nachmanides (or Azriel), and R. Eleazar of Worms in the יין הרקח to this verse, both of whom have this last *Derasha* (433-435) דימיתך רעייתי. Bachaye, to Gen. ix. 4, cites it from a מדרש, whilst סהולה (MS. Oxford) has: וכן אמרו במדרש מבאן היה ר' מאיר אומ' אע"פי שבא פרעה בסוסיא נקיבה אף המקום הראה אותו בסוסיא (בדמות margin) נקבה בכסא הכבוד לקיים מה

שנ' לסוסתי ברכבי פרעה ואין דימיתך אלא דמות מלמד שבדמיונים נגלה המקום על ישראל כאדם שמראה את חבירו לכך נא' דימיתך רעייתי. Cp. CH. *ibid.*, § 4 and פירוש מהרז"ו.

L. 436-441. תורי—העם. F., לכך נא' דימיתיך רעייתי זו עמידתן לפני הר סיני : תורי זהב נעשה לך אימתי····· בני ישראל וגו' ויקח משה חצי הדם····· את העולם הנה····· ר' חייא היה או' תורי זהב נעשה לך עם נקו' הכסף כמו שנ' ויעש האותות לעיני העם. See *Mechilta*, 63*b*, with regard to the דם הברית and LR., VI. 5, especially the saying of R. Nathan there. Perhaps in the second part of the verse the words נקודות הכסף were interpreted to mean the revelation on mount Sinai, which came afterwards. See Targum. The לקח טוב has here ד"א זו נתינת התורה הנחמדים מזהב ומפז רב. Cp. R. M. T., p. 10*a* : במדרש שה"ש בילמדנו תורי זהב נעשה לך אלו ד"ת וכו'. See also CH., I. 10, § 1, זה משה ואהרן, to which our text (ר' חייא וכו') perhaps refers. See the commentary attributed to R. Saadyah as above. עתה אחי דע כי פירוש נאוו לחייך ותורי זהב ועד שהמלך וצרור המור ואשכול הכופר דודי הם סמוכים בפירוש אלו הפסוקים הוא מספר עבודת העגל ואח"כ שומעם ספר הברית ואמרו ישראל למשה נשמע באזנינו ונפשוט צוארינו לשמוע זה הברית כמו החרוזים או הענולים לאזנים שנ' ויקח ספר הברית. Cp. Targum.

L. 442-445. עד—הר סיני. F., עד שהמלך····· רוחו עד שהשכינה בשמי המרום נתנה רשות (read ריחו for רשות?). There is a blank in the MS.. Probably we must complete here the opinion of R. Meir in the CH. I. 12, § 1. (Cp. also MT. 10*a* who quotes both opinions from בראשית רבה פ' ויצא לגנאי ולשבח). YS., § 983, 176*b*., at the end. In l. 444 F. reads כבר הקיף הענן את הר סיני. See CH. *ibid.* § 2, after which our text is to be completed and corrected.

L. 445-455. צרור—ויעף. F., צ' ה' ד' לי ר' יהודה היה או' זה היה הל' שלקו הבכורות ד"א בין שדי ילין זו הייתה השכינה····· המור דודי לי····· לבין מלחמת····· ולבין תחיית המתים ומנין אתם אומרים שהשכינה עתידה לחזור למקומה מצינו שהיה המקום מדבר····· הכרובים כשעלה שכינה למרום עלתה על גבי כרוב אחד לקיים מה שנאמר וירכב על כרוב ויעף····· להחזירה נ י ה ג אחד מן התינוקות····· אצלה כדי שתהא יודעת שהוא עתיד לחזור אצלה כך עשה המקום לפי שהיה גלוי לפניו שהשכינה עתידה לחזור למקומה לא עלתה אלא ע"ג כרוב אחד. YS. 167*c*, § 984,

beg. YM.Ps. 58*a*, quotes this passage (448-455) in the name of a מדרש, and agrees with F. only, וניהג אחד מן התינוקות עמה. See CH., I. 14, § 1, with regard to לקו הבכורות, which our text has rather shortened. Perhaps we ought to supply here the passage quoted by לקח טוב from מדרש שה"ש (ed. Buber, 25*b*), which is missing in the editions.

L. 456-463. אשכול—בשנה. F., אשכול הכופר דודי לי זו עמידתן של יש' בנחלי ארנון ר' חילפי ..... זו ביאתן של ישראל בקדש ברנע ד"א אשכול..... לי זו ביאתן של ישראל בשעה שחנו ישראל בנחל זרד י"ט שנה בנחל זרד וי"ט שנה חנו בקדש הרי ל"ח שנה ר' שמעי היה או' בשעה שקברו אהרן הכ"הג אשכול הכופר דודי לי..... מה כרמי עין גדי עושין ארבעה וחמשה פעמים בשנה כך צ' עתידים להיות מולידין ד' וה' פעמים בשנה וי"א על כל בע' ובע' ר"י—ובע'). YS. *ibid.* (l. 459-463). Rashi to this verse quotes something similar from an אגדה. With regard to the נחלי ארנון, see above l. 235 reading perhaps דדי instead of דודי. For the Darasha of חילפוי, see *Seder Olam*, c. 8, end. Perhaps he means in general the stay of Israel in the desert, tending to the same explanation as the Targum of this verse, so that the real point of the Derashah is missing in our text. For אהרן כ"ה compare *Tanchuma* תצוה, § 15.

L. 464-473. חביבה—נדיב. F., הנך יפה רעייתי בכל מקום שישראל משבחין את הקב"ה אף הקב"ה משבחן ' הרי מצינו בשני מקומות ישראל אמרו מי כ' ב' ה' א"ל הקב"ה א' י' מ' כ' ישראל אמר ה' י' ל' ו' אף אני הכתבתי בתורה ו' ת' לי מ' כ' וגוי קדוש אמרו ישראל אין כאל ישורון ר' שלמיא היה א' כ' י' אומר משל לבני אדם שהיו משבחין עם המלך ונענה אחד וא' להם אף אתם כיוצא בו כך א' המקום לישראל אף אתם כיוצא בו אין כאל ומי כאל ישורון וכנ"י אומרת דודי צח ואדום והמקום אומר לישראל מה יפו פעמיך בנעלים בת נדיב ד"א הנך יפה רעייתי כאדם שאומר לחבירו מה נאה איש זה בעל עינים נאות. R. Eliezer of Worms' commentary הנך יפה דודי בלשון אחד מקלסים זה את הקב"ה נקרא אחד וישראל ג"כ אחד וכן את ה' האמרת Cp. CH., I. 16, § 1, and *Mechilta*, 36*b*.

L. 473-481. ד"א—וישר הוא. F., ד"א במתנת הצדקה..... כשאתם הולכין בדרכי אתם אוהבי ורעי מה הם דרכי המקום ת"ל ושמרו דרך ה' לעשות צדקה ומשפט נותן מתנת חנם לכל באי עולם ' כי צדיק ה' צדקות אהב..... מאכיל רעבים מכסה ערומים פודה..... חסדים תקן נפשך שתהא אהוב להק"בה היה גומל חסדים ונותן צדקה

אבל איני יודע מה הוא שכר לנותני צדקה ישר יחזו את פניו ישר זה הקב"ה שנ' צדיק וישר הוא וישלח, § 10. See *Shabbath*, 133, and *Tanchuma*.

L. 481-493. ונאמר—בחכמתו .F ונ'..... אם אין חכם מכיר למי שבראו..... יש חכמים ' מי בכל מלכי הגוים ' הוי חכמים בעיניהם בני אדם שהכירו דרכי חמה..... ומה חמה..... וחילקו אותה על החדשים ' והתקינו השנה על הקופות החמה והשנים נוהגות ובאות כמה שהתקינו לא חסר ולא יתר..... להתקין התקנה הגדולה..... להכיר למי שבראם ואת כל העם חכמו הם לבנות מדינות וכרכים..... ולכבש את הים בלי..... לא דרך ולא שביל ומהלכין..... המים ולא החכימו לומר מי עשה הים ומי משיב את הרוח הזה ' חכמתם לתקן את אחרים..... טפשין כאחד איבדו את חכמתן..... ויכסלו מוסר הבלים בניהם ודלקו ביהרותם היא יאיר (הוי אומר ?) בלפדנים is not clear to me. The copiest of F. indicates his inability to read the word by the dots. מה שבח לאלו בחכמתן.

L. 493-497. אל– לתקלה .F ,גיבורים ש' הוי גבורים אל..... לשתות יין מי הם הגיבורים..... הצדיקים הכובשין..... עיר שהם מושלין במה שהוא רצונו רוצה.....

L. 498-507. אל—מזבח .F ,..... חסד מנכסים שלו אין לו אלא שעינו רע..... א"ל תן לשבוים תן לעניים תן להברות אבלים לקבור מתים והוא נוזף בהם ומקללם אומר להם מלאכה לעמול לפיכך אין עשרו מתקיים בעניין רע שעונה את גבאי צדקה..... אדם הזה השכל וידוע אותי עשה כמו שאני עושה..... כי אני ה'..... נאום ה'..... כיוצא בי רצונך שתקרב לי כראוי עשה צדקה שהיא חביבה לפני הקב"ה הרבה מן כל הקרבנות. Cp. *Koheleth R.*, V. 13; cp. *Sukka*, 49*b*.

L. 507-19. חטא—ידיו .F ,חטא אדם..... אם יש לו לאדם אלף רבואות זהב..... לו לאדם בשעת צרתו שכן הוא אומר..... ונותן הַקְּבָּה רשות עליו למשחית שכר אותה הצדקה שנתן מקדים למלאך המשחית..... אלא שדוחפו והופכו וכופתו על פניו ומפיים עליו לבית דין ואומרת אע"פי שחטא זה..... קדמתי ורשותי קדמה את רשותו כדיי היא הצדקה..... שהאכילן מתים היו ' כיסה ערומים כדי הם הנפשות שקיים להציל את נפשו וכן הוא אומר ומתן..... או לחם אחד שנותן לאדם ליד העני מעביר ממנו את הכעס ' ואיזו היא הצדקה עני אחד סומא בשתי עיניו ואין לו מה יאכל נתן לו אדם דינר אחד או לוגמא אחת לפי מה שהוא אדם אל יאמר בעצמו יודע הוא הסומא מי נתן לו אמר המקום אני רואה את הסתרים אני משלם על ידיו. YM.Ps. 257*b*: מדרש הנותן

צדקה אפי' היתה ונתחתם גזר דינו ליאבד וניתנה רשות למלאך הממונה על הפורענות לילך וליפרע ממנו אין המלאך הממונה על הצדקה מניחו אלא רץ ובא לו בין מלאכי המרום ומלאכי המרום נותנין לו ריוח והוא או' להק"בה לפניו פלוני שנתת רשות עליו לאבדו זכות גדולה בידו והממונה על הפורענות עבירה אחת בידו בלבד הלא אלף עבירות בשביל זכות אחד ימחל לו כל עבירותיו וזה אומ' זכות זה שעשה שקולה בנגד הכל צדקה היה נותן ומאכיל עניים אינה מצוה של מטון נפשות קיים אלולי כן מתים היו כדאי הן נפשות עניים שהשיב שימחל לו על כל חטאיו והקב"ה אומ' וצדקה תציל ממות והנותן צדקה בביכול מקבל פני שכינה בכל יום שנ' חסד ואמת יקדמו פניך והקב"ה אומ' למלאך הפורענות אל תיגע בו מצאתי זכות לו מחול על כל עונותיו שכן הוא אומ' ע"י אליהו ותקרב לשחת נפשו מצאתי כופר. See below ll. 563-93.

L. 519-530. F., ר"ע—הצדקה. ר' עקיבא מושלו משל אם יהיה אדם דנסתום לבעל הזמורה הרי לבו גם אם ילוה להגמון אחד····· אמר הקב"ה אם בנפשך שתהא מלוה דניסטו ויהיה לבך שמח תן לעני שכ"הא מ'ה'ח'ד' וגמול אדם ישלם לו או יכול····· קמח קלי ומה מצינו ששילם לו מה אמר בשלמה····· הקומין ההוא הפועל אלא נפשו שנ' ואליו····· מעלה עליו כאילו הוא גוזל את נפשו. See *Aruch, s. v.* דנסתטס and זמיון, which would mean to be the creditor of the man who had to levy fines. See *Baba Bathra*, 10*a*. Cp. *Ruth R.* V. 6, ד"א גשי הלום מדבר בשלמה.

L. 530-33. F., ארבעה—כולם והקרן מפירותיהם····· ד' דברים····· קיימת לו····· הם וג"ח היא הצדקה והבאת. See ARN. V. 1., c. 40, p. 60*a*, and parallels.

L. 533-44. F., ומה הוא—לא כל שכן מהו שכרם בעולם חלקם עם אב' יצ' ויעקב שנ' מתן בסתר יחריב לו ולפני גדולים ינחנו ואין גדולים אלא האבות שנ' האדם הנ' בע' וכן אמרו לו לאברהם····· גדול עליהם כאלהים ומה שכר נטלו על שכיבדו את אברהם····· רחב היא וכל ביתה ומהם הלכו····· לאפריקי ואף פלטו במלחמה בזכות אברהם שנ' בו האדם····· שלא שככה המלחמה מבין הכנענים אלא····· מכבדין אותו עכשיו כאילו שהוא חי ביניהם ומה אם לכנענים שלא הלכו במעשיו עמדה זכותו להם בניו שהולכין בדרכיו ואוהבין את המקום ועושין צדקות וג"ח על אחת כמה וכמה ואם לרשעים עמדה זכותו לישראל צדיקים עאכ"וכ. Of course, we must read מתן אדם, as in Proverbs xviii. 16. Cp. *Torath Kohanim* 85*c*. In YS. II. 6*c*, this passage is

quoted from the שה"ש רבה. See ER. XXXII. 2. See also LR. XVII. 6, and parallels with regard to the emigration of גרגשי.

L. 544-63. ולמה נקרא חברון קרית ארבע .F ולמה—הפורענות שהיא קרית של ארבעת גבורים ענר אשכול וממרא ואברהם ד"א שנקברו בו ד' אבות אדם הראשון אברהם יצחק ויעקב שנ' האדם זה אדם הראשון · הגדול זה אברהם יצ' ויע' שנ' בהם גדולים · באברהם כת'····· עשו היה ראוי שיקרא יעקב ויעקב היה ראוי להעמיד כהנים····· ורחל ובלהה ראויות ליעקב קלקל עשו נטלו ממנו כל חמתנות האלו ומכר את בכורתו ·····בגוים וגו' פרק ממנו עול שמים וה' שנאו····· ניטל את השם····· ניטלה הימנו הבכורה····· זכה במלכיות····· וזכה יעקב בארבעתן לפי שדבק בדרכי אבותיו שהן נותנין צדקות וג"ח····· אף הוא זוכה בכל····· ד"א····· שנקברו ב ה····· המהלך בדרכיהן של אבות שיהא חלקו עמהן שנ' מתן אדם ירחיב לו ולפני גדולים ינחנו משרה אותו לעולם הבא עו"ד כשם שחל השם על יעקב כך היה .YM.MP. 176*b*, עם האבות ראוי לחול על עשו····· עשו היו ראוי שיעמיד מלכים ויעקב כהנים · הברכות הראשונות היו ראויות לעשו והאחרונות ליעקב····· קלקל עשו בטלו הימנו····· אף הב"ד שנאו שנ' ואת עשו שנאתי נטל ממנו השם····· נטלה בכורה ממנו····· ואוהבים את המקום ברוך הוא. In the rest it agrees with F. See GR. LVIII. 4. Perhaps we ought to read in l. 545 ארבע צדיקים instead of גיבורים.

L. 563-93. ר"ע משלו משל לה"ד לבני אדם .F ר"ע—צדקה וכבוד שהיו חייבין למלך ונתן להם זמן שיתנו לו חובו · ולא היו מכבדין המלך בדורון ולא שואלים בשלומו והיה אחד מהם מכבד המלך בדורון ושואל בשלומו בכל יום ואומרין דרך ארץ הוא לכבד את הרופא לפני צורך · וכן יעקב אבינו אמר כי אמר אכפרה פניו במנחה ההולכת לפניו · הגיע זמנם····· כל אותן שהיו חייבין לו באו למשכן האיש ההוא שהיה מכבד את המלך אמר להם למה אתם ממשכנים אותו יש בידו לשלם לכו עמי לפני המלך · הלכו עמו כיון שראהו המלך נתן לו ריוח · עד שלא הגיע פישט המלך את ידו לו ושאל בשלומו תחלה ואמר הכנס לכאן · הן שהיו חייבין למלך עומדין ורואין אותו יושב בצידו · אמרו מה ראה המלך לכבד את זה והלא אף הוא חייב למלך · לא דיו שלא נתמשכן אלא שקיבל עוד את כל הכבוד הזה · אמרו להם שהיה הוא מכבד את המלך ומביא לו דורון ומשכים ושואל לו בשלומו ואתם לא כבדתם אותו · אף לא לשאל בשלומו · הרי אילו שהלכו למשכנו רואין אותו יושב בצידן והם שמחין שלא משכנוהו · והיו אומרין אלו משכננו את זה שכך הוא אוהב מכובד על המלך היינו מתים שצערנו אוהבו של מלך מי גרם לאיש הזה לבא לכל

הכבוד הזה הדורון שהיה מקריב למלך · התחילו כל אותן החייבין למלך מטפחין על פניהם ואומרין למה לא עשינו כך · ומה הוא דורון של מקום דקה שנ' עושה צדקה ומשפט נבחר לה' מזבח · כך הנותן צדקה אפילו היה בידו עבירה ונתחתם גזר דינו לאוביו וניתנה רשות למלאך הממונה על הפורענות לילך וליפרע ממנו · אין המלאך הממונה על הצדקה מניחו אלא הולך בין מלאכי המרום · ומלאכי המרום נותנין לו ריוח · והם אומרין לפני הקב"ה פלוני שנתנה רשות עליו לאבדו זכות גדולה בידו שהצלתו · והממונה על הפורענות אומר וכי עבירה אחת בידו בלבד · והלא אלף עבירות בידו · ובשביל זכות אחת ימחול לו כל עוונותיו · וזה זכות שעשה שקולה בנגד הכל · צדקה שהיה נותן ושהוא מאכיל את העניים · אינה מצוה של ממון נפשות קיים אילולו כן היו מתים כדיי הם נפשות העניים שהשיב שתמחול לו על חטאיו · והקב"ה אומר וצדקה תציל ממות · והנותן צדקה כביכול מקבל פני שכינה בכל יום שנ' חסד ואמת יקדמו פניך · והקב"ה אומר למלאך הפורענות אל תיגע בו כי מצאתי לו זכות למחול לו על כל עוונותיו שכן הוא אומר על ידי אליהו ותקרב..... כופר מי שעשה עבירות תשע מאות ותשעים וזכות אחת שעשה היא מעכבת ממנו הפורענות בעולם ומניח לו לעו"הב אם אין לו למי יתן צדקה אלא א"כ רודפו מנין שאם לא באו אצלו שילך אחריהם ת"ל צדק צדק תרדוף רדוף אחר הצדקה ואחר המצוה לעשותם שנ' רודף צדקה וחסד ימצא חיים צדקה וכבוד. See the quotations from the YM.Ps. above, ll. 507-19. The word כדלע"יל in the text, (l. 583), would suggest that our present text in ll. 507-19 is incomplete. See *Pesikta Rabbathi*, 127*a*: כבד את ה' מהונך אמר ר"א כבד את רופאך עד שלא תצטרך לו, and cp. parallels.

L. 593-601. וכן מצינו—משפט הצדקה. F., וכן מצינו באברהם .....לקבל את העוברים..... השרת ומה שכר קבל על הצדקה..... שא"ל המקום כי את כל הארץ אשר..... וערך השולחן לפני בניו ארבעים שנה · ועוד שיבחו האלהים כי ידעתיו וגו' וכן הקב"ה משבח את משה וגדול כחה של צדקה שכל מעשה של משה לא נשתבח אלא על הצדקה ועל הדין שנ' צדקת ה' עשה ומשפטיו עם ישראל..... ועל הדין שנ' צדקת ה' עשה ומשפטיו עם ישראל וכן בדוד ויהי דוד..... וכן מלכת שבא לא שיבמתו אלא על הצדקה ועל הדין וישימך למלך עליהם לעשות משפט וצדקה (see 1 Kings x. 9). Cp. *Midrash Mishle* XIV. and תד"אז I.

L. 601-21. וכל דור..... וג"ח אפילו כל. F., וכל דור—לאדם מעשיהם רעים אין גזר דינם נתחת' לאבד אילו היו דור המבול ואנשי סדום

עושין צדקה····· שהיה בידם כל העבירות לא נתחתם גז"ד אלא על שלא היו נותנין צדקה שנ' גאון שבעת לחם ושלות השקט היה לה ולבנותיה ויד עני ואביון לא החזיקה · מניין לאנשי המבול כסדום · בסדום ה"א זעקת ·····רבה ולהלן ה"א כי רבה····· מה רבה האמור בסדום כי ויד עני ואביון לא החזיקה לא הכירו את מי שבראן ולא רצו לעשות צדקה לפיכך אבדו מן העולם שכן הוא אומר מבלי משים לנצח יאבדו····· אע"פ שהמקום מטיב להן אינן מכירין אותו שנ' לוה רשע ולא ישלם · אפי' הקב"ה רואן אינן נותנין אבל הצדיקים אין כל יגיעם אלא צדקות שנ' צדיק חונן ונותן ואינן שבעים מן הצדקה ומן המצות ובפני הרשעים קשה המצוה לעשותה שנ' ראמות····· חסד אלא הן יריאין····· מזה המה · וכן אומרין הרשעים מה טובי שאני נותן את שלי לעניים וכי אין אלהים יכול ליתן להם····· ואני נותן להם לשונאיו של אלהים ואינן יודעין שהנכסין לניסיון ניתנין לאדם. See *Synhedrin*, 103*b*, with regard to מיכה (which passage is omitted in F.), and NR., IX. 24; GR XXVII. 3, ת"ל רבה רבה לגז"ש, inferring however another Derasha from it.

L. 621-27. וכן הוא אומר—בריוח. F., וכה"א אפס כי לא יהיה בך אביון וכתיב כי לא יחדל אביון מקרב הארץ כיצד אתה מקיים את שני כתובים אלא אם נותן לך נכסים ואתה עושה מתן צדקות הרי נכסיך קיימין לך ואם יבא עני ויאמר לך תן לי צדקה ולא נתת לו הכנס תחתיו שנ' כי לא יחדל אביון מקרב הארץ לכך נקרא נכסי'. Here is a long *lacuna* in F., some page being wanting in the MS. Cp. NR. XXII. 8, and *Tanchuma* מטת, § 6.

L. 627-44. ר' יונתן—ושלך שלו. The MS. תלמוד תורה (in the Bodleian in Oxford) 175*b*, to Deut. xv. 11, has the following passage: א"ר יונתן ב"ר יוסי העושה מצוה אֹ בדוחק סופו לעשותה בריוח והמבטל מצוה אחת מריוח סופה לבטלה מדוחק וכ"ראי כי פתוח תפתח את ידך פתח ליתן כדי שלא תפתח ליטול · ב' ידות הן בצדקה אֹ פתוחה ליתן ואֹ פתוחה ליטול כמה בין זו לזו · לפי' הנותן צריך ליתן שבח והודאה להבה שעשאו מן הנותנין ולא מן הלוקחין ושתי ידות אלו אֹ למעלה ואֹ למטה יד של עני למטה ויד בעל הבית למעלה לפי' צריך אדם ליתן שבח והודאה להבה שעשה ידו עליונה ולא תחתונה · ד"א פתוח תפתח כל הנותן צדקה לא לעצמו בלבד הוא מטיב אלא לכל העולם כולו דכתי' כי פתוח תפתח אמר הבה אם פתחת ידך לעני אני פותח לך השמים ומוריד גשמים ומרחם לכל העולם בשבילך שנ' יפתח לך את

אוצרו הטוב וגו׳ ואם יאמר לך אדם אם אתן צדקה אני מחסר ממוני ונכסי יסתכל בעצמו שהרי דבר שאינו חסר אינו מוסיף ודבר המתחכר מוסיף שער הראש והזקן שמתחסרין מוסיפין שער העפעפים שאינן מתחסרין אינן מוסיפין וכתי׳ שה פזורה ישראל וכתי׳ יכרסמנה חזיר מיער ישראל נמשלו לשה שנוזזין אותה ומגדלת יותר והאומות לחזיר שאינו נגזז מיסיף ילמדנו. YM.MP. 123*a*, מדרש שיר השירים פתוח תפתח כל הנותן צדקה לא לעצמו הוא מטיב אלא לכל הבריות מסוף העולם ועד סופו לכך נאמ׳ פתוח תפתח אם פתחת ידך לעני אתה פותח את השמים להוריד גשמים שנ׳ יפתח ה׳ לך את אוצרו הטוב נמצא זה מטיב לכל העולם כולו ולעצמו · ואל יאמר אדם מחסר אני את נכסי אם נותן אני לעניים · יסתכל אדם שכל מה שחסר אינו מוסיף שער הראש והזקן שהן מסתפרין לעולם גדלים והגבינים שאינן מסתפרין אינן מגדלין כלום כך נמשלו ישראל ברחל שנוזזין אותה והיא מגדלת צמר בכל שנה ושנה החזיר הזה שאינו נגזז אינו מוסיף כך נמשלו ישראל לאו״ה · ראה במה יתרון לנותני צדקה ממי שאינו נותן כרחל וחזיר אם נתת צדקה לא משלך נתת כי אם משלו שנ׳ לי הכסף והזהב אמר ה׳ צבאות וכן דוד אומ כי ממך הכל ומידך נתננו לך. MHG. V., ר׳ שמעון בן אלעזר אומר כל שאינו מוסיף ליתן צדקה ילמד מנופו בכל מקום שמסתפר הרי הוא מחליף וכל מקום שאינו מסתפר אינו מחליף שער הראש והזקן לפי שהן מסתפרין הן מחליפין הגבינין לא מסתפרין ולא מחליפין הרחילה הזו לפי שהיא נגזרת היא מחלפת והחזיר אינו נגזז ואינו מחליף כך רשעים לא נגזזין ולא מחליפין וכך היה רש״בא אומ׳ עשה עד שאתה מוצא מצוי לך ומוצא אתה מה שתתן שבעבור צדקה שאתה עושה בניך יושבין בשלום ומרבה אתה שלום בעולם שנ׳ והיה מעשה הצדקה שלום. See CH. VI. 11, § 1. See also מבוא to *Tanchuma*, B. 62*a* and *b*, where the same passage (with some variants) is given from a *Tanchuma* MS. in Oxford. See *Abboth* III. 7 and IV. 9, ARN. 41*b* and *Shabbath* 151*b*.

L. 644-47. מתכנסות—ומנין YM.Is. 18. See *Synhedrin*, 139*a*.

L. 647-48. הצדקה—ומניין. After הצדקה the word שלום must be supplied after Is. xxxii. 17. See NR. XI., about the end, גדול השלום שניתן לעושי צדקה.

L. 648-702. צדקה—שהרי הוא. We give here the following extracts from the MH., which will not only show us the verbal emendations to be made in our text, but also the proper arrangement of the various Derashoth which are, as will be seen, misplaced in the MS.

הרי הוא אומ׳ במועל נפש כי תמעל מעל וחטאה בשגגה מקדשי ה׳ כמה מעל בקודש בשוה פרוטה וכמה הוא פרוטה אחד משמונה באיסר האיטלקי והוא מביא תחתיה איל בשתי סלעים שהן אלף וחמש מאות שלושים ושש פרוטות והלא דברים קל וחומר ומה אם מועל בקודש בשוה פרוטה בלא יודע משלם אלף וחמש מאות שלושים וששה במה שמעל המתכוין למעול על אחת כמה וכמה ׳ הרי אדם שלא היה בידו לעשות צדקה אלא שאבד סלעו מתוך ידו ומצאה עני והלך ונתפרנס בה מעלין עליו כאלו נתנה בידו אמרת מה זה המועל בשוה פרוטה בלא יודע משלם אלף וחמש מאות ושלושים וששה במה שמעל המתכוון למעל על אחת כמה וכמה הזוכה בלא יודע מעלין עליו כאלו זכה המתכוין לזכות על אחת כמה וכמה····· גדולה צדקה שהיא דוחה את הגזירה ונותנת ארכא לרשעים ממי את למד מיהונתן בן גרשם דכת׳ ויהונתן בן גרשם בן מנשה הוא ובניו היו כהנים לשבט הדני נון תלוי למה אם זכה בן משה ואם לאו בן מנשה····· למה מתן צדקה דומה למלך בשר ודם שנכנס למדינה ולא כיבדוהו בני המדינה ולא נתנו לו דרון לאחר זמן נצטרכו לו נתקבצו כולן ובאו אצל המלך יצא הפרכס שלו ואמ׳ להן אחד מכם לא כיבד את המלך ולא נתן לו דרון עכשו אתם באים אצלו אין אתם יודעין שדרון של אדם גורם לו להיות אהוב אצל המלך ׳ וכך מתן צדקה דומה אדם שיש בידו מתן צדקה ובא לידו עבירה חמורה וגזרו עליו מלאך שהוא ממונה על הפורענות ליפרע ממנו שמע מלאך שהוא ממונה על הצדקה ובא ועמד לפני הגבורה נתנו לו מלאכי השרת רוח נכנם ועמד ביניהם אמ׳ לפניו רבונו של עולם אותו האיש שנזרת עליו פורענות יש לו מתן צדקה בידי שמע מלאך שהוא ממונה על הפורענות אמ׳ וכי יש צדקה שעשה תולה על העבירה שעשה שמע מלאך שהוא ממונה על הצדקה אמ׳ וכי צדקה שעשה של ממון היא והלא נפש פדה נפש החיה כדאי הוא שתתלה לו שמע הקב״ה דברי שניהם וגזר על המלאך שממונה על הפורענות שלא יגע בו כל עיקר שנ׳ ויחננו ויאמר פדעהו מרדת שחת מצאתי כפר אפלו אדם שיש בידו תתקצט עבירות ויש לו מתן צדקה ביניהן תולה לו על כולן שנ׳ אם יש עליו מלאך מליץ אחד מני אלף להגיד לאדם ישרו ויחננו ויאמר פדעהו ׳ וכל דור ודור שלא היה בידו מתן צדקה גזר דין מתחתם עליהם לאבדן דור המבול שלא היתה בידו מתן צדקה לפיכך אבדו מן העולם הזה ומן העולם הבא שנ׳ וירא כי רבה רעת האדם בארץ וכן סדומיים לא אבדו אלא על שלא היתה בידן מתן צדקה שנ׳ ויד עני ואביון לא החזיקה וכן המצרים וכן סיסרה אף גוג כולן לא אבדו אלא בשביל שלא היה בידן מתן צדקה שנ׳ מבלי משים לנצח יאבדו שכך דרך הרשעים לומר מה היא הצדקה ומה הן עניים לפיכך אבדו מן העולם אחאב מלך ישראל לא עשה צדקה מימיו

בעין יפה אלא שמנע סעודתו מבין שלוש שעות לפיכך נתנו לו שלש שנים כנגד שלש שעות ולא מנעה ליתנה לעניים אלא לבקש על עצמו וכן את מוצא בשחטאו ישראל לא היה בינם לבין חסדומיים אלא מתן צדקה בלבד שנ' לולי ה' צב' הותיר לנו שריד כמעט כסדום היינו ואין מעט אלא צדקה שנ' טוב מעט בצדקה ואומ' חי אני נאם ה' אלהים אם עשתה סדום אחותך היא ובנותיה כאשר עשית את ובנותיך ואומ' כמעט קט ותשחיתי מהם בכל דרכיך ואין מעט אלא צדקה שנ' טוב מעט בצדקה וכן את מוצא שלא עמדה להן בגולה בימי המן אלא צדקה שנ' ואהי להם למקדש מעט ואין מעט אלא צדקה שנ' טוב מעט עם צדקה וכי קטנה היא הצדקה והלא הכת' משבחה ע"ה גדולה אלא קטנה היא בעיני נותנה כאיזה צד אדם נותן לחבירו סלע או איסר או פרוטה או שתים או שלושה ואינו מדמה שיטול עליהם שכר · וכי מה דימה בועז ליטול שכר על מלא קומץ שנתן ומה שכר נטל שנטל את המלכות וכן את מוצא בנבוכדנצר הרשע כשראה אותו החלום ושמע פתרונו התחיל אומר לדניאל מה אתה יועצני אמר לו עניים אלו שהגליתם מארצם רעיבים צמאים ערומים פתח להן אוצרתיך ופרנס אותן אולי תרפא את החלום שנ' להן מלכא מלכי ישפר עלך וחטאך בצדקה פרוק וכי תעלה על דעתך שדניאל הצדיק היה משיא עצה לנבוכדנצר הרשע שונאו של מקום אלא לפי שראה ישראל שבגולה מטולטלין ברעב השיאו עצה זו בשביל לרחם על ישראל מיד פתח אתו רשע אוצרותיו וחילק להן שנים עשר חדש · לאחר שנים עשר חדש שכח אתו רשע החלום והתחיל מיטייל על פלטורין שלו שמע קול צעקת המון העניים לפני אוצרותיו אמ' מה זה הקול שאני שומע אמרו לו קול המון עניים שהגלית תובעין פרנסתן נכנסה בו עין רעה אמ' מה היא צדקה ומה הן עניים ענה מלכא ואמ' הלא דא היא בבל רבתא די אנא בניתה לבית מלכו בתקוף חסני וליקר הדרי אמ' אלולי החמון (הממון ?) שלי מהיכן אני בונה המדינה הזאת מיד צוה ופסק הפרנסה מהן עוד מלתא בפום מלכא קל מן שמיא נפל לך אמרין נבוכדנצר מלכא מלכותא עדת מוך אמ' לו הקב"ה רשע מי גרם לך כל אותו שנים עשר חדש שלוה הלא צדקה שעשית והלא דברים קל וחמ' ומה רשעי אומות העולם נתלה להן בשביל צדקה ישראל שעושין צדקה בכל שעה על אחת כמה וכמה וכן את מוצא במלכות אדום הרשעה שלא שעבדה בישראל אלא בזכות צדקה שעשה עשו וכן חגי מתנבא ואומ' עוד אחת מעט היא אמ' להן עוד מצוה קלה אחת שיש לו לעשו בידו היא שהעמידה בידו את המלכות · אחת זו ברכה שבירכו אביו ויאמר עשו אל אביו הברכה אחת היא לך אבי מעט זו צדקה שעשה תאמ' שהיה יצחק צריך לו והלא מצינו שהיה גדול מאביו באברהם הוא אומ' וה' ברך את אדני מאד ויגדל אבל ביצחק הוא אומ' ויגדל האיש וילך הלוך וגדול עד כי גדל מאוד הרי שלש גדולות

והרי הדברים קל וחמ׳ ומה אם זה שעשה לאביו והוא חייב לאביו ולא היה אביו צריך לו גרם לו ליטול מלכות העולם הזה המאכיל את העניים הרעבים ואת הצריכן על אהת במה וכמה לכך הנביא מזהיר שמרו משפט ועשו צדקה.

The way in which the various clerical errors are to be corrected is easily seen, and there is no need to dwell on them. We shall now try to give parallels and extracts from other MS. to each Derasha by itself. L. 648-62, שכר—שהרי. See *Torath Kohanim* 27*a*, for a parallel. The sentence relating to אחאב (l. 653-58, אחאב—כמה וכמה) is misplaced here, and must, according to MH., be transposed after the words מפני השכינה, l. 671. Cp. CH. I. 5, § 2, *Pesikta* K. 160*b*, *Synhedrin* 102*b*, אחאב וותרן היה. וכו׳. L. 662-71, השכינה—וכן אתה מוצא. This passage is quoted in YM.Is., p. 9, from which we give here the most important correction. L. 665, בפני עושה הנותן איסר ; l. 670, ולא עמד (עוד) ; l. 170, אינו מדמה ; l. 671, היא גדולה (אין גדולה) ; ll. 671-689, ומניין מדרש צדקה תרומם גוי צדקה. YM.MP. 121*a*, צדקה תולה— שעשה עשו היא גרמה לו שקבל מלכות יתר שכן הוא אומ׳ ע״י חגי שהיו הנביאים מצטערים על ישראל ואומ׳ עד מתי יגיע קצינו אמר להם עוד אחת מעט היא עד עכשו יש להם שתי מלכיות שיעבדו אותן מלכות יון ומלכות עשו ומה זכות היתה ביד יון בזכותו של יפת שהם····· השמלה ואין המקום מאבד שכר כל בריה אמ׳ יעמד מדי ופרס מיפת ויקבל מלכות וישעבד את ישראל שנה ויעמוד וקיבל אחריו מאה ושמונים שנה בזכותו שכבד את אביו שנה אחת במלכות מדי עמד חגי אמר הבה עוד קיים לה עוד אחת מעט זו מלכות עשו שהיו בידו שתי מצות שהאמין באביו ואמ׳ לו הברכה אחת לך אבי זו האמנה שהאמין באביו מעט זו הצדקה שעשה וכי עשה בצדקה מימיו אלא מה שנ׳ ויאהב יצחק את עשו אמ׳ הבה כדי היא האמונה שעשה שאתן לו המלכות הא אף לרשעים צדקה תולה. See *Abodah Zarah*, 8*b* and 9*a*, סע״ר XXX. and LR. XXIX. 2. We shall accordingly read in l. 678, יעמד יון מיפת see also GR. LXV. 16, with regard to the merits of עשו. See CH. II. 7, about the end, ר׳ יודן אמ׳ אהבה שאהב יצחק, etc. L. 689-702, וכן דניאל····· של צדקה. See ER. XXX. 24; l. 691, read מנכסי instead of מנסכי.

L. 702-3, ד״א—הארץ. See YS. II. 138*a*, quoted there from מדרש שיר השירים ; cp. NR. I. 9. Perhaps it was one of the Derashoth in *Pesikta* K. פ׳ שקלים.

L. 704-706. ד״א—מנחה. YS. *ibid.*, omitting the words ומביאים נקרונות וכפרימין. Perhaps we should read קרונות וכמריסין. See *Sifre* 14*a*, PK. 9*a* and *Aruch*, *s.v.* כמרוסא and קמר, or, perhaps, דורונות וכלדיקים; cp. CH. IV. 8, § 2.

L. 707-13. ד״א - כמה וכמה. YS. *ibid.*, in a shorter form; l. 707 read מקבלין instead of מקלסין; cp. *Shabbath* 33*b*.

L. 713-18. ד״א—חרב. YS. *ibid.*

L. 718-23. ד״א—ביניהם. Omitted in the YS.; l. 719, read לאומים חטאת (instead of ל׳ חסד).

L. 723-42. ד״א—לעשות וגו׳. YS. *ibid.*, in a very shortened and defective form. For the better understanding of those lines as well as of some of the preceding Derashoth, we give here also the following abstract from MH.:—ד״א ושמר ה׳ אלהיך לך את הברית ואת החסד זה חסד שניתן לאברהם אבינו שנ׳ תתן אמת ליעקב חסד לאברהם ולא נתחייבו או״ה כלייה אלא בזכות חסד שעשה אבינו אברהם ועליו הוא אומ׳ וחסד לאומים חטאת חסד שעשה אברהם אבי׳ הוא היה כעם על האומות א״ל הקב״ה לאו״ה הרי עשרים דור משנברא אדם הראשון ועד שבא אברהם לעולם ולא עמד אחד מהם ובנה מזבח עד שבא אברהם ובנה מזבח לשמי שנ׳ ויבן שם מזבח ויקרא בשם ה׳ • ד״א וחסד לאומים חטאת חסד שעשה יצחק הוא עמד לבניו במדבר שנ׳ כה אמ׳ ה׳ מצא חן במדבר • ד״א חסד שעשה יעקב הוא עמד לבניו להתגבר בין האומות שיהיו אומות ומלכיות מביאין אותן בסוסים וברכב ובצבים ובפרדים ובכרכרות • ד״א וחסד לאומים חטאת חסד שעשה יוסף הוא גרם לו ליטול מלכות במצרים שנ׳ אלה תולדות יעקב יוסף בן שבע עשרה שנה • והלא הוא משמש את יעקב אביו בבית המדרש אלא מלמד שאפילו בחיי אביו הוא היה מפרנס את אחיו • ד״א וחסד לאומים חטאת חסד שעשה מרודך הוא היה כעם על חזקיהו שנ׳ בעת ההיא שלח מראדך בלאדן ספרים ומנחה אל חזקיה • ד״א וחסד לאומים חטאת חסד שעשה בן הדד הוא היה כעם על אחזיהו שבן הדד כשחל השלח מלאכים אל אלישע ואמר לו האחיה מחולי זה ואחזהו נפל לתוך גזוזטרא שלו והלך לדרוש בבעל זבוב ואלהי עקרון באותה שעה ניטלה מלכות משומרון ונתנה למצרים שנ׳ כה אמר ה׳ כאשר יציל הרועה מפי הארי שתי כרעים או בדל אזן כן ינצלו וגו׳ • ד״א וחסד לאומים חטאת חסד שעשו אנשי נינוה הוא היה כעם על או״ה א״ל הקב״ה לאו״ה מפני מה לא עשיתם תשובה לפני כדרך שעשו אנשי נינוה תשובה שלימה לפני • ד״א וחסד לאומים חטאת חסד שאו״ה עושין הוא היה חטאת להם ומהוא חסד שהן עושין בונין דימסאות

ומרחצאות שירחצו בהם עניים ועשירים וכי מה בכך אלא בשעה שהן בונין אותן אומרין הניחו מקום שנעבוד בו ע"ז הניחו מקום שבו נחביא את הזונות נמצאת זכותן היא חובתן · והרי דברים ק"ו ומה דבר שהן סוברין שיזכו בו הן חייבין בו חטאיהם על אחת כמה וכמה · ד"א וחסד לאומים חטאת חסד שעשה משה הוא גרם לשכינה לירד למצרים להציל את ישראל ממצרים · ד"א וחסד לאומים חטאת חסד שעשו ישראל הוא גרם להן להידבק בשכינה שנ' ואתם הדבקים בה' אלהיכם חיים כולכם היום. See PK., pp. 12, 13 and 14; *Baba Bathra*, 10*b*; *Tanchuma* כי תשא, § 8, and עקב, § 3, and אור זרוע, 3*d*, the passage quoted there from the ילמדנו (cp. Jellinek's *Beth Hammidrash* V. 162). See also *Mechilta* 1*b*, with regard to נינוה and הגוים. Cp. also Rashi to Amos iii. 12: קרובי תשובה. ד"א מצאתי בדברי ר' מאיר זצ"ל בפאת מטה בעון אחזיה בן אחאב ששלח לדרוש בבעל זבוב אלהי עקרון האחיה מחלי זה ובדמשק ערש בן הדד מלך ארם שלח לדרוש באלהי ישראל.

L. 742-43. וכן משה—ממות. Here, probably some proof from נביאים is missing. See תד"אז I.; cp. YS. I. 24*a*; see also *Jerushalmi Peah* 15*a*, צדקה וג"ח שוקלת כנגד כל מצותיה של תורה.

L. 743-72. ומהו—קללות. See for the whole passage LR. XXXIV. 11, and YM.Is., pp. 229 and 237, from מדרש or הגדת שה"ש. The most important corrections are, according to the latter, l. 756, ומה אני (אנו); *ibid.*, אכסנו (ויכם), and l. 757, תהפוך פנים מהן. L. 744, מונעי צדקה····· ברכות לנותני צדקה. Read also, in l. 771, מן הצדקה (הצדיקים).

L. 772-80. הנותנין—באי עולם. YS. 176*d*, § 985 (omitting, however, from ד"א—לאביהן). (For Derashoth of an opposite tendency see NR. XXI. 16.)

L. 780-83. ד"א—ליריאיך. YS. *ibid.*, according to which we have to supply the word שכר after נותן, l. 783, and so we have to supply אומרת after the word ישראל, l. 781.

L. 783-84. ד"א—לפי מעשיו. Omitted in YS. See CH. I. 16, § 1. רבש"ע אף שאת מבא עלי, etc.

L. 784-88. אף ערשנו—מדמשק. YS. *ibid.*, YM.MP. 29*b*, מד"רש אף ערשנו רעננה אלו עשרת השבטים שגלו לפנים מסמבטיון כמה שנ' בפאת מטה מלמד שלא שייר הב"ה אלא אחד משמונה בהם וי"א אחד משבעה ר' אליעזר אומ' אחד משמנה של מטה ממה שנ' בפאת מטה

והפאה של מטה אחד משמונה של מטה הרי לך שתי פאות ושתי ירכים וארבע רגלים והמטה כולה להיכן הלכה לפנים מדמשק. See סע"ר XXII. Cp. Rashi, Amos iii. 12, ושמעתי משמו של רבי מנחם זצל שהיה מפרש זו אחד משמונה וכו'. The passage is also quoted by R. Abraham b. Moses Maimon from the מדרש שה"ש. See Epstein's אלדד הדני, p. 71, and especially his important note, pp. 79 and 80.

L. 789-91. קורות—לשלמה. Supply in l. 790 ביתו after ובנה; instead of משה in l. 791, read מצור. See CH. I. 1, § 5.

L. 791-95. כולה—ד"א. See *Yoma* 38*a*.

L. 795-98. השכינה—ד"א. In Deut. xxxiii. 21 and 1 Kings vii. 3, we read ספון וספון instead of צפון. See YS. I. 263*a*. Cp. CH. I. 17, § 3, at the end.

S. Schechter.

PHILO.

CONCERNING THE CONTEMPLATIVE LIFE.

(THE SUPPLIANTS, OR THE FOURTH BOOK CONCERNING VIRTUES.)

1.—I HAVE now spoken of the Essenes who followed with zeal and constant diligence the life of Action, and so excelled in all, or, to say what after all some bear not to hear said, in most particulars. And therefore I will presently, following the due sequence of my treatise, say whatever is meet to be said about them that have embraced contemplation, though without adding aught out of my own mind in order to exalt them unduly, as are wont to do all the poets and composers of tales in their dearth of noble examples. But I adhere simply to the bare truth, before which I know well even the most eloquent tongue will be weak and fail. Yet must I face the struggle and strive to master the task. For the greatness of these men's excellency must not be a cause of dumbness to them that hold that nothing noble should be hidden in silence. M. 471.

But the purpose and will of the lovers of wisdom is discovered in their very name and title ; for they are most fitly called healers,[1] male and female. Either by reason of their professing an art of healing more excellent than that which is found in cities ; for this heals men's bodies alone, but that their souls also, when overcome by diseases difficult and hard to heal, souls smitten and undone by pleasures and lusts and sorrows and fears, by forms of avarice and folly and injustice, and all the countless swarm of passions and vices :—for this reason, or because they have been educated by nature and the holy laws to worship the true Being, which is more excellent than the good, and simpler than the unit, and more primitive than the Monad. M. 472.

And with these men, whom is it proper to compare of those who make profession of piety ? Shall it be those who honour the elements, earth, water, air, fire ? Things to which some have attached one surname, others another, calling fire Hephæstus, I trow because it is kindled ; and the air Hera[2], because it is raised aloft and uplifted on high ; and water Poseidon, perhaps because it is potable ; and the

[1] The Greek word Therapeutæ means both "healers" and "worshippers."

[2] The writer's puns on the names Hephæstus and Hera cannot be reproduced in English.

earth Demeter, because it seems to be mother of all things, plants and animals. Albeit, these names are the inventions of shallow teachers ; and as for the elements, they are soulless matter, which of itself cannot stir, but is subjected by the artificer to all kinds of shapes and qualities.

Shall we then compare those who worship the finished works of creation, sun, moon, and the rest of the stars, wandering or fixed, or those who adore even the entire heaven and universe ? Yet even these came not into being of themselves, but by the hand of some creator perfect in his knowledge.

Shall we then compare those who honour the demi-gods ? Yet surely this at least is worthy of actual ridicule. For how can the same man be both mortal and immortal ? Not to mention that the very source of their being is open to censure as being tainted with that youthful incontinence, which men impiously dare to attribute to the blessed and God-like Powers ; when they declare that these beings who have no part in any passion and are thrice-happy, were filled with mad lust for mortal women and so chambered with them.

Shall we then compare the worshippers of rude idols and of images ? Yet the substances of which these are wrought, are stocks and stones, things quite shapeless up to a little time before ; the stonemasons and woodcutters having severed them from the masses to which by nature they belonged. And, moreover, their germane and kindred portions have been turned into pails and foot-baths, and into certain other vessels of dishonour, subservient rather to the wants fulfilled in darkness than to those fulfilled in the light of day. For to the rites of the Egyptians it is not well even to allude ; for they have advanced to divine honours brutes which are without reason ; and of these not only the tame ones, but even the fiercest of the wild beasts, from every species under the moon, the lion among land animals, and the crocodile of their country, of those which live in the water ; but of those which roam the air, the kite, and the Egyptian ibis. Albeit, they see these animals being begotten and standing in need of food, and insatiable in respect of eating and stuffed full of excrement, shooting out poison and devouring human beings, and beset with all sorts of diseases, and often perishing not merely by a natural death, but by violence. Nevertheless, they render homage to them, tame beings to the untamed and wild, rational to the irrational, they that have kinship with the godhead to creatures
M. 473. which one would not set on an equality with the apes of humanity, the lords and masters of creation to their natural subjects and slaves.

2.—But, forasmuch as these men infect with their folly, not only their own countrymen, but also those that live in their very neighbourhood, let them remain unhealed, their eyes—the most indispensable of their senses—maimed and useless. And I speak not of the eye of the body,

but of the soul's eye, wherewith truth and falsehood are known and recognised. But, on the other hand, let the Therapeutic kind, that hath not only the eye, but is ever learning beside to see with it, aspire to a vision of the true Being; let it even soar above the sun which our senses behold, and never forsake this post which leads to perfect happiness. But those who draw nigh unto holiness,[1] do so not from custom, nor from advice, or exhortations of any; but because they are rapt by heavenly love, like Bacchants or Corybantic revellers, and are lost in ecstasy until they behold the desire of their souls. But then, out of their yearning after the immortal and blessed life, they esteem their mortal life to have already ended, and so leave their possessions to their sons or daughters, or, in default of them, to other kinsmen, of their own free will leaving to these their heritage in advance; but, if they have no kinsmen, to their comrades and friends. For it needs must be that they who have received the wealth which sees from a free and open store, should resign the wealth which is blind to those whose minds are still blinded.

The Greeks sing the praises of Anaxagoras and Democritus, because, smitten with the desire for wisdom, they gave up their properties to be sheep-runs. I, too, admire these men for having risen superior to wealth. Yet how much better are those who, instead of abandoning their possessions for the beasts to batten upon, ministered to the wants of human beings, kinsmen or friends, aiding them in their need, and raising them from helpless poverty into affluence! For, indeed, their much-praised action was ill-considered, not to use the word "mad," of men whom Greece admired. But the conduct of these is sober, and exhibits the perfection proper to the highest wisdom. What worse acts do one's country's enemies commit than to cut down the crops and hew down the trees of those with whom they are at war, in order that a scarcity of the necessaries of life may weigh hard on them and compel them to give in? Yet this is what men like Democritus did to their own blood-relations, inventing an artificial want and hunger for them; not, it may be, of malice prepense, but because they did not look round them and have an eye to foresee what was for the benefit of their fellows.

How much superior, then, and more admirable are these men whom I describe! whose enthusiasm for Philosophy was no whit less than theirs, while at the same time they preferred to be magnanimous to being contemptuous and neglectful; and so freely gave away their properties instead of letting them go to ruin, in order, by so doing, to advantage others as well as themselves—others, by surrounding them with plenty; M. 474 themselves, by their devotion to philosophy. For the cares of wealth

[1] Literally "Therapy," *i.e.*, the part of those who heal others or who worship.

and chattels consume the users thereof ; but it is well to husband our time, since, as the physician Hippocrates saith, " Life is short, but art is long." And methinks this, too, is what Homer hinted at in the Iliad, at the beginning of the thirteenth rhapsody, in these words :—

Of the Masi, fighting hand-to-hand, and of the high-born mare-milkers,
That live on milk, and are simple in life—most just men.

He means that anxiety about life and money-making begets injustice by the inequality it produces, whereas the opposite motive begets justice through equality. And it is in accordance with such equality that the wealth of nature has its limits assigned, and excels that which consists in vainglory and empty fancies.

So soon, then, as they have divested themselves of their properties, without allowing anything to further ensnare them, they flee without turning back, having abandoned brethren, children, wives, parents, all the throng of their kindred, all their friendships with companions, yea, their countries in which they were born and bred. For, in truth, what we are familiar with has an attractive force, and is the most powerful of baits. However, they do not go away to live in another city ; like those who claim of their owners to be sold, unhappy wights or naughty slaves, and who so win for themselves, not freedom, but a mere change of masters. For every city, even the best governed, teems with riots and disasters, and troubles untold, which no one would endure that had once
M. 475. let himself be led by wisdom. Rather do they make for themselves their settlements outside the walls, in gardens or solitary cots, seeking solitude, not from any harsh and deliberate hatred of mankind, but as knowing that the intercourse with and the influence of those unlike themselves in character cannot profit, but only harm them.

3.—Now this kind is to be found in many parts of the world ; for it is right that the Greeks, as well as Barbarians, should have their portion in the perfect good. But it is very numerous in Egypt in each of the so-called Nomes, and most of all in the neighbourhood of Alexandria. And the best people from all parts, as if they were going to the native country of the Therapeutæ, leave their homes and emigrate to a certain spot most suitable, which is situate above the lake Marea, upon a low hill, very conveniently placed both for its security and well-tempered climate. The requisite security is afforded by the hamlets and villages which lie all around ; and the well-tempered climate by the breezes given off without ceasing, both from the lake debouching into the sea, and from the sea in close proximity. The sea-breezes are light, and those which blow from the lake are heavy, but blended they produce a most healthy condition of atmosphere.

And the dwellings of those thus met together are indeed of a cheap and simple kind, affording protection against the two things which most require it, namely, the extreme heat of the sun and the chilly cold of

the air. For they are neither too close to one another, as in towns; since close proximity would be burdensome and ill-pleasing to those who are seeking for solitude; nor, on the other hand, are they far apart, lest they forfeit the communion which they prize and the power of aiding each other in case of an attack of robbers.

But in each house there is a holy room, which is called the sanctuary and monastery; because in it they celebrate all alone the mysteries of the holy life, bringing into it nothing, neither drink, nor food, nor any other of the things necessary unto the wants of the body; but only the law and the oracles delivered under inspiration by the prophets along with the Psalms, and the other (books) by means of which religion and sound knowledge grow together into one perfect whole.

And so it is that they for ever remember God and forget him not; in such wise that even in their dreams they picture to themselves nothing else but the beauties of the divine excellencies and powers. Yea, and many of them even utter forth in their sleep, when lapt in dreams, the glorious doctrines of their holy philosophy.

And twice every day they are accustomed to pray, about dawn and about eventide; praying at sunrise for a fair day for themselves, for the day, which is really fair, which meaneth that their minds be filled with heavenly light. But at sunset they pray that the soul be wholly relieved of the disorderly throng of the senses and of sensible things, and left free to track out and explore truth in its own conclave and council-chamber.

But the entire interval from dawn to evening is given up by them to spiritual exercises. For they read the holy scriptures and draw out in thought and allegory their ancestral code of law. Since they regard the literal meanings as symbols of an inner and hidden nature revealing itself in covert ideas. But they have also writings drawn up by the men of a former age, who were the founders of their sect, and left many commentaries upon the idea involved in the allegories; and these writings they use as exemplars of a kind, emulating the ideal of character traced out in them. And so it is that they do not only contemplate, but also compose songs and hymns to God in divers strains and measures, which they write out in solemn rhythms as best they can. M. 476.

Now during the six days they remain apart, in strict isolation one from the other, in their houses in the monasteries afore mentioned; never passing the courtyard gate, nay, not even surveying it from a distance. But every seventh day they come together, as it were, into a common assembly; and sit down in order according to age in the becoming posture; holding their hands inwards, the right hand between the chest and the chin, but the left tucked down along the flank. And then the one that is eldest and most skilled in their principles discourses, with steady glance and steady voice, with argument and wisdom; not

making a display of his cleverness in speaking, like the rhetors or the sophists of to-day, but having carefully sifted and carefully interpreting the exact meaning of the thoughts, which meaning doth not merely alight on the outer ear, but passes through their organs of hearing into the soul, and there firmly abides.[1] But the others all listen, in silence, merely hinting their approval by an inclination of eye or head.

And this common sanctuary, in which they meet on the seventh days, is a double enclosure, divided into one chamber for the men and another for the women. For women, too, as well as men, of custom form part of the audience, having the same zeal and following the same mode of life. But the wall which runs midway up the buildings is, part of it, built up together like a breastwork from the floor to a height of three or four cubits ; but that part which extends above the ground (or as a loft) up to the roof is left open for two reasons : namely, to safeguard the modesty which is proper to woman's nature, and, at the same time, to facilitate on the part of those who sit within the auditory the apprehension of what is said ; there being nothing to impede the voice of him that discourses from passing freely to them.

4.—But continence they lay down, as it were, as a primitive foundation for the soul, and on it they build up the rest of the virtues. And not one of them will partake of meat or drink before sunset ; in as much as they judge the pursuit of wisdom to be consonant with the light, just as the wants of the body are with the darkness. Wherefore, they assign to the former the day, but to the latter an insignificant portion of the night only. And some there are, who at the end of three days bethink themselves of food, those, namely, in whom a more profound love of knowledge is seated. But others, again, so delight and luxuriate in the banquet, in which wisdom spreads out before them in bounteous wealth her teachings, that they abstain for double that period, and barely taste of so much food as will keep them alive at the end of six
M. 477. days ; having accustomed themselves, as they say the grasshoppers have, to live upon air ; for the song of these, I suppose, assuages the feeling of want. The seventh day, however, they regard as in a manner all holy and all festal, and have therefore deemed it worthy of peculiar dignity. And on it, after due attention to the soul, they anoint the body, releasing it, just as you might the lower animals, from the long spell of toil. But their diet comprises nothing expensive, but only cheap bread ; and its relish is salt, which the dainty among them prepare with hyssop ; and for drink they have water from a spring. For they propitiate the mistresses hunger and thirst, which nature has set over mortal creatures, offering nothing that can flatter them, but merely such useful food as life cannot be supported without. For this reason

[1] Cp. John Evang. xv. 7.

they eat only so as not to be hungry, and drink only so as not to thirst ; avoiding all surfeit as dangerous and inimical to body and soul.

There are then two kinds of shelter, the one consisting in the raiment, the other in the house ; and we have already spoken of their houses, declaring them to be unadorned, of a rough and ready description, constructed for utility alone. But as to their raiment, it also like the house is of a very cheap kind, by way of protection only against cold and heat ; being a thick cloak in winter, instead of a shaggy hide ; but in summer a smock without sleeves, the linen coat namely. For they, in all respects, carry out their ideal of modest simplicity, being aware that falsehood is the beginning of pride, but truth of simplicity ; and that each is like a fountain head. For from falsehood flow the manifold forms of all evils, but from truth the wealth and fulness of blessings, both human and divine.

But it is my wish to describe their common gatherings also, and their more cheerful ways of relaxation in their banquets, contrasting therewith the banquets of the rest of the world. For others when they have swilled themselves full of strong wine, are, as if they had drunk, not wine, but some deranging and maddening potion, or any other drug more baleful still in its power of unseating the reason. And they yell and rage like wild dogs, and set upon and bite one another, nipping of one anothers' noses, ears and fingers and any other parts of the body ; in such wise as to demonstrate the truth of the old story about Cyclops and the companions of Ulysses. For they devour, as the poet says, gobbets of human flesh, and with worse ferocity than he displayed. For he suspected that they were enemies and was defending himself. But it is their own familiar friends, yea, sometimes even kinsmen at their board and partaking of their salt, whom, in the midst of peace they treat so implacably ; behaving with the violence proper to a wrestling match ; but counterfeiting, as it were, the genuine coinage of training, wretches instead of wrestlers they, for there is no other term to apply to them. For deeds which the athletes perform soberly, and in the arena, having for spectators all the Hellenes in the light of day, scientifically, and for the sake of victory and of the M. 478. wreaths which grace the Olympic victor's brow ; these miscreants perform in spurious imitation at their banquets, in the darkness of night, like the drunken, disorderly demons they are ; without science, nay, with evil art, to the dishonour and insulting and deadly injury of their victims. And unless someone like an umpire intervene and separate them, they take yet more licence in their struggles ; dealing death and courting it at one and the same time. For the sufferings they incur are not less than those which they inflict ; though they do not realise these in their paroxysms of folly ; who are ready to drink wine not, as the comic poet says, to the harm of their neighbours alone, but to their own as well.

Wherefore it is that those who a little before went in to their banquets sound in body and good friends, quit them a little later as enemies, with their members mutilated ; and some require the service of surgeons and physicians, while others have to resort to lawyers and judges.

But some others of what appears to be a more moderate type of boon-companion, as if the strong wine they have drunk were mandragor, hiccup it up ; and pushing forward their left elbow and turning back their necks aslant, vomit up into the cups ; and are weighed down with deep sleep, so that they neither see nor hear anything, as retaining but a single sense only, and that the most slavish of them, namely taste.

But some I know who, so soon as they begin to reel with drink and before they are quite drowned therein, arrange beforehand to drink on the morrow, getting subscriptions and giving tickets ; as deeming the sure hope of future intoxication to be an element in the good cheer which at the moment they are enjoying.

In such wise they eke out their lives, remaining ever without home and hearth ; enemies of their parents and wives and children, and enemies too of their own country ; but most of all at war with themselves. For their sottish and abandoned life is a menace to everyone.

6.—It may be that some will approve of the arrangement of banquets which now everywhere prevails, out of love for that Italian fashion of sumptuosity and luxury, which both Hellenes and Barbarians have studiously followed, making all their preparations more for ostentation than for simple good cheer. Couches both for three to recline upon, and which extend all round, are manufactured of tortoise-shell or ivory, and of the more valuable woods ; and of them most parts are inlaid with precious stones. On them are laid cloths of purple with gold inwoven, as well as others dyed with divers bright colours, in order to attract the eye. And there is a multitude of cups set out of every kind. For there are drinkinghorns and bowls and cups and other vessels of many varieties ; Thericlean goblets most artistically made and daintily chased and embossed with reliefs by clever workmen. Then
M. 479. there are slaves to wait upon one, of graceful form and passing fair, as having been brought there not so much to do work, as to show themselves, and by doing so give pleasure to the eyes of the spectators. Of these, those that are still boys pour out the wine, while the big lads carry the water, all well washed and made smooth ; and their faces are painted with cosmetics, and their eyes underlined, and the hair of their head is neatly plaited and tightly braided. For they wear the hair long, either not having it cut at all, or merely having the hair over the forehead cut at the tips and trimmed off equally all round, in a neatly bevelled curved line. And their chitons are of materials spun as thin as a spider's web, and are of

a dazzling white; and they wear them well tucked up. In front they fall lower than beneath the knee; but behind a little under the hips, but each part drawn together along the line of join of the half chitons with bows of twisted ribbons doubled over; so that the folds may hang down obliquely, the hollows of the sides being puffed and broadened out.

And yet others wait in relays, youths on whose chins the first down of youth is just beginning to bloom; that were but a little time ago the playthings of Pæderasts, and are now tricked out with very superfluous finery for any services of a toilsome kind; by way of showing off the wealth of the hosts, as those who use them are well aware; but in reality it is a display of vulgarity.

Besides all this there are the varieties of cakes and viands and sauces over which the bread-makers and cooks are hard at work; solicitous to please, not merely the palate, as might be necessary, but the eyes as well by their refinery. At least seven or more tables[1] are brought in, containing all the products of land and sea, of rivers and the air; all carefully chosen and fattened up. There is flesh and fish and fowl, and each kind excels in the way in which it is served up and garnished; for they take care that nothing is left out of the things which nature can supply. So last of all the tables are brought in groaning under a weight of fruit, not to mention the festal cups, and the so-called knick-knacks that end up the repast. Then some tables are carried away, depleted by the gluttony of the company, who stuff themselves like gulls, and gobble down their food, so as actually to eat up bones and all; though other dishes they merely spoil by pulling them about, and then leave them half-eaten. And so soon as they are quite beaten, because their stomachs are gorged up to their very throats, though their lust of food is as unsatisfied as ever, being thoroughly exhausted and incapable of taking more food; they turn their necks this way and that, and gloat over it with their eyes and nostrils; with the one appreciating the fatness of the viands, and their quantity, and with the other the good smell steaming up from them. And then, when they are quite surfeited, both with the look and the smell, they urge others to eat, by praising extravagantly the way the viands are served, as also the host for sparing no expense.

But what need is there to dwell on these things, when they are already condemned by most respectable people, as stretching to bursting point lusts of which it were better to minimise the strength. For one may well pray for hunger and thirst, which are most deprecated of all M. 480. things, rather than for the excess and waste of meats and drinks which there is at such banquets.

7.—The two most celebrated and remarkable banquets that ever were in

[1] In antiquity each course of a dinner was brought in on a separate table.

Hellas, are those at which Socrates himself was present. The one was in Callias' house, and was held when Autolycus won the wreath, as a feast in honour of his victory. The other was in Agathon's house. And they were judged worthy of being remembered by men who were philosophers in character and language, to wit, Xenophon and Plato. For these writers have left accounts of them as being worthy of commemoration, because they supposed that posterity would use them as models of the conduct and mode of entertainment which is meet and befitting in banquets. Nevertheless, even these as compared with the banquets of our co-religionists, who have embraced the contemplative life, will plainly appear ridiculous.

Now the one and the other of them has its pleasing traits ; but that of Xenophon is the more suitable to mankind. For there are flute-girls and dancers, and jugglers and jesters, priding themselves on their jokes and wittiness. And there are also some other inducements to hilarity and relaxation.

But the Platonic treatise is almost wholly about love, not merely of men madly enamoured of women, or of women with men, for these passions are subject to the laws of nature ; but of men madly enamoured with males who only differ from themselves in age. For any refinements that there may seem to be in the treatise about Eros and the heavenly Aphrodite, are merely dragged in by way of being clever and amusing. For the greater part of it is taken up by the common and vulgar Eros, that filches away the virtue of manliness, so beneficial in war and peace ; and engenders in the soul instead a female disease, turning into effeminate creatures those who should rather be trained and braced in all masculine pursuits. And it also does irremediable harm to the youth of the boys, by reducing them to the level and condition of mistresses. At the same time, it does harm in essential respects to the lovers, namely to their body, soul and property. For the lover of boys cannot help having his mind put on the stretch for his darlings, having no keenness of vision for anything else but them, and at the same time he becomes blinded with respect to all other interests private and public. But his body is wasted by lust, especially if he is unsuccessful in winning his desire. His property however, suffers in two ways, by his at once neglecting it and lavishing it on the object of his amours. And, moreover, there must grow up along with it another still greater evil affecting the whole people, namely desolation of cities and scarcity of men, the lords of creation. For they artificially create a sterility and incapacity of offspring, who imitate those ignorant of husbandry, in
M. 481. sowing not the deep-soiled plain, but land tinged with salt, or stony and rough places ; which are not only of such a nature as to allow of no growth, but also destroy the seed cast upon them.

I say nothing of the mythical figments, and monsters with two bodies ;

which to begin with, grew together by mutual attraction in one mass, and afterwards were separated, as if parts which had merely come together, owing to the dissolution of the bond which held them together. For all such stories as these easily lead men astray ; as they can entice their ears by the novelty of the idea. But from a lofty vantage ground the disciples of Moses can despise such tales ; and keep themselves free from the deception, having learned from their tenderest age to love the truth.

8.—However, since the banquets so widely known are infected with such folly, and so carry in themselves their own condemnation to any one who cares to have regard to anything except fashion and the glamour of their reputation for being entirely correct and faultless of their kind ; I will contrast the banquets of those who have devoted all their means of livelihood as well as themselves to the knowledge and contemplation of the realities of nature, in accordance with the most holy counsels of the prophet Moses.

These meet together for the first time after seven weeks, out of reverence not only for the simple seventh, but for its power as well. For they recognise its holy and eternally virgin character. But this meeting is the eve-celebration of the greatest festival, which the number fifty has had assigned to it, as being the most holy and natural of numbers, being composed out of the power of the right-angled triangle, which is the source of the creation of the universe.

When, therefore, they have met in white raiment and with cheerful aspect, yet with the deepest solemnity, one of the Ephemereutæ (*i.e.*, leaders of the ceremonies chosen afresh day by day) gives a sign ; and before laying themselves down on the couches, they take their stand one after another in a row in orderly fashion, and upturn their eyes and outstretch their hands to heaven ; their eyes, since they have been taught to behold things which merit to be seen ; but their hands, because they are pure from unjust gains, being stained by no pretence of money-getting. So standing they pray to God that their festivity may be pleasing in his sight and acceptable. But after the prayer, the Elders lie down, each in the order of his election into the society. For they do not regard as elders those who can count their years and are merely aged ; but, on the contrary, account these to be still mere infants, in case they have been late in embracing the vocation. Elders are, in their regard, those who from their earliest age have passed their youth M. 482. and maturity in the contemplative branch of philosophy, which truly is the noblest and most divine.

But women, also, join in the banquet, of whom most are aged virgins, that have preserved intact their chastity ; not so much under constraint, like some priestesses among the Hellenes, as of their own free wills, and because of their zeal and longing for Wisdom ; with whom they

were anxious to live, and therefore despised the pleasures of the body. For they yearned not for mortal progeny, but for the immortal which the god-enamoured soul is alone able to bring forth of itself, because the father has sown into it rays of reason, whereby it can behold the principles of wisdom.

But they do not lie down indiscriminately, but the men's couches are set apart on the right-hand side, and those of the women apart on the left. Perhaps some one imagines that couches, if not of a very expensive kind, yet, anyhow, fairly soft, have been got ready for persons who, like themselves, are nobly born and of goodly life and practisers of philosophy. Well, they are beds of a rude material, on which are laid very cheap palliasses made of the native papyrus, raised a little near the elbows in order that they may lean upon them. For they remit the harshness of the Laconic discipline ; but practise always and everywhere the contentedness of true freedom, by opposing might and main the seductions of pleasure.

And they are not waited on by slaves, because they deem any possession of servants whatever to be contrary to nature. For she hath begotten all men alike free ; but the injustice and greedy oppression of some who were zealous for the inequality that is the source of all evil, laid a yoke on the weaker ones and gave the control into the hands of the stronger. In this holy banquet, then, there is, as I said, no slave ; but the service is one of entire freedom, and they perform such service and waiting as is required, not under constraint nor even waiting for orders, but spontaneously, and even anticipate their orders by their careful and ready zeal. For it is not any and every free man who is appointed to discharge these duties, but the novices of the society chosen by merit in the most careful manner ; as needs should be godly persons and noble, that are pressing on to win the heights of virtue. And these, like true sons, gladly submit to wait upon their fathers and mothers, and covet it as an honour ; for they regard them as their common parents, and as more their own than those who are so by blood ; inasmuch as in the regard of those who are high-minded, nothing is more one's own and akin to oneself than true righteousness.

And they go in to do the waiting with their chitons loose and not girt
M. 483. up, in order not to wear the least appearance of being slaves or of demeaning themselves as such.

Into this banquet—I know that some will make merry, when they hear of it. However only they will do so, whose own actions are matter for tears and lamentations—on the days in question wine is not brought to table, but the clearest and purest water ; cold for the many, but warm for such of the more aged as are of a delicate habit of life. And the table is free from the animal food, which would pollute it ; and on it is set bread to eat, with salt as a relish ; to which hyssop is sometimes

added as a seasoning to sweeten it, for the sake of the luxurious among them. For right reason, as it counsels the priests to offer sober sacrifices, so it counsels these to live soberly. For wine is a drug of folly, and expensive viands arouse lust, the most insatiable of brute beasts.

9.—And such are the preliminaries. But after the banqueters have lain them down in the positions set forth by me, and while those who are serving stand in due order ready for service ; their president, when silence has been established all round—and when is there anything but silence ? some one will ask ;—anyhow there is now a deeper silence than before, such that no one ventures to mutter or even take a loud breath—the president, I say, then, examines for himself some text in the scriptures, or explains one that has been put forward by another. And, in doing so, he does not concern himself to make a parade of his learning ; for he does not aspire to the reputation which is earned by cleverness in discussion. But he simply desires to see for himself certain things with fair exactitude, and having seen them to be in no wise grudging towards those who, even if they are not as sharp-sighted as himself, have at any rate as earnest a desire to learn. And so he proceeds in a leisurely way with his instruction, lingering and going slowly over the points ; and, by recapitulating them, impresses them on their souls. For if he ran on, and without pausing for breath made a rigmarole of his exposition, the mind of his audience would find itself incapable of keeping pace with him, and falling behind would miss the drift of his remarks. But they turn their faces upwards to him and remain in one and the same attitude as they listen ; signifying by a nod or a look that they understand and have taken in his meaning, and by their cheerfulness and by slightly turning their faces about their praise of the speaker; while perplexity they show by a very gentle movement of the head and with a finger-tip of the right hand. But the younger members who stand by attend to the discourse no less than those who have lain down.

But the exposition of sacred writ proceeds by unfolding the meaning hidden in allegories. For the entire law is regarded by these persons as resembling an animal ; and for its body it has the literal precepts, but for its soul the unseen reason (or *nous*) hidden away in the words. And in and through this reason the rational and self-conscious soul begins to contemplate in a special manner its own proper intuitions. For by means of the names, as it were by means of a gazing crystal, it discerns the surpassing beauties of the notions conveyed in them. Thus, on the one M. 484.
hand, it unfolds and unveils the symbols, and on the other brings forward the meanings into the light and exhibits them naked to those who by a little exercise of memory are able to behold things not clear by means of things that are.

So soon, therefore, as the president seems to have discoursed long enough, and when his discourse is judged to have met fairly and to the

purpose, the points raised, while at the same time they as listeners have responded with their attention; then, as if all were delighted together, hands are clapped all round, though for three times only. After which the one of them stands up and sings a hymn composed in honour of God ; either a new one which he has made himself or some old one of the poets that were long ago. For these have left measures and many melodies of poetry in triple measure, of professional hymns, hymns for the libation, hymns at the altar, hymns of station or of the dance, deftly proportioned for turning and returning.

After him, each one also of the rest sings, according to his rank, in due order, while all listen in profound silence, except when it is time to sing the catches and refrains ; for then they give out their voices in unison, all the men and all the women together. But when every one has finished his hymn, the novices bring in the table just now described, on which is the all-purest food, namely, bread leavened with a relish of salt, with which hyssop has been mixed, out of reverence for the holy table of offering in the sacred vestibule of the temple. For on this there are loaves and salt, without any seasoning to sweeten it. The loaves are unleavened, and the salt also is unmixed. For it is meet that the simplest and purest things should be reserved for the highest class of priests as a reward for their service in the temple ; but that the rest should aspire to a portion that is similar, yet abstain from one that is the same, in order that their superiors may keep their privilege. 10.—But after the feast is over, they celebrate the holy all-night festival ; and this is kept in the following manner :—All rise together, and in the middle of the banquet there are formed, at first, two choruses, one of men, the
M. 485. other of women, and a guide and leader is chosen on either side who is one most held in honour and most suitable. Then they sing hymns composed in honour of God in many measures and strains, sometimes singing in unison, and sometimes waving their hands in time with antiphonal harmonies, and leaping up, and uttering inspired cries, as they either move in procession or stand still, making the turns and counter-turns proper to the dance. Then, when each of the choirs has had its fill of dancing by itself and separate from the other, as if it were a Bacchic festival in which they had drunk deep of the Divine love, they unite, and form a single choir out of the two, in imitation of the dance long ago instituted by the side of the Red Sea to celebrate the miracles there wrought. For the sea, at the Divine behest, became to the one side a cause of salvation, but to the other of utter destruction. For the sea was rent asunder, and, with forced recoil, withdrew from its depths ; and walls, as it were, of water were congealed on either hand over against one another, in such wise that through the intervening space there was cut a broad highroad, and dry for all to walk upon; and by it the host walked upon dry land unto the opposite continent, and

were brought through in safety unto the rising ground. But then the returning floods ran back again, and poured themselves on the right hand and on the left into the floor of the sea that had been made dry land. And straightway those of the enemy which had followed were overwhelmed and were destroyed.

But when they both saw and experienced this mighty work, greater than could be told of, or thought of, or hoped for, men and women, all alike, were rapt with the Divine spirit, and, forming themselves into a single choir, sang hyms of thanksgiving unto God, Moses the prophet leading off the men and Miriam the prophetess the women.

In closest imitation whereof the choir of Therapeutæ, male and female, has formed itself, and, as the deep tones of the men mingle with the shriller ones of the women in answering and antiphonal strains, a full and harmonious symphony results, and one that is veritably musical. Noble are the thoughts, and noble the words of their hymn, yea, and noble the choristers. But the end and aim of thought and words and choristers alike is holiness.

When, then, they have made themselves drunk until dawn with this godly drunkenness, neither heavy of head nor with winking eyes, but more wide awake than when they came in unto the banquet, they stand up, and turn both their eyes and their whole bodies towards the East. And, so soon as they espy the sun rising, they stretch out aloft their hands to heaven and fall to praying for a fair day, and for truth, and M. 486. for clear judgment to see with. And after their prayers they retire each to his own sanctuary, to traffic in and cultivate afresh their customary philosophy.

Concerning the Therapeutæ, then, let so much suffice, who embraced the contemplation of nature and of her verities, and lived a life of the soul alone. They truly are citizens of heaven and of the universe, and have been established with the Father and Creator of all things by virtue, which secures unto them love ; proffering therein the only meet reward of godliness—better than any mere good fortune, because it lifts them in advance straight to the zenith of bliss.

F. C. Conybeare.

CRITICAL NOTICES.

Faith and Experience. Essays and Addresses by OSWALD JOHN SIMON. (London, 1895.)

MR. SIMON'S small volume, *Faith and Experience*, merits in more respects than one, a reviewer's praise. But its chief value lies, perhaps, in its purely devotional and religious elements. We have painfully few devotional and religious books in our modern Anglo-Jewish literature. And yet we need such books at least as much as any other community. Owing to the lack of them many persons who have some genuine appreciation or experience of personal religion turn for solace, stimulus and guidance to the many scores of such productions which owe their origin to the varying forms and phases of Christianity. It is quite possible that Judaism on this account suffers undeserved and serious injury. For it may be too lightly imagined that the Jewish religion is not capable of calling forth or of supplying the experience which these writings demand. It may be thought that Judaism is only a communal or race religion, but that it does not lend itself readily to that, as many believe, highest expression of religious activity which concerns the individual man in his personal relations with God.

Mr. Simon's book gives the lie to such misapprehensions. His devotion to Judaism is no less marked than his championship of the cause of personal religion. Nay, more : his personal religion is the outflow of his Judaism. To him the two are inseparably united together.

This identification is precisely what is needed in works of this class. Not that Mr. Simon is without his reasons for believing that Judaism affords the best training and teaching for the exercise and experience of personal religion, but these reasons occupy a secondary place. Books of devotion are not books of learned argument, and they are primarily intended for the religious community to which their writers belong. They rightly assume a belief in the superior excellence and purity of the religion which is their framework. To Mr. Simon that framework is Judaism.

His book consists of a number and Essays and Sermons, only a few of which have been printed before—two of them in the pages of this Review. One or two items, such as the essays on Tact and on Denominational Schools, seem slightly out of place in a whole, for which otherwise the phrase "Faith and Experience" forms an adequate and satisfactory

title. Our author, moreover, is almost uniformly at his best when dealing with purely religious topics. On the other hand, many of us will be glad to re-read the obituary notice on the late Master of Balliol, which concludes the volume. Mr. Simon, like many another, owed much to the kindness as well as to the teaching of Jowett. He was one of his most devoted and appreciative admirers. It deserves to be known, that the "round robin" which a number of Balliol men addressed to the Master in the year 1892, asking him to publish a selection of his sermons, was entirely due to the inspiration and initiative of Mr. Simon. Though at that time the Master felt unable to comply with the request, he has, I believe, given his literary executors power to publish a volume of his sermons, which he would not have done, had he not been almost compelled by the "round robin" to realise how deeply his pulpit utterances were valued. We shall, therefore, owe the preservation of these noble discourses to Mr. Simon.

I said just now that the words "Faith" and "Experience" were an accurate and suggestive summing-up of Mr. Simon's essays. I was especially thinking of the second of the two substantives, *experience*. By experience Mr. Simon means religious experience — religion as realised in experience. For to him religious experience is as real as any other experience ; or, put the other way, religion is hardly real till it is experienced. And that is why religion to him is mainly personal religion ; for these experiences are only realisable by and through the individual soul, and at the same time need of necessity no other accessory or environment. And here I must again repeat that we Jews are in great need of books from men or women to whom religion means just *that*, and who can record with adequate terseness and ability the impressions and results of this spiritual experience. Mr. Simon is one of those persons, and therefore his book has a notable and even peculiar value. Its dedication indicates that the author's experience has been partly gained by sorrow ; and, from a touching and striking allusion on p. 23, the reader can gather that Mr. Simon has had much time for meditation and thought. He has not been too busy to think and feel ; he has not been too busy to pray. And by prayer I mean what he means ; not the reading of prescribed and printed prayers of others, but free personal communion with God (pp. 95, 96). Through prayer he has won experience :—

> A person who knows himself to have passed through the experience of prayer—that is, to have felt that he was once in communion with the Deity—may reasonably regard the evidence of a Divine Presence as a matter of experience, and therefore independent of the testimony of others (p. 28).

Whether reasonably or no I will not inquire, but that all great religious writers and all truly religious persons would echo the statement is surely

certain. Hence it is that Mr. Simon is so wholly independent of the results of Biblical criticism ; they do not really matter to him and to his religion one bit. Nor, as he thinks, do they matter to Judaism. He combines this experienced religion with Judaism, and believes that the one is the very product and outflow of the other.

" We have a faith which is an experience, and we have to tell of our experience ; in other words, we bear witness of God " (p. 81). He is quite indifferent whether the Biblical miracles happened or not : personally, as I gather, he does not believe in them. " We speak only of a record of a vast human experience in the necessity and the efficacy of a life with God " (p. 82). " The genius of Judaism is that it is a story of natural religion, of spiritual aspiration among individuals and families through a long series of ages " (p. 92). Mr. Simon should better forswear the use of the adjective " natural," as applied to religion, for nobody knows without elaborate explanations what sense any particular writer chooses to give to it. It is as elastic as the vocabulary of Humpty Dumpty. But what Mr. Simon apparently means is that this " personal life with God " has been proved and tested and experienced by countless individual Jews through many generations, and that Judaism is therefore the record and the proof of the validity and the value of these experiences. This is, I think, a novel and most suggestive idea.

Into the contents of the various essays I cannot enter. I hope that Mr. Simon may do much further work, either of this character or, if I may be allowed the expression, *still more so.* I mean, may he be still more purely religious, spiritual, devotional. He might, after a time, be able to produce for Jewish religious life a volume of religious aphorisms and maxims such as Mr. Patmore has lately produced for the Catholics. There are several specimens of the kind in the volume before us. Such are the following, which I pick out at random :—

" There is no prayer which is so blessed as the prayer which asks for nothing " (p. 13).

" One might almost describe the two kinds of loneliness thus :—One brings merely the consciousness of self, the other the consciousness of God " (p. 17).

" It rests with us [Jews] to elect between archæology and religion " (p. 105).

" Jews must be spiritual persons, or their very name is meaningless " (p. 136).

" Judaism is a missionary religion, or it is nothing " (p. 137).

" The relation between the divine and human is not merely general, but is essentially personal " (p. 84).

" Almighty God—who is surely our Father, or else we are not concerned with him—has mystically determined that he shall become manifest to us through the feelings, through the affections, through a divine untold

love. That is why the head corner-stone of Judaism is the command to love God with all the powers of our being" (p. 185 *fin.*).

"It is the personal and secret conviction treasured up in one soul after another, receiving constant renewal by prayer, that makes up the sum of human witness to our affinity with the living God" (p. 203).

"Faith, love, and sorrow are three elements that mysteriously blend in human experience, each having its own tale to tell of the relation which we bear to the Supreme Being" (p. 204).

Sermons such as those entitled "The Divine Presence" and "Higher Judaism" are excellent reading; but I should give a wrong impression of Mr. Simon's book if it were to be supposed that it does not deal with the religious life of the community as well as with the religious life of the individual. Mr. Simon has very definite opinions, and knows how to express them. He does not attempt to obscure his position in the camp of the Reformers; but yet his conception of Reform has many characteristics of its own. Both sides would do well to consider his words and weigh them well. It is to be hoped that his book will have many readers within our borders. I am pretty confident that it will have many beyond them. The outer world is possibly more interested in certain phases and developments of Judaism than the Jewish community itself.

C. G. MONTEFIORE.

As Others Saw Him: A Retrospect, A.D. 54. London, 1895.

This is a striking and suggestive little book. The writer proposes to describe Jesus from the point of view of a thoughtful Jew living in Jerusalem. He accordingly assumes the person of Meshullam ben Zadok, a lawyer in the Holy City, whom he identifies with the Synoptics' questioner about the great commandment in the Law. Meshullam subsequently removes to Alexandria, and some one-and-twenty years after the crucifixion records his reminiscences for the benefit of a Greek physician, Aglaophonos, of Corinth, whom he had formerly known in Jerusalem. The choice of this form of narrative imposes obvious restraints; but it also gives opportunity for the introduction of plenty of local colour which is often very happily employed. At times, indeed, this seems somewhat superfluous; readers of the type for whom the book is intended might be supposed to be already acquainted with the interior arrangements of a synagogue (p. 34). In some details, its accuracy might be doubted. Was the doctrine of a Messiah who should precede the Son of David, Messiah ben Joseph (p. 116), really pre-Christian? Occasional lapses into modern style betray some of the

strain which the composition involved ; phrases like the following, "As none but Jesus would have known his own feelings" (p. 23), "finding new ideals" (p. 38, cp. 210, 212), "mystical communion" (p. 84), "we localise him [God] nowhere" (p. 113), "any such attempt would be entirely futile" (p. 172), "the empire which he had wielded over men's minds" (p. 199), are imperfectly combined with the speech of a Jerusalem Jew of the first century.

The real interest of the presentment of Jesus lies in the relation in which it sets him to the movements of his time. The use which the writer makes of the supposed Jewish original of the "Two Ways," a sort of manual of morals for the instruction of proselytes, may be exaggerated in respect of the personal indebtedness of Jesus to this particular book ; but it must be received as the picturesque expression of the fact, which so many recent investigations have confirmed, that there was a considerable body of organised moral and religious teaching current at the time, which was in general harmony with many of his main thoughts. The leading representatives of this teaching were, no doubt, to be found among the Pharisees ; and our author expends some skill in portraying the attitude of Jesus towards them. The scene at the dinner in the house of Elisha ben Simeon, where the Pharisaic ideal is unexpectedly vindicated from the reproaches of Jesus by the aged father of the host, is one of the most vigorous in the book. On the other hand, the antagonism of Jesus to the Sadducees, and especially to the tyrannical temple-rulers who trembled for their gains, is employed to bring about the final catastrophe, which is attributed to two chief causes, immediately to the hatred of the high-priestly party, and less directly to the angry disappointment felt by the populace at Jerusalem in consequence of the Teacher's answer about the tribute-money. The hurried meeting of the priestly section of the Sanhedrin, at which Hanan urges on the condemnation of Jesus, is dramatically conceived ; and by taking advantage of the tradition that Barabbas was also named Jesus, the writer is able to suggest a confusion between the two prisoners which partially explains the popular demand for the hero of the sedition.

In spite, however, of its vivid style, and the abundant learning which lies behind it, in spite also of its real sympathy with much of the character and teaching of Jesus, this book will probably satisfy no one. Its avowed object, to depict Jesus as he showed himself to a Jerusalem Jew, involves a certain limitation. The first three Gospels confine the appearance of Jesus in the capital to the last fatal week. The Teacher was then exposed to a series of baffling trials deliberately designed to withdraw from him the enthusiasm which had greeted his entry. He lies under a doom of failure which veils his true greatness. The originality of his teaching, the depth and force of many of his great

sayings, cannot be displayed. The author is conscious of this one-sidedness, and makes his narrator apologise for it (p. 207), by describing the impression produced on him afterwards by the Memorabilia of Matathias. But it is too late ; the narrower view has been already set down (p. 201). It might seem, indeed, as if this position had been purposely adopted for the partial vindication of the reproach against Israel involved in the execution of one of the best of its sages. If so, we cannot think that this has been wisely chosen as one of the main themes of the book. The causes which led to the death of Jesus are no doubt matter of high interest historically. But they are quite subordinate to the larger questions concerning what Jesus was in himself, and what was his significance for his own age and for posterity. The volume therefore really deals with a topic contracted within larger issues. These are of course in our author's mind as well as in his readers'; and he is remarkably dexterous in his attempt to find means to deal with them. But the treatment is inadequate, and consequently lacks sufficient vitality. The condition which he has imposed on himself obliges him to renounce the materials of the synoptic tradition prior to the last days.[1] But the Jerusalem records he can distribute in fresh combinations. Next he has at his command a vast store of extra-canonical sayings, the so-called "Agrapha," gathered by the unwearied diligence of Dr. Resch from the remains of early Christian literature. Many of these are of highly doubtful authenticity ; but they enable the writer to compile notes of a couple of addresses, which have an air of verisimilitude as well as of novelty. The effect of massing these disconnected fragments, in a juxtaposition to which no long usage has lent sanction and charm, will be differently judged by different tastes. Thirdly, he has the Fourth Gospel, which he apparently accepts as no less trustworthy than the other three. This supplies him with a much larger scope than the Synoptics. He is no longer bound to the final week, he can bring Jesus to Jerusalem at various intervals within three years. He takes advantage of this extension to break up the series of Temple colloquies which occupy the last days of the Common Tradition, and fling them about on previous occasions, reserving the denarius incident alone for the close, in order that he may isolate and heighten the effect of Jesus' want of patriotism. But this treatment is really uncritical, and gives undue prominence, and—many will think—a false interpretation, to a particular aspect of the Teacher whom he portrays. Reliance on the Fourth Gospel further leads to the surprising result that Jesus

[1] The only earlier incident is that of the rich young man, here placed on the way out from Jerusalem to Bethany, and apparently introduced only for the sake of the additional detail supplied from the Gospel of the Hebrews.

twice drives the money-changers out of the Temple, once at the opening, the other time at the close of his career. The first of these scenes, most picturesquely described, opens the book; the second follows three years later; but the apology for the repetition (p. 132 f.) will not seem convincing to many. Nor will the use made of the Johannine discourses, with the suggestion that Jesus claimed to be the very God (pp. 114, 180), content the student, who knows that these discourses are alike of uncertain origin and of disputed interpretation. A writer who rationalises the resurrection into a sort of hypnotic effect produced by the eyes of Jesus (pp. 41, 88-92) might have been expected to employ his documents with more judicial reserve. This remark must also apply to his adoption of Chwolson's elaborate attempt to explain how Jesus ate the Paschal lamb a day in advance of the rest of Jerusalem. The difficulty of course arises from the different chronologies of the Synoptics and the Fourth Gospel. Chwolson assumes, without any investigation, that the Johannine last supper was the Paschal meal. But a glance at such a commentary as Meyer's shows, what a multitude of interpreters of various schools agree in affirming, that in the Fourth Gospel, whatever be the source of the incongruity, the meal preceding the arrest is not recognised in this character.[1] A dramatic narrative is not the place for balancing critical probabilities, but some readers will feel that in following Chwolson, our author has misconceived the problem, which receives its true solution through the veiled hint in John xix. 36 (based on Paul) that Jesus was himself the Paschal lamb for the whole world.

One point more must be named, in which our author seems needlessly to depart from historical likelihood. What ground is there, apart from later Jewish virulence, for supposing that Jesus was not born in wedlock? The grotesque treatment of Matthew i. in Tolstoi's recently-published (though not recently-written) *Harmony of the Gospels* will not commend itself to sober judgment. Is it not sufficiently plain that the charge of bastardy naturally arose in protest against the claim to virgin-birth, set up, as the Gospel to the Hebrews shows ("My mother, the Holy Spirit"), outside the Palestinian tradition? The charge is employed in this book to explain certain features in the demeanour of Jesus—his detachment from family ties, his deep pity for outcasts and sinners, his aloofness from the popular aims of national greatness. Another and deeper explanation of these characteristics is, of course, at hand, commended by the whole tenour of his inner life, as far as we can judge of it from the fragmentary records which alone survive.

[1] Chwolson is content to leave this aspect of the question undiscussed, with the simple remark that in that case the contradiction between John and the Synoptics is "noch greller."

With the view which finds the secret of them in the strength of his consciousness of the presence of God and the oneness of the race, our author is not really out of sympathy. In the character which he has assumed, as Meshullam writes to his friend at Corinth, he naturally compares the death on Calvary with that in the Athenian prison, and he concludes that a greater than Socrates is here. Will it not be possible for a Judaism which recognises the universal elements in the character and teaching of Jesus, and a Christianity which appreciates the contribution made by his race to the religion and morals of the world, to come a little nearer, and at last, perhaps, to make common cause on behalf of their common truth ?

J. Estlin Carpenter.