The Jewish Quarterly Review

EDITED BY

I. ABRAHAMS AND C. G. MONTEFIORE

VOLUME VIII

London
MACMILLAN AND CO., LTD.
NEW YORK: MACMILLAN & CO.
1896

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

THE JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW

VOL. VIII

OXFORD
HORACE HART, PRINTER TO THE UNIVERSITY

CONTENTS

PAGE

ANGLO-JUDAICA:

IBN EZRA IN ENGLAND. By Dr. M. Friedländer 140

A DOCUMENT ILLUSTRATIVE OF EARLY ANGLO-JEWISH HISTORY, *and*

JEWS' HOUSES IN LINCOLN IN 1484. By B. L. Abrahams 360

BRUTE CREATION, SYMPATHY WITH. By Elsie Davis 714

CHINA, JEWS IN. By Dr. A. Neubauer 123, 362

COTTON GROTTO, AN ANCIENT QUARRY IN JERUSALEM. By Dr. Cyrus Adler 384

CRITICAL NOTICES:

Apocrypha, The Revised Version of the ... 321

W. Bacher's "Anfänge der hebräischen Grammatik" 499

H. Barnstein's "Onkelos to Genesis"... ... 664

S. Buber's "Ansche Schem" 178

S. Buber's "Midrash Suta" 179

A. Büchler's "Priester und Cultus"... ... 666

F. C. Conybeare's "Philo about the Contemplative Life" 155

W. H. Greenburg's "Haggadah in Yemen Rite" 662

M. Grunwald's "Eigennamen des alten Testaments" 655

H. Hirschfeld's "Assabiniyya" 175

J. Jacobs' "Jews in Spain"... 486

Z. Kahn's "Sermons et Allocutions" 678

B. Königsberger's "Sifre Suta" 329

A. Kraushara's "Frank i Frankisci" 335

PAGE

CRITICAL NOTICES (*continued*).

M. LEWIN'S "ARAMÄISCHE SPRICHWÖRTER" ... 333
A. MERX'S "PALÉOGRAPHIE HEBRÄIQUE ET ARABE" 172
NEUBAUER'S "MEDIAEVAL JEWISH CHRONICLES" 336
S. POZNAŃSKI'S "MOSES B. SAMUEL IBN CHIQUITILLA" 177
M. SILBERBERG'S "SEFER HA-MISPAR" 657
STEINSCHNEIDER "FESTSCHRIFT" 652
H. STRACK'S "ABRISS DES BIBLISCHEN ARAMÄISCH" 505
H. STRACK'S "EINLEITUNG IN DAS ALTE TESTAMENT" 507

DAVID DEL BENE OF MANTUA. By Prof. D. KAUFMANN 513

DEMONOLOGY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT. By F. C. CONYBEARE 576

DERENBOURG, JOSEPH. By Dr. A. NEUBAUER 189

THE DIETARY LAWS FROM A WOMAN'S POINT OF VIEW. By Mrs. M. JOSEPH 643

EGYPTIAN FRAGMENTS. By Dr. A. NEUBAUER 541

HUMAN SYMPATHY. By ELSIE DAVIS 716

IBN EZRA MANUSCRIPT. By the REV. Dr. M. BERLIN ... 711

IHERING, RUDOLF VON: CONTRIBUTIONS TO BIBLICAL EXEGESIS. By Prof. W. BACHER 185

INFORMERS IN THE MIDDLE AGES:
By Prof. D. KAUFMANN 217
By S. HALBERSTAM 527

JEHUDA BONSENYOR AND HIS COLLECTION OF APHORISMS. By Dr. M. KAYSERLING 632

JEHUDAH HADASSI'S "ESHKOL HAKKOFER." By Prof. W. BACHER 431

JOWETT'S RELIGIOUS TEACHING. By OSWALD J. SIMON 245

KARAITE MISCELLANIES. By Dr. S. POZNAŃSKI 681

LEAVES FROM THE "GOLDEN BOUGH." By G. H. SKIPWITH 704

MASSORETIC STUDIES. By Prof. L. BLAU 343

MEGILLATH MISSRAIM, OR THE SCROLL OF THE EGYPTIAN PURIM:
I. By the REV. G. MARGOLIOUTH 274
II. By Prof. D. KAUFMANN 511

MENACHEM DI LONSANO. By Prof. D. KAUFMANN ... 525

PAGE

MISCONCEPTIONS OF JUDAISM AND CHRISTIANITY BY EACH OTHER. By C. G. MONTEFIORE 193

PHILONEAN TEXT OF THE SEPTUAGINT. By F. C. CONYBEARE 88

POETRY: TRANSLATIONS FROM THE HEBREW:

THE ROYAL CROWN 71, 239

HYMN FOR THE DAY OF ATONEMENT 74

MERCY AND PARDON 75

PASSOVER HYMN 381

LIGHT AND DARKNESS. By Mrs. HENRY LUCAS 382

ELIJAH'S PRAYER 609

HYMNS FOR THE EVE OF ATONEMENT. By ELSIE DAVIS 76, 77

"I AM THE SUPPLIANT" 78

THE ARK OF THE COVENANT 82

A SONG OF REDEMPTION 269

A SONG OF LOVE 271

THE BURNING OF THE LAW 426

A DIRGE FOR THE NINTH OF AB. By NINA DAVIS 611

THE SILVER BOWL. By D. I. FREEDMAN ... 534

POINTING: SUGGESTIONS FOR A SIMPLER MODE. By G. H. SKIPWITH 707

RABBINIC THEOLOGY, SOME ASPECTS OF. By S. SCHECHTER 1, 363

RELATIVE ש IN GENESIS. By G. H. SKIPWITH 706

REUCHLIN, JOHANN, THE FATHER OF THE STUDY OF HEBREW AMONG CHRISTIANS. By Dr. S. A. HIRSCH 445

SAMARITAN LITERATURE AND RELIGION. By A. COWLEY 562

SHIR HASHIRIM: CORRECTIONS AND NOTES TO AGADATH SHIR HASHIRIM. By S. SCHECHTER ... 289

SINKER'S TEXTS OF THE TESTAMENTS OF TWELVE PATRIARCHS COLLATED WITH THE ARMENIAN VERSION. By F. C. CONYBEARE:

I. REUBEN AND SIMEON 260

II. JUDAH, DAN, JOSEPH, AND BENJAMIN ... 471

THE

JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW

OCTOBER, 1895

SOME ASPECTS OF RABBINIC THEOLOGY:

THE "LAW."

THE Law derives its authority from the kingdom. For this, according to the Rabbis, is the meaning of the scriptural words, "I am the Lord thy God," or "the Lord your God," with which certain groups of laws are introduced (e. g. Exod. xxii. 2 and Lev. xviii. 2); that is, God makes his people conscious of the fact of his claims on them because of their having received his kingdom, saying unto them, "You have received my kingdom in love." "Yes" and "Yes" answers Israel, wherefore God says, "If you have received my kingdom, you receive now my decrees[1]."

The current notions about the Law or Torah are still so misleading, that often as the question has been discussed in this Review a brief exposition of its real meaning with the Rabbis will not be superfluous. There appears to be an uneasy feeling among theologians, "that if the Psalter be indeed of post-exilic origin, then it is certain that Judaism or Scribism cannot have been wholly the evil thing we have thought[2]."

[1] Torath Kohanim, 85 d; Mechilta, 67 a and b.

[2] See Bruce's *Apologetics*, p. 272, and cp. Smend, *Lehrbuch der Alttestamentlichen Religionsgeschichte*, VIII.

Still this does not prevent them from enlarging upon the "Night of Legalism," the darkness of which is made the more visible by the utter absence of any religious documents calculated to throw light upon this terribly long night, from which we only suddenly emerge by a miracle supposed to have taken place about the year 30 of our era.

If the study of comparative religion has for its purpose the finding of parallels rather than the gathering of contrasts, we might reason that an age which gave birth to Christianity could not have been entirely devoid of at least a sprinkling of great sages, great saints, great religious enthusiasts. But nothing of the kind is generally allowed. We learn just enough of the time to prepare us for the strange modes of Paul's interpretation of the Scriptures, the narrow particularism of Peter and James, and the legalistic and Judaic heresies into which the first Christians were bound to relapse and against which the Church had to defend herself. In one word the whole age is a preparation for the Anti-Christ.

Now it cannot be denied that the religious history of the intervening age between the Maccabeans and Jesus is very obscure. For its literary *Hebrew* remains—which alone enable us to form a clear judgment—are very scanty, only a few sayings having come down to us from that period. But if Rabbinism be the logical and legitimate outcome of Legalism, the theology of the Rabbis in its most prominent and spiritual features should be allowed to throw some backlight on that obscure period. Examined by this light we shall find that Legalism was neither the evil thing commonly imagined nor led to the bad consequences assumed by our theologians. Nor has it ever constituted the whole religion of the Jew, as defined by most modern critics.

It must first be stated that the term Law, or Nomos, is not a correct rendering of the Hebrew word Torah. The legalistic element, which might rightly be called the Law, represents only one side of the Torah. To the Jew the word

Torah means a teaching or an instruction of any kind. It may be either a general principle or a detailed injunction, whether it be found in the Pentateuch or in other parts of the Scriptures—or even outside of the canon. The juxtaposition in which *Torah* and *Mitzvoth*, Teaching and Commandments, are to be found in the Rabbinic literature, implies already that the former means something more than merely the Law[1]. Torah and Mitzvoth are a complement to each other, or as a Rabbi expressed it: "they borrow from each other, as wisdom and understanding—charity and lovingkindness—the moon and the stars"—but they are not identical[2]. To use the modern phraseology, to the Rabbinic Jew, Torah was both an institution and a faith. I shall treat them separately: first, Torah and then the Mitzvoth.

It is true that in Rabbinic literature the term Torah is often applied to the Pentateuch to the exclusion of the Prophets and the Hagiographa[3]. But this is only for the purpose of classification. It is also true that in a certain measure the Pentateuch is put on a higher level than the Prophets—the prophetic vision of Moses having been, as the Rabbis avow, much clearer than that of his successors[4]. But we must not forget that for the superiority of the Torah, they had the scriptural authority of the Torah itself (Num. xii. 6–8, Deut. xxxiv. 10), whilst on the other hand they could not find in the Prophets anything deprecatory of Moses' superior authority. They may, occasionally, have felt some contradictions between the Prophets and the Torah, but only in matters of detail, not in matters of principle[5].

[1] See, for instance, Berachoth, 31 a ; Makkoth, 23 a ; Aboth, III, 11.

[2] See Exod. Rabbah, XXXI.

[3] See, for instance, Megillah, 31 a ; Baba Bathra, 13 b, and elsewhere.

[4] See Jebamoth, 49 b ; Lev. Rabbah, I.

[5] See the well-known passages about Ezekiel in Shabbath, 13 b, and Menachoth, 45 a. The contradictions are there reconciled to the satisfaction of the Rabbis at least. A contradiction which they did not try to reconcile was that between Isa. vi. 1 "I saw the Lord sitting upon

Of any real antagonism between Mosaism and "Leviticalism" and Prophetism, which modern criticism has brought to light, the Rabbis were as little conscious as the Apostles. With the Rabbis, the Prophets formed only a complement or even a commentary to the Torah, which, indeed, needed explanation, as we shall see. Hence the *naïveté*, as we may almost call it, with which the Rabbis chose, for reading on the Day of Atonement, the 58th chapter of Isaiah, one of the most prophetic pieces of prophetism—as the accompanying lesson for the portion from the Pentateuch, Leviticus xvi—the most Levitical piece in Leviticalism [1].

But even the Pentateuch is no mere legal code, without edifying elements in it. The book of Genesis, the greater part of Exodus, and even a part of Numbers are simple history, recording the past of humanity on its way to the kingdom, culminating in Israel's entering it on Mount Sinai, and their subsequent relapses. The book of Deuteronomy, as the "Book containing the words of exhortation" (Tochachoth) [2], forms Israel's *Imitatio Dei*, consisting chiefly in goodness [3], and supplying to Israel its confession of faith, whilst the Book of Leviticus—marvel upon marvel—first proclaims that principle of loving one's neighbour as one's self (Lev. xix. 18) which believers call Christianity, unbelievers, Humanity.

The language of the Midrash would seem to imply, that at a certain period there were people who held the narratives of the Bible in slight estimation, looking upon them as fictions (Piyutim) and useless stories. The Rabbis, however, reject such a thought with indignation. To them the whole of the Torah represented the word of God, dictated by the

a throne," and Moses in Exod. xxxiii. 20 "For there shall no man see me, and live" (Jebamoth, 49 b. See Jolowicz's *Himmelfahrt, &c. des Propheten Jesaiah*, p. 7, Leipzig, 1854). But it is significant that it is the wicked Manasseh who saw this contradiction.

[1] See Montefiore, *Hibbert Lectures*, pp. 510 and 511.

[2] Sifre, 64 a.

[3] See Sifre, 85 a; Mechilta, 37 a; and parallels.

Holy Spirit, suggesting moral lessons everywhere, and embodying, even while it speaks of the past, a history of humanity written in advance[1]. "The Book of Generations of Adam," that is the history of the Genesis, in which the dignity of man is indicated by the fact of his having been created in the image of God, teaches, according to Ben Azai, even a greater principle than that of Lev. xix, in which the law of loving one's neighbour as one's self is contained[2]. Another Rabbi deduces from the repetitions in Gen. xxiv the theory that the conversation of the servants of the patriarchs is more beautiful than the laws even of later generations[3]. Another Rabbi remarks that the Torah as a legal code would only have commenced with Exod. xii, where the first (larger) group of laws is set forth, but God's object was to show his people the power of his work, "that he may give them the inheritance of the heathen" (Ps. cxi. 6), and thus, in the end, justify the later history of their conquests[4].

The Book of Genesis, which contains the history of this manifestation of God's powers, as revealed in the act of creation as well as in the history of the patriarchs, and leads up to the story of the Exodus from Egypt, is, according to some Rabbis, the book of the covenant which Moses read to the people (Exod. xxiv. 7) even before the act of revelation. To come into the possession of this book (the book of Genesis), which unlocked before them one of the inner chambers of the king (or revealed to them the holy mysteries of God's working in the world), was considered by the Rabbis one of the greatest privileges of Israel, given to them as a reward for their submission to God's will[5].

Thus *Torah*, even as represented by the Pentateuch, is

[1] See Genesis Rabbah, LXXXV; Sifre, 33 a; Sanhedrin, 99 b.

[2] Torath Kohanim, 89 b, and parallels. Cp. Bacher, *Agada der Tannaiten*, I, 720.

[3] Genesis Rabbah, LX.

[4] See Tanchuma, ed. Buber, I, 4 a. Cp. Rashi to Genesis i. 1.

[5] See Mechilta, 63 b. Cp. Midrash Shir Hashirim, I, 4 on הביאני המלך חדריו.

not mere Law, the Rabbis having discerned and appreciated in it other than merely legal elements. Moreover the term Torah is not always confined to the Pentateuch. It also extends, as already indicated, to the whole of the Scriptures on which the Rabbis "laboured" with the same spirit and devotion as on the Pentateuch. We must not be mistaken about this point. Christianity has not, as some writers apparently think, been the first to discover the Prophets, somewhat in the same way that the Germans claim to have discovered Shakespeare. That lessons from the Prophets almost always accompanied those taken from the Pentateuch is a well-known fact[1], as likewise that the Talmud Chacham or the disciple of the wise, had to beautify himself with the knowledge of the twenty-four books of which the Bible consists, even as a bride adorns herself with twenty-four different kinds of ornaments[2]. That this injunction was strictly fulfilled by the student is clear from the facility and frequency with which the Rabbis quoted the Prophets and the Hagiographa.

A striking instance may be seen in the *Mechilta*, a small work of not more than about seventy octavo pages when stripped from its commentaries: it has about one thousand citations from the Prophets and the Hagiographa.

"The sinners in Israel," the Rabbis complain, "contend that the prophets and the Hagiographa are not Torah, but are they not already refuted by Daniel (ix. 10) who said, "Neither have we obeyed the voice of the Lord our God, to walk in his Toroth which he set before us by his servants the prophets." Hence, the Rabbis proceed to say, Asaph's exclamation in Ps. lxxviii, "Give ear, O my people, to my Toroth[3]." Note, in passing, that this Psalm, which claims to be Torah, is nothing but a resumé of Israel's

[1] See Zunz, *Gottesdienstliche Vorträge*, p. 3 (2nd ed.), and Schürer's *Geschichte*, II, 380 f.

[2] See Exodus Rabbah, XLI.

[3] See Midrash, Tillim LXXVIII, and Tanchuma ראה, § 1. Probably the Samaritans are the "Sinners in Israel."

history. With the Rabbinic Jews, the Hagiographa formed an integral part of their holy Scriptures. The prophets of truth and righteousness were, as can be seen from the benediction preceding the weekly lesson from the Prophets, God's chosen, in the same way as the Torah, as his servant Moses, and his people Israel—the depositary of revelation [1]. In olden times they had even a special benediction before they began to read either the Prophets or the Hagiographa, running thus: "Blessed art thou, our Lord God, who hast commanded us to read the holy writings [2]." This was quite in accordance with their principle regarding prophecy as "the word of God [3]," and the continuation of his voice heard on Mount Sinai [4], a voice which will cease only with the Messianic times, when the earth will be full of the knowledge of God and all the people of the Lord will be prophets [5].

[1] See *Daily Prayer Book* with the Rev. S. Singer's Translation, p. 149. In מס' סופרים, XIII (ed. Müller), the words ובישראל עמו are omitted.

[2] See מס' סופרים, XIV, and Dr. Müller's *Notes*, p. 188.

[3] Shabbath, 138 b.

[4] See Sifre, 92 a, and parallels given in the מ"ע. MH. ובקולו תשמעו בקול נביאיו. Cp. Exod. Rabbah, XXIX, 6, the opinion of רש"בל. See also Sifre, 135 b רב"שע כבר כתבת הן ישלח אדם "Lord of the world thou hast written, If a man put away his wife," &c., which is a verse in Jer. iii. 1. Cp. Blau, *Zur Einleitung in die Heilige Schrift*, p. 14.

[5] See Jerushalmi Megillah, 70 d, and the Commentaries. Cp. also Maimonides' Mishneh Torah הלכות מגילה וחנוכה, II, 18 and the השגת הרא"בר. The passage to the effect that the Pentateuch will retain its importance even after the Messiah has come, is, as so many other passages of a similar nature, undoubtedly the result of the opposition to Paulinistic Christianity, the most fierce attacks of which were directed against the Law, demanding its abolition. The answer of the Rabbis was therefore that even the authority of the Messiah himself will not prevail against that of Moses. In this sense—as opposition against the teaching of Paul—must also be understood the passage in Jerushalmi Berachoth, 3 b and parallels, where the prophet, so to say, is required to bring his imprimatur from the Torah חותם שלי וסמנטרין שלי, the prophet without such a legitimation being so very probably an antinomianist. Hence also the effort made by the Rabbis to prove that the Pentateuch already indicated the teachings of the Kethubin. See Weber, 79, the reference to Taanith must be 9 a.

It is in harmony with this spirit—the Prophets and the Hagiographa being a part of Israel's Torah—that the former are cited in Rabbinic literature with the terms "for it is said" or "it is written" in the same way as the Pentateuch. Again, in the well-known controversy about the Scriptural authority for the belief in resurrection, both the Prophets and the Hagiographa are quoted under the name of Torah; and the evidence brought forward by them seems to be of as much weight as that derived from the Pentateuch [1]. In the New Testament they also occasionally appear under the title of Nomos or Law. To the Jew, as already pointed out, the term Torah implied a teaching or instruction, and was therefore wide enough to embrace the whole of the Scriptures [2].

In a certain manner it is extended even beyond the limits of the Scriptures. When certain Jewish Boswells apologized for observing the private life of their masters too closely, they said: "It is a Torah, which we are desirous of learning [3]." In this sense it is used by another Rabbi, who maintained that even the everyday talk of the people in the Holy Land is a Torah (that is, it conveys an object-

[1] Sanhedrin, 91 b; see also Mechilta, 34 b and 40 b. Cp. Blau, as above, pp. 16 and 17.

[2] See Schürer's *Geschichte,* II, 253, note 17, for the references from the New Testament. Following Weber (p. 79) Schürer seizes the opportunity of making the remark that there is perhaps nothing more characteristic of the full appreciation of their importance on the part of the Jews than that they too (the Prophets and the Hagiographa) were not first of all to the Jewish conviction didactic or consolatory works, not books of edification or history, but were considered chiefly as Law, the substance of God's claims upon his people. So far Schürer, which of course only proves again to what misconception the rendering of Torah by Law must lead. Besides we find that the Rabbis had such specification for the various books in the Bible as ספר יציאת מצרים for the Exodus (see Blau, as above), תוכחות for Deuteronomy (see above), the Psalms again are called the Book of Praises or Hymn Book, whilst the whole of the Kethubin are the Books of Wisdom (Pesikta d' R. Kahana, 158 b), whilst Isaiah was chiefly characterized as the "work of consolation" (Baba Bathra, 14 a).

[3] Berachoth, 62 a.

lesson). For the poor man in Palestine, when applying to his neighbour for relief, was wont to say, "Acquire for thyself merit, or strengthen and purify thyself" (by helping me)[1]; thus implying the old axiom—that the man in want is just as much performing an act of charity by receiving as his benefactor by giving. In the east of Europe you can, even to-day, hear a member of the congregation addressing his minister, "Pray tell me some Torah." The Rabbi would never answer him by reciting verses from the Bible, but would feel it incumbent on him to give him some spiritual or allegorical explanation of a verse from the Scriptures, or would treat him to some general remarks bearing upon morals and conduct.

To return to Torah proper. It is the Torah as the sum total of the contents of revelation, without regard to any particular element in it, the Torah as a faith, that is so dear to the Rabbi. It is the Torah in this abstract sense, as a revelation and a promise, the expression of the wisdom of God, which is identified with the wisdom of Prov. viii, thus gaining, in the course of history, a pre-mundane existence, which, so to speak, formed the design according to which God mapped out the world. Said Rabbi Hoshayah: "It is written of Wisdom, 'Then (before the world was created) I was with him *amon*, and was daily his delight, rejoicing always before him.' The word *amon* is to be read *uman*, meaning architect. For as a king employs an architect when he proposes to build a palace, and looks into his plans and designs to know where the various recesses and chambers shall be placed, so did God look into the Torah when he was about to create the world[2]." How far the idea is originally Jewish is not here the place to discuss. Nor is its meaning quite clear when subjected

[1] Lev. Rabbah, XXXIV.

[2] See Genesis Rabbah, I, and parallels. Cf. Bacher, *Agada der Palästinensischen Amoräer*, I, 107, and his references to Freudenthal and the JEWISH QUARTERLY, III, 357-60. See also Prof. Cheyne's *Job and Solomon*, pp. 160-62.

to a strict analysis. One of the later commentators of the Midrash tries to connect it with the *Tzimtzum* theory, that is, the limitation-mystery of the later Cabbalists, according to which the act of creation was an effluence of God's ineffable goodness and mercy—when he withdrew himself into himself, and thus revealed from himself the universe. But it is not quite clear what part the Torah plays in this mystical system[1]. As far as any definite meaning may be attached to such hazy and nebulous ideas, it may perhaps be reduced to this: that the Torah having been long destined to become a main factor in God's government of the world, its creation must have been predesigned by God before he called the world into existence. In this sense the Torah is classed with other creations of God which are endowed with pre-mundane existence, as Israel, the throne of God (kingdom?), the name of the Messiah, hell and paradise (or reward and punishment), and repentance[2]. With regard to repentance, the chapters of Rabbi Eliezer teach: "When God was designing the world he found no firm basis for it until he created the quality of repentance[3]." The same thought of the impossibility of a world without a revelation may also have been present to the mind of the Jew when he spoke of the pre-mundane existence of the Torah.

Plausible, however, as this explanation may be, it is a little too sober and would hardly account for that exaltation of the Torah, which is such a prominent feature in Jewish literature. As soon as the Torah was identified with the Wisdom of Proverbs, the mind did not rest satisfied with looking upon it as a mere condition for the existence of the world. Every connotation of the term Wisdom in the famous eighth chapter of Proverbs was invested with life and individuality. The Torah, by this same process, was

[1] See פירוש מהר"ו to Genesis Rabbah, I.

[2] See Genesis Rabbah, I, § 4, and all the parallels given there, which are very varying.

[3] See צד"רא, III, and the notes of ר"דל.

personified and endowed with a mystical life of its own, which emanates from God, yet is partly detached from him. Thus we find the Torah pleading for or against Israel, as on the occasion of the destruction of the Temple, when the Torah was called to give evidence against Israel, but desisted from it at the instance of Abraham, who said unto her, "My daughter, were not my children the only ones who received thee, when other nations refused to do so?[1]" Nay, even single letters of the alphabet are endowed with a separate life, enabling them to act the same part almost as the Torah[2]. The whole later mystical theory which degenerates into the combinations of letters to which the most important meaning is attached, takes its origin from these personifications.

This notion of the personification of the Torah never hardened into an article of faith. Its influence is less felt in dogma than in literature, particularly in the legends and scriptural interpretations bearing on the subject of the revelation on Mount Sinai. We must, at least, consider them in their main features.

First, the day of revelation is considered as the day on which earth was wedded to heaven. The barrier between them was removed by the fact that the Torah, the heavenly bride, the daughter of the Holy One, was wedded to Israel on that day[3]. The simile is carried further, and even the feature of the capture of the bride is not missing,—the verse in Ps. lxviii. 19, "Thou hast ascended on high, thou hast led captivity captive," being interpreted as referring to Moses, who ascended to heaven and captured the Torah, in spite of the resistance of the angels, who were most reluctant to allow the Torah, the desirable treasure, to be taken away from among them[4]. Indeed, our planet is con-

[1] See פתיחתא דאיכה רבתי. See also Lev. Rabbah, XIX, and parallels.

[2] See Genesis Rabbah, I. Cp. Pesikta Rabbathi, 109 a.

[3] See Pesikta K., 104 b, and Exod. Rabbah, XXX, 5 and XXXIII, 7.

[4] See Shabbath, 89 b; Pesikta Rabbathi, 98 a and b, and Exod. Rabbah, XXVIII, and parallels.

stantly trembling lest Israel should imitate the example of their heathen neighbours, which would signify their doom to destruction. Hence the attention of the whole universe is directed to this glorious act. When God gave the Torah we read that the creatures of the firmament paused in their flight, those of the earth ventured not to lift up their voices, the waves of the boisterous seas ceased to roll, and the angels interrupted their eternal song of "Holy, Holy, Holy [1]," —heaven and earth listening to the good message.

This listening of the universe suggests the universalistic feature of the Sinaitic revelation. Though magnifying Israel for their readiness to receive the Torah, and strongly blaming the Gentiles who refused to subject themselves to the word of God, so that a certain animosity comes down from Mount Sinai against the worshipper of idols [2], these legends still betray a universalistic tendency as to the real and original purpose of the revelation. Thus with reference to Isa. xlv. 19, God is supposed to have said: "I have not spoken (the word of the revelation) in secret. I did not reveal it in hidden places and in dark places of the earth. I did not even postpone the giving of the Torah till Israel should enter into the Holy Land, lest Israel might claim it for themselves and say that the nations of the world have no share in it; (in other words, it was not God's intention to make it a national religion). I gave it in open places, in the free desert, so that every man feeling the desire might receive it. Nor did I say *first* to the children of Jacob, 'Seek ye me [3].'" For, as we read in other places, the Holy One came first to the sons of Esau and offered to them the Torah. These asked, "What is written in it?" God answered, "Thou shalt not kill." "We cannot accept it," they rejoined,

[1] Exod. Rabbah, XXIX. [2] Shabbath, 89 a.

[3] See Mechilta, 62 a and 66 b, the whole passage beginning ויחנו במדבר. The text is not quite correct. See מ"צ to the passage, and cp. Bacher, *Agada der T.*, II, 164, note 1; and Aruch ed. Kohut, s. v. כנגם. See also Yalkut Machiri on *Is.*, p. 156, reading פוגום instead of כנגם. The MH. reads תהו בקשוני לא עשיתיה הפותיקי אלא נתתי מתן שכרה בצדה.

"killing being our profession." Other nations objected to it on account of the seventh and eighth commandments, immorality and the appropriation of other men's possessions being the purposes of their lives, and the motive-springs of their actions, and so they said: "For the knowledge of thy ways, we have no desire—give thy Torah to thy people[1]."

It is rather characteristic of these legends, which probably reflect the attitude of the Rabbis towards the missionary enterprises of their time, that it is chiefly the moral part of the decalogue to which the nations objected. Esau is broad enough for general principles and will admit the Jewish God into his pantheon, if he submit to the process of accommodation and evolution so that he can share his honours with other gods. Esau objected to the "Do nots." These were too definite to allow of a wide interpretation in which the wisdom of Edom excelled, and might thus interfere with Esau's calling, his gladiators, his legions, and the policy of his procurators.

Thus Mount Sinai becomes the place in which God reveals himself to the world, and Israel undertakes the terrible responsibility of bearing witness to this fact. "If you will not make known my divinity to the nations of the world, even at the cost of your lives, you shall suffer for this iniquity," said God[2]. By this acceptance of the Torah, Israel made peace between God and his world[3], the ultimate end being that its influence will reach the heathen too, and all the Gentiles will one day be converted to the worship of God[4]; for the Torah "is not the Torah of the Priests, nor the Torah of the Levites, nor the Torah of the Israelites, but the Torah of Man (Torath ha-Adam), whose gates are open to receive the righteous nation which keepeth the truth and those who are good and upright in their hearts[5]."

[1] See Mechilta, ibid.; Sifre, 142 b איכה רבתי, III; Pesikta Rabbathi, 99 b, and parallels.

[2] See Lev. Rabbah, VI, and commentaries.

[3] Gen. Rabbah, LXVI.

[4] See Berachoth, 54 b.

[5] Torath Kohanim, 86 b.

Another important feature in these legends and interpretations is the fact that the revelation was an act of grace and the effluence of God's goodness. When the princes of the world heard the thunders and lightnings which accompanied the revelation they were frightened, thinking the world was to pass through another judgment as it did in the days of the deluge, whereupon they consulted their prophet Balaam. He calmed their fears, saying: "Fear not, ye kings, he who rests in heaven has revealed himself to his children in his glory and his mercy. He has appeared, to give to his beloved people Torah, wisdom and instruction[1], and to bless them with strength and peace[2]." In another passage it is stated that God appeared on this occasion in the aspect of an instructing Elder, full of mercy[3]. Like rain and light, the Torah was a gift from heaven of which the world is hardly worthy, but which is indispensable to its maintenance[4].

The gift was a complete one, without any reserve whatever. Nothing of the Torah, God assures Israel, was kept back in heaven[5]. All that follows is only a matter of interpretation. The principle held by the Rabbis was that the words of the Torah "are fruitful and multiply[6]." Thus the conviction could ripen that everything wise and good, be it ethical or ceremonial in its character, the effect of which would be to strengthen the cause of religion, was at least potentially contained in the Torah. Hence the famous adage, that everything which any student will teach at any future time, was already communicated to Moses on the Mount Sinai, as also the injunction that any acceptable truth, though discovered by an insignificant man in Israel should be considered of as high authority as if it had emanated from a great sage or prophet or even from Moses himself. It requires but an earnest religious mind to

[1] See Pesikta Rabbathi, 95 a.
[2] See Sifre, 142 b.
[3] See Mechilta, 66 b.
[4] Gen. Rabbah, VI.
[5] Deut. Rabbah, VIII.
[6] See Chagigah, 3 b.

discover all truth there [1]. For the Torah came down from heaven with all the necessary instruments: humility, righteousness and uprightness—and even her reward was in her [2]. And man has only to apply these tools to find in the Torah peace, strength, life, light, bliss, happiness, joy and freedom [3].

The Torah was, in short, all things to all men. To the Theosophist, who had already come under the sway of Hellenistic influences, it was the very expression of God's wisdom, which would, as far as it is consistent with Biblical notions, elevate it into an emanation of God's essence, and endow it with a pre-mundane existence, reaching almost to infinity. To the mystical poet, with his love for the picturesque, it was the heavenly bride adorned with all the virtues which only heaven could bestow on her, at whose presentation to Israel the whole universe rejoiced, for her touch with mankind meant the wedding of heaven to earth. What, then, could the poor mortal do better than to learn to know her and to fall in love with her?

To the great majority of the Rabbis who retained their sober sense and cared more about what God requires us to be than about knowing what he is, the Torah was simply the manifestation of God's will, revealed to us for our good; the pedagogue, as the Rabbis expressed it [4], who educates God's creatures. The occupation with the Torah was, according to the Rabbis, less calculated to produce schoolmen and jurists than saints and devout spirits. "Whosoever labours in the Torah for its own sake, merits many things .... he is called friend, beloved, a lover of God, a lover of mankind; it clothes him in meekness and fear (of God), and fits him to become righteous, pious and

[1] Sifre, 79 b. [2] Deut. Rabbah, ibid.

[3] See Pesikta K., 105 b; Mechilta, 36 b, 47 a; Sifre, 82 b and 83 b; Exod. Rabbah, XXXVI.

[4] See Gen. Rabbah, I. Cp. אבות עם הלמוד ירושלמי &c. by R. בח חיים מקברין on the פרק קנין תורה 3 b and 4 a, the passage given there from the Mechilta, and Ishmael.

upright; it keeps him far from sin, brings him towards the side of virtue and gives him sovereignty and dominion and discerning judgment. To him the secrets of the Torah are revealed; he becomes a never-failing fountain, he grows modest and long-suffering, forgives insults and is exalted above all things[1]." On the other hand his individualism does not make him exclusive, his freedom does not involve the subjection of others, the world rejoices in him, for he enriches it with sound knowledge, understanding and strength[2]. His life is one continuous mourning for the glory of God and the glory of Israel (at present obscured) and a constant longing for their salvation[3], whilst his activity (a continuation of the revelation) is making peace between heaven and earth[4]. In sooth Israel has recognized the strength (or the secret) of the Torah; therefore, they said: "We forsake not God and his Torah, as it is said: 'I sat down under his shadow with great delight and his fruit was sweet to my taste' (Song of Songs, ii. 3)[5]."

In fine, to the Jew the Torah was anything but a curse. He understood how to find out the sweetness and the light of it and of the Law which formed a part of it.

S. SCHECHTER.

[1] See פרק קנין תורה and תרב"או פ' י"ז.
[2] ק"ח, ibid.
[3] See תרא"ר פ"ד.
[4] Sanhedrin, 99 b.
[5] See Exod. Rabbah, XVII.

(To be continued.)

ON THE HISTORY OF SPINOZISM.

If one would realize, by the most striking example, the various views that may be entertained of great men and their works, one must study the history of Spinoza and his teaching. Ever since he appeared on the scene and began to beat out a new path in the domain of thought, praise and blame, veneration and depreciation have fallen to his lot to an unusual degree. In the two centuries which have passed since his death, his name becomes the shibboleth of contending theories of the universe, and ever as the one or the other gains the upper hand, the highest admiration for his system alternates with the most scornful contempt for it. Even at the present day the contest around the teaching of Spinoza is not at an end. Just as once the bravest of the Greeks fought round the arms of Achilles, so now we find the most celebrated thinkers at variance with each other concerning the intellectual heritage which Spinoza bequeathed. It is worth while to investigate somewhat closely this continual ebb and flow of opinion for and against Spinoza, and thus to discharge at least one part of the task, which the history of philosophy has hitherto avoided.

I.

The happiness which springs from being known and loved by honest friends of truth, from forming their minds and perfecting their morals by frank exchange of thought: this, as is evident from his letters, Spinoza was by no means slow to appreciate. He was also animated by the desire to gain a hearing for his doctrines, and to secure their diffusion, among those who were capable of comprehending them. But being free from all small feeling, he

never yielded to the mere vain striving after fame and glory, after popularity and universal recognition. He showed by the very form which he gave to his philosophical writings, and especially to his chief work, the *Ethics*, that his object was not to write for the great mass of people, but for the learned few; to the understanding of the masses he made not the smallest concessions. He knew very well that "whoever wishes to teach any doctrine to a whole nation—to say nothing of the whole human race,—and who desires to be understood by all, must prove his subject by experience alone, and must adapt his reasons and explanations chiefly to the understanding of the common people, who form the greater portion of the human race. But he must not develop his arguments with close connexion or present his expositions with strict regard to continuity; otherwise he will write only for scholars, that is, he will be understood only by the very small minority of men[1]." And, indeed, whoever has but cast a glance at the *Ethics* of Spinoza and at the stiff mathematical structure of its ideas, which is an object of awe even to many a scholar, perceives that Spinoza had no thought of appealing to the masses when he wrote his masterpiece, but that "he wished to be understood only by the very small minority of men." His general attitude corresponds entirely with this position. He warns his friends to whom he sends the *Short Tractate*, not to communicate its contents to any first comer, but only to those of whom they know for certain that it "will tend to their happiness." In the preface to the *Tractatus Theologico-Politicus*, he declares still more emphatically how little he desires that that book should become popular. "I know that it is as impossible to remove superstition from the common people as fear; I know further that firmness with the mass of people is obstinacy, and that in dealing out praise and blame, they are not guided by reason, but are

[1] *Tract. Theol.-Polit.*, V, 37.

transported by passion. Hence I do not invite the populace or those who are controlled by the same emotions as the populace, to read this book. Indeed I would rather that they should leave it quite unnoticed, than that they should become troublesome by wrongly interpreting its meaning, and not only do no good to themselves but injure others."

But it was not only his mean opinion of the common people that prevented him from striving after popularity. He lacked the quality which alone could lead to such striving, viz. ambition. It is entirely in accordance with his innermost being when he remarks in his *Ethics*: "He who desires to assist other people either by advice or by deed, will strive to win their love, and not to draw them into admiration, in the hope that his teaching may be named after him[1]." And for this reason he published only one book under his own name, and that one contains the principles not of his own, but of the Cartesian philosophy. Of his other works, though some of them are free from elements that provoke opposition, only one appeared in his life-time, and that was published anonymously, viz. the *Theologico-political Tractate*. And it is clear from the instructions which he gave his friends shortly before his death, that this cautiousness is not due solely to his fear of a conflict with the authorities of the state. He gives them permission to have his posthumous works printed, but not to mention the name of the author, "because," as the literal quotation from the *Ethics* runs, "he did not wish that his tenets should be named after him." He knew that his thoughts would live on eternally; the name of their author might perish. Just as he had lived in calm seclusion, so he wished to vanish and be forgotten after his death.

Fate has decided otherwise than he had thought and wished. Even in his life-time he enjoyed abundant honour

[1] *Ethics*, IV, app. c. 25.

and fame; though his philosophy did not gain the assent of that learned minority, for whom above all he wrote. After his death his name was in every one's mouth, but his philosophy was misinterpreted and distorted. None of the great thinkers of Germany, England, and France ranged themselves on his side; we must seek for his followers among those whom he disdained, among the Protestant clergy and that humbler class whom he regarded as not ripe for scientific knowledge. It is not till a hundred years after his death, that we find in the European world a real understanding of his teaching.

Spinoza had scarcely attained to manhood when a number of young men flocked round him, who were animated with a burning eagerness to assimilate and propagate his doctrines[1]. Then, when the *Principia Philosophiae Cartesianae* had appeared, and other works in the handwriting of the philosopher were passed from hand to hand; when also in the year 1670 the *Tractatus Theologico-Politicus* was published and the name of the author could not remain long concealed beneath the veil of anonymity, the fame of Spinoza penetrated far beyond the quiet retreat in which he had taken refuge: far, too, beyond the borders of his native land.

Shortly after the publication of the *Principia*, Spinoza wrote that he was scarcely any longer his own master, so many were the friends who came to visit him. Stoupe, a French colonel, who in the year 1673 wrote a book entitled *Religio Hollandorum*, relates in it that Spinoza had become an object of universal curiosity. "Ce Spinoza," he says, "vit dans ce pays; il a demeuré quelque temps à la Hage où il était visité par tous les esprits curieux et même par des filles de qualité, qui se piquent d'avoir l'esprit au-dessus de leur sexe. Ses sectateurs n'osent pas

[1] Regarding Spinoza's circle of friends, see especially *Epist.* 9 and 26 (8 ed. Hag.) and end of the *Tract. Brevis.* Stoupe's account, which I have not read in the original, is given by Jenichen in *Hist. Spinozismi*, p. 56, and by A. v. d. Linde in his *Benedictus Spinoza, Bibliografie*, p. 19.

se découvrir," &c. But not only did men and women of polite society seek out Spinoza in his seclusion, but the best men of Holland were counted among his friends —men like the noble statesman Jan de Witt, the great physicist Huyghens, and the excellent philologist Isaac Voss. From England came Oldenburg, the secretary of the Royal Society, to seek instruction from the hermit of Rhynsburg, and he was the means of effecting an acquaintance between Spinoza and the greatest chemist of that time, Robert Boyle. In France, the atheistical epicureans, who were then a rather numerous body, thought that they had in Spinoza a fellow-thinker. One of them, the poet d'Hénault, made a journey to Holland on purpose to make Spinoza's acquaintance. The latter, however, as Bayle informs us, did not think much of the Frenchman, whose frivolous view of life was very remote from his own lofty outlook upon the world.

Of Germans, Tschirnhausen and Leibniz may be mentioned as having sought out Spinoza and as having maintained a scientific intercourse with him. But the respect which his name enjoyed in Germany, is best proved by the "call" which emanated from Carl Ludwig, the enlightened Electoral Prince of the Palatinate, after he had read Spinoza's *Principia Philosophiae Cartesianae*[1]. He offered the spectacle-grinder of the Hague a professorship at the University of Heidelberg. Spinoza declined the offer, for the outward splendour of an honourable position would not have sufficed to compensate him for the loss of his independence.

We see that Spinoza had attained to that which he had never striven to gain, viz. great celebrity ; but the recognition of his doctrines did not keep pace with the renown of his name. Of all the distinguished scholars, philologists, naturalists, and philosophers, who lived in the time of Spinoza, there is not one who would have acknowledged

[1] *Chevraeana*, part II, p. 99 in Paulus' *Benedictus de Spinoza, Opera* I, p. xxiii.

himself Spinoza's disciple. And even among the men just named who visited, knew, and highly esteemed Spinoza, who corresponded with him on the most varied scientific subjects, and who sought enlightenment on the meaning of his philosophy, even among these there is not one who would have liked to hear himself called a Spinozist. Malebranche read Spinoza's works and often quoted them; his mystical teaching, derived from the sources from which Spinoza drew, comes very near to Spinoza's doctrine of Universal Substance. But he indignantly rejects the reproach of Spinozism, which Mairan, Fénelon, and others had cast at him, and his disparaging expressions sound harsh to the point of unworthy rudeness, when he speaks of Spinoza as this "misérable athée," the "méchant esprit," and of his "chimère épouvantable et ridicule."

Again, Henry More, like Spinoza and Malebranche, was led to the adoption of his philosophical system through the study of neo-Platonism and of Descartes, and he comes even nearer to Spinoza than Malebranche in his conception of space, which, like Spinoza, he regards as an attribute of the Deity. But this does not prevent him from strongly emphasizing his remoteness from Spinoza and from disclaiming the latter's theological and metaphysical views in a harsh piece of criticism [1].

Leibniz not only stood on terms of personal intercourse with Spinoza and carried on a correspondence with him, but also read and studied his books with great eagerness, both the earlier works and those which appeared after his death. And in the course of the development of his philosophy, which extended over years and decades, there was certainly one phase in which, according to his own confession, he inclined towards Spinozism [2]. But this phase was of short duration. In the period that follows, he turns

[1] Henrici Mori *Epist. altera in Opera philos.*, I, p. 563, ed. 1679.

[2] This has been shown by L. Stein, *Leibniz und Spinoza*, p. 27; his other assertions on the relation of the two thinkers are, on the contrary, very disputable.

away with more and more definiteness from Spinoza's mechanical Pantheism, and seeks to widen the breach which separates his own philosophy from Spinoza's to the point of absolute opposition. In this, however, he does not quite succeed, for even the later form of his philosophic teaching exhibits numerous points of contact with Spinoza's. Nevertheless he succeeded in carefully obliterating every trace of the friendly intercourse which once existed between him and the notorious Jew, as he calls him[1].

The philosophy of Walter von Tschirnhausen comes yet nearer to Spinoza's teaching. He seems to have aimed at realizing the ideal which Spinoza, in his self-effacement, had formed of the relation of the teacher to his pupils. Tschirnhausen's work, *Medicina Mentis*, clearly shows the influence of Spinoza's doctrine of Cognition, but the name of the man to whom he is indebted for a considerable portion of his ideas is not once mentioned by him. Thus Spinoza's teaching continues to live a kind of impersonal life in the work of the pupil after the death of the master—exactly as the latter at his death had wished. Yet it cannot escape the attentive reader of the *Medicina Mentis*, that it is after all only the outer shell of Spinozism that we here encounter, and that Tschirnhausen is quite as unfriendly towards its inner kernel as Leibniz.

But what is true of Tschirnhausen may be stated still more emphatically of the admirable scholars who, like

[1] *Otium Hannoveranum*, p. 221, ed. 1737. It is worthy of remark that Leibniz's dissenting criticism of Spinoza had come before the notice of several of the latter's antagonists, and was repeated by them. Jacob Thomasius, Leibniz's teacher, was the first who published a polemical work against Spinoza's *Theologico-political Tractate*. To him Leibniz writes as follows, in January, 1672—the words had been communicated to him by Graevius (Spinoza, *Epist.*, p. 184, ed. Land): "Spinoza Judaeus ἀποσυνάγωγος ob opinionum monstra" (*Epist. ad div.*, III, p. 63). The same words are used by Musaeus, perhaps the most important of the older opponents of Spinoza, in his *Dissertation on the Tractate* (p. 1), and by Kortholt, in his work *De Trib. Impost.*, p. 75.

Huyghens, Vossius, and Boyle, stood in the most friendly relations with Spinoza. They held in esteem the character and mind of the great thinker, but the scientific and religious convictions of these empirics differed too widely from the opinions of Spinoza to allow of his philosophy exercising a lasting influence upon them.

There were but a few unimportant men who were faithful followers of Spinoza in his life-time: men like Simon de Vries, who died young, or the versatile physician Ludwig Meyer, or the Mennonite merchant Jarrig Jellis, or like Saint-Glain first captain, then editor of a newspaper, or the jurist Adrian Koerbagh, and some others of their standing—none of them philosophers by profession, but philosophic dilettants[1]. But these could not form a school, they could not win the assent of contemporaries to a system so sharply combated as Spinoza's, or prevent the storm which broke over him and his doctrines even in his life-time.

II.

Spinoza learned, at two widely-separated periods, what terrible power was still in his day wielded by religious fanaticism and theological intolerance. First in the year 1656, when "on account of his bad teachings and actions" he was excommunicated, expelled from the communion of Judaism, and driven from his home by the magistrate of Amsterdam. How dreadful sound the words with which the seceder was excommunicated and anathematized[2]: "According to the decision of the angels and the judgment of the saints, with the sanction of the holy God and the whole congregation, we excom-

[1] The above-mentioned persons are all well known, except the last two. With respect to St.-Glain, the translator of the *Tract. theol.-polit.*, cf. Des Maizeaux on Bayle, *Op.* iv, p. 46, and Baumgarten, *Nachrichten*, I, p. 69 a. Koerbagh is the author of a work founded upon Spinozistic principles, and entitled: *Een Ligt Schijnende in Duystere Plaatsen om te verligten de voornaamste saaken der Godsgeleertheyd en Godsdienst*, Amsterdam, 1668 and 1711.

[2] Van Vloten, *Bened. de Spinoza, Opp. Suppl.*, p. 290.

municate, expel, curse, and execrate Baruch de Espinoza before the holy books and the six hundred and thirteen commandments which are contained in them, with the ban which Joshua decreed upon Jericho, with the curse which Elisha pronounced over the children, and with all the execrations which are written in the Law. Cursed be he by day and cursed be he by night, cursed be he when he lieth down and cursed be he when he riseth up, cursed be he when he goeth out and cursed be he when he cometh in. May God never forgive him! His anger and his passion shall be kindled against this man, on whom rest all the curses and execrations which are written in the Holy Scriptures. . . . No one shall have intercourse with him, either by speech or in writing, no one may do him a favour, no one be together with him beneath the same roof or within four ells, no one read a book which he has composed or written."

There is something which rouses our indignation in seeing this kind of religious hatred practised by a community, the members of which had almost all but lately escaped from the most terrible religious persecution. They were Marranos or descendants of Marannos; either in their own persons or in those of their fathers and brothers, they had learnt to know the misery and the horrors of religious fanaticism in the torture-chambers of the Spanish Inquisition and the dungeons of the Portuguese ecclesiastical tribunals. Only a short time before had they begun to breathe the freer air of the Netherlands. And now they themselves punish with proscription and excommunication, with curses and denunciations, a man whom no one could accuse of sordid conduct or of any offence against morality and law, against whom no other charge could be brought but that he thought otherwise, more freely about his faith than his co-religionists, and that he ordered his life accordingly. And indeed the ban which fell upon Spinoza's head has not infrequently been regarded as a *proof of the persecuting spirit of Judaism*, and sentence has been

pronounced upon the council of the Amsterdam congregation as upon a *band of fanatics*. If, indeed, we judge of the procedure of this congregational council in the light of our views on the freedom of thought and belief, we can scarcely find a word of blame which would be severe enough. But their excuse is the spirit of their time and of their environment. The Jewish congregations of the Middle Ages and of modern times, though animated by a jealous care that the inner sanctuary of their religion should be untouched by any strange breath, have yet always adapted themselves in externals to the manners and customs of their environment. As with their dress, dwellings, and entire conduct of life, so also in the relations of the individual towards the collective body, they regulated their habits essentially according to the ideas and laws prevalent in the land in which they dwelt. They were lenient and indulgent in matters of faith under the enlightened Mohammedan rule: they were intolerant under the fanatical Christian nations of the Middle Ages. Similarly in the seventeenth century, they followed the example of the nations among which they lived. The period was far removed from religious toleration. In Spain and Portugal religious error was still regarded as a crime worthy of death; there the prisons of the Inquisition were still filled with suspects, and year after year the flames consumed the bodies of the hapless people who had been declared heretics. Even in Protestant countries—in Germany, England, Scotland, Switzerland, Sweden—no real freedom of belief was yet known, and no toleration was extended to unbelievers. Perhaps the most instructive example of the intolerance of this period is afforded by the Protestant settlers in America, who, driven from Europe on account of their faith, had themselves scarcely escaped persecution, when they persecuted all who differed from them with fearful cruelty.

In the Netherlands there was in a certain sense more tolerance. Jews and Dissenters were not only allowed

to live in the country; they were also granted, within certain limits, the free exercise of their religion. Yet here too a rigid religious coercion fettered the members of the ruling Church, and suffered no loosening of religious bondage. The seventeenth century is filled with the persecutions which befel heretics and sectaries in the Netherlands. Hugo de Grot and Oldenbarneveld are witnesses for this; so, too, are the Arminians, who were forbidden by the Synod of Dordrecht to hold Divine worship, and whose ministers were driven into exile. Philosophy, too, and the philosophers were by no means free in the Netherlands. Descartes had to thank the intercession of the French ambassador for his escape from imprisonment and banishment; his philosophy, on the other hand, did not escape proscription. In the same year in which the Jewish community excommunicated Spinoza, the second Synod of Dordrecht issued a prohibition against reading and propagating the works of Descartes. Geulincz was compelled on account of heretical teachings to give up his professorship at Löwen and to flee to Leyden, and he would have perished in misery had not the Cartesian Heidanus taken pity upon him. As late as 1690, the Synod of Amsterdam declared as false and pernicious the doctrine that the magistrates do not possess the right to suppress heresy by force.

It is not to be wondered at that the rulers of the Jewish community imitated the examples, which the ecclesiastical and political authorities of the freest country of Europe set them, and that they on their part strove to protect the purity of their faith by solemn excommunications. The formula which was employed against Spinoza is indeed absolutely barbarous; it was, however, prescribed by ancient legal directions, and was not to be softened for the sake of the heretic.

Moreover, the ban seems to have exerted but a small effect on Spinoza's external life. He enjoyed as before the respect of the best men of his native country. Christian

and Jewish[1] friends of science carried on intercourse with him in the most unconstrained and friendly way. He lived unmolested in the immediate neighbourhood of Amsterdam, and went as often as he wished to Amsterdam itself. Moreover, the Jewish writers who towards the end of the seventeenth century developed an extraordinary activity, hardly took any notice of their famous co-religionist who had fallen under the ban[2]. But that the curse which was pronounced upon him, and the forced separation from his father and brothers and sisters, from friends and relatives, inflicted a wound upon his heart which had not healed many years later, is shown by the *Tractatus Theologico-Politicus*, which was not published till 1670. It is alleged that this treatise contains portions of the *Vindication*, which Spinoza wrote immediately after the ban had been pronounced upon him. This accounts for the irritated tone of the *Tractatus*. It is not the passionless thinker, free from prejudice, such as he usually is, that speaks to us here, but the deeply embittered, unjust, grudging opponent of Judaism[3]. Spinoza was after all a man; and it is conceivable, though not justifiable, that human rancour at the injustice done him found expression in a work, the first planning of which falls into the period of his excommunication.

If, however, a more modern inquirer is right in his data regarding the works of Spinoza, and we should have to assume that the *Tractatus Brevis* was finished before the year 1656, then the only possible hypothesis would be that the opinions expressed in this work were the "bad teachings," on account of which, as the formula of excom-

[1] Greiffencrantz in Kortholt *De Trib. Imp. Magnis*, Praef.: Judaeis etiam domestico usu non semper inderdixit; van Vloten, *Spinoza*, p. 29. To letter 49 (43 ed. Hag.), which was formerly believed to have been addressed to Isaac Orobio, it is no longer permissible to refer, since the real addressee is Johann Oosten. Cf. Ben. de Spinoza, opp. II, pp. v and 169, ed. Hag.

[2] Graetz, *Hist. of the Jews*, vol. X, p. xi.

[3] This has been proved by M. Joël's learned *Examination of the Theol.-Polit. Tractatus* (Breslau, 1870).

munication asserts, Spinoza was accused and sentenced. But this assumption is without foundation. Neither this nor any other work of Spinoza which is known to us was composed before 1656[1]: it must therefore have been oral utterances, for which Spinoza was brought to account, and for this assertion, indeed, we have the testimony of the philosopher's biographers.

III.

With the publication of the *Theologico-political Tractate* begins a second period of heresy-hunting and calumniation. This phase is not introduced by a single event taking deep hold of Spinoza's life, like the decreeing of the ban in the year 1656, but it is filled with a long series of violent, often savage and malicious, attacks upon the candid opponent of the orthodox doctrine of the church.

Spinoza had in this work expressed the freest and boldest views concerning God and nature, liberty and necessity, the Bible and revelation, church and state. His opinions contradicted, with great asperity, all theological and philosophic systems prevailing in the seventeenth century. Religion appeared to be threatened in her deepest foundations. Christianity and Judaism, Scholasticism and Cartesianism were attacked in equal measure. What wonder that all sects and schools united in condemnation of the dangerous book? Protestants, Catholics, and Jews, disciples of the later scholasticism and of Descartes, theologians, philologists, and physicians, Dutch, Germans, French, and English, vied with each other in the rejection and repudiation of the *Tractate* as of a mischievous, heretical, unscrupulous work, which denied the Deity, destroyed the true faith, uprooted morality, and hence undermined the stability and welfare of the state.

[1] Spinoza would hardly have used christological terminology before his expulsion from the Jewish community, as he does in *Tract. Brev.*, I, c. 9. II, c. 22.

Scarcely had a few months elapsed since the *Tractate* had appeared—without mention of the author, and with a false place of issue—when two German professors, Jacob Thomasius (the teacher of Leibniz) and Friedrich Rappolt, thundered against the anonymous author of the "blasphemous Tractate" and his "insane love of innovation." So quickly did the news of this interesting, infamous book, as well as the book itself, penetrate into the very heart of Germany. But Rappolt and Thomasius were not antagonists of equal standing with Spinoza; their works were without effect. The States-General[1] promulgated an order which attached Spinoza's work, and forbade its further propagation. But in vain. For there appeared three further impressions of the *Tractate*, which, however, did not purport to be new editions, but faithfully copied the first edition, and all exhibited the date 1670. These testify to the tremendous sensation which the book created, and this is further shown by the fact that in the years 1673–74 four new editions could be prepared in Amsterdam and Leyden. Only one of them, however, is printed with the proper title; the three others are smuggled through under a false flag as innocent historical or medical works. It is from this time that the real battle against Spinoza begins. If Thomasius, Rappolt, and some other opponents had in the years 1670–71 attacked the author of the *Tractate* in tractlets, noisy speeches, and letters, the fighting was now carried on by means of weighty treatises and huge, learned books. In the single year 1674 no fewer than five scholars published refutations of the *Tractate*: Jacob Vateler, the preacher of the Remonstrants in the Hague, Regner von Mansfeld, Professor of Theology, Musaeus, Professor of

[1] According to epist. 47 (44, ed. Hag.) not before Feb., 1671. But in April, 1671, the prohibition had already been promulgated, as Graevius' letter to Leibniz (Leibniz's *Phil. Writings*, I, p. 115) shows. This prohibition is also mentioned by Stoupe, *Relig. des Holland.* (in Jenichen, *Hist. Spin.*, Leenhof, p. 51), and J. Braun, *Vera Belgarum Relig.* (in Jenichen, *ibid.*). Comp. also Spinoza, Opp. II, p. 184, ed. Hag.

Theology in Jena, Spitzelius, Lutheran preacher in Rotterdam, and William Blyenbergh, a merchant who dabbled in philosophy, and who, at an earlier period, had put Spinoza's patience to the severest test by his importunate questions. During the succeeding three years Johann Bredenberg, Franciscus Cuper, Pierre Poiret, Lambert Velthuysen, appear upon the arena, the last-named, an opponent whom even Spinoza held in respect, and whose arguments he thought alone worthy of refutation[1]. What the other opponents lacked in argument, most of them made up in severity, even barbarity, of judgment upon the "most godless of all writers," and his "absurd, pernicious, and poisonous book." One of the best of these hostile works is a treatise by Musaeus, the Jena professor. In this book Spinoza is described as "a man of bold countenance, fanatical and estranged from all religion." The following judgment is passed upon the *Tractate*: "He (Spinoza) has left no mental faculty, no cunning, no art untried, in order to conceal his fabrication beneath a brilliant veil, so that we may with good reason doubt whether among the great number of those whom the devil himself has hired for the destruction of all human and divine right, there is one to be found who has been more zealous in the work of corruption than this traitor who was born to the great injury of the church and to the harm of the state[2]."

All these outbreaks of religious fanaticism failed to rob Spinoza of the cheerful composure which seldom left him throughout his life. When he met with Mansfeld's libel in a bookshop, and had cursorily glanced at it, he wrote to his friend Jarrig Jellis: "I have seen in a bookseller's window the book which the Professor of Utrecht has written against my work, and from the little I read of it through that opportunity, I perceived that it does not deserve to be read, still less to be answered. Therefore I pay no regard to the book and its author. But I said

[1] Ep. 48, 49, 75 (42, 43, 69).

[2] Musaeus, *Tract. Theol.-Polit. ad veritatis lancem examinatus*, pp. 1, 2.

to myself with a smile, how precisely the most ignorant are usually also the most impudent, and the most ready to rush into print[1]."

Spinoza, indeed, could not be an impartial judge in his own cause, yet the majority of those who have given an account of his life are still at the present time no less severe than he in their judgment. The authors of these attacks are declared to be ignorant, narrow-minded, malicious fanatics, who were incapable of estimating the greatness of their opponent, and who did not even make the attempt to understand his teaching. These verdicts, however, are not just. There were some very learned, clear-sighted, and well-intentioned men among Spinoza's opponents. Most of them were unquestionably most profoundly convinced of the pernicious tendency of Spinoza's *Tractate*, and believed that they served religion and the good of the state, by attacking the dangerous book with the sharpest weapons at their disposal, and by bringing about, if possible, its suppression. Religiously biassed, as they almost all were, they did not know that the spirit of a great modern epoch spoke to them out of the *Tractatus Theologico-Politicus*, the spirit of unprejudiced research, of scientific independence, of sober criticism, the spirit which quakes before no authority, not even before Bible and dogma, and which recognizes no higher tribunal than clear, impartial, self-consistent thought. To the children of the nineteenth century, to whom freedom of thought and belief, the independence of knowledge, and even the toleration of religious error have become current notions, Spinoza appears as one of the most conspicuous among those intellectual champions, who saw the value of religion not in unintelligible dogmas and meaningless ceremonies, but in its purifying and hallowing influence upon our will and action, who sought to free political life from the interference of priestly power, and who claimed the free use of reason as an inalienable

[1] Epist. 50.

human right. It would be unfair to demand of Spinoza's contemporaries a similar estimation of the man and of his life's work. For the seventeenth century still lay entirely beneath the fetters of religious and scientific bondage. Dogmas still governed every department of theoretical and practical life; "holy theology," to use Bacon's language, "was still regarded as the acme of all human intellectual activity, as its haven and resting-place." The Reformation had won back one of the rights of which the Middle Ages had robbed research, the right of free study of the Bible. But before the word of the Bible the reformers had made a halt, and even this right was insecure amid the strife of wrangling churches. It is true that through the action of some of the numerous Protestant sects, the Quakers, Arminians, Socinians, &c., some milder elements had been engrafted upon the stern system of traditional church doctrine; true that the philosophy of a Descartes, a Hobbes, and a Herbert of Cherbury came into collision with this or that religious conviction; nevertheless in spite of all the attacks of philosophic doubters and heterodox sects, the rock of Catholic and Protestant theology remained unshaken; unshaken stood the belief in the divinity of the Bible, the truth of prophecy, the correctness of the doctrines concerning God and man which are contained in Holy Writ. And now came an anonymous writer, who later on emerged to view as a spectacle-grinder expelled from the Jewish community, and attacked all these fundamental articles of the prevailing faith, partly in open words, partly with ill-concealed hostility. He regarded and explained the Bible as a profane work. He looked upon the prophets as ordinary men, and their predictions as lively pictures of the imagination. A suspension of the order of nature by means of a miracle he declared to be inconceivable, and on the doctrines which relate to the existence of Christ he was altogether silent. He conceived of God himself, not as the Creator and Ruler of the world, but as an essence inhering in and inseparable from it. He took

no heed of any doctrine of the Synagogue or of any dogma of the Church ; no decisions of Councils and Synods bound him ; he was bold enough and self-convinced enough to set his reason above a sacred tradition of more than a thousand years. And even the state, whose power he raised far above that of the Church, was to possess no right over the thought and belief of the citizen, so long as he did not act contrary to its laws.—Such were the teachings of this dangerous man ; people perceived in them the most audacious speculations of a reason that overrated itself. They saw in Spinoza only the atheist and despiser of religion, who jeopardized the state and morality. Who could honestly blame pious men, if, as the Jewish congregation of Amsterdam had already done, they brought forth the sharpest weapons from their theological armoury in defence of their threatened faith, and essayed to protect religion, morality, and the state with all the strength at their disposal. It is true that the tone in which they spoke was ignoble. The violence of the abuse which they heaped upon Spinoza is obnoxious to us. Yet we must remember that a period degenerate with the religious strifes of many years, felt and fought differently from ourselves ; we must understand that the opponents of Spinoza wielded the weapons which the custom of their time offered them, and that they were not conscious of doing anything blameworthy, if in the heat of the battle they made use of more violent expressions than politeness and propriety allowed.

All these men appear to us in comparison with Spinoza unspeakably little. They do not approach him either in depth of perception, or in breadth of view, or in historical importance. But it is inevitable that they adhered with much greater firmness to their standpoint than he to his, and that in many of their objections they had right on their side. Spinoza, who had broken with so many inherited religious views, saw himself opposed to a world filled with superstitions and prejudices, rooted in the views which he rejected and furnished with the most terrible

instruments of power. He knew that he could not with impunity defy it, wound its deepest feelings, and declare its deepest convictions to be void. He wished, however, not to wound but to reconcile, not to provoke but to explain. He wanted to bring peace to a world torn by sad religious wars, not to bring fresh struggles to it. He wished to find peace for himself in this turbulent, strife-seeking world, for he needed peace for the accomplishment of his life's work. Hence, like Descartes and Leibniz, he always displayed a certain cautiousness in the expression of his opinions, sought for compromises, and seldom spoke his last word. He never indeed denied the truth, but he often forbore to speak his true meaning. He submitted the Bible to critical examination, but in order to please his contemporaries, often enough tried to establish an agreement between it and his views where the most decided opposition is to be found. This is not cowardice, neither is it hypocrisy, but a precaution which the circumstances of the time seem to force upon him. But it could not be difficult for his opponents to hunt up such weak points in his work. Musaeus is entirely right when, in the course of his attack on Spinoza, he emphasizes the statement, that religion demands something more from man than obedience and love; that it is by no means a matter of indifference in respect to faith whether we conceive of God as fire, spirit, light, or thought; that the Holy Scriptures do certainly not declare the will of God and the law of nature to be identical; and that the ceremonies of the Israelites were not given solely for the promotion of their temporal happiness and the welfare of the State[1]. The remark of Thomasius is alike appropriate and spiteful when he observes that Spinoza, who esteemed himself fortunate that he lived under a state which granted its citizens full liberty of thought and belief, could yet not be so very happy, since he did not even dare to acknowledge himself

[1] Joh. Musaeus, *Tractatus Theol.-Polit. ad veritatis lancem examinatus*, pp. 24, 29, 65.

openly as the author of the *Tractate*[1]. That Spinoza moreover misunderstood or falsely explained numerous passages of the Bible was pointed out by several of his opponents, and especially by Franz Cuper[2].

If the facts which have thus been adduced are considered, we shall judge the opponents of Spinoza more leniently than has been usually the case, and we shall understand how it was that men so insignificant as all those who have been mentioned were able to direct the judgment of contemporaries and of posterity concerning Spinoza for quite a century. With rare unanimity they declared Spinoza to be an Atheist devoid of all religion and his teaching to be an absurdity. Sentence of death was thereby passed upon his philosophy, and his influence upon the development of the mental sciences was for a long time crippled. He was thrown aside "like a dead dog": one who denied God deserved no better fate. Many of the whilom friends of Spinoza were embarrassed by the cry raised by his antagonists and shaken in their friendly sentiments. Oldenburg, who since 1661 had been in very active correspondence with Spinoza, and to whom as early as that year the most important passages from the first book of the *Ethics* had been communicated, sorrowfully calls attention to the fact that *so very many* are of opinion that he, Spinoza, confounds God with nature, abolishes the veneration paid to miracles, and suppresses his true opinion of Jesus Christ, the Saviour of the world. He begs him to express himself openly on this point, and to do so in a manner that would satisfy orthodox Christians. Spinoza replies frankly and honestly, as he was bound to do to a friend of so many years' standing. But Oldenburg writes to his still greatly esteemed friend, that confronted as he was with the choice between Spinoza's heretical views and the faith of the Bible, he did not hesitate to decide for the latter, and with this discordant note their

[1] Jac. Thomasius, *Dissertationes*, LXIII, p. 573.

[2] Franciscus Cuperus, *Arcana Atheismi Revelata*, Roterod , 1676.

correspondence ends.—About the same time a creature like Albert Burgh ventured to appear as vindicator of the divine revelation "against the bold and deplorable presumption" of his former teacher, dared to pronounce his philosophy mere illusion and chimera and to invite him to abandon his "foolish wisdom" and to enter the haven of the Roman Catholic Church, which alone brings salvation. The answer which Spinoza vouchsafed to his former pupil belongs to his severest, frankest, most pregnant letters. Anger at the importunity of the bold fanatic, and pain at the aberration of the infatuated man, made Spinoza emerge from the reserve which he usually imposed on himself. Relentlessly he lays bare the weakness into which the proselytizing zeal of the youthful convert had betrayed him into, and while he heaps upon him biting scorn, he at the same time annihilates him with sober argument: never has the folly of an unreasoning zealot been more thoroughly refuted or more severely castigated.

But Albert Burgh had only stated concerning Spinoza's philosophy that which in consequence of the constant charges brought against him was universally accepted. So inimical to Spinoza was public opinion at this time, that he did not venture to send his *Ethics* to the Press, as he had intended. Theologians and Cartesians had spread the report that he was about to prove in a new work that there is no God; they laid an information against him with the magistrates, and he determined not to publish the book, though it was his favourite work. We know that it was only printed after his death, together with his other posthumous works, and then only with the bare initials of the author, and without the name of publisher, printer, or place of printing: an indication how dangerous it still was to circulate the works of the decried atheist.

IV.

The *Tractatus Theologico-Politicus*, the heretical contents of which had raised this storm of indignation against

Spinoza, contains, side by side with theological expositions, many of the important ideas of his philosophy, but without the strong foundation and without the mathematically close connexion which the *Ethics* gave them. In this work, which before its publication in 1677 had only been entrusted to a few friends in manuscript, the whole of Spinoza's theoretical and practical philosophy is for the first time set forth in its comprehensive entirety. The passages, which in the *Tractate* only hover in the air, appear now as indispensable components of an admirable fabric of thought, which brings into combination Plato and Aristotle, Stoa and Neo-Platonism, Christian scholasticism and Jewish religious philosophy, and which exhibits the frigidity of French rationalism together with the emotional warmth of German mysticism, and the rigidity of mathematics together with the mystical extravagances of the Kabbala. People might reject, dispute, refute this grandiose work; but no one could deny its logical sequence of thought, depth of subject-matter, clearness of presentation. The publication of the *Ethics*, one would have thought, would have necessarily made an epoch in the history of Spinozism. This, however, was not the case. The *Ethics* did not correct the opinions about Spinoza and his teaching, which had been established by seven years' violent polemics, and it modified them but little. Nevertheless, immediately after its appearance the accusers were suddenly silenced for several years — perhaps because on June 25, 1678, the States of Holland and West Friesland had forbidden all men to sell, print, and translate "the profane and atheistic work," and ordered it in every way to be suppressed[1]. Possibly, too, the sudden death of Spinoza, which had taken place just before, won his opponents to a more conciliatory frame of mind. But from the end of the seventh decade the flood of attacks swells to unlimited dimensions. The old charges are repeated

[1] The Placet of the States of Holland and West Friesland is copied in A. v. d. Linde, *Bened. Spinoza, Bibliogr.*, p. 7.

and increased by new accusations. In Holland, France, Germany, England appear ever new enemies of the Spinozistic doctrines; ever again the statement is made that Spinoza is an enemy of religion, of morality, of civil order; that he teaches atheism, acknowledges no God and no devil, no good and no bad spirits, denies the immortality of the soul, and will not hear of revelation any more than he will of Christ's work of salvation. Not less offensive seems to be the fact that he subordinates religion to the civil law, the church to the state; and indignation is excited by the discovery that, in spite of all his heterodoxy, he sometimes assumes the mien of a genuine believer, and pretends to defend reverence for the Holy Scriptures, whose teachings he nevertheless disdains and deprecates.

Other critics examined more keenly the philosophical ideas of Spinoza. They denounced Spinoza's doctrine of Sole existence and its corollaries; the immanence of the Deity, the unity of substance, and the abolition of all individual existence. They tried to demonstrate the error of his psychological monism, censured his rejection of the conception of design, his fixed Determinism, his denial of free human action, which puts an end to all distinction between good and evil, between right and wrong.

The tone of the works written to refute these theories was unchanged. As in the life-time of Spinoza, gross invectives, unworthy aspersions and maledictions are hurled at him. Theologians and philosophers do not yet fight for or against scientific theories with arguments pertinent to the subject. They think themselves compelled to find and refute dangerous heresies in Spinoza's works: hence their pens are dipped, as at the time of Spitzelius and Musaeus, in poison and gall.

It is by no means necessary to wade through the quagmire of animosities, of groundless and repulsive charges, of which Spinoza was the object towards the end of the seventeenth and at the beginning of the eighteenth century. It will suffice to give a few specimens of this controversy.

One of the most extensively read and quoted controversial works is Christian Kortholt's book *On the Three Great Traitors*, viz. Herbert of Cherbury, Thomas Hobbes, and Spinoza. The dissertation directed against Spinoza is introduced by the following barbarisms[1]: "May the last-named be attacked by the itch! But who is he? It is *Benedictus* (The Blessed) *Spinoza*, who should rather be called *Maledictus* (the Cursed), because that earth which by divine curse is filled with thorns (terra *spinosa*), has produced no more accursed man, no man more thorny in his works. He was at first a Jew, but was then expelled from the synagogue because of the monstrous opinions which he uttered concerning Judaism, and finally he has confessed himself to belong to the Christians, I know not through what artifices and deceptions." "One can see here," says Kortholt in another place, "the extremely infamous teachings of the wicked man—teachings that deserve the flames of hell. . . . And yet this accursed hypocrite is so shameless, so audacious, that he dares assert that he has taught nothing which can injure piety, good morals, and the orthodox training of youth[2]."

Among the numerous theologians of France who opposed Spinoza, Huet, Bishop of Avranches, was one of the most learned and respected. But he too speaks of him in his *Demonstratio Evangelica* and in the work *De Concordia Rationis et Fidei*, with unspeakable disrespect. "When I found him on my way," he says, "I did not spare him, this foolish and infamous man, who deserved to be fettered with chains and to be scourged with rods."

A laudable exception to the books in this controversy which abound so greatly in insults and calumniations, is presented by the biography of Spinoza, which Joh. Colerus published in 1705 in Dutch, and then in the following year in French. Colerus is an ardent opponent of the

[1] Chr. Kortholt, *De Tribus Impostoribus Magnis*, p. 75, ed. 1700.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 97.

Spinozistic philosophy; but the character of Spinoza fills him with admiration. Hence the more emphatically he expresses his abhorrence of the doctrines of the heretic, the profounder is the impression produced by his description of this quiet, pure life of a thinker.

We should, however, be very much mistaken if we should think that Spinoza's teachings could give offence only to orthodox persons. Spinozism seemed terrible, nay, absurd, also to sceptics and freethinkers, to those who, estranged from orthodox Church doctrine, embraced deistic views, or tried to combine philosophic doubts with a simple devoutness that assumed no special form. Of these opponents of Spinoza Bayle has become the standard instance.

Bayle and Spinoza are far apart as the antipodes in their views, and in the methods and objects of their research. Bayle, starting from Descartes but never estranged from the beliefs of the Church, ever restless, ever doubting, ever criticizing, holds human perception in high esteem and depreciates it at the same time, regards the contents of the creeds as irrational and yet acknowledges allegiance to them—because he looks upon them as the inviolable foundations of human life. Hateful to him indeed must have been the teaching of the man, who wished to be a philosopher pure and simple, who did not understand that thought could contradict itself, who declared an irrational faith to be folly, and who made all faith and hope, all belief and feeling, subject to the dictates of clear and definite thought. Bayle endeavours to show that precisely this reliance on one's own reason led Spinoza astray[1]. He admits that Spinoza led an honourable and virtuous life, but his teaching does not appear to him to gain in value on that account. He reproaches Spinoza with having involved himself in much greater difficulties in order to escape the difficulties of Theism. Spinoza, he says, disputes the dogmas and is himself the worst dogmatist. He denies

[1] P. Bayle, *Dictionnaire historique et critique*, s.v. Spinoza, Rotterdam, 1697.

the God of the Bible, and cuts up his God into a million portions. If one says: the Germans have killed ten thousand Turks, this, according to Spinoza, means that God, modified as German, has killed God, modified as Turk. And similarly, we must assume, according to Spinoza, that God hates himself, persecutes himself, eats himself, slanders himself, and sends himself to the scaffold.

These objections are excessively stupid. They rest upon a complete misunderstanding of the Spinozistic system, which never assimilates the temporal to the eternal, as Bayle presupposes. But the witty way in which the clever sceptic presented his arguments, and the great popularity of his works, won approval for this polemic, and caused it to be widely diffused. It may be asserted that the greater portion of the attacks directed against Spinoza in the eighteenth century go back to Bayle's superficial criticisms.

Voltaire speaks of Spinoza in exactly the same way as Bayle[1]. No doubt can be entertained, he says, of the honesty of his sentiments and the purity of his character, but much of the correctness of his views and the validity of his proofs. He found his writings obscure and confused and the Latin he wrote very bad. It is perfectly clear to him, that Spinoza acknowledged no God, and only used the word God in order not to shock the reader. He adds that there were not ten persons in the whole of Europe who had read Spinoza's works from beginning to end. Voltaire also expressed this opinion of Spinoza in some sarcastic verses which have often been quoted. They run as follows:

> Alors un petit Juif au long nez, au teint blême,
> Pauvre, mais satisfait, pensif et retiré,
> Esprit subtil et creux, moins lu que célébré,
> Caché sous le manteau de Descartes, son maître,
> Marchant à pas comptés, s'approcha du grand être.
> Pardonnez-moi, dit-il, en lui parlant tout bas,
> Mais je pense entre nous, que vous n'existez pas.

[1] Voltaire, *Le philosophe ignorant*, p. 24.

A sounder judgment might be expected from Diderot, learned, unprejudiced, acute thinker as he was. But he, too—in the article "Spinoza" in the *Encyclopedia*—contented himself with repeating, and in part copying literally, Bayle's superficialities.

Condillac did not derive his knowledge of Spinoza from Bayle. He read Spinoza's *Ethics*, the first book of which he submits to severe criticism in the *Traité des Systèmes*. It cannot, however, be affirmed that this criticism is more thorough than that of Bayle and Voltaire.

We find likewise in numerous German and Dutch works of the eighteenth century Bayle's criticism reproduced, being often, indeed, plagiarized word for word. The learned Mosheim states plainly that "the precision with which Bayle drew shocking and absurd inferences from Spinoza's teaching cannot be surpassed[1]."

If, then, we hear the cry of murder against the wicked heretic on the one hand, and sarcasms on the foolish philosopher on the other, we must fairly wonder that the teachings of this man were regarded as at all worthy of correction and refutation. And yet no other philosophy was so much discussed as Spinoza's, and in spite of the rareness of his works, which never once went through a new edition during the eighteenth century, the most important of his ideas passed from mouth to mouth, though in variously distorted forms. Nothing, therefore, can be falser than the statement which has been sometimes made, that during the first eighty years of the last century Spinoza "was forgotten, and was not deemed worthy of esteem[2]." Spinoza was never less forgotten than during the time when his name was covered with insult and disgrace, and when the majority of people had nothing for his teaching but ridicule and contempt. The large number of hostile works directed against him would alone testify how much attention

[1] Mosheim on Cudworth, *Syst. int.*, p. 1140.

[2] Täsche, *Pantheism*, Preface to vol. III; Horn, *The Political Doctrines of Spinoza*, p. 14; *Ben. de Spinoza Opp.* ed. Bruder, Praef. vol. I, p. xviii.

was paid to him. But how little Spinoza had been forgotten can be proved by the express testimony of widely different authors.

Towards the end of the seventeenth century the publisher of Wittich's *Anti-Spinoza* writes: "Everywhere Spinoza's works are offered for sale; to an age thirsting for innovation they are recommended by their folly; they allure the reader by their godlessness; they lead one on to admiration through their obscurity. . . . Also Spinoza has left behind no less abundant a crop of disciples than some Greek sophist or disputant. But these, with a wantonness peculiar to them, labour with the sole object of making known and diffusing far and wide the pernicious doctrines of the new master. In this rash enterprise they have succeeded. For in a brief space of time this poison has spread through all parts of the Christian world, and it advances and steals on further from day to day [1]." Similar statements emanated from authors of the eighteenth century.

In Holland, Roellius says, they run after Spinoza by shoals [2].

In the year 1707, Jenichen complains that his age is so extremely fruitful in Spinozistic literature [3]. And in 1767 Brucker, the learned historian, writes: "As the injurious tare thrives more luxuriously than the fruitful ears, and sends forth its roots afar, so too does it happen in the mind of man. No event testifies more conspicuously to this truth than the shameful result which the godlessness of Spinoza has had [4]." So widely prevalent must Spinoza's teaching have been at this time, that more than one famous theologian felt it imperative on him to preach against it publicly. On Easter Sunday, 1704, Johann Colerus, minister of the Lutheran congregation in the Hague, preached against Spinoza's allegorical interpretation of the resurrection of

[1] Christoph Wittichii *Anti-Spinoza Praef.*, 1690.

[2] Roellius, *De relig. natur.*, p. 166.

[3] Jenichen, *Hist. Spinozismi Leenhofiani*, Praef.

[4] Brucker, *Hist. Philos.*, tom. IV, pars 2, p. 696.

Christ, and he had his sermon printed next year together with his biography of the philosopher. In France, the moderate Massillon warned the orthodox from the pulpit against the "monster" Spinoza, "who, after having embraced various religions, finished by having no religion at all, who fashioned out of his own head an impenetrable chaos of godlessness, a confused and obscure work, the perusal of which can only engender the wish not to believe in God[1]." In Germany, Mosheim preached against "the wretched nonsense of the revilers of religion," as he called the teaching of Spinoza. "Is there anything more absurd," he says, "than seriously to say that this world is God? That hares, dogs, and gnats are limbs of God? Is anything more ridiculous?[2]"

We see that the opposite of Spinoza's wishes had been realized: his teaching was, if not forgotten, yet distorted and misunderstood; but his name was in every one's mouth.

V.

But where are the followers of Spinoza to be found against whom such violent attacks are directed? Who had the courage in the seventeenth and eighteenth century to declare himself a Spinozist in spite of the flood of insults and imprecations which was poured at this time upon Spinoza and his system? We find the followers of Spinoza first of all in his native land. Even in his life-time, as has been already observed, Spinoza saw a circle of pupils and devotees flocking around him. They studied eagerly the works of their master; they looked after the publication and translation of his books; one or another sought also to do him some service by means of biographies and other works. But there it had stopped; these men did not possess any great influence. Similarly destitute of result

[1] Massillon in Nourrisson, *Spinoza et le naturalisme*, Paris, 1866.

[2] Mosheim, *Heilige Reden*, v. II: "The wretched nonsense of the reviler of religion"; in Krakauer, *On the History of Spinozism*, p. 22.

were the works which Abraham Johann Cuffeler[1] and Hendrik Weyermars[2] wrote after Spinoza's death in the spirit of his teaching. Of greater importance is the fact that a scholar and freethinker, well known in the literary circles of Holland and France, viz. the Count of Boullainvilliers, gave, in the guise of an opponent, a luminous description and explanation of the Spinozistic philosophy[3].

But the influence of the Spinozistic philosophy penetrated far deeper. The spirit of his Pantheism seized hold of numerous men who moved and laboured in the midst of the people: clergymen of the reformed church and simple handicraftsmen. With these there began a movement, which keenly aroused the dullness of the Dutch, powerfully stirred up the church, and, in its final after-effects, reached down into the nineteenth century[4].

One of the first of the Dutch divines who became attached to Spinozism was Pontian van Hattem. Born in the year 1641, he studied in Leyden and Saumur, and while still a student he was suspected of a leaning to Spinoza. Appointed minister in Philipsland in Zeeland, he openly showed his heretical Spinozistic views in a work on the Heidelberg Catechism. In consequence of this book he was in 1683 deposed from his post, his writings were prohibited and burnt, and his opinions most warmly combated by highly-esteemed theologians. Nevertheless he continued to advance his doctrines in various addresses and writings, and attracted a large number of followers. Of these the most worthy of mention are: (1) Jacob Bril of Leyden, first weaver, then lecturer of the reformed church, (2) Marinus Adriansz Booms, according to his sign an honourable shoemaker of Middleburg, who in 1714 was declared guilty of "horrible Spinozistic and Hattemistic

[1] Cuffeler is the author of an anonymous work full of Spinozistic ideas, *Specimen artis ratiocinandi*, Hamb. 1684.

[2] Weyermars, *Den ingebeelde Chaos*, &c., Amst. 1710.

[3] *Réfutation des erreurs de Benoît de Spinoza*, p. 151 s. Bruxelles, 1731. The work of Boullainvilliers was composed shortly after 1704.

[4] For the Dutch Spinozists, cf. A. v. d. Linde, *Spinoza*, p. 134.

errors." For this reason he was excommunicated by the church council and banished from the town by the magistrate. His "vexatious and soul-destroying books" were ordered to be torn to pieces and burnt on the gallows by the hands of the executioner. (3) A faithful pupil of Hattem was his servant-maid Dina Jans, nicknamed Pastor Dina on account of her successful zeal for the propagation of his doctrines. She boasted of having confirmed no fewer than 7,000 persons in the right faith, i.e. in the Spinozistic-mystical teaching of her lord and master, and she was excommunicated in 1726. (4) Grosvinus von Buitendyk, preacher at Schore and Vlake, in Zeeland, was removed from his post in 1712 on account of his Hattemistic views. He then studied medicine, and, when a physician, held numerous religious meetings in concert with Booms, at which he sought to win souls to Hattem's doctrines. He was expelled from Breda in 1726, and from Amsterdam in 1728.

To show how closely these men were connected with Spinozism, a few sentences may be quoted from the works of Jacob Bril: "God is one, and all is one in him. For he is the essence of all temporal things, which in him are nothing. The whole world is only his shadow, and we are his modes, figures, pictures. He is the sole essence and being . . . . With respect to the Holy Scriptures, men speak of a fallible and infallible spirit; we say that the prophets and apostles possessed an infallible spirit. But have we, then, a fallible spirit? Have we not the spirit of Christ? If then we are fallible, then God himself is fallible. Scripture and reason are the same; hence the Holy Scriptures cannot be distinguished from reason . . . Scripture rests on nature, nature on reason, reason on the mind, but the mind upon God, who is the foundation of everything. Hence we can better understand Scripture from nature, than nature from Scripture. Nature is the vesture in which God has clad himself, and Scripture is only a shadow of the light, with which God illumines us. . . . We must not accommodate ourselves to Scripture, but Scripture must accommodate

itself to us. But when I say 'us,' I do not understand us, but God who resides in us. . . . Some one might ask: does God also desire sin? But do you not perceive that all things are good with God, and that this distinction between good and evil takes place only in our soul?"

While von Hattem, Booms, Bril, and Buitendyk[1] appropriated especially some passages from Spinoza's theoretical philosophy and fused them with Christian ideas, Friedrich von Leenhof[2] starts from the Ethics of Spinoza. He was born in 1647, became preacher of the reformed congregation at Zwolle in 1681, was excommunicated for his heresies in 1708, and died in 1712. In his famous, or rather notorious, book, *Den Hemel op Aarden*, we find that if we disregard all the peculiar non-essential parts of his writing, his teaching amounts to the following, which in the main follows precedents in Spinoza: There is a necessary order of nature to which everything which happens in the world is subject, and which God himself cannot abrogate; for it is identical with God's own being. God is therefore neither the lawgiver nor king nor judge of the world, and when Holy Scripture gives him these names, it does so because it accommodates itself to the understanding of the people. Its object, in fact, is not to instruct us philosophically, but to lead us to true happiness by means of love and obedience. Happiness is only to be found in joy. For all events are effects of an eternal divine order, which we must therefore accept with a glad heart. To let oneself be led astray into sadness by them is to rebel against the laws of nature, or, which is the same thing, against God. Joy is a transition to greater perfection, sadness a transition to less perfection. It follows from this

[1] A. v. d. Linde in his *Dissertation on Spinoza* has also mentioned William Deurhoff as a follower of Spinoza (p. 142 f.). But this is incorrect. A. v. d. Linde now himself acknowledges, in accordance with numerous older authorities, that Deurhoff "was only slightly affected by Spinozistic speculations," and is rather to be regarded as an opponent of Spinoza (*Bibliografie*, p. 55).

[2] Concerning him and the fate of his teaching, v. G. F. Jenichen, *Historia Spinozismi Leenhofiani*, Lips. 1707.

that as we must strive after perfection so we must after joy, and that we must shun all sadness. Regret also is a kind of sadness, therefore an evil, a weakness which will keep far away from the truly wise. The wise man never grieves —not even at the loss of father and mother, of children and friends, for no one can live for ever, and what can tears avail?

Such are the most important of the moral tenets of Leenhof, which adhere closely to Spinoza's ethical doctrines. And in a letter at the end of Wittich's *Anti-Spinoza*, which was published anonymously, he explains and defends Spinoza's metaphysics.

As may be easily imagined, his *Heaven upon Earth* did not pass without contradiction. Divines of note undertook the task of refuting it; and a year after the appearance of the work the authorities brought him to account. Its author, however, had no ambition for a martyr's crown. He signed a declaration drawn up by the consistory of Zwolle, according to which he repented of and condemned the Spinozistic teachings in his work, renounced the wicked opinions of Spinoza, and vowed humbly that he desired in future to conform to all the doctrines of the reformed church. But this declaration, plain and adequate as it appears to us, did not satisfy the authorities of the Church. Hence, in 1708, Leenhof was excommunicated and removed from his post. Yet his influence on the people was not thereby destroyed, as is proved by the fact that down to the end of the last century a warning was publicly issued to beware of his followers. So, too, the teaching of Hattem and his pupils found friends in Holland until far into the nineteenth century. "Even at the present day," says V. d. Linde, "there exist in Holland secluded circles where the Spinozistic-Brillic mysticism is the only comfort of the soul[1]." Of such powerful and lasting effect was Spinoza's profound teaching even in the obscurity and distortion of a gloomy mysticism.

[1] A. v. d. Linde, *Spinoza*, pp. 141, 142, 158.

VI.

As regards the German people, no evidence of a similarly far-reaching influence of Spinoza is forthcoming from the seventeenth century or from the first seven decades of the eighteenth. But even here he did not entirely lack followers. That Tschirnhausen stands on Spinozistic ground with his doctrine of Cognition has already been mentioned. And it has also been shown above that Leibniz passed through Spinozism in order to arrive at his own philosophy. But even when he seemed in his doctrine of Monads to present a complete antithesis to Spinoza's Pantheism, his system stood, in important points, very near to that of Spinoza. If we consider his definition of the relation of the monads to the Deity, his Determinism, his view of action and passion, of the aim of religion, of evil, and of the miracles, we shall find that this assertion is justified. It is true that the exterior form of his system has been carefully kept from all contamination from Spinozism. For Leibniz was, as Mendelssohn says [1], not only one of the greatest, but also one of the most cautious philosophers. Hence he avoided the name of Spinoza as much as possible, for in the mere name people would have discovered a refutation of all the doctrines which were borrowed from the atheist.

Leibniz and his disciple Wolff dominated the German philosophy of the eighteenth century. With their works numerous Spinozistic tenets passed unperceived into the otherwise absolutely anti-Spinozistic, because anti-pantheistic circle of theologians and philosophers. To what strange results this led is shown by one instance, viz. that of the Wolffian Reimarus, who in his dissertations fights bravely against Spinoza's doctrine of Substance and is much praised for this onslaught against the heretic, but in other respects is carried by his freethinking ideas exactly along the path which Spinoza had carved out.

[1] Mendelssohn, *Works*, I, p. 202, ed. 1843.

Neither were there wanting in Germany harebrained persons who, like the Dutch visionaries of whom mention has just been made, either used half-understood or entirely misunderstood Spinozistic doctrines as battering-rams against Church doctrine, or combined them with biblical Christian ideas, producing a curious mixture. J. C. Dippel and J. C. Edelmann[1] are the most noted of these venturesome persons. John Conr. Dippel was born in 1673 and died, after an unsettled, roving life, in 1734. He was a wild, scatter-brained fellow, a notorious brawler and freethinker, and at the same time a penitent and a mystic, first theologian, then physician, and later, as he himself relates, jurist, mathematician, logician, metaphysician, and ontologist. As a philosopher he is not to be taken seriously. He sets the most contradictory opinions side by side with each other; to-day he recognizes Spinoza as his teacher, only to pelt him with dirt to-morrow as a "clever buffoon and faddist," as a "thorn and a bull-head." He would, like Spinoza, reject all incarnation of God, yet he regards as necessary the propitiation of the angry God. He denies the inspiration of the Scriptures, but he regards himself as illumined by a supernatural spirit. With Spinoza he would reduce the existence of all things to God. With him he maintains that God as "the material basis of all creatures" carries them in himself and animates them. Agreeing with the essential contents of the *Tractatus Theologico-Politicus*, he declares that the orthodox faith is wrong on the subjects of revelation and prophecy, and that it here needs much correction. But he also maintains that Spinoza confounded God and creature with each other. This misinterpretation of Spinoza, which was borrowed from Bayle, furnishes him with an opportunity for the most offensive attacks. And in a manner no less obnoxious, he inveighs against the fatalism, which he imputes to Spinoza. Yet Spinoza's reputation could not be damaged by the calumnies of a harebrained

[1] On their relations to Spinoza, Krakauer has written a small treatise *Zur Geschichte des Spinozismus in Deutschland* (Breslau, 1881).

fellow like Dippel; that end would indeed be better attained by the praises and recommendations of such a man.

Dippel's pupil, Johann Christian Edelmann (b. 1698, d. 1767), though more estimable as a man, was scarcely less confused and obscure. Like his master, he rages against orthodox ecclesiasticism, against Bible, dogmas, ceremonies, and clergymen. Like him, he professes a curious syncretism, the elements of which are furnished by (among others) Spinoza, Jacob Böhme, Toland, and that Christianity which he so severely attacked. The link which connects him with Spinoza is the well-known idea, which he is never tired of inculcating, that there is only one true Being, who is God; that the visible world is only a shadow of this incomparable Being; and that all created things are mere modifications of it. This world has therefore not been created within the limits of time; it has no beginning and no end; God must have changed himself, if he had at any time begun to make a world. Edelmann denies the inspiration and the composition of the Holy Scriptures by the divine spirit. He does not admit, however, that morality is thereby shaken: for the spirit of God dwells in ourselves, and his voice, the conscience, speaks more clearly to us than the text of the Bible, which, being obscure and ambiguous, has been the cause of the most useless disputes and the most terrible wars. It is not difficult to find the Spinozistic passages which are the source of these conclusions. Indeed, he acknowledges that he read Spinoza often and diligently, and he is indignant with "the Christians of the present day, who have made the honourable Spinoza an atheist." For "since he distinctly makes God the cause of all things, not only in the sense in which he has produced them as an artist produces his work, who afterwards goes away and leaves it to the capricious treatment of others, but since he plainly acknowledges that God is always really present in the things and by his very presence brings about their existence, our present-day lip-

Christianity could not better betray the fact that it has no thorough knowledge of God whatever, than by venturing to make this man an atheist[1]."

But although he comes forward so decidedly on Spinoza's side and even declares "that the title, Spinozist, has nothing of which an honest man need be ashamed," yet he will only allow that he borrowed a single principle from him, viz. the immanence of the Deity[2]. The Spinozistic teaching was, in fact, just then in too bad repute for him to acknowledge that he had derived much from it. And why should we blame a caution in Edelmann, which even a Leibniz regarded as necessary?

Besides those named there were many other men in the eighteenth century who were Spinozists, or at least passed as such. But it was for the most part single doctrines of Spinoza's, torn from their connexion, to which they professed allegiance. His whole system of philosophy found scarcely a single adherent at this period. Indeed, most persons lacked the opportunity of becoming acquainted with it, as the works of Spinoza were exceedingly scarce. Thus a zealous opponent of Spinoza writes in 1737: "And how many secret Spinozists may there not be here and there? Many would gladly have read Spinoza, if they could only get his books, which are somewhat rare[3]." So rare were these books that even Schleiermacher was obliged to base his statement of the Spinozistic teaching not on the works which Spinoza left, and which he did not possess, but on the extracts of Jacobi[4]. Spinozistic ideas hovered about in the air as it were, whilst people were unable to seize them. Spinozism was scented everywhere, but people were wont to describe by it not the true teaching of the philosopher, but every false conception of the God-idea, the deification of nature,

[1] Edelmann, *Moses*, II, p. 120.

[2] Idem, *The First Epistle of St. Harenberg*, p. 65.

[3] Eusebius Ulmigena, *Reflections on the Wolffian Philosophy*, § 14.

[4] Schleiermacher, *Works*, Division III, vol. IV, part i, p. 11.

fatalism, every deviation from the orthodox faith[1]. Indeed, to have been somewhat lax in attacking Spinoza, was a sufficient reason for being suspected of Spinozism. Malebranche, Toland, and Montesquieu were branded as Spinozists. Authors of adverse criticisms, like Johannes Bredenburg, Christopher Wittig, and Franciscus Cuper were declared to be disguised followers of Spinoza, either because they did not condemn all his teachings as wrong, or because in their criticism they were careful to adopt a moderate tone. Thus Spinoza became a phantom of terror, whose mere name excited hatred and abhorrence. Men made of him a scapegoat, on whose head were heaped all the iniquities of freethinking philosophers. And it is evident that they were in the habit of condemning Spinoza without understanding him, without knowing him, without having even read the smallest part of his works. Herder, in his colloquies on Spinoza's system, has most strikingly stigmatized the unparalleled injustice with which Spinoza was judged and sentenced. Philolaus has uttered a hard word against Spinoza. "Have you read Spinoza?" asks Theophraon. And Philolaus answers: "I have not read him; who would indeed read every obscure book of a madman? But this I have heard from the mouth of many who have read him, viz. that he was an Atheist and Pantheist, a teacher of blind necessity, an enemy of revelation, a mocker of religion, therefore a destroyer of states and of all civil society, in fact a foe of the human race—and that he died as such. He deserves therefore the hatred and abhorrence of all friends of mankind and true philosophers[2]."

VII.

These contemptible words—the condemnation of a philosopher without knowledge of his philosophy—are an echo of the unfair judgments which were passed a thousand

[1] Cf. Chr. Wolff, *Theol. Natur.*, § 678, p. 680, ed. 1741; Lotterus, *Philosophema de causis*, &c., c. ii. § 2.

[2] Herder, *God. Some Colloquies*, p. 103, ed. 1828.

times upon Spinoza in the seventeenth and the first part of the eighteenth century. That men learnt to judge more justly of him, that in the second half of the last century they valued, admired, and venerated him as much as they had previously despised, derided, and calumniated him, is usually ascribed to the influence of Lessing. He is said to have been the man who first rescued Spinoza's memory from the rust of time, just as it was he who saved so many others who were innocently condemned. This is, however, an exaggeration. Lessing's merit in regard to Spinoza is great; but he is not the first who appeared in his defence in the eighteenth century. It was not Lessing, but the spirit of his time, that rehabilitated Spinoza and repelled the unjust, preposterous, and malicious judgments of him.

When Spinoza appeared on the scene with his new ideas, he stood, as has been shown above, in presence of a world whose mind was steeped in theology. But in the course of the eighteenth century, the religious view of God and nature began to totter at its foundation. The need of faith receded, and theology no longer claimed the interest of the cultured, but its place was taken by nature, science, and philosophy. As a mighty storm, moving on tumultuously from all quarters, shatters a decayed building, so the tide of freethinking philosophy, swelling with even greater force, convulsed the effete system of ecclesiastical teaching. Deistic and pantheistic ideas, sensualistic and materialistic doctrines were put forth with ever greater boldness and assurance. The claims of universal conformity to reason were asserted in opposition to religious dogmas, and Rationalism raised its head in the midst of a theology hitherto regarded as unassailable: one stone after another gave way in the firm fabric of ecclesiastical doctrine. At this epoch, when men were striving in all the departments of science and practical life to extricate themselves from the fetters of a nonage of many hundreds of years; when the English freethinkers were relentlessly exposing the antiquated conditions prevailing in state, Church, and school, and French Deism was subjecting

the dogmas of all positive religions to the most scathing criticism; when, too, in Germany a Rationalism, everywhere demanding the explanation of things, was pressing forward victoriously into the domains of philosophy and theology; at the time when Voltaire mocked at the creed of the Church, when Rousseau was crying out passionately for a religion of the heart, when Lamettrie was transforming the mechanical natural philosophy of Descartes into an atheistic materialism, and Condillac perverted Locke's Empiricism to Sensualism; at this time, the ban which had rested for so long upon Spinoza's name and teaching began to be removed. Since the middle of the eighteenth century the flood of hostile and abusive literature directed against Spinoza gradually receded, and the number of critics who were favourably disposed towards him steadily increased. We find Spinozistic ideas penetrating into the philosophy of France and Germany and making way for a pronounced Pantheism; the term, Spinozism, ceases to be the nightmare of free research, it soon becomes an honourable name for a deeply-penetrating philosophic insight.

The first in Germany who defended Spinoza eagerly, was — if we leave out of account harebrains like Dippel, Edelmann, Wachter—a young follower of Leibniz, at that time quite unknown to the learned world, viz. Moses Mendelssohn. He is, indeed, very far from approving of the system of Spinoza in its entirety. On the contrary, in his first work, belonging to the year 1755[1], he rather attaches himself to the earlier opinions, when he declares that "Spinoza's views are, according to the judgment of the whole world, very absurd."

But he nevertheless treats Spinoza as an erring philosopher, not, like nearly all his opponents, as a wicked man. He asserts that "many of his views are consistent with true philosophy and with religion," that "we have much to thank Spinoza's errors for," and that the charges of

[1] M. Mendelssohn's *Dialogues*, *Works*, I, p. 201, ed. 1843.

many of his antagonists, especially those of Bayle, are "strokes in the air." Very beautiful are the words in which Mendelssohn shows that Spinoza's system "was the necessary transition from the Cartesian to the Leibnizian philosophy[1]." "Of course! Leibniz, Wolff, and several of their successors, to what perfection they brought philosophy! How proud may Germany be of them! Yet of what use is it to attribute greater merit to oneself than is just? Let us always acknowledge that another than a German, and I add further, another than a Christian—that Spinoza, in fact, takes a great share in the improvement of philosophy. Before the transition from the Cartesian to the Leibnizian philosophy could be accomplished, it was necessary for some one to fall into the vast intervening abyss. This unhappy lot befell Spinoza. How much is his fate to be pitied! He was a victim of human understanding; but a victim *that deserves to be adorned with flowers*. Without him, philosophy would never have been able to extend its boundaries so far."

Nevertheless, how far was even Mendelssohn from a just estimation of the Spinozistic philosophy! He might eagerly repel the scorn and derision which it had encountered, recognize the significance of Spinoza for the history of philosophy, and show the connexion of some of his principles with those of Leibniz — yet the whole doctrine of a mechanically-working, immanent Deity was repugnant to him; and even in the most brilliant presentation of it, it remained to him, as he expressed it thirty years later, "a dead skeleton around which a cloak is hung: the more horrible, the more magnificent the garment[2]." Hence he rose up like an enraged lion against Jacobi when the latter maintained that Lessing—Lessing so tenderly beloved by Mendelssohn—was a Spinozist. One might, indeed, let various single principles of Spinoza pass, but,

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 204.

[2] Mendelssohn, *Letter to Elise Reimarus in the year* 1783, in his *Works*, V, p. 703.

in Mendelssohn's view, it was sheer folly to adopt his fundamental ideas of his Pantheism, and from this folly he thought he was bound to clear Lessing's memory.

In the same year in which Mendelssohn, the faithful follower of the older metaphysics, appeared in Spinoza's defence, the father of the new critical philosophy employed the fundamental idea of the Spinozistic philosophy in order to solve a problem which much occupied the natural philosophy of the eighteenth century. How do substances affect each other? To this question the most varied answers were given. Kant answers, in the spirit of Spinozism, that they affect each other only because they depend upon a common principle, the divine Intelligence, which maintains their mutual relations[1]. This thought, which recurs also in the "only possible argument[2]," shows us that the monism of Spinoza was at this time no longer regarded in German philosophy with the abhorrence which it had previously caused to piously-disposed minds. This is also evident from several other works which appeared at this time. A. E. Renthe proved, in 1766[3], that Spinoza was not an atheist, as had been universally assumed in the earlier controversy. Aug. Wilh. Rehberg, in a treatise on the nature of forces, laid before the Royal Academy of Sciences at Berlin in 1779, spoke of "the great Spinoza," whose system it is not at all impossible to reconcile with religion[4]. But a pronouncement of the truly pious Lavater, emanating from the seventies, shows more emphatically than all these facts with what astonishing rapidity the change in the judgment of Spinoza must have been accomplished. In his *Physiognomical Fragments* he describes a portrait of Spinoza in the following words[5]: "Not the

[1] Kant's *Works*, I, p. 40, ed. Rosenkranz. [2] *Ibid.*, I, p. 216.

[3] Renthe, *Probatio quod B. de Spinoza graviter errans non fuerit atheus*, Coethen, 1766.

[4] A. W. Rehberg, *Treatise on the Nature of Forces*, pp. 51 and 75.

[5] Lavater, *Physiognomical Fragments*, Third Essay, p. 277. Leipzig and Winterthur, 1777.

best portrait that I have seen of Spinoza. There are not in it the strong eyebrows of the profound thinker, not the mature sagacity in the lower outline of the nose, nor in the mouth the moderation and melancholy of the original. Yet, taking it as it is, what a speaking head! How the man stands in himself and for himself alone! How he goes his own way regardless of calumniators or followers! How he accomplished his culture and growth in deep stillness! What quiet firmness in the forehead! What astonishing intelligence lies between the eyebrows down to the root of the nose! How widely and deeply observant the glance! How quick to trace the weak spots of every system he meets with! How wearied with thinking, searching, doubting! In the mouth—though surely only half true to nature—how much wisdom and quiet nobility, humour and salt."

At the same time a change in the estimation of Spinoza takes place also in France. In 1760, the Abbé de Lignac declares that Spinoza was no atheist but a spiritualist. "He knows God only," says de Lignac; "the world and material things are dreams of the Deity[1]." The Abbé Sabatier de Castres places himself still more definitely on Spinoza's side. He tries to clear Spinoza from the blot of atheism which had rested upon him for a whole century. He calls him the most pious and holiest of men. "O thou most vilely misjudged sage," he addresses him, "modest and virtuous Spinoza, forgive me for having shared the error of all concerning thy books before I had read them, and receive to-day the tribute of gratitude due to thee. If in an age of corruption and madness, and in the capital famed for its talent and its pleasures, I have remained true to the faith of my fathers, it is thou whom I have to thank for it[2]." There are two other French divines, more famous than de Lignac and de Castres, who came forward as fol-

[1] De Lignac in Janet, *Rev. Philos.*, vol. XIII, p. 119.

[2] Sabatier de Castres, *Apologie de Spinoza*, Paris, 1766. This little-known work was referred to by Nourrisson in his work on Spinoza, Paris, 1866.

lowers of Spinoza: Jean Baptiste Robinet in his book *De la Nature* which appeared in 1761–1766, and Dam. Deschamps in his work *Réfutation de Spinoza*, a work which was written in 1770, but which has only become known in very recent times. Although the title of this book would lead us to expect rather an opponent than a friend of Spinoza's in Deschamps, yet the contents show that, like Robinet, he was, in spite of numerous divergences, a disguised Spinozist. Both teach us, with Spinoza, to recognize God as the absolute primal foundation of the world, the modifications of which are individual existences. Both, on the model of Spinoza, depart widely from the orthodox conception of God and his attributes.

VIII.

It is a matter of course that even since the middle of last century there has been no lack of determined opponents of Spinoza. In works by M. Laurent François in France, Bernard Nieuwentyt in Holland, Balthasar Münter in Germany, the old, hateful judgments of Spinoza, which had gradually become more and more silent, are re-echoed. They were for a long time wholly to cease, after a greater man than Mendelssohn had appeared as a champion of Spinoza, viz. Gotthold Ephraim Lessing. In a conversation with Jacobi, which, to Mendelssohn's regret, the latter published, Lessing asserted: "*There is no other philosophy than the philosophy of Spinoza*[1]." And Jacobi, who wholly rejects this philosophy of Spinoza, and indeed all philosophy, as infidel, atheistical science, does not hesitate to declare: "*I love Spinoza.* Such tranquillity of spirit, such a heaven in the domain of intellect, as this bright, pure mind has created, few can have tasted." And in another passage: "Be thou blessed of me, great, aye holy Benedictus! though thou mightest philosophize on the nature of the highest Being and mightest go astray in words, yet his truth was in thy soul and his love was in thy life[2]."

[1] F. H. Jacobi, *Works*, IV, 1, p. 55. [2] *Ibid.*, pp. 69, 70.

The work in which Jacobi gives an account of his conversation with Lessing, and the wearisome quarrel with Mendelssohn and his friends which has its origin in this account, created an epoch in the history of Spinozism. Followers and opponents of the Spinozistic philosophy were at one in their veneration of the great man, the profound thinker, the noble ornament of humanity: who could have henceforth spoken of him as "of a dead dog"? A confidential communication of Jacobi's regarding Lessing's utterances led Goethe, in the winter of 1785–1786, "to read and re-read" Spinoza's works. How honestly he endeavoured to penetrate the sense of the obscure philosophy of Spinoza, is shown by an essay only lately discovered in the Goethe-Archive at Weimar, which Suphan published in the *Goethe Year-book* for the year 1891, and which Dilthey has elucidated in the *Archiv für Geschichte der Philosophie*[1]. Goethe has here clearly shown what binds him to Spinoza, as well as what separates him from him. He is at one with him in the acknowledgment of a highest Reality, in which everything that is truth, life, and existence is united—at one with him also in the principle, that existence and perfection are one and the same: but his poetic mind could not bear the bright light in which the substance and its modifications appeared to Spinoza's cool thought. In the Eternal and in each individual there is, according to Goethe, something inscrutable; there is no rational connexion between God and the human mind. Goethe never got over this opposition to Spinoza, but he acknowledges often and joyfully how much he owes to the study of Spinoza. In 1784 he writes to Knebel: "I feel that I am very near to Spinoza, although his mind is much deeper and clearer than mine." And those are noble words in which he expressed his relation to Spinoza in his *Wahrheit und Dichtung*[2]. But the most beautiful and noble results that sprang from that relation are some

[1] *Archiv für Gesch. der Philos.*, 1894, p. 317.

[2] Goethe, *Works*, vol. XII, p. 177, ed. 1867.

poems, which are filled with the spirit of Spinoza. For instance, the famous confession of faith in Faust, and a series of poems to which Goethe gave the common superscription, "God and the World."

Like Goethe, Schiller, too, yielded to the spell which proceeds from Spinoza's *Ethics*. One of the main themes which are treated by him in the *Philosophical Letters*, was suggested to him by Spinoza. "All perfections in the universe," it runs, "are united in God. God and nature are two quantities which are exactly equal to each other[1]."

But Herder had, still earlier than Goethe, seized hold of the spirit of the Spinozistic teaching. About the time when Lavater wrote the above-quoted admiring tribute, provoked by Spinoza's likeness, Herder produced a work which was intended not merely as a vindication of Spinoza, but as "an oblation presented on the altar of his virtue[2]." Indeed at this time, long before Lessing and Jacobi had cast their eyes back upon Spinoza, Herder was already filled with enthusiastic love for him. A priest of the Christian religion could predicate nothing higher of a man than the words that Herder uttered in the year 1778: "Love is the highest reason, as well as the purest, most divinely willing; if we will not believe this from St. John, we may do so from the undoubtedly *still more godly Spinoza*, whose philosophy and morality move entirely round this axis[3]." It is, therefore, quite in the spirit of Herder when one of his friends sets Spinoza side by side with Christ. Von Dalberg writes to Herder: "Spinoza and Christ; only in these two lies pure knowledge of God. In Christ the secret higher way to the Godhead, in Spinoza the highest point which rational demonstration can reach[4]."

But it was not till much later that Herder gave

[1] Schiller, *Works*, vol. X, p. 237, ed. 1873.

[2] Herder, *God*. Preface to the first edition.

[3] Idem, *On Perception and Feeling*, p. 53, ed. 1828.

[4] V. Dalberg, in Herder's *Journey to Italy*, p. xxx.

a detailed exposition of his views regarding Spinoza. In 1787, incited by the Jacobi-Mendelssohn controversy, he published a book entitled *God. Some Dialogues on Spinoza's System.* In these dialogues he combats Jacobi in many points, and approaches the Mendelssohnian conception of Spinoza's doctrines. Spinozism is for him neither atheism nor fatalism. But he is at one with Jacobi in pure admiration of Spinoza's character and of the strict logical consistency of his system. "Do I dream, or have I been reading?" he makes his *Philolaus* ask. "I thought to find an insolent atheist, and I find almost a metaphysical-moral enthusiast. What an ideal of human effort, of science, of the knowledge of nature is in his soul![1]" And further on[2], "The conception of God with Spinoza has become so present, so immediate, so intimate, that I should regard him rather as an enthusiast for the existence of God than as a doubter or denier."

The judgments of the great poets sank deep down into the heart of the German nation; so deep that a mocker like Heinrich Heine, the spoilt favourite of the muses, could not escape the tenacious impression produced by the Spinozistic works. He has passed judgment on Spinoza and his teaching in magnificent words[3]: "In reading Spinoza, a feeling seizes us as at the sight of great nature in that restfulness of hers so instinct with life. A forest of heaven-high thoughts, whose blossoming summits are in undulating motion, while the immovable trunks are rooted in the eternal earth. There is a certain breath in the writings of Spinoza which is inexplicable. One is fanned as by the breezes of the future; the spirit of the Hebrew prophets still rests perhaps on their far-off descendant. There is besides a seriousness in him, a self-conscious pride, a grandeur of thought which seems likewise to be a heritage, for Spinoza belongs to those martyr families who were expelled from Spain by the most Catholic king.

[1] Herder, *Works*, vol. IX, p. 123, ed. 1828. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 132.

[3] Heinrich Heine, *On Germany*, *Works*, V, p. 124. ed. 1861.

There is in addition the patience of the Dutchman, which is never discarded in his works just as it was ever present in his life. It is proved that Spinoza's path in life was free from all blame, and was as pure and spotless as the life of Jesus Christ. Like him, he too suffered for his teaching, like him he wore his crown of thorns: Golgotha is everywhere where a great spirit speaks out its thoughts."

IX.

While thus Spinoza was delivered from the grave through Mendelssohn, Lessing, Jacobi, Goethe, and Herder, and the thinker so often declared dead stood once more as a living being amongst the living, his teaching rose to a position of real importance in the world's history. The "impudent, miserable, godless Spinoza" became now the "sainted, the godly Spinoza." An absolute worship was carried on under his name. His philosophy became the soul of the great speculative systems which arose in Germany on the soil of the Kantian criticism. Fichte, Schelling, Schleiermacher, Hegel—all these were pupils of Spinoza. In their philosophies lives the monistic idea, which Spinoza first worked out with mathematical exactness and in systematic completeness. Similarly the systems of Schopenhauer, of Krause, of Lotze, of Fechner, and of Edward v. Hartmann are impregnated with Spinoza's spirit. But to pursue in detail the transitions which Spinoza's teaching has undergone in the philosophy of Germany from Fichte to Edward v. Hartmann, would mean to write a history of modern metaphysics. This cannot be undertaken here. But how the great German thinkers themselves regarded their relation to Spinoza, and what judgments they passed on him and his teaching, may be laid before the reader.

"There are," says Fichte, "only two entirely consistent systems, the Critical (Fichte's), which acknowledges the limit (of the Ego), and the Spinozistic, which transcends it."

. . . "The theoretical portion of our scientific teaching is really — systematic Spinozism[1]." "No one," asserts Schelling, "can really hope to reach what is true and perfect in philosophy, who has not at least once in his life plunged into the abyss of Spinozism[2]." But this only conveys very imperfectly what an important part the teaching of Spinoza plays in Schelling's philosophy. Hegel speaks more plainly and frankly[3]: "It may be observed in general that thought must have arisen from the standpoint of Spinozism; that is the essential beginning at all attempts at philosophy. If one begins to philosophize, he must first be a Spinozist. The soul must bathe itself in this ether of one Substance, in which everything that men have looked upon as true has sunk!" . . .

And in another place[4]: "Spinoza is the chief point of modern philosophy; either Spinozism or no philosophy."

But no one has described in such trenchant words what the best men at the turn of this century thought of Spinoza, as the man who, distinguished alike as theologian, philosopher, and philologist, had the keenest understanding of the genius of Spinoza, viz. Schleiermacher. In his sermons on religion he utters these beautiful words[5]: "Offer respectfully with me a fillet to the manes of the sainted, outcast Spinoza! He was penetrated by the high world-spirit, the Eternal was his beginning and end, the Universe his one and everlasting love; in sacred innocence and deep humility he reflected himself in the eternal world, and saw, too, how he was its most lovable reflecting-glass. Full of religion was he, and full of the holy spirit; and thus here also he stands alone and unapproached, master in his art, but exalted above the profane vulgar, without followers and without rights of citizenship."

With these words, which were published for the first time

[1] Fichte, *Works*, I, pp. 101, 122.

[2] Schelling, *Works*, part I, vol. X, p. 33.

[3] Hegel, *Works*, vol. XV, p. 376.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 374.

[5] Schleiermacher, *Works on Theology*, I, p. 190.

in the last year of the eighteenth century, Schleiermacher atoned for the sins committed by fanatics and blockheads against the genius of Spinoza. Never has more ardent veneration been evinced towards a philosopher than the great theologian Schleiermacher showed to the great heretic Spinoza.

But that this collection of sober judgments may not lack a bright ending, we may quote in conclusion what Schopenhauer, that always high-spirited, never quite real writer, asserts in his malicious way concerning the relation of Spinoza to the German and to his own philosophy [1]: "Since in consequence of the Kantian criticism of all speculative philosophy, the philosophizers in Germany nearly all threw themselves back upon Spinoza, *so that the whole series of abortive attempts known under the name of post-Kantian philosophy is simply Spinozism trimmed up without taste, veiled in all manner of unintelligible language, and otherwise distorted*, I will, after I have set forth generally the relation of my teaching to Pantheism, indicate where it specially attaches itself to Spinozism. It is, in fact, related to it as the New Testament to the Old. For that which the Old Testament has in common with the New is the same God-Creator. And similarly, with me as with Spinoza, the world exists by reason of its own inner power and of its own accord. But with Spinoza, that *substantia aeterna* of his, the inner essence of the world, to which he gives the name of Deus, is also, by reason of its moral character and its worth, the Jehovah, the God-Creator, who applauds his own creation, and finds that everything has turned out admirably, *πάντα καλὰ λίαν*. Spinoza has done nothing more than deny his personality. With him, therefore, the world and all in it is also quite admirable and as it should be: therefore man has nothing to do but *vivere, agere, suum Esse conservare, ex fundamento proprium utile quaerendi* (*Eth.* IV, par. 67): he is just to enjoy his life, as long as it lasts: exactly like Koheleth 9.7–10.

[1] Schopenhauer, *The World as Will*, vol. II, p. 738.

In short it is Optimism; hence the ethical side is weak, as indeed in the Old Testament, it is even false and in part revolting."

It would produce a wrong picture of the relations which exist between Spinoza and modern philosophy, if his influence were sought only in metaphysics and not also in other departments of philosophy.

Johannes Müller, that original physiologist, desires at the end of his *Physiology* to give an exposition of human emotions and passions, and thinks he cannot do better than communicate to his readers in a faithful translation a large portion of the Spinozistic ethics.

Johannes Müller's view is shared by the English physiologist Maudsley. In his *Physiology and Pathology* we find the remarkable words: "Spinoza's admirable dissertation on the emotions has never been and probably never will be surpassed[1]." That Spinoza, both in his life and teaching, is a great preacher of the genuine doctrine of truth, who does not hold out external things as ultimate goals, but seeks the centre of gravity of life in one's own inner being, has been brought prominently to view by Paulsen, the author of a work on *Ethics*, which has appeared lately[2].

Spinoza's influence has penetrated still more deeply into modern psychology. The darkest problem known to psychological research, the question of the relation of physical to psychical processes, has met with the most varied solutions, but neither the dualistic, nor the materialistic, nor the spiritualistic view has been able entirely to satisfy. Hence Spinoza's great idea of the parallelism of mental and physical processes offered itself as the one possible explanation. Body does not act on mind, mind does not act on body, but every psychical process corresponds to a movement, every movement to some psychical occurrence. The physical and the psychical are only two external, entirely harmonious phenomena of the one uni-

[1] Maudsley, *Physiology and Pathology*, p. 147, ed. Carus.

[2] Paulsen, *Ethics*, p. 410.

versal substance. Thus what we call soul is only the inner existence of the same essence, which we, regarding it externally, know as its body. In this way the old riddle seems to be solved, and difficulties seem to be overcome, which the most acute psychologists had regarded as insuperable. On this common ground of Spinozistic psychology, philosophers like Fechner, Wundt, and Paulsen are united with sober naturalists like Nägeli and Hering, with the great English psychologist Bain, with the Danish Höffding, and with numerous French thinkers, who issued from the school of Cousin.

In our century Spinoza has not lacked admiration, recognition, and emulation. But men have not only admired and wondered at that which former times had depreciated and condemned; they have also directed serious criticism upon Spinoza's teachings.

The great post-Kantian thinkers of Germany, whose judgments of Spinoza, substantially agreeing, have been adduced above, stand upon the ground of a Spinozistically-coloured Pantheism. But in the nineteenth century not only has this theory of the universe reached its highest development, but also its antithesis, the individualistic and teleological theism of Leibniz, has found new adherents. And starting from the standpoint of this doctrine, a violent opposition to the Spinozistic philosophy has asserted itself. The first and most important opponent who appeared in our century is Herbart. The very fact that Spinozistic metaphysics had not died out in his time, but actively continued its work, made the task of combating it a duty for him. Thus he sets himself in opposition not only to the metaphysics of Spinoza, but also to his psychology and his ethics; he calls his conceptions unhealthy, his axioms and definitions incorrect, his deductions inconclusive, his results inadequate: the whole system he regards as a mere fabric of imagination, and his foundation as a groundless hypothesis [1].

[1] Herbart, *Metaphysics*, part I, pp. 122, 128, 169, ed. 1829.

Following the example of their master, the most distinguished of the pupils of Herbart also expressed themselves against the Spinozistic philosophy, for the most part indeed in measured language, but not seldom in bitter and even unjust terms. Thus Robert Zimmermann, Gustav Hartenstein, Volkmann v. Volkmar, C. A. Thilo. Also the ingenious Lotze, speaking from the point of view of his psychological spiritualism, has repeatedly shown his opposition to Spinoza, though he is in agreement with him in the fundamental ideas of his metaphysics. Still more important for forming a correct estimate of the Spinozistic teaching are the critical works of Trendelenburg, Camerer, Ueberweg, and Riehl.

Thus through the enthusiastic worship of the one party, as well as through the incisive criticism of the other, there arose a thorough study of Spinoza, which set itself the task of considering, elucidating, and expounding all sides of the Spinozistic teaching with loving diligence. In comprehensive works of history, as well as in special treatises, Spinoza's life has been described and his system explained, while particular points in his teaching have been made the subject of the most exhaustive examination. Thanks to the unceasing eagerness in research displayed by modern investigators, works of Spinoza long lost to knowledge have been rediscovered and rendered accessible to the general intelligence; and the old well-known works have been repeatedly published and excellently translated. The connexion of Spinoza with his predecessors and contemporaries has been ascertained, and his influence on later thinkers examined. Nearly all the nations of Europe have taken part in this earnest, exhaustive, and impartial investigation. What a long series of scholars, philosophers, jurists, philologists, and historians one would be obliged to enumerate, were one to mention all those who during the last few decades have gained distinction for their knowledge of the Spinozistic teaching. Let it suffice to mention only the most prominent. The Germans are—H. C. W. Sigwart, H. Ritter, L. Feuerbach, J. E. Erdmann, B. Auerbach,

C. Schaarschmidt, C. Hebler, Chr. Sigwart, K. Fischer, H. Böhmer, J. E. Horn, Rich. Avenarius, M. Joël, F. Tönnies; the Dutch—A. v. d. Linde, J. van Vloten, J. P. N. Land; the English—R. Willis, James Martineau, Frederick Pollock, John Caird; the French—V. Cousin Nourrisson, Am. Saintes, Jean Raynaud, P. Janet; the Italians—Turbiglio and Sarchi; the Swede—Forsberg; the Finlander—Bolin; the American—Fullerton.

Thus the *hundred years* of base depreciation and the *sixty years* of enthusiastic veneration have been followed by a period of just estimation. We no longer see in Spinoza a wicked atheist, but neither do we any longer proclaim him a saint. His teaching is for us no ridiculous illusion, but neither is it the only true philosophy. Free from the prejudices of former generations, from the blind hatred of the one side and the exuberant admiration of the other, we are in a position to probe his system to its depths, to measure his greatness and to become conscious of the limits of his mind. We recognize now the eternal truths that he revealed to us, but at the same time we do not overlook the errors from which he was as little free as were any of those who preceded and followed him.

J. FREUDENTHAL.

Breslau, *March*, 1895.

SOME TRANSLATIONS OF HEBREW POEMS.

THE ROYAL CROWN.

(SOLOMON IBN GEBIROL.)

I.

Wondrous are thy works, O Lord of hosts,
And their greatness holds my soul in thrall.
Thine the glory is, the power divine,
Thine the majesty, the kingdom thine,
Thou supreme, exalted over all.

Thine is the throne in heavenly heights sublime,
The hidden dwelling-place all worlds above,
Th' existence from the shadow of whose light
Springs every living thing, of which aright
We say, that in its shade we live and move.

Thine the two worlds, that thou dost hold apart,
The first for work, the next for heavenly rest;
Thine the reward, which thou hast treasured there
Wrought for the righteous ones, with loving care,
Because thou hast beheld and known it blest.

II.

Thou art One, the first great cause of all,
Thou art One and none can penetrate,
Not even the wise in heart, the mystery
Of thy unfathomable Unity;
Thou art One, the infinitely great.

III.

Thou dost exist, but not the hearing ear,
Or seeing eye can reach thee; what thou art
And how and wherefore is to us unknown.
Thou dost exist, but through thyself alone,
King, in whose power no other has a part.

Thou dost exist; thou wast ere time began,
Pervading all, when there was yet no space.
Thou dost exist: thy mystery, concealed
Far from men's sight lies ever unrevealed,
Deep, deep, where none can find its dwelling-place.

IV.

Thou livest, but not with the twofold life
Of soul and mind: soul of the soul art thou.
Thou livest, and eternal joy shall bless,
At th' end of days, those whom thy graciousness
To penetrate thy mystery will allow.

V.

Thou art mighty, and of all thy works
There is none whose power to thine comes nigh.
Thou art mighty, and thy boundless power
Makes thee pardon, even in the hour
Of thy wrath, man's sore iniquity.

VI.

Thou art light: pure souls shall thee behold,
Save when mists of evil intervene.
Thou art light, that, in this world concealed,
In the world to come shall be revealed;
In the mount of God it shall be seen.

VII.

Thou art God, and all whom thou hast formed
Serve and worship thee in love and fear;
Nor aught lessens it thy majesty
That they worship others besides thee,
For they all would fain to thee draw near.

Yet like blind men from the path they stray,
While they seek the great King's road to gain.
In destructive pits and snares they lie,
Ever deeming their desire is nigh,
Though they toil and labour all in vain.

But thy servants move with open eyes,
On the straight path ever travelling,
Nor to right or left on either hand
Turn they till within the court they stand
Leading to the palace of the King.

Thou art God, and thy Divinity
And thy Unity the world uphold.
Thou art God, eternal, one, divine:
Thus in thee thy attributes combine,
Indivisible, yet manifold.

VIII.

Thou art wise, and at thy side hast reared
Wisdom, fount of life, thy first-born son.
Thou art wise: this universal frame
At thy mighty word to being came,
When to aid or counsel thee was none.

Thou didst span the heaven's vast canopy
And the planets' shining tent uprear,
In thy hand dost thou, O Lord of might,
All creation's utmost ends unite,
Gathered as one whole from sphere to sphere.

ALICE LUCAS.

HYMN FOR THE DAY OF ATONEMENT.

While yet we dwell on earth
God watches us, to whom his word gave birth,
And waits, in love and graciousness,
For penitence, that he our latter end may bless.

Can man be provèd righteous in the sight
Of God, to whom all hidden thoughts are known?
Yea, if his soul repent before his light
Is quenched—and thus alone—
Can he gain pardon and for sin atone.

Even darkness hideth nought from God on high,
The evil deeds man holds invisible
Will at the end against him testify.
Therefore for him 't is well,
Confessing them, guilt's shadow to dispel.

Behold, the heaven of heavens is not pure
In the eyes of God: how much less man, defiled
By shame and sin, whom guilty thoughts allure.
Let him, the oft-beguiled,
Then muse on this, ere earth reclaim her child.

His treasured gold will not, in death's dark hour,
Ransom his soul; but if through life he cling
To mercy and to righteousness, their power
Will his redemption bring,
And he shall see the glory of the King.

'Tis good for man the law's mild yoke to bear,
With love and awe its statutes to obey,
For his oft-faltering steps it will prepare
The path of right alway,
And lead him through the grave to heavenly day.

Lord, in thy hand as potter's clay are we;
Do thou sustain us on life's troubled shore,

And fill our hearts with love and fear of thee,
So that we may adore
Thy name, and sing thy praises evermore.

While yet we dwell on earth
God watches us, to whom his word gave birth,
And waits, in love and graciousness,
For penitence, that he our latter end may bless.

ALICE LUCAS.

MERCY AND PARDON.

Come, let us bow and bend the knee
And seek, with souls contrite
And hearts uplifted, ceaselessly
God's mercy infinite.
All we like sheep have gone astray,
But he will hear us when we pray,
So that we yet may find to-day
Mercy and pardon.
For though our sins are numberless,
And daily we his law transgress,
Yet hope inspires the prayerful song:
"Unto the Lord our God belong
Mercy and pardon."

God's loving mercies far exceed
The measure of our sin;
Then let us seek them in our need,
Our shelter there to win.
For though the wrath of God be just,
Yet, bending humbly to the dust,
We still may gain, in loving trust,
Mercy and pardon.
Come, we will hasten penitent
To pray to him omniscient,

To raise again the prayerful song:
"Unto the Lord our God belong
Mercy and pardon."

Man cannot by his works alone
His load of guilt annul.
Let him with prayers besiege the throne
Of Heaven most merciful.
To those who seek him earnestly,
In penitent humility,
The Lord our God will multiply
Mercy and pardon.
O'er heaven above, o'er earth below,
His wide extended blessings flow,
Then raise with joy the prayerful song:
"Yea to the Lord our God belong
Mercy and pardon." ALICE LUCAS.

HYMNS FOR THE EVE OF ATONEMENT.

I.

From even ascendeth our cry,
From dawn it soareth on high,
To even it rendeth the sky.

From even ascendeth our voice,
From dawn thy "jewels" rejoice,
To even, the sons of thy choice.

From even ascendeth our wail,
From dawn with petition we hail,
To eve, that sweet song may avail.

From even ascendeth our light,
From dawn is thy refuge our might,
At eve let thy pardon alight.

From even ascendeth "We crave,"
From dawn with Thy purity lave,
To eve, with thy Presence, oh, save!

From even ascendeth "Recall,"
From dawn all prostrate we fall,
At eve is thy glory our pall.

From even ascendeth our quest,
From dawn may our seeking be bless'd,
At eve may our search sleep in rest.

From even ascendeth a tear,
From dawn it speedeth thee near,
At even let pardon appear.

ELSIE DAVIS.

II.

Lo! as the potter mouldeth plastic clay,
To forms his varying fancy doth display;
So in thy hand, O God of grace, are we:
Thy bond regard, let sin be veiled from thee.

Lo! as the mason's hand the block doth hew
To shapes sublime, or into fragments strew;
So in thy hand, O God of life, are we:
Thy bond regard, let sin be veiled from thee.

Lo! as the smith the rigid steel hath bent,
Softened with fire and wrought with strength unspent,
So in thy hand, O God of might, are we:
Thy bond regard, let sin be veiled from thee.

Lo! as the seaman's hand doth cast or weigh
The pond'rous anchor in the foaming spray;
So in thy hand, O God of pardon, we:
Thy bond regard, let sin be veiled from thee.

Lo! as the worker melteth vitreous flow,
And biddeth blossoms from the crystal blow;
So in thy hand, O God of love, are we:
Thy bond regard, let sin be veiled from thee.

Lo! as the embroid'rer's hand the robe hath made,
At will in lines of beauty, light, and shade;

So in thy hand, O God of fear, are we:
Thy bond regard, let sin be veiled from thee.

Lo! as the smelter fuseth silv'ry vein,
Removing dross, that naught impure remain;
So in thy hand, O God of healing, we:
Thy bond regard, let sin be veiled from thee.

Lo! as the potter mouldeth plastic clay
To forms his varying fancy doth display;
So in Thy hand, O God of grace, are we:
Thy bond regard, let sin be veiled from thee.

ELSIE DAVIS.

I AM THE SUPPLIANT.

From the Hebrew of Baruch ben Samuel.

A Selicha recited in the Musaph service on the Day of Atonement.

I am the suppliant for my people here,
Yea, for the House of Israel, I am he;
I seek my God's benign and heedful ear,
For words that rise from me.

Amid the walls of hearts that stand around[1]
My bitter sighs swell up and mount the sky;
Ah! how my heart doth pant with ceaseless bound
For God, my Rock on high.

With mighty works and wondrous hath he wrought,
Lord of my strength, my God. When me he bade
To make a sanctuary for him, I sought,
I laboured, and 't was made.

The Lord my God, he hath fulfilled his word,
He ruleth as an all-consuming fire;
I came with sacrifice, my prayer he heard,
Then granted my desire.

[1] Jer. iv. 19.

My sprinkling he accepted at the dawn
Of this, the holiest day, the chosen one,
When with the daily offering of the morn
The High Priest had begun.

And when the services thereafter came,
In glorious order, each a sacred rite,
I, bowing low, and calling on the Name,
Confessed before his sight.

The holy Priests, the ardent, for their sin
Upon this day made their atonement then,
With blood of bullocks and of goats, within
The city full of men[1].

The Priest with glowing censer seemed as one
Preparing for the pure a way by fire;
When with two rams I came, 't was as a son
Doth come unto his sire.

The bathings and ablutions, as 't was meet,
Were all performed according to their way;
Then passed before the throne of God, complete,
The service of the day.

And when sweet strains of praise, to glorify,
Burst forth in psalmody and songs of love,
Yea, when I heard the voice uplifted high,
I raised my hand above.

The rising clouds of incense, mantling o'er
The mercy-seat, lent savour to its grace:
Then glory filled me, and my soul did soar
To yon exalted place.

Of ancient times I dream, of vanished days;
Now wild disquiet rageth unrestrained;
Scorned and reproached by all, from godly ways
Have I, alas, refrain'd.

[1] Lam. i. 1.

Afar mine eyes have strayed, and I have erred,
And deaf I made mine ears, their listening quelled,
But righteous is the Lord, for at his word[1],
I sorely have rebelled.

Perverseness have I loved, and wrongful thought,
And hating good, strove righteousness to shun,
And in mine actions foolishness have wrought,
Great evil have I done.

Pardon, I pray thee, our iniquity,
O God, from thy high dwelling, and behold
The souls that in affliction weep to thee;
For lo! I have grown old[2].

Work for me, I beseech thee, marvels now,
O Lord of Hosts! in mercy lull our fears;
Answer with potent signs, and be not thou
Silent unto my tears[3].

Open thy hand exalted, nor revile
The hearts not comforted, but pierced with care[4],
Praying with fervent lips, that know not guile[5],
O hearken to my prayer!

Look thou upon my sorrow, I implore,
But not upon the sin that laid me low;
Judge, God, the cause of mine affliction sore,
Let me not see my woe[6]!

O thou, my Maker! I have called on thee,
Pictured my thought to thee, pronounced my word,
And at the time my spirit failed in me[7],
Remembered I the Lord.

Behold my wound, O thou who giv'st relief!
Let me thine ears with voice of weeping win;
Seek in thy mercy balsam for my grief,
But seek not for my sin.

[1] Lam. i. 18. [2] Gen. xxvii. 2. [3] Ps. xxxix. 12. [4] Hosea i. 6.
[5] Ps. xvii. 1. [6] Num. xi. 15. [7] Jonah ii. 7.

Give ear unto my voice, O list my call!
And give me peace, for thou art great to save.
What profit is there in my blood, my fall[1]
Down low unto the grave?

But I unceasing will declare thy praise;
Grant my atonement, though I sinned so oft.
Bring not my word to nothingness, but raise
My fallen sheaf aloft[2].

Redeem thy son, long sold to bondage grim,
And on his substance let thy blessings flow;
How long, O Lord, ere thou wilt say to him,
"I know, my son, I know[3].

"I see thee heavy-laden with thy care,
With sorrow's burden greater than thy strength,
I hear thee wailing: yea, but I will spare,
And will redeem at length."

And now, O my Redeemer, lo! behold
The chains that bind me 'neath their cruel sway,
And seek thy servant, wandered from the fold[4],
A lost sheep, gone astray.

Beauty's perfection lieth fallen low,
Broken and waste which stood in majesty,
The glory passed away and fled, for woe!
The One went out from me[5].

My strong bars he hath broken ev'ry one,
He hath been wroth with me: I am bereft.
For my beloved hath turned aside and gone[6],
A desert am I left.

My gates are sunken, they that stood so high;
My sacred doors are shattered and laid waste;
Lo! they are moved and vanished hence; and I
Am humbled and disgraced.

[1] Ps. xxx. 9. [2] Gen. xxxvii. 7. [3] Gen. xlviii. 19. [4] Ps. cxix. 176.
[5] Gen. xliv. 28. [6] Song of Songs v. 6.

Dumb are mine advocates to mine appeal;
High in their pride my scorners raise their crest;
They quench my light, they darkly do conceal
My welfare and my rest.

O Lord, my God! all strength doth dwell in thee,
O hear my voice, as humbly here I bow;
And let the sentence of thy judgment be,
"Take thou my blessing now[1]."

Behold me fallen low from whence I stood,
And mine assembly with compassion see;
And this my soul, mine only one, 't is good
To give it unto thee.

Take back thy son once more, and draw him near,
Hide not from him the radiance of thine eye,
Turn not away, but lend a favouring ear
Unto my plaint, my cry[2].

NINA DAVIS.

THE ARK OF THE COVENANT.

Suggested by the annexed fragments from the Talmud.

There is a legend full of joy and pain,
An old tradition told of former years,
When Israel built the temple once again
And stayed his tears.

'T was in the chamber where the Wood Pile lay,
The logs wherewith the altar's flame was fed;
There hope recalled the Light of vanished day,
The Light long fled.

A priest moved slowly o'er the marble floor,
Sorting the fuel in the chamber stored;
Frail was his form, he ministered no more
Before the Lord.

[1] Gen. xxxiii. 11. [2] Lam. iii. 56.

Wrapt in deep thought, with sad and mournful mien,
Plying his axe with oft a troubled sigh,
Dreaming of glory that the House had seen
In days gone by.

Mused of the time when in the Holy Place
God's Presence dwelt betwixt the Cherubim,
And of the day he turned away his face,
And light grew dim.

When the Shechinah from that erring throng,
Alas, withdrew, yet tarried in the track,
As one who ling'reth on the threshold long
And looketh back.

Then step by step in that reluctant flight
Approached the shadow of the city wall,
And lingered yet upon the mountain height
For hoped recall.

The Temple standeth, pride of Israel's race,
Yet resteth there no sacred Ark of Gold,
God's Glory filleth not the Holy Place,
Ah! loss untold.

Surely the glory of the House is o'er,
Gone is the Presence, silent is the Voice;
They who remember that which is no more,
Can they rejoice?

Convulsed, a sacred spasm seized his frame,
The axe fell from his trembling hand's control,
A fire leapt upward, and the burning flame
Consumed his soul.

His eyes were fixed upon the ground, he gazed
Upon a stone of that smooth marble plain,
Which seemed as from its place it had been raised,
And set again.

Into his heart there flashed prophetic light,
With sudden force the secret was revealed;

Nought but one treasure sacred in his sight
Lay there concealed.

As one of Heaven bid, who dare not wait,
With step grown firm as with the strength of youth,
He hastened to his comrade to relate
The wondrous truth.

His hand uplifted, and a light sublime
Shot from his eyes and like a joy-beam shone;
He seemed a holy seer of olden time
To look upon.

Yet from his parted lips no message came,
In silence reached he his immortal goal,
And from its dwelling in the earthly frame
Went forth his soul.

Soon o'er the house flew sad and strange reports,
And men and women bristled at the sound,
And priests came swiftly from the sacred courts,
And thronged around.

Piercing the crowd a woman made her way,
Seeming to own a right which none gainsaid,
And neared the spot where that calm figure lay,
The priestly dead.

And reverent to the prostrate form she passed:
Pressing her lips upon the peaceful brow,
She whispered, "Thy desire hath come at last,
'T is granted now."

Then spake the High Priest, "Wherefore dost thou thus?
Is the dead thine that thou hast spoken so?
And knowest thou the secret hid from us,
Which dealt the blow?"

"O priest, it is according to thy word,"
She answered, "And I know that secret well,
He, as he breathed his last, the message heard
And that did tell."

"Woman, thy tongue is false, thy word untrue,
Yon priest divulged nought with his dying breath,
Nor uttered sound, ere to his heart there flew
The shaft of death."

"My lord, thy servant lieth not," she said,
"His soul departing did to mine unfold
A glorious light, and as his spirit fled
The tale was told.

"Oft have I stood in prayer in yonder court,
And marked that weak, wan figure, worn with care,
Transformed by heavenly light, and sacred thought,
To beauty rare.

"On ye, O priests, his longing eyes were bent,
While at the altar ye your charge have kept,
And oft a sigh so deep the silence rent,
In prayer I wept.

"And I have read this day his life's fair dream,
And in his death have seen that dream fulfilled,
The longing of his heart, the wish supreme,
That faith instilled.

"Say ye, God's Ark is captive far away?
And weep ye, Ichabod, the glory fled?
And mourn ye that the brightness of the day
Is quenched and dead?

"Maybe 't is true that in a far-off land,
The Ark of God in exile dwelleth still;
It resteth ever with the pure of hand
Who do his will!

"Know then, ye priests and Levites, Israel, all,
Hid in its place the Ark of God doth lie,
His Presence hath not gone beyond recall,
But bideth nigh.

"Behold Thou comest as the dawn of day!
Shechinah! changeless, to illume the night!

O thou, who art a lamp upon the way,
Who art a light!

"Haste, brethren, let the gates asunder burst,
Regain the Ark, the Covenant hold fast,
And by the glorious Second House, the First
Shall be surpassed."

She ceased, and silence cast its shackles o'er
The awe-struck crowd; her shadowy form moved on:
With God-lit eyes, she stood a moment more,
And then was gone.

So was that death with life's quintessence crown'd;
The truth illumined each inquiring face,
For all knew then God's Ark would yet be found
Within its place.

NINA DAVIS.

Rabbi Eliezer saith: "The Ark hath gone into captivity unto Babylon, as it is said, 'And at the return of the year King Nebuchadnezzar sent and brought him[1] to Babylon, with the goodly vessels of the House of the Lord.'"

Rabbi Simeon ben Yochai saith: "The Ark hath gone into captivity unto Babylon, as it is said, 'Nothing shall be left, saith the Lord.' This referreth to the Ten Words which were enshrined therein."

Rabbi Judah (ben Lakish) saith: "The Ark is hidden in its place, as it is said, 'That the ends of the staves were seen from the holy place before the oracle: but they were not seen without; and there they are unto this day.'"

. . . . . .

And where it is written "unto this day," it is always understood to mean for ever.

. . . . . .

And the sages say, "The Ark was hidden in the chamber of the Wood Pile."

Rabbi Nachman bar Isaac saith: "I likewise have received a tradition. It is related of a priest, who, while wrapt in contemplation, perceived that one of the stones of the pavement differed in appearance from the others. And he forthwith went to apprise his comrade;

[1] Jehoiachin.

but before he had ended his words his soul went forth. And they knew of a truth that there the Ark was hidden."

. . . . . .

There was a tradition with the disciples of Rabbi Ishmael, that two priests, who were maimed, were examining the wood (to be burnt upon the altar), when the axe of one fell, and a flame went forth and consumed him.

Talmud Babli, Yoma, pp. 53 b and 54 a.

. . . . . There were thirteen places of prostration in the sanctuary. But in the time of Rabban Gamliel and Rabbi Chanina, the second High Priest, they prostrated themselves at fourteen places. And where was the additional place? By the Wood Pile; for they had received a tradition from their fathers that the Ark was hidden there. It is related of a priest, who while wrapt in contemplation, perceived that one of the stones of the pavement differed in appearance from the others. And he forthwith went to apprise his comrade; but before he had ended his words his soul went forth. And they knew of a truth that there the Ark was hidden.

Talmud Yerushalmi, Shekalim, ch. 16.

The Shechina withdrew by ten stages.

From the Mercy-Seat to one Cherub, from one Cherub to the other, and from the Cherub to the Threshold, from the Threshold to the Court, from the Court to the Altar, from the Altar to the Roof, from the Roof to the Wall, from the Wall to the City, from the City to the Mount, and from the Mount to the Wilderness. From the Wilderness it ascended and abode in its place, as it is said, "I will go and return unto my Place."

Talmud Babli Rosh Hashana, 31 A.

ON THE PHILONEAN TEXT OF THE SEPTUAGINT.

Quaestiones in Genesin.

Sermo III.

The following pages are a continuation of the examination of the Septuagint citations in the Armenian allegorical Commentary of Philo of Alexandria, which was commenced in a previous number of the Jewish Quarterly. In 1893 was published in Paris a fourth or fifth century Greek Papyrus of the *Quis Rerum Divinarum Heres*. Many of the citations in Genesis given in Philo's Sermo III are met with in this Treatise, and in examining them as they occur in the Armenian, I have always made use of the text of Philo newly rescued from a Coptic tomb. In using an Armenian Version of Philo, caution must be exercised against the risk of the citations having been adjusted either by the translator or copyists to the text of the Armenian Vulgate. I have, therefore, compared each citation, as it stands in the Armenian Philo, with itself as it stands in the Armenian Vulgate; and have printed in a heavier type those variants which being in the Armenian Philo are also found in that Vulgate. Such a work of comparison, however, has satisfied me that the Version of Philo was made, if not anteriorly to, yet independently of, the Armenian Vulgate; so that if the same variants recur in both, that is so much additional evidence in behalf of, and not against, the Version of Philo.

Wherever a text in the Commentary is cited in any other work of Philo's, I have taken notice of the fact. And the evidence of this Sermo III, and of the first sixty sections of Sermo IV, strengthens a surmise which, from examination of Sermones I and II, I had already formed, namely, that Philo, at different times, and in writing his different works, used different Texts of the LXX. This is in no way surprising. The Greek Text of Genesis was already some two hundred years old when he wrote, and must have swarmed with variants. It is rather remarkable that there are on the whole so few differences between his citations in different works of the same Text.

Qu. I.—Ch. XV. 7: Τί ἐστι Ἐγώ εἰμι Κύριος ὁ θεός σου ὁ ἐξαγαγών (or ὃς ἐξηγαγόν) σε ἐκ γῆς Χαλδαίων, ὥστε δοῦναί σοι τὴν γῆν ταύτην κληρονομῆσαι;

Here (i) εἰμι is added after ἐγώ.

(ii) Κύριος is added before ὁ θεός.

(iii) σου is added after ὁ θεός.

(iv) ἐκ τῆς γῆς instead of ἐκ χώρας.

Of these (i) εἰμι is added in (Holmes) 20, 37, 59, 61, 76, 106, 107, 129, 134, 135. Slav. Ostrog. Arm. I. Arm. Ed. We may accept it, therefore, as due to Philo's Text of LXX.

(ii) Κύριος is found in Ambr. Arm. I. Arm. Ed. We may the less certainly accept it as due to Philo, because in Bouriant's Papyrus of the *Quis Rerum*, i. 486, it is omitted.

(iii) σου is in (Holmes) 37, 59, 61, 79, Ambr., and in Arm. I. Arm. Ed.; Bouriant's Papyrus of Philo's *Quis Rerum*, i. 486, omits it.

(iv) ἐκ γῆς is given in Mangey in Philo i. 486, where the verse is cited, and in margin of (Holmes) 131. And ἐκ τῆς γῆς in Chrys. iv. 373. But Bouriant's Papyrus has ἐγὼ ὁ θεὸς ὃς . . . σε ἐκ χώρας. It is not certain, therefore, that Philo here wrote ἐκ τῆς γῆς rather than ἐκ χώρας. The Armenian Vulgate implies ἐκ χώρας and omits ὥστε. The variants (i), (ii), and (iii) being given neither in Mangey's Text of Philo, i. 486, nor in the Papyrus, should not,

perhaps, be reckoned to Philo, but rather to the influence of the Armenian Vulgate. But this also is doubtful, for the latter part of the verse from ἐξαγαγών σε, as given in the Vulgate, varies considerably from the version of Philo.

Qu. 2.—Ch. xv. 8: Διὰ τί φησι Κύριε (or δέσποτα), κατὰ τί γνώσομαι ὅτι κληρονομήσω αὐτήν;

Here either δέσποτα or κύριε is omitted. But as the Armenian has but the single word *Tér* to render both, giving Tér Tér as the equivalent in the Vulgate, we cannot be sure which was the original of this passage. δέσποτα indeed seems to be involved in the solutio, which runs thus in Aucher's rendering: "Illi vero, qui promisit, venerationem condignam praestat per dictum, *Domine*. Scio enim te, dicit, Dominum principemque universorum, qui etiam omnia potes, et non est apud te impotentia." Such a commentary harmonizes on the whole better with the reading δέσποτα than with κύριε. In Philo's *Quis Rerum*, i. 487, is read, however, κύριε θεέ (also found in Holmes 19, 108, Compl.). θεέ was certainly not in the original of the Armenian title. The Bouriant Papyrus reads δέσποτα simply, omitting κύριε or θεέ, and we may, therefore, infer that Philo here wrote δέσποτα without addition.

Qu. 3.—Ch. xv. 2: Διὰ τί φησι Λάβε μοι δάμαλιν τριετίζουσαν καὶ αἶγα τριετίζουσαν καὶ κριὸν τριετίζοντα (καὶ in B)[1], τρυγόνα καὶ περιστεράν;

Here καί is omitted before τρυγόνα. So also in (Holmes) 37, 61, 106 Georg. Therefore Philo omitted it in his LXX. It is worthy of notice that here we have the order δάμαλιν . . . αἶγα . . . κριόν, and that this is implied more than once by the Armenian Commentary to have been the order in which Philo took the words therein. In *Q. R. D. H.* i. 487, 490, the Commentary implies with equal decisiveness the order δάμαλιν . . . κριόν . . . αἶγα found in (Holmes) 37, 129. This variation of order is, therefore, at least as old in the

[1] B is a second MS. of the Armenian Philo, No. 2051 of the Edschmiadzin Patriarchal library, with which I compared the lemmata of Aucher's text.

MSS. of the LXX as Philo. We must suppose that Philo used two different MSS. of the LXX in writing these Quaestiones and in writing the *Quis Rerum Divinarum*.

Qu. 4.—Ch. xv. 10: *Διὰ τί φησιν Ἔλαβε δὲ αὐτῷ ταῦτα πάντα*;

Here *ταῦτα πάντα* for *πάντα ταῦτα*. So (Holmes) X. 14, 18, 25, 32, 37, 38, 57, 59, 61, 72, 73, 75, 78, 79, 106, 128, 129, 130, 131, 135, Cat. Nic. Philo, i. 491. Cyr. Al. Aug. Hesych. in Levit. Georg. There is no doubt but that Philo's LXX had *ταῦτα πάντα*. The Arm. Vulg. has *ἔλαβε δὲ πάντα ταῦτα* and omits *αὐτῷ*.

Qu. 5.—Ch. xv. 10: *Τί ἐστι τὸ διεῖλεν αὐτὸ μέσον καὶ ἔθηκεν ἀλλήλοις* (B omits) *ἀντιπρόσωπα*;

Here (i) *αὐτό* for *αὐτά*.

(ii) *μέσον* for *μέσα*.

(iii) *αὐτά* omitted after *ἔθηκεν*.

(iv) *ἀλλήλοις ἀντιπρόσ.* for *ἀντιπρ. ἀλλ.*

Of these (ii) *μέσον* is in (Holmes) 14, 18, 25, 32, 38, 57, 77, 79, 128, 131. Cat. Nic., and (iii) is in Cyr. Al. Glaph. 70 Georg.

In Philo *Q. R. D. H.* i. 491 the words are cited thus: *εἶτ' ἐπιλέγει. Διεῖλεν αὐτὰ μέσα*, a reading furthermore implied in the words of the Commentary i. 502: *φάσκων ὅτι τὰ τμήματα ἔθηκεν ἀντιπρόσωπα ἀλλήλοις*, where the Greek Text does not seem to have been tampered with. The Arm. Vulg. has *διεῖλεν αὐτὰ μέσα*, and uses a different word to render *διεῖλεν*.

Here, then, we see a discrepancy in Philo's readings of the LXX, again to be only explained, as in the preceding verses, by supposing that he used different MSS. of the LXX at different times, and that those MSS. had different readings. One of these MSS. had *αὐτὸ μέσον* and the other *αὐτὰ μέσα*. The Armenian solutio seems to involve *αὐτὸ μέσον* in its lemma.

Qu. 6.—Ch. xv. 10: *Διὰ τί φησι Τὰ δὲ ὄρνεα οὐ διεῖλε*;

Qu. 7.—Ch. xv. 11: *Τί ἐστι Κατέβη δὲ τὰ ὄρνεα ἐπὶ τὰ σώματα τὰ διχοτομηθέντα*;

Here τὰ διχοτομηθέντα instead of ἐπὶ τὰ διχοτομήματα αὐτῶν is read in Mangey's Text of Philo i. 506, but the Papyrus has τὰ διχοτομήματα without ἐπί or αὐτῶν. It is also found in (Holmes) 20, 75 and Chrys. iv. 375. The following (Holmes) in omitting ἐπί keeps a trace of the old reading: I, X, 15, 19, 20, 31, 37, 61, 68, 75, 82, 83, 106, 107, 108, 120, 121, 129, 130. Alex. Slav. Mosq. The Arm. Vulgate="et descendebant aves super divisum membrorum numerum eorum"=ἐπὶ τὰ διχοτομήματα αὐτῶν. Both the variants διχοτομήματα and διχοτομηθέντα seem to have been in Philo's Text of LXX.

Qu. 8.—Ch. xv. 11: Διὰ τί φησιν (παρελθὼν) ἐνεκάθισεν αὐτοῖς Ἀβραάμ; In Latin: "transiit sedit super illas Abraham."

Here Tisch. has (i) συνεκάθισεν and (ii) Ἄβραμ, and (iii) omits παρελθών. The latter (iii) is due simply to the Armenian idiom; but ἐνεκάθισεν or ἐπικάθισεν was certainly read in Philo's LXX; for in *Q. R. D. H.* the citation is given in the same way: ὁ ἀστεῖος λέγεται αὐτοῖς ἐγκαθίσαι, οἷα προεδρός τις ἢ πρόβουλος ὤν.

In the Armenian solutio of Qu. 10 (Gen. xv. 13) the citation is repeated in the same way: δι' ἣν αἰτίαν ἐλέχθη πρότερον ὅτι ἐνεκάθισεν Ἀβραὰμ αὐτοῖς.

Qu. 9.—Ch. xv. 12: Τί ἐστι περὶ δυσμὰς ἡλίου ἔκστασις ἔπεσεν ἐπὶ τὸν Ἀβραάμ, καὶ ἰδοὺ φόβος μέγας σκοτεινὸς ἐπέπεσεν (B ἐπιπίπτει) αὐτῷ;

Here we have (i) δυσμὰς ἡλ. for ἡλ. δυσμάς, (ii) ἔπεσεν ἐπὶ τόν for ἐπέπεσε τῷ, (iii) Ἀβραάμ for Ἄβραμ, (iv) μέγας σκοτ. for σκοτ. μέγ. This last variant is also implied in the solutio, which however wavers between ἐπιπίπτει and ἐπέπεσεν.

The passage is cited in *Q. R. D. H.* thrice, wholly or in part, i. 508, 510, 511. At i. 508 ἔπεσεν ἐπὶ τόν is given; at i. 510 ἐπέπεσεν ἐπὶ τόν. It is certain, therefore, that (ii) ἔπεσεν or ἐπέπεσεν ἐπὶ τόν was in Philo's LXX. In i. 508, 510, Ἀβραάμ is also given, and was, therefore, in Philo's LXX. The other variants are not given, at least

not in Mangey's Text of i. 508; where the Papyrus has *ἐπέστησεν τῷ Ἀβραάμ*, though in i. 510, 511, it has *ἐπέπεσεν*.

Turning to Holmes' sources, we find that (ii) is in margin of X. 135, and in Text of 32, 55, 76, 134. Cyril. Al. Glaph., p. 76. Theodoret in Cat. Nic. 208. Slav. Arm. Ed.; (iv) is in X, 37, 61, 106, 129, 130, while Chrys. iv. 375, has *φοβ. μέγ. καὶ σκ.*

All the variants, then, of the lemma except (i) may be ascribed to the Text of the LXX used by Philo.

Qu. 10.—Ch. xv. 13: *Διὰ τί Ἐρρέθη πρὸς αὐτὸν Γινώσκων γνώσῃ ὅτι πάροικον ἔσται σπέρμα σου ἐν γῇ οὐκ ἰδίᾳ, καὶ δουλώσουσιν καὶ ταπεινώσουσιν καὶ κακώσουσιν αὐτοὺς ἔτη τετρακόσια*; B omits the words *καὶ ταπεινώσ. καὶ κακώσ.*

Here (i) *αὐτόν* for *Ἄβραμ*.

(ii) *τό* omitted before *σπέρμα*.

(iii) *αὐτούς* omitted twice after *δουλώσ.* and *ταπειν.*

(iv) the order *ταπεινώσ. κ. κακ.* instead of *κακ. κ. ταπ.*

(v) *ἔτη τετρακ.* for *τετρακ. ἔτη.*

In *Q. R. D. H.* i. 511 the verse is thus cited: *ἐρρέθη πρὸς Ἀβραὰμ . . . . γινώσκων* (Papyrus omits) *γνώσῃ ὅτι πάροικον ἔσται τὸ σπέρμα σου ἐν γῇ οὐκ ἰδίᾳ.* We may, therefore, neglect variants (i) and (ii). Philo's Commentary at i. 511 proves that (iv) also may be set aside; for he writes, *ἓν μὲν δὴ παίδευμα τοῦτο· ἕτερον δέ, ὅτι δουλείαν καὶ κάκωσιν καὶ δεινήν, ὡς αὐτὸς ἔφη, ταπείνωσιν ἐπάγοντα τῇ ψυχῇ, τὰ κατὰ γῆν ἐστιν οἰκίδια.* This proves that at least the LXX from which he wrote the *Q. R. D. H.* had the same order as Tischendorf.

As to variant (iii) *αὐτούς* after *δουλώσουσιν* is omitted in Macar. Hom. p. 532. Slav. Ostrog. and other early authorities conflict as to reading, e.g. Alex. and Chrys. have *αὐτό*. The second *αὐτούς* is omitted in X, 37, 61, 107, 108. Compl. Chrys. i. 192; iv. 375. Arm. 1. Arm. Ed. Variant (v) is in X, 19, 37, 59, 75, 77, 106, 108, 129, 130. Compl. Epiph. i. 153; Chrys. iv. 375; Macar. *l.c.*; Theodoret, i. 78; Cyr. Al. Glaph. p. 70; Arm. 1, Arm. Ed.

There is thus a good probability that (iii) and (v) are due to Philo's own LXX.

Gen. xv. 14 is given in the Arm. Sol. of Qu. 10 as follows: *τὸ δὲ ἔθνος ᾧ ἐὰν αὐτοὶ* (or *ἐκεινοι*) *δουλεύσωσι, κρινῶ ἐγώ· μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα ἐξελεύσονται ὧδε μετὰ πολλῆς ἀποσκευῆς.*

Here (i) *αὐτοί* is added after *ἐάν*.

(ii) *πολ. ἀποσκ.* for *ἀποσκ. πολ.*

In Philo *Q. R. D. H.* i. 512 the verse is cited according to Tischendorf.

There is no trace in Holmes' sources of the variants (i) and (ii), which are probably mere devices of rendering.

Qu. 11.—Ch. xv. 15: *Τί ἐστι Σὺ δὲ πορεύσῃ* (or *ἀπελεύσῃ*) *πρὸς τοὺς πατέρας σου μετ' εἰρήνης ταφεὶς ἐν καλῷ γήρᾳ*; The Armenian solutio repeats the citation in the same way.

Here note (i) *πορεύσῃ* (probably) for *ἀπελεύσῃ*.

(ii) *μετ' εἰρήνης* for *ἐν εἰρήνῃ*.

(iii) *καλῷ γ.* for *γ. καλῷ*.

In Philo *Q. R. D. H.* i. 512 the verse is thus cited: *Σὺ δὲ ἀπελεύσῃ πρὸς τ. π. σ. μετ' εἰρήνης ταφεὶς ἐν γήρᾳ καλῷ*, and in the Commentary i. 513 is read the following: *μετὰ δὲ τὸ ἀπελεύσῃ γέγραπται τὸ πρὸς τοὺς π. σου*, and on i. 514 *μετ' εἰρήνης ταφείς* is repeated. The original Greek of the Armenian quaestio is given by Wendland from the Cod. Barb., and has *ἀπελεύσῃ*, not *πορεύσῃ*.

On the other hand, *πορεύσῃ* is in (Holmes) 15, 19, 82, 108, 135, Compl., and is implied in the Arm. Vulgate, which in other respects differs from this Armenian lemma.

As to (ii) it is clear that it was in Philo's LXX. It is also found in (Holmes) X, 14, 15, 19, 25, 32, 37, 38, 55, 57, 73, 74, 76, 77, 78, 79, 106, 107, 108, 129, 134. Compl. Alex. Cat. Nic. Clem. Hom. iii. 650. Orig. iii. 689, 828. Cyr. Al. Glaph., p. 70. Theodoret i. 78.

Variant (iii) is probably a device of rendering, as no other source gives it.

Qu. 12.—Ch. xv. 16: *Διὰ τί φησι τετάρτῃ γενέαι ἀποστραφήσονται ὧδε*;

The Armenian translator had mistaken the dative

ΓΕΝΕΑι for ΓΕΝΕΑΙ the nom. pl., an error the easier to commit because the plural verb *ἀποστραφήσονται* follows. In Philo i. 516, 517, the citation is given in the usual form.

Qu. 13.—Ch. xv. 16: *Τί ἐστιν Οὔπω ἀναπεπλήρωνται αἱ ἁμαρτίαι τῶν Ἀμορραίων ἕως τοῦ νῦν* (but for *ἕως τ. νῦν* Text B has "coram me");

This agrees with Tischendorf, but in Philo *Q. R. D. H.* i. 516, we read thus: *Τὸ δὲ ἄχρι τίνος, αὐτὸς μηνύει, λέγων, Οὔπω γὰρ ἀναπεπλήρωνται αἱ ἀνομίαι τῶν Ἀμορραίων*, and in i. 517, l. 10: *Ἕως μὲν οὖν οὐκ ἀναπεπλήρωνται τὰ ἁμαρτήματα τῶν Ἀμορραίων.* That *ἀνομίαι* was read in some Texts is certain because it is in (Holmes) 59, and is implied in Greg. Naz. *Adv. Iul.*, Orat. III. p. 60. We may almost infer that in one of Philo's codices of the LXX *ἀνομίαι* was read with *ἁμαρτήματα* written in the margin, and that in another there stood *ἁμαρτίαι.*

Qu. 14.—Ch. xv. 17: *Τί ἐστιν Ἐπειδὴ ὁ ἥλιος ἐγένετο πρὸς δυσμάς, φλὸξ ἐγένετο;*

Here *ἐπειδή* for *ἐπεὶ δέ.*

The citation occurs in Philo i. 517, where in Mangey's Edition is read *ἐπεὶ δέ.* Philo himself certainly read *ἐπειδή* in his LXX; for that is implied in the Arm. solutio, which begins thus: *ἢ ὁ ἥλιος φλογοειδὴς ἐφαίνετο πρὸς δυσμὰς γενόμενος ἢ ἄλλη φλὸξ πρὸς ἑσπέραν* κ.τ.λ. The Armenian Vulgate has *ἐπεὶ δέ.* In Chrys. iv. 368 *ἐπειδή* is read. *ἐπειδὴ δέ* is in (Holmes) 57, 107, 134, 135, and *ἐπειδὴ δὲ ἤδη* in X.

Qu. 15.—Ch. xv. 17: *Τί ἐστιν, Ἰδοὺ κλίβανος καπνιζόμενος καὶ λαμπάδες πυρὸς αἳ διῆλθον ἀνὰ μέσον τῶν διχοτομημάτων;*

Here *τούτων* is omitted after *διχοτομημάτων*, an omission certainly due to Philo's LXX, as it also occurs in (Holmes) 20, 57, 75; Philo i. 518; Chrys. iv. 378; Theodoret, ut videtur, ii. 1692; Copt. Arab. In Philo i. 518 *ἀνά* is omitted before *μέσον.*

Qu. 16.—Ch. xv. 18: *Διὰ τί φησιν Ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ*

διαθήκην διέθετο τῷ Ἀβραάμ, λέγων· Τῷ σπέρματί σου δώσω τὴν γῆν ταύτην ἀπὸ τοῦ ποταμοῦ Αἰγύπτου ἕως τοῦ ποταμοῦ (? τοῦ) μεγάλου Εὐφράτου;

Here διαθ. διέθ. τῷ Ἀβ. instead of διέθ. Κύριος τῷ Ἄβραμ διαθήκην. In Philo i. 518 the citation runs thus: ἐν γὰρ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ, φησίν, ἐκείνῃ συνέθετο Κύριος τῷ Ἀβραὰμ συνθήκην λέγων, where also is read τοῦ ποταμοῦ τοῦ μεγάλου, Εὐφράτου.

The Armenian lemma would equally allow of συνθήκην συνέθετο (or of ἔθετο) and does not, therefore, really conflict with Philo i. 518. The variants of the Armenian seem due to citation only.

Qu. 17.—Ch. xv. 19: Τίνες εἰσιν οἱ Κεναῖοι καὶ Κενεζαῖοι καὶ Κεδμοναῖοι καὶ Χεταῖοι καὶ Φερεζαῖοι καὶ Ῥαφαεὶν καὶ Ἀμορραῖοι καὶ Χαναναῖοι καὶ Γεργεσαῖοι καὶ Ἰεβουσαῖοι; (Another MS. has the order Χεταῖοι καὶ Κεδμοναῖοι.)

Here the words καὶ τοὺς Εὐαίους are omitted. The Armenian Commentary and Philo i. 536 alike demonstrate that Philo in his copies of the LXX omitted them. They are also omitted in (Holmes) X, 18, 19, 56, 72, 82, 106, 107, 129, 135. Compl. Cat. Nic. Copt. Arab. 3, Arm. 1, Arm. Ed.

Qu. 18.—Ch. xvi. 1: Διὰ τί Σάρα ἡ γυνὴ Ἀβραὰμ οὐκ ἔτικτεν;

Here αὐτῷ is omitted after ἔτικτεν, an accident of citation for in Philo i. 519 it is suggested and also implied by the words in Philo i. 520, l. 9: Σάρρα οὖν ἡ ἄρχουσά μου τῆς ψυχῆς ἀρετή, ἔτικτε μέν, οὐκ ἔτικτε δ' ἐμοί.

Qu. 19.—Ch. xvi. 1: Τί ἐστιν Ἦν αὐτῇ παιδίσκη Αἰγυπτία ᾗ (B. om.) ὄνομα Ἄγαρ;

Here the Arm. solutio has Ἄγαρ.

Qu. 20.—Ch. xvi. 2: Διὰ τί εἶπε Σάρα πρὸς Ἀβραὰμ Ἰδοὺ συνέκλεισέ με Κύριος τοῦ μὴ τίκτειν· εἴσελθε πρὸς τὴν παιδίσκην ἵνα τεκνοποιήσῃς ἐξ αὐτῆς; (Codex B paraphrases: "Cur dixit Sara ad Abraham iamiam cognovi quia conclusit meus dominus uterum meum; intra," &c.).

Here (i) οὖν is omitted after εἴσελθε.

(ii) *μου* after *παιδίσκην*.

(iii) *τεκνοποιήσῃς* for *τεκνοποιήσωμαι*.

The same citation is given in Philo i. 519, and there agrees in (i) and (iii) with the Armenian lemma. These variants, therefore, we may at once ascribe to Philo's LXX. The variant (ii) is in (Holmes) 77 ; also Cyr. Al. vi, parte prima, p. 48, reads *σου*. Perhaps this omission is due to citation. (i) is in (Holmes) 31, 68, 120, 121. Ald. Arm. 1. Arm. Ed. (iii) *τεκνοποιήσῃς* is in III, X, 38, 74, 129, 134. Chrys. iv. 384. Cyr. Alex. vi. Also *τεκνοποιήσεις*, which answers to the Armenian, perhaps, better than *τεκνοποιήσῃς*, is in 56, 76, 106.

Qu. 21.—Ch. xvi. 3 : *Διὰ τί γυναῖκα Ἀβραὰμ εἶπε τὴν Σάραν, λαβοῦσα γάρ φησι Σάρα ἡ γυνὴ Ἀβραὰμ τὴν ἑαυτῆς παιδίσκην Ἄγαρ τὴν Αἰγυπτίαν ἔδωκεν εἰς χεῖρας* (or *ἐν χερσὶν*) *αὐτοῦ ;* But one of the Edschmiadsin MSS. omits *ἑαυτῆς παιδίσκην*, another transposes after *Αἰγυπτίαν*, and for *εἰς χεῖρας αὐτοῦ*, both imply *τῷ ἀνδρὶ αὐτῆς*.

The same citation is given in Philo i. 429, but in a form agreeing with Tischendorf, save that there is read *ἔδωκε τῷ Ἀβραὰμ τῷ αὐτῆς ἀνδρί, αὐτῷ εἰς γυναῖκα* instead of *ἔδωκεν αὐτὴν τῷ Ἄβραμ ἀνδρὶ αὐτῆς αὐτῷ γυναῖκα*.

In the Armenian lemma we have—

(i) *τὴν ἑαυτῆς παιδ.* set before, instead of after, *Ἄγαρ τὴν Αἰγ.*

(ii) *μετὰ δέκα ἔτη*—*Χαναάν* is omitted.

(iii) *ἔδωκεν εἰς χεῖρας αὐτοῦ*.

Of these (ii) is found in Holmes, 106; it is, therefore, doubtful if the omission is merely due to citation. Variants (i) and (iii) also have not the air of being accidents of citation, yet one hesitates to attribute them, without evidence from other sources, to Philo's LXX.

Qu. 22.—Ch. xvi. 4: *Τί ἐστιν εἶδεν ὅτι ἐν γαστρὶ ἔχει καὶ ἠτιμάσθη ἡ Κυρία ἐναντίον αὐτῆς ;* (But Codex B omits the words : *ἐν γαστρὶ ἔχει καί*, and also *ἡ Κυρία*.)

Qu. 23.—Ch. xvi. 5: *Διὰ τί Σάρα ὡς μετεμέλησεν, εἶπε δὲ πρὸς Ἀβραὰμ Ἀδικοῦμαι ἐκ σοῦ· ἐγὼ δέδωκα τὴν παιδίσκην μου*

εἰς τὸν κόλπον σου, ἰδοῦσα δὲ ὅτι ἐν γαστρὶ ἔχει ἠτιμάσθην ἐναντίον αὐτῆς ;

In Philo i. 539 *ἐνώπιον αὐτῆς*, and may equally with *ἐναντίον αὐτῆς* have been in the original Greek of the Quaestio.

Qu. 24.—Ch. xvi. 6 : *Διὰ τί φησιν Ἀβραὰμ Ἰδοὺ ἡ παιδίσκη σου ἐν ταῖς χερσί σου· χρῶ αὐτῇ ὡς ἄν σοι ἀρεστὸν ᾖ ;* But Codex B omits *ἐν τ. χ. σου*, and thus implies simply *χρῶ ὅ, τι ἂν θέλῃς.*

The citation is also in Philo i. 541 ; omitting *σου* after *παιδίσκη* and *ᾖ* after *ἀρεστόν* ; though according to Mangey's note some MSS. add *ᾖ*.

Qu. 25.—Ch. xvi. 6 : *Διὰ τί φησιν ἐκάκωσεν αὐτὴν Σάρα ;*

Qu. 26.—Ch. xvi. 6 : *Διὰ τί ἀποδιδράσκει Ἄγαρ ἀπὸ προσώπου αὐτῆς ;*

Here *τοῦ* is omitted as in verse 8.

Qu. 27.—Ch. xvi. 7 : *Τί ἐστιν εὗρεν αὐτὴν ἄγγελος Κυρίου ἐπὶ τῆς πηγῆς τοῦ ὕδατος ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ Σούρ ;*

Here *ἐπὶ τῆς πηγῆς* is omitted before *ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ* Σ. It is certain that Philo omitted it in his LXX, for it is omitted in (Holmes) 75, 106. Chrys. iv. 389. Cyr. Al. Glaph., p. 72. In Mangey's Text Philo i. 546, where the citation occurs, *ἐπὶ τῆς πηγῆς τῆς ἐν τῇ ἐρ.* is read.

Qu. 28.—Ch. xvi. 8 : *Διὰ τί εἶπεν αὐτῇ ὁ ἄγγελος Ἄγαρ παιδίσκη Σάρας, πόθεν ἔρχῃ καὶ ποῦ πορεύῃ ;*

Here *Κυρίου* is omitted after *ἄγγελος*. In Mangey's Text Philo i. 546, where the citation occurs, *Κυρίου* is added.

Qu. 29.—Ch. xvi. 8 : *Τί ἐστιν, Ἀπὸ προσώπου Σάρας τῆς κυρίας μου ἐγὼ ἀποδιδράσκω ;*

Qu. 30.—Ch. xvi. 9 : *Διὰ τί εἶπεν ὁ ἄγγελος αὐτῇ Ἀποστράφηθι πρὸς τὴν κυρίαν σου καὶ ταπεινώθητι ὑπὸ τὰς χεῖρας αὐτῆς ;*

Here *Κυρίου* is again omitted after *ἄγγελος*, this time also in (Holmes) 108. Compl. We cannot, however, safely attribute the omission to the Text of Philo's LXX, for in Philo i. 546 *Κυρίου* is supplied.

Qu. 31.—Ch. xvi. 10 : *Διὰ τί εἶπεν αὐτῇ ὁ ἄγγελος· Πλη-*

θυνῶ φησι τὸ σπέρμα σου καὶ οὐκ ἀριθμηθήσεται ὑπὸ τοῦ πλήθους ;

Here are omitted (i) *Κυρίου* after *ἄγγελος*, and (ii) *πληθύνων* before *πληθυνῶ*.

Of these both may possibly have occurred in Philo's LXX, but there is no other evidence to bring but the Armenian lemma.

Qu. 32.—Ch. xvi. 11 : *Τί ἐστιν Εἶπεν αὐτῇ ὁ ἄγγελος Ἰδοὺ σὺ ἐν γαστρὶ ἔχεις καὶ τέξεις υἱὸν καὶ καλέσεις τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἰσμαήλ, ὅτι ἐπήκουσε Κύριος τῇ ταπεινώσει σου ;*

Here (i) *Κυρίου* is omitted after *ἄγγελος*. It is remarkable that throughout this passage *Κυρίου* is omitted in the lemmata after *ἄγγελος*.

(ii) *τέξεις* for *τέξῃ* seems to be implied by the Armenian and is found in Philo i. 546, where the citation occurs.

Qu. 33.—Ch. xvi. 12 : *Τί ἐστιν, Οὗτος ἔσται ἄγροικος ἄνθρωπος· αἱ χεῖρες αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ πάντας, καὶ αἱ χεῖρες πάντων ἐπ' αὐτόν, καὶ κατὰ πρόσωπον πάντων τῶν ἀδελφῶν αὐτοῦ κατοικήσει ;*

I suspect that *αὐτοῦ* after *ἀδελφῶν* is an interpolation either in the original Greek of this title or in the Arm. MSS. For (i) in the Arm. solutio itself we read thus : *διό φησι κατὰ πρόσωπον πάντων τῶν ἀδελφῶν κατοικήσει*, omitting *αὐτοῦ* : (ii) in (Holmes) 135 and Philo i. 577 *αὐτοῦ* is also omitted; (iii) the Arm. Vulgate like Tischendorf's Text adds *αὐτοῦ*, so a scribe may have added it, though otherwise the Armenian lemma shows no trace of having been revised according to the Arm. Vulgate.

Qu. 34.—Ch. xvi. 13 : *Διὰ τί φησι, Καὶ ἐκάλεσε ὄνομα Κυρίου τοῦ λαλοῦντος πρὸς αὐτήν, Σὺ θεὸς ὁ ἐπιδών με· ὅτι εἶπε, Καὶ γὰρ ἐνώπιον εἶδον ὀφθέντα μοι ;*

In Philo i. 577 *ὁ* is omitted before *θεός*, also in Holmes 82, but the Arm. title does not make it certain that it was omitted in the original Greek of the title. Nor is it certain that *τό* was omitted before *ὄνομα* in the original Greek of the Quaestio; the omission may be in the rendering only. Holmes 82 and Ald. omit.

Qu. 35.—Ch. xvi. 14: Τί ἐστιν Ἕνεκεν τούτου ἐκάλεσε τὸ φρέαρ φρέαρ οὗ ἐνώπιον εἶδον ;

In Philo i. 577 διά is read instead of ἕνεκεν. The Arm. title is not decisive as to which was read in its Greek original.

Qu. 36.—Ch. xvi. 14: Διὰ τί τὸ φρέαρ ἀνὰ μέσον Κάδης καὶ ἀνὰ μέσον Φαρρὰν εἶναι λέγει ;

Here Φαρράν is used for Βαράδ. In (Holmes) Arm. 2 Φαρράν is implied. The Arm. Vulg. has Βαράδ. Philo's LXX certainly had Φαρράν.

Qu. 37.—Ch. xvi. 15: Τί ἐστιν Ἔτεκεν Ἄγαρ τῷ Ἀβραὰμ υἱόν ;

Qu. 38.—Ch. xvi. 16: Διὰ τί ἓξ καὶ ὀγδοήκοντα ἐτῶν Ἀβραὰμ λέγεται εἶναι ἡνίκα ἔτεκεν αὐτῷ τὸν Ἰσμαήλ ;

The Armenian solutio seems to imply that ὀγδοηκονταἑξ stood in the Greek original of the title, for it begins thus: Ὅτι τὸ ἑπόμενον τῷ ὀγδοήκοντα τὸ ἓξ πρῶτος ἐστι τέλειος ἀριθμός.

In any case the Arm. title sets ἐτῶν after and not before the numeral, and so agrees with (Holmes) X, 14, 15, 16, 18, 38, 56, 57, 73, 76, 77, 78, 79, 82, 83, 128, 129, 131, 134, 135 Alex. The other variant also, αὐτῷ for τῷ Ἄβραμ, must not be ascribed to Philo's LXX.

Qu. 39.—Ch. xvii. 1: Διὰ τί γενομένῳ ἐνενηκονταεννέα ἐτῶν φησι, ὤφθη Κύριος ὁ θεὸς καὶ εἶπε Ἐγὼ Κύριός εἰμι ὁ Θεός σου ;

Here (i) ἐτῶν is placed after the numeral.

(ii) ὁ θεός is added after ὤφθη Κύριος.

(iii) Κύριος is added after ἐγώ.

All these variations are endorsed by the solutio, and may be ascribed to Philo's LXX. As to Holmes' sources, (i) is in 129, 134, (ii) in Chrys. iv. 396, 397, Κύριος is replaced by ὁ θεός, and Κύριος ὁ θεός is in 59. Arm. 1. Arm. Ed. As to (iii), ἐγώ εἰμι Κύριος ὁ θεός is read in 135, and Philo i. 582: "et hanc lectionem urget in Commentario, licet alibi saepe habeat θεός simpliciter." (Holmes ad loc.)

Qu. 40.—Ch. xvii. 2, 3: Τί ἐστιν, Εὐαρέστει ἐνώπιον ἐμοῦ, καὶ γίνου ἄμεμπτος, καὶ θήσω τὴν διαθήκην μου ἀνὰ μέσον ἐμοῦ καὶ ἀνὰ μέσον σοῦ, καὶ πληθυνῶ σε σφόδρα σφόδρα ;

Here (i) *σφ. σφ.* for *σφ.* singly.

(ii) *θήσω* for *θήσομαι* is doubtful. But as it is read in Philo i. 586, Cat. Nic., and in the MSS., 14, 15, 16, 18, 37, 56, 57, 59, 73, 75, 77, 78, 82, 106, 107, 128, 130, 131, 135, which usually have the Philonean tradition, and as it agrees better with the Armenian than would *θήσομαι*, we may assume that it was read.

As to *σφόδρα σφόδρα*, it is certain that Philo read it in his LXX, for the Arm. solutio urges it, as follows: *τὸ δὲ δὶς λέγειν πληθυνῶ σε σφόδρα σφόδρα τὸ πλήθους ἀπερίγραπτον φανερῶς δηλοῖ.* The same variant is in (Holmes), 15, 16, 18, 25, 57, 59, 73, 77, 78, 79, 82, 130, 131, 135. Cat. Nic. Procop. in Cat. Nic. 221, Arm. 1. Arm. Ed.

In the Arm. solutio is also read: *τὸ γὰρ θήσω τὴν διαθήκην μου ἀνὰ μέσον ἐμοῦ καὶ σοῦ*, as if the second *ἀνὰ μέσον* were omitted. Procopius omits it l. c.

Qu. 41.—Ch. xvii. 3: *Τί ἐστιν, ἔπεσεν Ἀβραὰμ ἐπὶ πρόσωπον;*

Here *αὐτοῦ* is omitted after *πρόσωπον*. So also (Holmes) 106, 107, Philo i. 586. Praemittit ✻ in textu, cum eodem signo in margine, Arm. 1. We may infer that Philo's LXX omitted *αὐτοῦ*.

Qu. 42.—Ch. xvii. 3, 4: *Τί ἐστιν καὶ ἐλάλησεν αὐτῷ ὁ θεὸς λέγων Καὶ ἐγώ, ἰδοὺ ἡ διαθήκη μου μετὰ σοῦ, καὶ ἔσῃ πατὴρ πλήθους ἐθνῶν;*

Qu. 43.—Ch. xvii. 5: *Τί ἐστιν Οὐ κληθήσεται τὸ ὄνομά σου Ἄβραμ, ἀλλ' Ἀβραὰμ ἔσται τὸ ὄνομά σου;*

Here (i) *ἔτι* is omitted after *κληθήσεται*.

(ii) *ἀλλ' Ἀβραὰμ ἔσται τὸ ὄ. σου* for *ἀλλ' ἔσται τὸ ὄ. σ. Ἀβ.*

(i) is in (Holmes) 72 and Philo i. 587, therefore it was in Philo's LXX; (ii) is read in Eusebius, while Alex. has *ἔστ. Ἀβρ. τὸ ὄ. σου.* No doubt the title preserves the reading of Philo's LXX, though in Philo i. 587, the order of Tischendorf is found.

Qu. 44.—Ch. xvii. 6: *Τί ἐστιν Αὐξανῶ σε σφόδρα, καὶ θήσω σε εἰς ἔθνη, καὶ βασιλεῖς ἐκ σοῦ ἔσονται;*

Here Tischendorf has *σφόδρα σφόδρα.* But the second

σφόδρα is omitted in (Holmes) III, 135. Aug. Copt. Arm. 1. Arm. Ed.; habet in minore charactere Alex. The title is repeated in the solutio without change. The omission of second σφ. may, therefore, be set down to Philo's LXX. ἔσονται for ἐξελεύσονται must be due to Philo's LXX, for Ambrose has "de te erunt."

Qu. 45.—Ch. xvii. 8: Τί ἐστι δώσω σοὶ καὶ τῷ σπέρματί σου μετὰ σὲ τὴν γῆν ἣν παρῴκηκας, πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν Χαναὰν εἰς κατάσχεσιν αἰώνιον;

Here the perfect παρῴκηκας is not to be accounted for unless it was Philo's own reading. The Arm. Vulgate has παροικεῖς, besides many other differences.

Qu. 46.—Ch. xvii. 10, 11: Τί ἐστι Περιτμηθήσεται πᾶν ἀρσενικὸν ὑμῶν καὶ περιτμηθήσεσθε τὴν σάρκα τῆς ἀκροβυστίας;

Here we have (i) πᾶν ἀρσ. ὑμ. for ὑμῶν πᾶν ἀρσ., a variation not found in any other source; (ii) ὑμῶν is, perhaps, omitted after ἀκροβυστίας. Some Armenian MSS. have ὑμῖν for ὑμῶν after ἀρσενικόν, a reading found in (Holmes) 19, 37, 38, 106, 107, 108. Compl.

Qu. 47.—Ch. xvii. 10: Διὰ τί τὸ ἀρσενικὸν μόνον κελεύει περιτέμνειν;

Qu. 48.—Ch. xvii. 12: Διὰ τί φησι, Καὶ παιδίον ὀκταήμερον περιτμηθήσεται πᾶν ἀρσενικόν;

Here (i) ὑμῖν is omitted after περιτμηθήσεται.

(ii) ὀκταήμερον for ὀκτὼ ἡμερῶν.

(ii) is in (Holmes) 59, 128, Arm. 1. Arm. Ed. Cyr. Al. Glaph. p. 72. This may, therefore, be set down to Philo's LXX; as may with almost equal certainty the omission (i) of ὑμῖν, though not found in other sources.

Qu. 49.—Ch. xvii. 12: Διὰ τί ἐν τῇ ὀγδόῃ ἡμέρᾳ τὴν περιτομὴν ἐντελλέται;

Qu. 50.—Ch. xvii. 12: Διὰ τί τοὺς οἰκογενεῖς καὶ τοὺς ἀργυρωνήτους περιτέμνει;

Qu. 51.—Ch. xvii. 13: Τί ἐστι, Καὶ ἔσται ἡ διαθήκη μου ἐπὶ τῆς σαρκὸς ὑμῶν;

Qu. 52.—Ch. xvii. 14: Διὰ τί ἐπὶ παιδίου κατακρίνει θανάτου κρίσιν· λέγων, Ἀπερίτμητος ἄρσην ὃς οὐ περιτμη-

θήσεται τὴν σάρκα τῆς ἀκροβυστίας τῇ ὀγδόῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἐξολοθρευθήσεται ἡ ψυχὴ ἐκείνη ἐκ τοῦ γένους αὐτῆς ;

Here *αὐτοῦ* is omitted after *ἀκροβυστίας*. Holmes notes thus : *αὐτοῦ*] praemittit * in textu, cum eodem signo in margine, Arm. 1. It is, therefore, probable that Philo's LXX omitted it.

Qu. 53.—Ch. xvii. 15 : *Διὰ τί λέγει, Σάρα ἡ γυνή σου οὐ κληθήσεται Σάρα, ἀλλὰ Σάρρα ἔσται τὸ ὄνομα αὐτῆς ;*

Here (i) *τὸ ὄνομα αὐτῆς* is omitted after *κληθήσεται* : (ii) *ἀλλά* is added before *Σάρρα*. The former is not found in any of Holmes' MSS., but is in Philo i. 130, so that we may ascribe it to Philo's LXX. So we may (ii) for the same reason. We find *ἀλλά* also in (Holmes) X, 14–19, 25, 31, 32, 38, 55, 56, 57, 59, 68, 71, 73, 75–79, 82, 83, 106–108, 120, 121, 128–131, 134, 135. Compl. Alex. Chrys. iv. 404. Cyr. Al. vi, parte prima, 49. Aug. Slav. Arm. 1. Arm. Ed. Georg. In Philo i. 130 *αὐτῆς* is read after *Σάρρα*, instead of at the end of the sentence.

Qu. 54.—Ch. xvii. 16 : *Διὰ τί φησι, Δώσω σοι ἐξ αὐτῆς τέκνα καὶ εὐλογήσω αὐτήν, καὶ ἔσται εἰς ἔθνη, καὶ βασιλεῖς ἐθνῶν ἐξ αὐτῆς ἔσονται ;*

Here *τέκνα* for *τέκνον* is urged in the Arm. solutio, which Aucher thus renders : "Vix oportet quaerere, quod in plurali dixerit Pueros unicum dilectumque filium eorum." Therefore Philo so read in his LXX. From Philo i. 601 it is certain that Philo read in his LXX *αὐτῆς*, not *αὐτοῦ*, before *ἔσονται*. This is as compatible with the Armenian as *αὐτοῦ* ; and it also renders it certain that he read in his LXX after *εὐλογήσω*, not *αὐτό* or *αὐτόν*, but *αὐτήν*, of which the Armenian equally admits. For after *τέκνα* neither *αὐτό* nor *αὐτόν* would be appropriate. But if *εὐλογήσω αὐτήν* was read here, it becomes probable that Philo's LXX omitted *εὐλογήσω δὲ αὐτήν* at the beginning of the verse. Of that the Armenian is not decisive, though it is sufficient that in the Philonean title the citation begins from *δώσω* only. In Philo *De Nom. Mut.* i. 598, l. 12, this surmise is confirmed, for we read : *ἀποχρώντως οὖν περὶ τῆς τῶν ὀνομάτων ἀλλαγῆς*

τε καὶ μεταθέσεως εἰρηκότες, ἐπὶ τὰ ἑξῆς τῆς ἐφόδου τρεψόμεθα κεφάλαια. Εἴπετο δὲ εὐθὺς ἡ γένεσις Ἰσαάκ· καλέσας γὰρ τὴν μητέρα αὐτοῦ Σάρραν ἀντὶ Σάρας, φησὶ τῷ Ἀβραάμ, Δώσω σοι τέκνον. And Philo i. 600, l. 41, we have εὐλογήσω δέ, φησίν, αὐτήν, καὶ ἔσται εἰς ἔθνη. It is certain, therefore, that Philo's LXX (i) omitted εὐλογήσω δὲ αὐτήν, καί: (ii) read τέκνα not τέκνον: (iii) αὐτήν not αὐτό: (iv) αὐτῆς not αὐτοῦ. The MSS. of Philo have been conformed to later Texts of the LXX at i. 598, l. 17.

Qu. 55.—Ch. xvii. 17: Διὰ τί Ἀβραὰμ ἔπεσεν ἐπὶ τὸ πρόσωπον καὶ ἐγέλασε; (But cod. B. has the order ἔπεσεν Ἀβραάμ.)

Here are the following variants: (i) Ἀβρ. ἔπ. for ἔπ. Ἀβρ.: (ii) τὸ πρόσωπον for πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ. The latter was in Philo's LXX, for against αὐτοῦ Holmes notes thus: "habet in minore charact. Alex.; praefigit * in textu, cum eodem signo in margine, Arm. 1." Omit III, X, 57, 59, 72, 73, 76, 78, 79, 106, 134, 136; Philo i. 130; Chrys. iv. 405; Cyr. Al. vi, parte prima, 49.

Qu. 56.—Ch. xvii. 17: Διὰ τί ὡς ἀπιστεῖ τῷ χρησθέντι Εἶπε γάρ φησιν ἐν τῇ διανοίᾳ εἰ τῷ ἑκατονταετεῖ υἱὸς γενήσεται, καὶ Σάρρα ἐνενηκονταετὴς τέξεται;

Here (i) αὐτοῦ λέγων is omitted after διανοίᾳ.

(ii) υἱὸς γενήσεται for γεν. υἱός.

(iii) εἰ *omitted* before Σάρρα.

(iv) ἐνενηκονταετής for ἐνενήκοντα ἐτῶν.

(i) αὐτοῦ is omitted in 106, 108, Compl., and λέγων in 14, 15, 16, 18, 25, 38, 59, 72, 77, 78, 79, 82. Cat. Nic. Slav. Ostrog. Arab. 3, Georg. In Philo i. 605, l. 13, we read: γελάσας εὐθὺς εἶπε τῇ διανοίᾳ Εἰ τῷ ἑκατονταετεῖ γενήσεται, καὶ ἡ Σάρρα ἐνενήκοντα ἐτῶν οὖσα τέξεται; Μή τοι νομίσῃς, ὦ γενναῖε, τὸ εἰπεῖν οὐχὶ τῷ στόματι, ἀλλὰ τῇ διανοίᾳ προσκεῖσθαι παρέργως, ἀλλὰ καὶ πάνυ ἐξητασμένως. This almost proves that αὐτοῦ λέγων was omitted in Philo's LXX, as it certainly proves that καί was read for εἰ before Σάρρα. In the Armenian solutio the words εἶπεν ἐν τῇ διανοίᾳ are again repeated, but still without αὐτοῦ λέγων.

(ii) is in Epiph. i. 153, 154. But as the Greek Philo omits *υἱός* in i. 605, 104, and only retains it once, i. 130, and then has the order *γενήσεται υἱός*, it may well be doubted if it stood at all in his LXX. The Armenian solutio gives no hint of *υἱός*. Holmes' MSS. 15, 55, 59, 74, 76, 82, 134 omit it. The very dissonance of order between the Arm. title and Philo i. 130, points to its having been originally absent from the Text.

The third variant is found in 14, 15, 18, 31, 32, 57, 82, 131. Cat. Nic.; Philo i. 130; i. 605; Cyr. Al. vi, parte prima, 49. It may, therefore, be set down to Philo's LXX. Perhaps the *ἡ* before *Σάρρα* was also absent from the original Greek of the Quaestio. Variant (iv) does not occur in any other sources, but the Arm. solutio also implies it. Philo i. 104, 130, 695 has *ἐνενήκοντα ἐτῶν οὖσα.*

Qu. 57.—Ch. xvii. 18: *Διὰ τί εἶπεν Ἀβραὰμ πρὸς τὸν θεὸν Ἰσμαὴλ οὗτος ζήτω ἐνώπιόν σου;*

Qu. 58.—Ch. xvii. 19: *Διὰ τί ὁ χρησμὸς θεοῦ εἰς ὁμολόγησιν λέγων τῷ Ἀβραάμ· Ναί· ἰδοὺ Σάρρα ἡ γυνή σου τέξεταί σοι υἱόν;*

Here *τῷ Ἀβραάμ* instead of *πρὸς τὸν Ἀβραάμ*. The same reading occurs in X, 14, 15, 16, 18, 25, 56, 59, 72, 75, 77, 78, 79, 82, 129, 130, 135. Alex. Cat. Nic. Philo, i. 617; Arm. 1. Arm. Ed. Georg. It may, perhaps, be ascribed to Philo's LXX.

Qu. 59.—Ch. xvii. 20: *Διὰ τί φησι, Περὶ δὲ Ἰσμαὴλ ἰδοὺ* (om. cod. B.) *ἐπακούσομαί σου, καὶ εὐλογήσω αὐτόν* (Add. *καὶ* B.) *δώδεκα ἔθνη γεννήσει;*

Here Tisch. reads: *Περὶ δὲ Ἰσμαὴλ ἰδοὺ ἐπήκουσά σου, Καὶ ἰδοὺ εὐλόγηκα αὐτόν, καὶ αὐξανῶ αὐτόν, Καὶ πληθυνῶ αὐτὸν σφόδρα· δώδεκα ἔθνη γεννήσει.* In Philo 1. 618, is given: *Διό φησιν εὐλόγηκα αὐτόν, αὐξήσω αὐτόν, πληθυνῶ, δώδεκα ἔθνη γεννήσει.*

The future *εὐλογήσω* is in Compl. Arm. . . . Arm., Ed., and should perhaps be ascribed to Philo's LXX. Other differences are due to the citation only.

Qu. 60.—Ch. xvii. 21: *Διὰ τί φησι, Τὴν δὲ διαθήκην μου*

στήσω πρὸς Ἰσαάκ, ὃν τέξεται Σάρρα εἰς τὸν καιρὸν τοῦτον ἐν τῷ ἐνιαυτῷ τῷ ἑτέρῳ ;

Here σοι is omitted after τέξεται. In Philo i. 618, however, it is supplied.

Qu. 61.—Ch. xvii. 24, 25: Διὰ τί φησιν ὅτι Ἀβραὰμ ἦν ἐτῶν ἐνενήκοντα καὶ ἐννέα ἡνίκα περιετέμετο, Ἰσμαὴλ δὲ ὁ υἱὸς αὐτοῦ ἐτῶν τρισκαίδεκα ;

Here we have (i) ἦν ἐτ. ἐνεν. καὶ ἐν. for ἐνεν. ἦν ἐτ.

(ii) τὴν σάρκα τῆς ἀκροβυστίας αὐτοῦ is omitted after περιετέμετο.

(iii) τρισκαίδεκα for δεκατριῶν.

Of these, (i) is in (Holmes) 19, 25, 56, 106, 107, 108, 129, 130. Compl. Aug.: "et sic primo 134 et sic nisi quod καί interponant ante ἐννέα 59. Slav. Ostrog. Arm. 1. Arm. Ed.," and may be set down to Philo's LXX, as also, perhaps, may (iii), which is in (Holmes) 15. The omission (ii) is due to title.

Qu. 62.—Ch. xvii. 27 : Διὰ τί ἐξ ἀλλογενῶν ἐθνῶν περιτέμνει Ἀβραάμ ;

This title implies that after ἐθνῶν were added the words περιέτεμεν αὐτούς found in (Holmes) X, 15, 25, 56, 59, 71, 72, 75, 82, 106, 129, 135. Alex. Copt. Arab. 3, Slav. Ostrog. Arm. 1. Arm. Ed., while καὶ περιέτεμεν αὐτούς is added in 14, 16, 18, 32, 38, 56, 57, 68, 73, 74, 76–79, 83, 107, 120, 121, 128, 130, 131, 134. Ald. Cat. Nic. Slav. Mosq. Georg.

Philonis earum quae in Genesi Quaestionum et Solutionum.

Sermo Quartus.

Qu. 1.—Ch. xviii. 1, 2: Διὰ τί φησι, Ὤφθη δὲ Κύριος ὁ Θεὸς τῷ Ἀβραὰμ ἐν τῇ δρυῒ τῇ Μαμβρῇ καθημένου αὐτοῦ ἐν τῷ θερμῷ τῆς ἡμέρας πρὸς τῇ θύρᾳ τῆς σκηνῆς αὐτοῦ, ἀνέβλεψε δέ ;

Tischendorf has: ὤφθη δὲ αὐτῷ ὁ Θεὸς πρὸς τῇ δρυῒ τῇ

Μαμβρῇ, καθημένου αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τῆς θύρας τῆς σκηνῆς αὐτοῦ μεσημβρίας. ἀναβλέψας δὲ τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς αὐτοῦ, κ.τ.λ.

Either the citation in the Quaestio is a very free one or the Text has been tampered with, for the Armenian solutio requires it rather to have run thus: Ὤφθη δὲ Κ. ὁ Θ. τῷ Α. ἐν τῇ δρυὶ τῇ Μ. καθ. αὐτοῦ πρὸς τῇ θύρᾳ τῆς σκ. μεσημβρίας, ἀναβλέψας δὲ τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς. Thus the only variants to which we can attach any weight are: (i) αὐτῷ omitted before ὁ Θεός, and replaced after Θεός by τῷ Ἀβραάμ: (ii) Κύριος added before ὁ Θεός: (iii) ἐν τῇ δρυί for πρὸς τῇ δρυί: (iv) πρὸς τῇ θύρᾳ for ἐπὶ τῆς θύρας.

Of these, that (i) may be set down to mere citation is clear from the fact that in the solutio of Qu. 2 the citation recurs according to Tischendorf's Text. (ii) is not urged in the Arm. Commentary, and must not be ascribed to Philo's LXX, though it is also found in Eus. *Eccles. Theolog.* l. ii. 137. In the solutio of Qu. 2 the citation recurs without Κύριος. (iii) is in (Holmes) 130. Slav. Georg. and is urged by the Commentary. The oak, says Philo, was the mean between the two extremes of seen God and seeing man, that is the medium in which and through which God revealed himself; and he appositely remarks that there were religionists who, because the fruit of the oak had served man for food long before he had corn, therefore attributed life and power to the tree, and esteemed it to be the temple and altar of the one God. (Thus Philo virtually associates this apparition of God ἐν τῇ δρυί to Abraham with the tree-worship with which he was familiar. Perhaps he had the cult of Jupiter Ammon in his mind.) This in itself would account for the changing in later MSS. of LXX of ἐν into πρός. (iv) is also repeated in the solutio, besides being in (Holmes) 25. Euseb. *Eccles. Theolog.* l. c. We may, therefore, ascribe it to Philo's LXX.

Qu. 2.—Ch. xviii. 2: Τί ἐστιν Εἶδεν καὶ ἰδοὺ ἄνδρες τρεῖς εἱστήκεισαν ἐπάνω αὐτοῦ;

Here Tisch. has τρεῖς ἄνδρες.

The Arm. solutio of this Quaestio (p. 224, Aucher's Ed.)

has embedded in it several fragments of this chapter xviii, which in the following retranslation of the solutio are underlined: Τὸ λεγόμενον γὰρ (verse 1) ὤφθη αὐτῷ ὁ Θεὸς καὶ (3) Κύριε, εἰ ἄρα εὗρον χάριν ἐναντίον σου, καὶ (3) μὴ παρέλθῃς τὸν δοῦλόν σου, καὶ τὸ (5) οὕτω ποίησον καθὼς εἴρηκας, Καὶ ὁ (9) εἶπε πρὸς αὐτὸν Ποῦ ἐστι Σάρρα ἡ γυνή σου, καὶ (10) ἐπαναστρέφων ἥξω πρός σε ἐν τῷ καιρῷ τούτῳ καὶ (13) εἶπε πρὸς αὐτὸν ὁ Θεός. Τί ὅτι ἐγέλασε Σάρρα; ταῦτα πάντα ἐνδείκνυσι ὥσπερ θεοῦ φαντασίαν. Ἀλλ' ὥσπερ ἀνδρῶν ξένων ἐκεῖνα, (2) ἀναβλέψας τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς εἶδεν καὶ ἄνδρες τρεῖς εἱστήκεισαν ἐπάνω αὐτοῦ, καὶ τὸ (2) ἔδραμεν πρὸς αὐτοὺς καὶ (4) νιψάτωσαν τοὺς πόδας ὑμῶν, καὶ (4) καταψύξατε ὑπὸ τὸ δένδρον καὶ τὸ (5) φάγεσθε καὶ τὸ (8) εἱστήκει ἐναντίον αὐτῶν καὶ τὸ (16) ἐξαναστάντες ἐκεῖθεν οἱ ἄνδρες.

We take the above citations in the order given. In verse 3 δοῦλον for παῖδα is in I. Aug. et sic Ambr. bis, ubique. We may, probably, ascribe δοῦλον to Philo's LXX, even though in Philo ii. 20, the best MSS. in giving the citation read παῖδα. The Arm. Vulg. has δοῦλον. In verse 10 ἐπαναστρέφων is read in Philo i. 456, but in ii. 20 is read ἐπανίων (which, however, is omitted in the Lincoln College MS. of Philo). In verse 13 we have (i) ὁ Θεός for Κύριος, and (ii) ἐν ἑαυτῇ omitted after Σάρρα. As to (i) in Qu. 17, Κύριος is read, and not ὁ Θεός, whence we may, perhaps, infer that Philo read in his LXX Κύριος ὁ Θεός found in (Holmes) 14, 16, 18, 25, 56, 57, 73, 77, 78, 79, 108, 128, 129, 131. Cat. Nic. As to (ii), since ἐν ἑαυτῇ is also omitted in Qu. 17, we may infer that it was not in Philo's LXX. It is omitted in Just. M. *Dial.*, p. 254, et *Dial.* parte secunda, 409.

In verse 2 ἔδραμεν may be accepted, but on πρὸς αὐτούς see below the discussion of Quaestio 3. In verse 8 Tisch. reads παρειστήκει αὐτοῖς, and no source gives hint of any other reading.

It may be remarked that the solutio of this Quaestio 2 (Aucher, p. 245) contains three verses of Homer's *Od.* XVII,

485, of the second of which the Armenian version affords so choice an emendation that I venture to add them :—

καί τε θεοὶ ξείνοισιν ἐοικότες ἀλλοδαποῖσι
παντοῖοί τε λαθόντες ἐπιστρωφῶσι πόληας,
ἀνθρώπων ὕβρεις τε καὶ εὐνομίας ἐφορῶντες.

Instead of τε λαθόντες the texts of Homer have τελέθοντες.

Qu. 3.—Ch. xviii. 2 : Διὰ τί φησι Ἰδὼν ἔδραμεν εἰς συνάντησιν αὐτοῖς καὶ προσεκύνησεν ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν ;

Here (i) is omitted after αὐτοῖς the words : ἀπὸ τῆς θύρας τῆς σκηνῆς αὐτοῦ. (ii) ἔδραμεν for προσέδραμεν. Neither change is endorsed by the evidence of any other source, and they must be mere accidents of citation.

Qu. 4.—Ch. xviii. 3 : Κύριε, εἰ εὗρον χάριν ἐναντίον σου, μὴ παρέλθῃς τὸν δοῦλόν σου ;

Here ἄρα is omitted before εὗρον. In Philo ii. 20, Mangey's Text omits ἄρα, as does the oldest Paris MS. of Philo, No. 435, though the Lincoln MS., which is a good authority, supplies ἄρα. In the solutio of Qu. 2 we found the citation with ἄρα, so that weight must not be attached to its omission here. It is remarkable that, like Philo, other early Greek Fathers sometimes add ἄρα in citations of this verse and sometimes omit it, e.g. Chrys. ix. 676, and Cyr. Al. vii, parte secunda, 20, 268.

We have seen above that δοῦλον was probably read in Philo's LXX.

In the Arm. solutio (Aucher, p. 247) Gen. iv. 13 is again cited, and this time without any ambiguity ; the passage is as follows : ὅθεν καὶ ὁ ἀδελφοκτόνος Κάϊν φησι Μείζων ἡ αἰτία (lit. "damnum poenae") τὸ ἀφεθῆναί με, αἰνιττόμενος ὅτι μείζων οὐκ ἐστι ζημία ἢ ἀπολείπεσθαι ὑπὸ Θεοῦ· ὁ δὲ Μώσης ἐν ἄλλῳ τόπῳ λέγει, Μή ποτε ἀπαλλάξει ἀπ' αὐτῶν Κύριος (Exodus xix. 22), where our LXX reads ἀπαλλάξῃ.

Qu. 5.—Ch. xviii. 4 : Διὰ τί πάλιν πληθυντικῶς λέγει Ληφθήτω ὕδωρ καὶ νιψάτωσαν τοὺς πόδας αὐτῶν καὶ καταψύξατε ὑπὸ (? τὸ) δένδρον πυκνόν (Cod. B. omits) ;

Here (i) δή is omitted after ληφθήτω.

(ii) *πυκνόν* is added.

This verse has already been cited, but without (ii), which is, probably, a copyist's gloss. No other source omits *δή*, though some codd. read *δέ*. The solutio cites Gen. i. 2: *πνεῦμα Θεοῦ ἐφέρετο ἐπάνω τοῦ ὕδατος.*

Qu. 6.—Ch. xviii. 5: *Διὰ τί φησιν Οὕτως ποίησον καθὼς εἴρηκας;*

Qu. 8.—Ch. xviii. 6, 7: *Διὰ τί πάντες σπεύδουσι; φησὶ γάρ, ἔσπευσεν Ἀβραὰμ ἐπὶ τὴν σκηνὴν πρὸς Σάρρα καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῇ Σπεῦσον καὶ φύρασον τρία μέτρα σεμιδάλεως καὶ ποίησον ἐγκρυφίας, καὶ εἰς τὰς βόας ἔδραμεν καὶ ἔλαβεν μοσχάριον ἁπαλὸν καὶ ἔδωκε τῷ παιδί, καὶ ἐτάχυνε τοῦ ποιῆσαι αὐτό;*

Here (i) *Ἀβραάμ* is omitted after *ἔδραμεν*.

(ii) *μοσχάριον ἁπαλόν* for *ἁπαλὸν μοσχ.*

(iii) *καὶ καλόν* is omitted.

(i) may be due to citation; (ii) is in I, 14–16, 18, 19, 25, 32, 38, 56, 57, 59, 68, 71–73, 77–79, 82, 106–108, 128–131, 134, 135. Compl. Alex. Cat. Nic. Chrys. iv. 419. Athan. ii. 446. The other variant (iii) is in no other source; we can, therefore, only ascribe (ii) to Philo's LXX.

In the solutio (Aucher, p. 252) is quoted Exodus xxxiii. 13, as follows: *ἐμφάνισόν μοι σεαυτόν, γνωστῶς ἴδω σε.*

Here *ἵνα* is omitted before *ἴδω*. It was certainly omitted in Philo's LXX, for it is omitted in Philo i. 107, 579; also in (Holmes) II, VII, X, 14–16, 18, 19, 25, 29, 30, 37 bis, 52, 54–59, 64, 73–78, 82, 84, 85, 106, 108, 118, 128–132, 134. Ald. Lips.; Eus. in Pss., p. 102; Cyr. Al. iv. 590; v. 475; vii, parte secunda, 83. Georg.

Qu. 9.—Ch. xviii. 8; *Διὰ τί φησι, Παρέθηκεν αὐτοῖς καὶ ἔφαγον;*

Qu. 10.—Ch. xviii. 8: *Διὰ τί λέγεται, Αὐτὸς δὲ παρειστήκει αὐτοῖς ὑπὸ τὸ δένδρον;*

Qu. 11.—Ch. xviii. 9: *Διὰ τί πάλιν ἐνικῶς φησι, Ποῦ Σάρρα ἡ γυνή σου; ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν, ἐν τῇ σκηνῇ;*

Here *ἰδού* is omitted after *εἶπεν*, but merely through citation; for the solutio urges it, and in Philo i. 203, it is supplied.

Qu. 12.—Ch. xviii. 10, 14: *Διὰ τί φησιν ἐνικῶς Ἐπαναστρέφων ἥξω πρὸς σὲ κατὰ τὸν χρόνον τοῦτον εἰς ὥρας, καὶ ἔσται υἱὸς Σάρρᾳ τῇ γυναικί σου ;*

In Philo i. 456 and ii. 20, the usual reading is given: *καὶ ἕξει υἱὸν Σάρρα ἡ γυνή σου.* Nor does any other source agree with the title. In verse 14, however, we find *καὶ ἔσται τῇ Σάρρᾳ υἱός*, which is what is translated in the title, which thus renders the beginning of verse 10 and the end of verse 14.

Qu. 13.—Ch. xviii. 10: *Διὰ τί φησι, Σάρρα δὲ ἤκουσεν πρὸς τῇ θύρᾳ τῆς σκηνῆς οὖσα ὄπισθεν αὐτοῦ ;*

Qu. 14.—Ch. xviii. 11: *Διὰ τί φησιν, Ἀβραὰμ καὶ Σάρρα πρεσβύτεροι ἦσαν προβεβηκότες ἡμερῶν ;*

Here *ἦσαν* is added, as in the Arm. Vulgate. In Holmes, 19, Compl., it is added after *προβεβηκότες.*

Qu. 15.—Ch. xviii. 11: *Τί ἐστιν Ἐξέλιπε Σάρρᾳ γίνεσθαι τὰ γυναικεῖα ;* Here *τῇ* is perhaps omitted before *Σάρρᾳ* as in Philo i. 130.

Qu. 16.—Ch. xviii. 12: *Τί ἐστιν, Ἐγέλασε δὲ ἐν ἑαυτῇ Σάρρα λέγουσα Οὔπω μέν τι γέγονεν ἕως τοῦ νῦν· ὁ δὲ κύριος μου πρεσβύτερος ;*

Here (i) *ἐν ἑαυτῇ* Σ. for Σ. *ἐν ἑαυτῇ* must be accidental, for Tischendorf's order is given in Philo i. 603. (ii) *τι* for *μοι* before *γέγονεν* is due to a corruption of the Arm. Text, for in the solutio the citation recurs, as follows: *οὔπω μέν μοι γέγονεν ἕως τοῦ νῦν, ὁ δὲ κύριος μου πρεσβύτερος.*

Qu. 17.—Ch. xviii. 13: *Διὰ τί ἐπετίμησέ πως τῇ Σάρρᾳ· Ἀβραὰμ γὰρ ἐγέλασε καὶ οὐκ ἐπετίμησεν αὐτῷ· φησι γάρ, Καὶ εἶπε Κύριος πρὸς Ἀβραὰμ Τί ὅτι ἐγέλασε Σάρρα λέγουσα Ἀρά γε ἀληθῶς τέξομαι· ἐγὼ δὲ γεγήρακα. Μὴ ἀδυνατήσει* (*ἀδυνατεῖ* in B.) *τῷ Θεῷ* or *τοῦ Θεοῦ* (+*τὸ* B.) *ῥῆμα ;*

Here (i) *ἐν ἑαυτῇ* is omitted after *ἐγέλασε Σάρρα.* The same omission is in Just. M. *Dial.*, p. 254, et *Dial.* parte secunda, 409. We may, therefore, impute it to Philo's LXX. (ii) *παρά* is omitted after *ἀδυνατήσει.* So in MSS. of Holmes, 16 and 75. Both *τῷ Θεῷ* and *τοῦ Θεοῦ* are found in the earliest MSS., and either of them is compatible with

the Armenian, which is only decisive as to the omission of παρά. The citation is made in Philo, *De Abrahamo* i. 17, where texts and codices alike conflict. Mangey and Turnebus read: Μὴ ἀδυνατεῖ παρὰ τῷ Θεῷ ῥῆμα; but the Lincoln MS. has: μὴ ἀδυνατεῖ παρὰ τῷ Θεῷ πᾶν ῥῆμα; Paris MS. Gk., 435—the oldest of our MSS. of Philo—has μὴ ἀδυνατεῖ παρὰ Θεοῦ ῥῆμα; The Armenian solutio makes for the omission of παρά, for it begins thus: ὅτι τὰ θεῖα ῥήματα ἔργα καὶ δυνάμεις εἰσι, δηλὸν διὰ τῶν προτέρων, ὅτι τῷ θείῳ (or τοῦ θείου) οὐδὲν ἀδύνατον. All the above readings are represented in the Greek codices, and amidst such a conflict of evidence there can be no certainty how in Philo's LXX the passage was read. The Arm. Vulg. has παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ ῥῆμα.

Qu. 18.—Ch. xviii. 14: Τί ἐστιν Εἰς τὸν καιρὸν τοῦτον ἀναστρέψω πρὸς σὲ εἰς ὥρας καὶ ἔσται υἱὸς τῇ Σάρρᾳ;

Here we have υἱὸς τῇ Σ. for τῇ Σ. υἱός: a variant not found in any other source.

Qu. 19.—Ch. xviii. 15: Διὰ τί ἠρνήσατο Σάρρα λέγουσα, οὐκ ἐγέλασα· ἐφοβήθη γάρ. Καὶ αὐτὸς (potius ἐκεῖνος) εἶπεν, οὐχί, ἀλλὰ ἐγέλασας;

Here αὐτὸς εἶπεν is read for εἶπεν αὐτῇ, a variant not found elsewhere, though αὐτῇ is omitted in (Holmes) I, 14, 15, 16, 18, 25, 31, 56, 59, 68, 72, 73, 75, 77, 78, 82, 120, 121, 128, 129, 130, 131. Ald. Alex. Cat. Nic. Copt. Arab. 1, 2, 3. Georg.

From Philo *De Abr.* ii. 30, one might suppose that in Philo's LXX there was added after or before ἐγέλασας the words: μηδὲν εὐλαβήθῃς. Philo's Commentary is as follows: Διόπερ θαρσύνων αὐτὴν ὁ ἱερὸς λόγος φησίν. Μηδὲν εὐλαβήθῃς, ὄντως ἐγέλασας, καὶ μέτεστί σοι χαρᾶς. Οὐ γὰρ εἴασεν ὁ πατὴρ τὸ ἀνθρώπων γένος λύπαις καὶ ὀδύναις καὶ ἄχθεσιν ἀνιάτοις ἐμφέρεσθαι κ.τ.λ. It cannot be by a mere coincidence that the Armenian solutio also implies the addition of μηδὲν εὐλαβήθῃς. Aucher faithfully renders it as follows: "Unde acceptans propitius ille, et dulcis ac beneficus animi pudorem reverentia, oratione, et timore

Dei affectum, dicit ei: *Noli Timere*, non enim timoris est res, ita ut negare velis. Risisti ergo, et gaudio impleta es," &c.

Qu. 20.—Ch. xviii. 16: Διὰ τί Ἀβραὰμ συνεπορεύετο μετ' αὐτῶν, συμπροπέμπων αὐτούς;

Qu. 21.—Ch. xviii. 17: Διὰ τί φησι, Μὴ κρύψω (B + ἐγὼ) ἀπὸ Ἀβραὰμ τοῦ δούλου μου ἃ (or ὃ) ἐγὼ ποιῶ;

Here (i) οὐ is omitted before μή. (ii) ἐγώ is omitted after κρύψω. (iii) δούλου instead of παιδός. But this last variant is doubtful, for the Armenian translator may have rendered παιδός as if it were δούλου. The Armenian equivalent of παῖς has the secondary meaning of *servant* or *slave*, just like παῖς or *garçon* in French. Supposing however φίλου to have been the original reading, the shuffle δούλου and παιδός is intelligible, both being of the nature of corrections.

The verse is cited elsewhere in Philo i. 93, thus: Μὴ κρύψω ἐγὼ ἀπὸ Ἀβραὰμ τοῦ παιδός μου ἃ ἐγὼ ποιῶ; and i. 401, thus: Μὴ ἐπικαλύψω ἐγὼ ἀπὸ Ἀβραὰμ τοῦ φίλου μου;

It is certain, therefore, that (i) was in Philo's LXX. οὐ is also omitted in (Holmes) I, 14, 15, 16, 18, 25, 31, 56, 57, 59, 73, 75, 77, 78, 82, 83, 128, 131. Ald. Alex. Cat. Nic.; Epiph. ii. 34; Arm. 1, 2. Arm. Ed. Variant (ii) is in (Holmes) 19, 108, 135. Compl. et Chrys. vii. 314, licet habeat alibi: but one hesitates to impute it to Philo's LXX.

Qu. 22.—Ch. xviii. 19: Διὰ τί φησιν, Ἤδειν γὰρ ὅτι συντάξει τοῖς υἱοῖς αὐτοῦ καὶ τῷ οἴκῳ αὐτοῦ μετὰ αὐτόν, καὶ φυλάξουσι τὰς ὁδοὺς Κυρίου, ποιεῖν δικαιοσύνην καὶ κρίσιν, ὅπως ἂν ἐπαγάγῃ ἐπὶ Ἀβραὰμ ἃ ἐλάλησεν πρὸς αὐτόν;

Here (i) Κύριος is omitted after ἐπαγάγῃ.

(ii) ἅ for πάντα ὅσα.

Both variants may be set down to Philo's LXX. The second one, ἅ, is read in (Holmes) 15, 72, 82, and πάντα is furthermore omitted in 59, 130. Also Chrys. i. 82, iv. 426 and Eus. ii. 233, read ἅ for ὅσα.

Qu. 23.—Ch. xviii. 20: Τί ἐστιν, Εἶπε δὲ Κύριος, Κραυγὴ Σοδόμων καὶ Γομόρρων πεπληθύνται καὶ αἱ ἁμαρτίαι αὐτῶν μεγάλαι σφόδρα;

Here (i) Γομόρρων for Γομόρρας.

(ii) πρός με omitted after πεπληθύνται.

Both are due to Philo's LXX: (i) is in (Holmes) I; (ii) in (Holmes) I, 15, 59, 68, 72. 82, 120, 121. Alex. Just. M. *Dial.* 254; Bas. i. 139; Hier. Aug. Hilar. Ambr. Auctor de Praedict. ap. Prosp. Anonym. ap. Aug.; Arab. 1, 2; Arm. 1, 2. Arm. Ed.

Qu. 24.—Ch. xviii. 21: Διὰ τί ἀνθρωπικῶς φησι λέγων, Καταβὰς οὖν ὄψομαι εἰ κατὰ τὴν κραυγὴν αὐτῶν τὴν ἐρχομένην πρὸς μὲ ἐργάζονται, εἰ δὲ μή, ἵνα γνῶ;

Here ἐργάζονται for συντελοῦνται. Such a reading is not found elsewhere. The Arm. solutio also implies it: "num sequantur vocem facta eorum, an aliud dicunt sicut culpabile, et aliud faciunt minus culpandum: multi enim male loquentes, virtutes faciunt et bene proferentes, leges violant per facta eorum." Here the Arm. word which I render by facta = ἔργα. Ambrose, in paraphrasing the passage, used the word "commissa," which hardly reflects the "opere compleverint" by which Hieronymus rendered συντελοῦνται. Lastly, the Armenian Vulgate translates συντελοῦνται quite literally, and so militates against the supposition that the translator of Philo only paraphrased συντελοῦνται in this passage.

Qu. 25.—Ch. xviii. 22: Διὰ τί πάλιν ἑνικῶς φησιν, Ἀβραὰμ δὲ ἦν ἑστὼς ἔτι ἐναντίον τοῦ Κυρίου;

Perhaps the original Greek of the Quaestio had: ἦν ἔτι ἑστώς, which is read in (Holmes) 72, 129. Cat. Nic. Aug. Slav. Ostrog. Tischendorf has: ἔτι ἦν ἑστηκώς. I render the Arm. by ἑστώς, because ἑστώς is read in Philo i. 231, 688, and is not repugnant to the version.

Qu. 26.—Ch. xviii. 23: Τί ἐστι, Καὶ ἐγγίσας Ἀβραάμ, εἶπε, μὴ συναπολέσεις (συναπολλύεις B.), τὸν δίκαιον μετὰ τοῦ ἀσεβοῦς καὶ ἔσται ὁ δίκαιος ὡς ὁ ἀσεβής;

Here (i) συναπολέσεις for συναπολέσῃς may be a device

of rendering. It is found, however, in (Holmes) 59, 75. Greg. Nyss. iii. 362; Theodoret v. 1005. (ii) *τόν* and *τοῦ* added before *δίκαιον* and *ἀσεβοῦς* may be a device of rendering. In the Armenian the whole sentence is read as a question, and so, doubtless, it was read in Philo's LXX, for Holmes notes thus: "ad finem inter rogative distinguunt." Alex. Just. M. *Dial.*, 255; Orig. ii. 631; Chrys. iv. 428; Theodoret v. 1005; Procop. in Cat. Nic. 239. Slav.

Qu. 27.—Ch. xviii. 24–32: *Διὰ τί ἀπὸ πεντήκοντα ἀρξάμενος καὶ εἰς δέκα τελευτᾷ; καὶ διὰ τί ἐν ἀρχῇ πέντε πέντε δὶς ἀφαιρεῖ ἕως τοῦ τεσσαράκοντα, ἀπὸ δὲ τούτων δέκα δέκα ἕως τοῦ τέλους τῆς δεκάδος· εἶπε γὰρ Ἐὰν ὦσι πεντήκοντα δίκαιοι ἐν τῇ πόλει, ἀπολεῖς αὐτούς; οὐκ ἀνήσεις τὸν τόπον· τί δέ, ἐὰν ὦσι πέντε καὶ τεσσαράκοντα; ἐὰν δὲ τεσσαράκοντα; τί δὲ ἐὰν τριάκοντα; ἀλλὰ δέ, ἐὰν εἴκοσι; τί δέ, ἐὰν δέκα;*

Here the omission of *πάντα* before *τὸν τόπον* is probably due to Philo's LXX, for it occurs in (Holmes) 35. Alex.

Qu. 28.—Ch. xviii. 27: *Διὰ τί φησι, Νῦν ἠρξάμην λαλῆσαι πρὸς τὸν Κύριον· ἐγὼ δὲ γῆ εἰμὶ καὶ τέφρα;*

In Philo i. 296, 477, *τέφρα* is read for *σποδός*, and since it answers to the Armenian no less well than *σποδός* I retain it, but the version is not decisive of it as against *σποδός*.

The other variants are: (i) *μου* omitted after *Κύριον*. (ii) *γῆ εἰμί* for *εἰμὶ γῆ*. Cod. B. has *εἰμὶ γῆ*; so we may only set down to Philo's LXX variant (i), which is also found in (Holmes) I, III, X, 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 25, 56, 57, 59, 61, 68, 73, 78, 79, 82, 108, 120, 121, 128, 129, 131, 135. Compl. Cat. Nic. Arab. 1, 2. Arm. 1. Arm. Ed. Georg. (ii) is in Arm. Vulgate.

Qu. 29.—Ch. xviii. 33: *Τί ἐστιν, Ἀπῆλθεν ὁ Κύριος, ὡς ἐπαύσατο λαλῶν τῷ Ἀβραὰμ καὶ Ἀβραὰμ ἀπέστρεψεν εἰς τὸν τόπον αὐτοῦ;*

Qu. 30.—Ch. xix. 1: *Διὰ τί τριῶν ὀφθέντων φησιν, Ἦλθον οἱ δύο ἄγγελοι εἰς Σόδομα ἑσπέρας;*

Qu. 31.—Ch. xix. 2: *Διὰ τί Λὼτ ἐκάθητο παρὰ τὴν πύλην Σοδόμων;*

Qu. 32.—Ch. xix. 1 : Τί ἐστιν, Ἰδὼν ἐξανέστη εἰς συνάντησιν αὐτοῖς, προσεκύνησε τῷ προσώπῳ ;

Here (i) Λώτ is omitted before ἐξανέστη.

(ii) ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν omitted after προσεκύνησε.

Both seem due to citation.

Qu. 33.—Ch. xix. 2 : Διὰ τί κληθέντες εἰς ξενοδοχίαν ἀποτρέπονται, λέγοντες, Οὐχί, ἀλλ' ἐν τῇ πλατείᾳ καταλύσομεν ;

Qu. 34.—Ch. xix. 3 : Τί ἐστι κατεβιάσατο αὐτούς, καὶ ἐξέκλιναν πρὸς αὐτόν ;

Qu. 35.—Ch. xix. 3 : Διὰ τί ὁ μὲν ἐποίησεν αὐτοῖς πότον καὶ ἀζύμους, Ἀβραὰμ δὲ ἐγκρυφίας καὶ οὐ (B. omits) πότον ;

Qu. 36.—Ch. xix. 4 : Διὰ τί οἱ Σοδομῖται περιεκύκλωσαν τὴν οἰκίαν ἀπὸ νεανίσκου ἕως πρεσβυτέρων, ἅπας ὁ λαὸς ἅμα ; Here B. has νεανίσκων, and so has the Arm. Vulgate, but both independently of one another. πρεσβυτέρων for πρεσβυτέρου is also evidenced by the Armenian Vulgate.

Qu. 37.—Ch. xix. 5 : Τί ἐστιν Ἐξάγαγε αὐτοὺς πρὸς ἡμᾶς, ἵνα συγγενώμεθα αὐτοῖς (or πρὸς αὐτούς) ;

Qu. 38.—Ch. xix. 7, 8 : Διὰ τί εἶπε πρὸς αὐτοὺς (or αὐτοῖς) Λώτ, Μὴ οὕτω, ἀδελφοί, μὴ πονηρεύεσθε (or πονηρεύσησθε)· εἰσὶ δέ μοι δύο θυγατέρες, αἳ οὐκ ἔγνωσαν ἄνδρα· ἐξάξω αὐτὰς πρὸς ὑμᾶς, καὶ χρήσασθε αὐταῖς (B. omits) καθὰ ἀρέσκει ὑμῖν· μόνον εἰς τοὺς ἄνδρας μηδὲν ἄδικον ποιήσητε, οὗ ἕνεκεν εἰσῆλθον ὑπὸ τὴν στέγην τῶν δοκῶν μου ;

Here (i) μὴ οὕτως for μηδαμῶς.

(ii) τούτους omitted after ἀνδράς (but B. adds τούτους).

(iii) μηδὲν ἄδ. ποι. for μὴ ποι. ἄδ.

(iv) στέγην for σκέπην.

(v) ἀρέσκει for ἂν ἀρέσκοι.

(vi) πονηρεύεσθε for πονερεύσησθε.

Of these (i) and (ii) are not in any other source and may be discarded. But (iii) is virtually found in Holmes, 20, and Chrys. iv. 440. Holmes notes also : ἄδικον] praemittunt μηδέν X, 15, 16, 18, 25, 38, 56, 57, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 107, 128, 129, 131, 134, 135, Alex. Cat. Nic. (iv) is in I, III, X, 14, 15, 18, 25, 31, 32, 55, 56, 57, 59, 68, 71, 72, 73,

78, 79, 82, 120, 121, 128, 129, 131. Ald. Copt. (v) is in 18, 20, 25, 31, 59, 72, 75, 82, 106, 107. Ald. Chrys. *l. c.* (vi) is in 14, 16, 18, 19, 25, 38, 57, 59, 68, 73, 77, 78, 79, 106, 107, 131, 135.

We may probably ascribe all these variants to Philo's LXX.

Qu. 39.—Ch. xix. 9: *Τί ἐστιν, Εἶπαν ἀπόστα ἐκεῖ· εἰσῆλθες παροικεῖν, μὴ καὶ κρίσιν κρίνειν ;*

Here *αὐτῷ* is omitted after *εἶπαν*, a variant which we may impute to Philo's LXX, since it is in (Holmes) I, X, 15, 16, 18, 25, 31, 38, 56, 59, 68, 72, 73, 75, 76, 77, 79, 82, 83, 106, 120, 121, 128, 129, 130, 131, 134, 135. Ald. Copt. Alex. Slav. Ostrog. Arm. 1, 2. Arm. Ed. Georg.

Qu. 40.—Ch. xix. 10, 11: *Τί ἐστιν, Ἐκτείναντες οἱ ἄνδρες τὰς χεῖρας εἰσεσπάσαντο τὸν Λὼτ πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς εἰς τὸν οἶκον καὶ τὰς θύρας τοῦ οἴκου ἀπέκλεισαν· τοὺς δὲ ἄνδρας τοὺς ὄντας ἐπὶ τῆς θύρας (τοῦ οἴκου* B.) *ἐπάταξαν ἀορασίᾳ ;*

Here (i) *τὰς θύρας* for *τὴν θύραν*. This is doubtful.

(ii) *τοῦ οἴκου* omitted after *ἐπὶ τῆς θύρας*.

(iii) *ἐν* omitted after *ἐπάταξαν*.

Of these, (i) is in Holmes, 107; (ii) is in 19 Compl.; (iii) is in I, III, X, 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 25, 55, 56, 57, 59, 68, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 79, 82, 83, 106, 107, 120, 121, 128, 129, 130, 131, 134, 135. Ald. Orig. i. 437 et ii. 37; Chrys. iv. 443; Cyr. Al. i, parte prima, 25. We may, perhaps, ascribe (iii) to Philo's LXX, for the Armenian solutio seems to urge it: *Τρία ἐποίησαν, τὸν ξενόδοκον ἔσωσαν καὶ τὰς θύρας ἐπέκλεισαν καὶ τοὺς ἐπιόντας καὶ βιαζομένους ἐτύφλωσαν.*

Qu. 41.—Ch. xix. 11: *Τί ἐστι, Καὶ παρελύθησαν ζητοῦντες τὴν θύραν ;*

Qu. 42.—Ch. xix. 12, 13: *Τί ἐστιν, Εἶπαν οἱ ἄνδρες πρὸς τὸν Λὼτ ἐξαγαγεῖν πάντας οἰκείους αὐτοῦ, ὅτι μέλλομεν ἀπολλύσειν τὸν τόπον· ὅτι ὑψώθη, φησι, ἡ κραυγὴ αὐτῶν ἔναντι τοῦ Κυρίου καὶ ἀπέστειλεν ἡμᾶς ἐκτρῖψαι ;*

The formal citation begins, as the introduced *φησι* shows, at *ὅτι ὑψώθη*. The variants, therefore, in the earlier part of

the title are due to citation only. The beginning of verse 13 is formally cited in the Arm. solutio : *ἀλλ' οὐ τυχόντως, ἀλλὰ φυσικῶς γέγραπται, ἀπόλλυμεν τοὺς τόπους τούτους.*

The genuine variants, then, are these :

(i) *τοὺς τόπους τούτους* for *τὸν τόπον τοῦτον.* This is in no other source.

(ii) *Κύριος* omitted before *ἐκτρῖψαι.* This is in Holmes, 71.

(iii) *αὐτήν* omitted after *ἐκτρῖψαι.* This is not in any other source, though some read *αὐτούς.*

In the Armenian solutio the words *ἀπέστειλεν ἡμᾶς ἐκτρῖψαι* are cited afresh, so that we may infer that variants (ii) and (iii) were in Philo's LXX.

Qu. 43.—Ch. xix. 14: *Διὰ τί φησιν Ἀνηγγέλθη τῷ Λὼτ ὑπὸ τῶν ἀγγέλων ἔδοξε δὲ τοῖς γαμβροῖς γελωτοποιεῖν ;*

This seems to be a paraphrase as far as *ἀγγέλων*, though introduced by *φησίν.* The words *ἔδοξε δὲ τ. γ. γελ.*, however, seem to represent Philo's Text of the LXX, for the sense, "*and it seemed good to the sons-in-law to make mock*," is incompatible with *ἐναντίον τῶν γαμβρῶν.* Of such a reading of the passage there is no trace in any other source, though the minor variant *γελωτοποιεῖν* for *γελοιάζειν* is found in (Holmes) 32. The Armenian solutio confirms *γελωτοποιεῖν*, but does not bear on the rest of the Quaestio ; and Philo nowhere else cites the passage.

Qu. 44.—Ch. xix. 16: *Διὰ τί οἱ ἄγγελοι ταραχθέντες τῆς τοῦ Λὼτ ἐκράτησαν τῆς χειρὸς καὶ τῆς τῆς γυναικὸς καὶ τῆς τῶν θυγατέρων ;*

Aucher's Latin version of this and of the last Quaestio is very wide of the mark. The above title clearly implies that it was the angels who were disturbed, and, therefore, held Lot's hand, and so indicates to us that the reading of Philo's LXX is reflected rather in Holmes' MS. 75 than in any other ; for that source has *ἐταράχθησαν οἱ ἄγγελοι καὶ ἐκράτησαν.* The piety of a later age would naturally have changed the reading so as to make it appear that it was Lot and not the angels who were scared.

Of the other variants, the omission of *τῆς χειρός* before

τῆς γυναικός, and of *τῶν χειρῶν* before *τῶν θυγατέρων* is, probably, not due to mere exigencies of citation, for in (Holmes) 71 we find both omissions, and it was characteristic of Philo's LXX to be without such additions, made in a later age to give precision to the narrative. The omission of *δύο* before *θυγατέρων* may be imputed with certainty to Philo's LXX, for it is in (Holmes) 14, 16, 18, 25, 38, 57, 73, 77, 78, 131. Just. M. *Dial.* 255. The Armenian solutio is very obscure in its bearing on the title.

Qu. 45.—Ch. xix. 17: *Διὰ τί οἱ ἐξαγαγόντες ἄγγελοί φασι Σῶζε τὴν σεαυτοῦ ψυχήν· μὴ βλέψῃ εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω, μηδὲ στῇς ἐν πάσῃ τῇ περιχώρῳ ταύτῃ;*

Here (i) *σώζων* is omitted before *σῶζε*. So in (Holmes) 55, 72, 76, 82, 134, 135. Chrys. iv. 445: Athan. ii. 448; Bas. i. 604; Arm. 1, 2. Arm. Ed. (ii) *βλέψῃ* for *περιβλέψῃ* is in 31, 68, 83. Ald. (iii) *ταύτῃ* added after *περιχώρῳ* is found in Slav. Ostrog. Probably all these variants were in Philo's LXX.

Qu. 46.—Ch. xix. 17: *Τί ἐστιν, Εἰς τὸ ὄρος σώζου, μή ποτε συμπαραληφθῇς;*

Qu. 47.—Ch. xix. 19, 20: *Τί ἐστιν, Εἶπε Λώτ, ἐγὼ οὐ δυνήσομαι διασωθῆναι εἰς τὸ ὄρος. μή ποτε Καταλάβῃ με τὰ κακὰ καὶ ἀποθάνω. Ἰδοὺ ἡ πόλις αὕτη ἐγγὺς τοῦ καταφυγεῖν εἰς ἐκείνην, ἥ ἐστι μικρά, καὶ οὐκ ἐστι μικρά· ἐκεῖ διασωθήσομαι, Καὶ ζήσεται ἡ ψυχή μου;*

Here we have (i) *εἰς ἐκείνην* for *με ἐκεῖ*.

(ii) *καὶ οὐκ ἐ. μ. ἐκεῖ διασ.* instead of *καὶ ἐκεῖ διασωθήσομαι. οὐ μικρά ἐστι;*

(iii) *ἕνεκεν σοῦ* omitted after *ψυχή μου*.

(iv) *ἡ πόλις* for *πόλις*.

Of these (iv) is in I, X, 15, 16, 18, 20, 25, 31, 38, 55, 56, 57, 59, 68, 72, 73, 76, 77, 79, 82, 83, 106, 120, 121, 128, 129, 130, 131, 134. Compl. Alex. Just. M. *Dial.* 256; Chrys. iv. 445; Athan. ii. 448; Cyril Al. i, parte primus, 28; Theodoret v. 1009. The reading (ii) *ἥ ἐστι μικρὰ καὶ οὐκ ἐστι μικρά* is confirmed by Philo ii. 25, and certainly stood in Philo's LXX; as also (iii), which is in I, 55, 59, 68, 72,

74, 76, 82, 134, 135. Just M. *l.c.*; Athan. *l.c.*; Cyr. Al. *l.c.*; Theodoret *l.c.* uncis inclusit Alex.

Qu. 48.—Ch. xix. 21 : Τί ἐστιν, Ἰδοὺ ἐθαύμασα τὸ πρόσωπον σου καὶ ἐπὶ τῷ ῥήματι τούτῳ ;

Here we have τὸ πρ. σ. for σ. τὸ πρ. The same reading is in (Holmes) 15, 72, 82, 135. Cyr. Al. i, parte prima, 30 licet alibi ut Vat. Slav. Arab. 3. Arm. 1, 2. Arm. Ed. Georg. We may impute it to Philo's LXX.

Qu. 49.—Ch. xix. 22 : Τί ἐστι, Σπεῦσον τοῦ σωθῆναι ἐκεῖ ;

Here οὖν is omitted after σπεῦσον. The omission must have stood in Philo's LXX, since it is found in 14, 16, 18, 25, 38, 57, 73, 77, 79, 128, 131. Cat. Nic. Just. M. *Dial.* 256.

Qu. 50.—Ch. xix. 22 : Τί ἐστι, Διὰ τοῦτο ἐκάλεσε τὸ ὄνομα τῆς πόλεως Ζούρ ;

(i) ἐκείνης is omitted after πόλεως.

(ii) Ζούρ for Σηγώρ.

Of these the former is in (Holmes) I, 14, 15, 55, 59, 76, 82, 134. Just. M. *Dial.* 256. Arab. 1, 2. Uncis includit Alex. Both must be ascribed to Philo's LXX. Some of the MSS. of the Arm. Philo have Σούρ instead of Ζούρ.

Qu. 51.—Ch. xix. 23, 24: Διὰ τί ὁ ἥλιος ἐξῆλθεν ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν καὶ Λὼτ εἰσῆλθεν εἰς Ζούρ. Καὶ Κύριος ἔβρεξεν ἐπὶ Σόδομα καὶ Γόμορρα θεῖον καὶ πῦρ ἐξ οὐρανοῦ ;

Here (i) Ζούρ for Σηγώρ.

(ii) παρὰ Κυρίου omitted after πῦρ.

The Quaestio as far as end of verse 23 is preserved in Greek along with the solutio (R. Harris, p. 34), but ἐξῆλθεν ὁ ἥ. is read, and Σηγώρ instead of Ζούρ. The two verses are also cited in Philo i. 633, where Σηγώρ is read, and παρὰ Κυρίου ἐξ οὐρανοῦ omitted, or at least not cited. We must ascribe (i) and (ii) to Philo's LXX.

Qu. 52.—Ch. xix. 26 : Διὰ τί ἐπέβλεψεν ἡ γυνὴ αὐτοῦ εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω, καὶ ἐγένετο στήλη ἁλός, οὐχὶ δὲ ἄλλης τινος ὕλης ;

In Philo *De Prof.* i. 564, we read : Οὕτω φησὶ τὴν γυναῖκα Λὼτ στραφεῖσαν εἰς τοὐπίσω γενέσθαι στήλην. This citation implies that in some of Philo's copies of the LXX there was read in Gen. xix. 26, not ἐπέβλεψεν but ἐπέστρεψεν.

So also in Philo i. 657 : Τὴν γὰρ Λὼτ γυναῖκα καὶ ἐπιστραφεῖσαν εἰς τοὐπίσω φασιν οἱ χρησμοὶ γενέσθαι στήλην ἁλῶν. But that ἐπέβλεψεν was also read by him is clear from the Commentary which follows this citation, thus : εἰκότως δὲ καὶ προσηκόντως. Εἰ γάρ τις μὴ τὰ πρόσω θέας καὶ ἀκοῆς ἄξια διορᾷ· ταῦτα δέ εἰσιν ἀρεταὶ καὶ τὰ κατὰ τὰς ἀρετὰς ἔργα. περιβλέπεται δὲ τὰ ὀπίσω καὶ τὰ νώτια, κωφὴν δόξαν καὶ τυφλὸν πλοῦτον. The Armenian Commentary reveals the same ambiguity. The solutio of Qu. 45 (Aucher, p. 280) urges in ch. xix. 17 μὴ βλέψῃ or μὴ περιβλέψῃ, yet in the Commentary on Qu. 52 (Aucher, pp. 287–8) we read (I give Aucher's Latin, which is faithful): "Ratio nunc reddenda, quare mandaverint Angeli non redire retrorsum . . . . quam ob rem revertitur ut putatur in Sodomam . . . . quoniam mandaverant Angeli non redire in tergum, quae transgressa est mandatum." It looks almost as if Philo had one reading in his Text of the LXX, and the other as a variant in the margin. The Armenian Vulgate implies ἔστρεψεν or ἐστράφη as its original.

Qu. 53.—Ch. xix. 27 : Διὰ τί ὀρθρίσας τῷ πρωΐ Ἀβραὰμ εἰς τὸν τόπον οὗ εἱστήκει ἐναντίον τοῦ Κυρίου, ἐπέβλεψεν ἐπὶ πρόσωπον Σοδόμων καὶ Γομόρρων καὶ περὶ χώραν ἐκείνων καὶ ἰδοὺ ἀνέβαινε φλὸξ τῆς γῆς ὡσεὶ φλὸξ καμίνου ;

Here (i) Tisch. has ὤρθρισε δὲ Ἀβραὰμ τῷ πρωΐ : (ii) the title adds τοῦ before Κυρίου : (iii) Γομόρρων for Γομόρρας : (iv) περὶ χώραν ἐκείνων for ἐπὶ πρόσωπον τῆς περιχώρου : (v) καὶ εἶδε omitted before καὶ ἰδού : (vi) τῆς γῆς for ἐκ τῆς γῆς : (vii) φλὸξ καμίνου for ἀτμὶς καμίνου.

Of these (i) is in 56 and 129, but it seems to be due to citation only; (iii) is in 108. Compl.; (vi) is found in X, 14, 16, 18, 25, 38, 57, 59, 72, 73, 77, 79, 128, 131. Alex. Copt. Arab. 1, 2. Arm. 1, 2. Arm. Ed.

With the exception of (i) and (vi) all these variants seem to have stood in Philo's LXX.

Qu. 54.—Ch. xix. 29 : Διὰ τί μετὰ τὸ ἐκτρῖψαι τοὺς περιοίκους Σοδόμων, ἐμνήσθη ὁ Θεὸς τοῦ Ἀβραάμ· Καὶ ἐξαπέστειλε τὸν Λὼτ ἐκ μέσου τῆς καταστροφῆς ;

Here (i) *μετὰ τὸ ἐκτ.* for *ἐν τῷ ἐκτ.*

(ii) *τοὺς περιοίκους Σοδόμων* for *τὸν Θεὸν πάσας τὰς πόλεις τῆς περιοίκου.*

Perhaps these are due to citation. The end of verse 29, *ἐν τῷ καταστρέψαι κ. τ. λ.*, is omitted in (Holmes) VI, and it is significant that Philo's Commentary proceeds direct to verse 30 without citing or in any way implying the words thus omitted in VI.

Qu. 55.—Ch. xix. 30: *Διὰ τί Λὼτ φοβηθεὶς κατοικῆσαι ἐν Σηγὼρ εἰς τὸ ὄρος ἀνέβη καὶ κατοικεῖ ἐν τῷ σπηλαίῳ μετὰ τῶν δύο θυγατέρων;*

The variations must be set down to title. *δύο* is urged in the Arm. solutio.

Qu. 56.—Ch. xix. 31: *Διὰ τί ἡ πρεσβυτέρα πρὸς τὴν νεωτέραν εἶπε, ὁ πατὴρ ἡμῶν πρεσβύτερος, καὶ οὐδεὶς ἐστιν ὃς εἰσέρχεται πρὸς ἡμᾶς, ὡς καθήκει πάσῃ τῇ γῇ. Δεῦρο καὶ ποτίσωμεν τὸν πατέρα ἡμῶν οἶνον καὶ κοιμηθῶμεν μετ' αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐξαναστήσωμεν ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν σπέρμα;*

Here (i) Tisch. has order, *εἶπε δὲ ἡ πρεσβ. πρὸς τὴν νεωτέραν*: (ii) *ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς* is omitted after *οὐδεὶς ἐστιν*: (iii) *εἰσέρχεται* for *εἰσελεύσεται.*

Qu. 57.—Ch. xix. 37: *Διὰ τί τεκοῦσα υἱὸν ἡ πρεσβυτέρα καλεῖ τὸ ὄνομα Μωάβ, φωνοῦσα ἐφ' ὃ κρύπτειν ἔδει, ἐκ τοῦ πατρός μου;*

Qu. 58.—Ch. xix. 37: *Διὰ τί ἡ πρεσβυτέρα τεκοῦσα υἱὸν καλεῖ ἐκ πατρός μου· ἡ δὲ νεωτέρα οὕτως λέγει ὅτι Ἀμμάν, υἱὸς γένους μου· καὶ τὸν μὲν λέγει, οὗτος πατὴρ Μωαβιτῶν, τὸν δέ, οὗτος πατὴρ Ἀμμωνιτῶν ἕως τῆς σήμερον;*

The form *Ἀμμωνιτῶν* is in no other source, though *Ἀμμονιτῶν* is in Compl., and *Ἀμονιτῶν* in Arm. Vulgate. The Codex B. of Philo adds *ἕως τῆς σήμερον Μωαβιτῶν.*

F. C. CONYBEARE.

JEWS IN CHINA.

THE peace made between China and Japan, as a result of which many seaports will be thrown open to commerce in China, will attract attention to the Jews living at Kai-fung-fu, capital of the province of Honan. Herr P. G. von Möllendorff, in the *Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judenthums*, April, 1895, fascicule 7, says that, according to missionary reports, the Jews at Kai-fung-fu formed, at the beginning of the last century, a congregation of 500 to 600 members, who possessed a synagogue. Amongst other items, he mentions that the Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews possesses seven MSS. brought from China, which contain parts of copies of the Old Testament and of the liturgy for *Purim*. He adds, that as far as he knows, no specialist has examined these MSS. We shall see later on that this is not the case. He then speaks of Dr. W. A. P. Martin's visit to Kai-fung-fu in 1865. That being the last report concerning the Jews in China, we shall reproduce it *in extenso* from the *Journal of the North-China Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society*, New Series, vol. III, December, 1866, p. 30 sqq., which, we believe, is not generally known to our readers:—

The existence of a colony of Jews, who profess to have entered China as early as the dynasty of Han, has long been known to the Christian world. They were discovered by Father Ricci in the seventeenth century, and full inquiries concerning their usages and masses, subsequently made by Jesuit missionaries who resided at Kai-fung-fu. In 1850 a deputation of native Christians was sent among them by the Bishop of Victoria and the late Dr. Medhurst. Two of the Jews were induced to come to Shanghai, and some of their Hebrew manuscripts obtained; but up to the date of my

journey, for more than a century and a half they had not, so far as we are informed, been visited by any European. It became therefore a matter of interest to ascertain their present condition, and this, as I have remarked, was the chief consideration that induced me to make Kai-fung-fu a point in the course of my inland travels. What others may have published I shall not repeat, but concisely as possible, lay before you a resumé of my own observations.

Arriving in their city on the 17th of February, I inquired for the Jewish synagogue, but getting no satisfactory answer from the pagan innkeeper, I went for information to one of the Mahommedan mosques, of which there are six within the walls. I was well received by the Mufti, and the advent of a stranger from the West, who was reported to be a worshipper of the True Lord, drew together a large concourse of the faithful. At the request of the Mufti, holding a New Testament in my hand, I addressed them in relation to the contents of the Holy Book of Jesus Christ, whose name he pronounced with reverence, as that of one of the most illustrious of their prophets. The Jews he denounced as Kafirs, and evinced no very poignant sorrow when he informed me that their synagogue had come to desolation. It was, he assured me, utterly demolished, and the people who had worshipped there impoverished and scattered abroad. "Then," said I, "I will go and see the spot on which it stood," and directing my bearer to proceed to the place indicated by the Mufti, I passed through streets crowded with curious spectators to an open square, in the centre of which there stood a solitary stone.

On one side was an inscription commemorating the erection of the synagogue in the period Lung-hing of the Sung dynasty, about A.D. 1183, and on the other, a record of its rebuilding in the reign of Hung-che of the Ming dynasty; but to my eye, it uttered a sadder tale—not of building and rebuilding, but of decay and ruin. It was inscribed with *Ichabod*—"the glory is departed." Standing on the pedestal, and resting my right hand on the head of that stone which was to be a silent witness of the truths I was about to utter, I explained to the expectant multitude my reasons for "taking pleasure in the stones of Israel and favouring the dust thereof."

"Are there among you any of the family of Israel?" I inquired. "I am one," responded a young man whose face corroborated his assertion; and then another and another stepped forward, until I saw before me representatives of six out of the seven families into which the colony is divided. There, on that melancholy spot, where the very foundations of the synagogue had been torn from the ground, and there no longer remained one stone upon another, they confessed with shame and grief that their holy and beautiful house

had been demolished by their own hands. It had, they said, for a long time, been in a ruinous condition. They had no money to make repairs, they had lost all knowledge of the sacred tongue, the traditions of the fathers were no longer handed down, and their ritual worship had ceased to be observed. In this state of things, they had yielded to the pressure of necessity and disposed of the timbers and stones of that venerable edifice, to obtain relief for their bodily wants.

In the evening, some of them came to my lodgings, bringing for my inspection a copy of the Law inscribed on a roll of parchment, without the points, and in a style of manuscript which I was unable to make out, though I had told them, rather imprudently, that I was acquainted with the language of their sacred books. The next day, the Christian Sabbath, they repeated their visit, listening respectfully to what I had to say concerning the Law and the Gospel, and answering as far as they were able my inquiries as to their past history and present state.

Two of them appeared in official costume, one wearing a gilt and the other a crystal button; but far from sustaining the character of this people for thrift and worldly prosperity, they number among them none that are rich, and but few that are honourable. Some indeed, true to their hereditary instincts, are employed in a small way in banking establishments (the first man I met was a money-changer); others keep fruit stores and cake shops, drive a business in old clothes, or pursue various handicrafts, while a few find employment in military service. The prevalence of rebellion in the central provinces for the last thirteen years has told sadly on the prosperity of Kai-fung-fu, and the Jews have not unlikely, owing to the nature of their occupations, been the greatest sufferers.

Their number they estimated, not very exactly, at from three to four hundred. They were unable to trace their tribal pedigree, keep no register, and never on any occasion assemble together as one congregation. Until recently, they had a common centre in their venerable synagogue, though their liturgical service had long been discontinued. But the congregation seems to be following the fate of its building. No band of union remains, and they are in danger of being speedily absorbed by Mahommedanism or heathenism. One of them has lately become a priest of Budha, taking for his title *pen-tau*, which signifies "one who is rooted in the knowledge of the Truth?" The large tablet that once adorned the entrance of the synagogue, bearing in gilded characters the name Israel (E-ez-lo-yeh), has been appropriated by one of the Mahommedan mosques; and some efforts have been made to draw over the people, who differ from the Moslems

so little, that their heathen neighbours have never been able to distinguish them by any other circumstance than that of picking the sinews out of the flesh they eat—a custom commemorative of Jacob's conflict with the angel.

One of my visitors was a son of the last of their rabbis, who some thirty or forty years ago died in the province of Kan-sah. With him perished the last vestige of their acquaintance with the sacred tongue. Though they still preserve several copies of the Law and prophets, there is not a man among them who can read a word of Hebrew; and not long ago it was seriously proposed to expose their parchments in the market-place, in hopes that they might attract the attention of some wandering Jew, who would be able to restore to them the language of their fathers. Since the cessation of their ritual worship, the children all grow up without the seal of the covenant. The young generation are uncircumcised, and as might be expected they no longer take pains to keep their blood pure from intermixture with Gentiles. One of them confessed to me that his wife was a heathen. They remember the names of the feast of Tabernacles, the feast of unleavened bread, and a few other ceremonial rites, that were still practised by a former generation; but all such usages are now neglected, and the next half-century is not unlikely to put a period to their existence as a distinct people.

We shall now sum up the different opinions as regards the arrival of the Jews on Chinese soil.

The missionaries reported that the Jews believe, according to a tradition, that their ancestors came to China during the Han dynasty, viz. 58–76 A.D., from Persia; indeed, we shall see further on that the Jews in China were familiar with the Persian language. At the time of the emperor Hsian-tsung (1163–1190), seventy families were settled in Kai-fung-fu, and, as has already been noted, in the last century they formed a congregation of 500 to 600 members, with a rabbi at their head. Since the demise of the late rabbi (who died forty or fifty years ago at Hang-tshou), the congregation has been dissolved, and the Hebrew language forgotten to such an extent that none of their number now know even the Hebrew alphabet. They do not observe the precepts of the Law, they intermarry with Chinese, and have scarcely any notion of the Jewish feasts. No doubt, unless a Jewish Society take the matter up, as was the

case with the Bene Israel in India, all trace of Chinese Judaism will disappear.

Their books consist of the Pentateuch, Prayer-book, and, according to the first Roman Catholic missionary, they also possess Apocryphal books in Aramaic, viz. the first book of the Maccabees, Judith, and Sirach (see *The Jews in China*, by James Finn, p. 32). Of the last three no trace has thus far been found among the Chinese Jews, whilst Pentateuchal scrolls or books, as well as fragments of Prayer-books of all kinds, are preserved in the Library of the Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews. These last were kindly sent to us by the Rev. Secretary W. Gidney for inspection, and we are happy to acknowledge with cordial thanks this courtesy. This collection consists of twenty-nine numbers, which were described, with some degree of accuracy, in the *Jewish Intelligence*, January, 1853. This description was reprinted, without acknowledgment, in the London *Jewish Chronicle*, 1853, Nos. 356 and 358. From this source Zunz (*Die Ritus des Synagogalen Gottesdienst*, 1859, p. 58) derived his information concerning the rite of the Jews in China, which, according to him, resembles that of the Sephardim, with the exception of some points wherein the Ashkenazic rite is followed. We believe the ritual of the Jews at Kai-fung-fu will prove to be the Persian rite, which is almost unknown. The little we know of it inclines us to the belief that it is more nearly akin to the Ashkenazic than the Sephardic rite, which is also the case with the Yemen rite, exclusive of the hymns which were incorporated at a later period in the Yemen *Siddur*.

That the Chinese Jews came from Persia cannot be doubted, for all directions as to the recital of their prayers are given in Persian. In the case of אתה נאלתה in the הגדה (see below, p. 137, no. *e*), which, as Zunz has rightly guessed, is that composed by S^{e}adyah Gaon, each strophe is completely rendered in Persian. The colophons at the ends of the sections of Pentateuch are also in Persian (see below, pp. 137, 138, nos. *a*, *f*). The inscription of their synagogue

contains Persian phrases (see J. Finn's *The Orphan Colony of Jews in China*, p. 65). Graetz (*Geschichte der Juden*, 2nd ed., IV, 407) states, without giving his reasons, that the Jews in China date from 230 A.D. He relied perhaps on the tradition of the Jews in Kai-fung-fu, who told Dr. Martin that they came to China under the Han dynasty (202 B.C. to 220 A.D.): that seems to be a mere tradition, not based on any documentary evidence. From inscriptions found in the ruined synagogue at Kai-fung-fu we learn that it was erected in 1163–1165, and repaired in 1488–1506. This is in accordance with the document which says, that under the emperor Hsian-tsung seventy Jewish families immigrated (Möllendorf, l. c., p. 328).

On the other hand, an Arabic document mentions the existence of Jews in China in the ninth century A. D. Abu-Zaid Hassan al-Sirafi (see Reinaud, *Géographie d'Aboulféda*, &c., Paris, 1848, tom. I, p. lxxiii) says, that in the revolt of Baichu there perished in China one hundred thousand Mohamedans, Jews, Christians, and Parsees, who came there for purposes of commerce (see *Ancient Accounts of India and China, by two Mohamedan travellers; who went to those parts in the ninth century;* translated from the Arabic by E. Renaudot, London, 1733, p. 42). Thus, if Sirafi is to be trusted, Jews were in China in the ninth century. The locality, Canfu, which the Baichu sacked and destroyed (*ibidem*), is most likely identical with الخنسا, whereat Ibn Batuta (1346 A.D.) says there resided Mohamedans, Jews, and Christians. Dr. von Möllendorff (*Monatsschr.* &c., p. 329) identifies Alkhansâ with Hang-tshou, where, as we have seen (above, p. 126), the last rabbi of the Chinese Jews died. He adds, that although Ibn Batuta gives his information from hearsay, still it is not impossible that under the Mongol dominion (1260–1368) China had lively intercourse with Central Asia. Thus it is probable the Jews settled in the ninth century at Khansu, from whence a considerable number of them journeyed to Kai-fung-fu in the thirteenth century, when the emperor built a synagogue for them

(above, p. 123). The Persian which is found in their Prayer-book is not the old language, but that spoken now and since Firdusi. If they had emigrated in the third century we ought to find a trace of the old Persian language. The Jews in Kai-fung-fu were certainly not Qaraites, as can be seen from their prayers, which are nearly identical with those of the Rabbanites. There is no quotation in their book from the Gemara, but parts of the Mishnah are to be found in their Prayer-book. Of course, if they had emigrated to China in the eighth century, they could scarcely have had the Gemara with them.

Seeing that the contents of their Prayer-book are not generally known, we propose to briefly analyze them, adding the hymns by Ebjatar Eleazar, as well as the Aramaic pieces recited at various occasions:—

I. *Daily and Sabbath Prayers.*

a. For the evening (מעריב; on the flyleaf כפור מעריב) of the close of Sabbath, no הבדלה. *Without vowel points.* [No. 28.]

b. במה מדליקין, אין כאלהינו, Biblical passages, the שיר המעלות (for שבת?), followed by יהי רצון, headed אגר הר שבת הר מועד וכפור בכאנד. [No. 23.]

c. Fragment of prayers for morning and evening: ברכו to אמת ויציב, והוא רחום, and ובא לציון. *Without vowel points, folded form.* [No. 21.]

d. Fragment of morning prayers, beg. with קדיש, followed by ברכו and a fragment of הלל. *Folded form.* [No. 20.]

e. End of prayers (שחרית and מנחה) for שבת. *Folded form.* [No. 18.]

f. Prayers for Sabbath upon which the new moon falls, beg. with קדיש, followed by רבנן ברכו את יהוה המבורך גמאעת באז גוינד ברוך... שׂע, הלל, קדיש, lacuna, and the end יברך את עמו בשלום, with the following blessing:

דכירין לטב ועוד יהוה דוכרן נכון לטב לשם טב לרוממה לקרן זקופה להצלחת עבדין טבין לכל קהלא קדישא הדין למרב רביכון ועד זעירכון מנדי

ידע שמהתכון הוא יכתוב יתכון בספר חיים[1] עם צדיקים מלכה דעלמא יברך יתכון ויפיש יתכון ויסגי יתכון וישמע בקול צלותכון ויעיק לו (so) מעיקיכון וישיצי כל דחקיכון ויברך בעמל ידכון ויפרוש סוכת שלמה רבא מן שמיא עלינו ועליכון ועל כל קהליהון דישראל ואמרו אמן.

Next come the reading of the Law, only indicated (here אפטרא), and שִׁעְ. Follows מנחה, only indicated. [No. 10.]

g. The following hymn (see No. 2) with acrostic אלעזר:

אֱלהי עולם יהוה אתה · מעלה ומטה בחכמה כוננתה · גלגלים שבעה ברום עולם תתה · והארץ לשבעה גבולות הצבתה · ואתה מתהלל בפי יונקים ועולל · וגם המה יהללו (והלל .MS) ברוב הודות והלל · לך ישא[ו according to No. 2] קולם יברכו שאמר והיה העולם · ברוך שאמר והיה העולם.

לבות תמימים לשכבך הכנתה · ואופני שחק לרכבך רתמתה · ואות בלבבות על הדר כבודך שמתה · ועוז מפי עולל ויונק יסדתה · ובשמי רום עומדים צבאות וגדודים לשם קדשך מודים וצדקך מגידים בלב אחד כולם יברכו שאמר והיה העולם · ברוך שאמר והיה העולם.

עֲרבות רכבתה ועל כרוב דאיתה · ושחק כזריעה לבדך נטיתה · ונוגה כשלמה וכמעיל עטיתה ועין יצרתה ואוזן כריתה יסודות חברתה וגופות גזרתה רוחות חוללתה ודעות חננת · פרטם וכללם יברכו שאמר והיה העולם · ברוך שאמר והיה העולם.

זֹהר מזרים ואור המאורות · מזיו שכינת כבודך נגזרות · ורוחות נכבדות בגופות נעצרות · ודעות מזהירות בכח נעדרות · ושרפי להבה לאלף ורבבה למול שר הצבא · וחיות מרכבה ואופנים למולם וברכו שאמר והיה העולם · ברוך שאמר והיה העולם.

הֹוח יצרתה לרחף בינים · ותולדות אש לעלות שמים · ועפר לרדת למטה ממים · ומים חלקת בכוחך לשנים · ואלה ארבעתם · כאחד חברתם ושלש חלקתם · ועל ארץ שמתם כבדם עים קולם יברכו שאמר והיה העולם · ברוך שאמר והיה העולם. חזק

Next comes fol. 2[b] ברוך שאמר for שבת, different from the Sephardic rite. Next comes the following hymn, acrostic אלעזר:

אֵיך תיחלי טוב גופה תחלש ותמות · בת יקר ואיך נכספה אתי לבית אדמות · עורך והיית צופה כל בעין מזימות · קרבי לאל משיחי שי ולא יגורך רע וקדמי בשבחי יוצרך וצורך:

[1] MS. היה.

לעמוד בסוד היסודות שוחחים וגבוהים · בחרי ומתולדות תדעי אלהים · ועלי בסולם סודות אל שמי גבוהים · כי שמך בדעתך אל חי יעמוד וזכרך ועלי שמך מבטחי לא עלי בשרך :

עַל זבול מקומות רמות וחן חן תשואות · לאישים כקרבם זמות כעפף וראות · בהקיץ וגם בתמונות יחזו פלאות · קבלי בקול מוכיחי להלוך בדרך האמת וממדיחי רחקי מזורך :

זכרו נשמות רמות בהיות דשנות · בטוב אל תמול במרומות ועל צד אמונות · מאסו היות באדמות כפגר טמונות · הלל בעודני חי יוצרך בשירך בת יקר ונגד אחי עוררי זמירך :

רוממי יחידה אחד מכל צד ופנה · לא נחלק וגם לא ייחד ואין לו תמונה · האמת אשר לא נכחד מבני תבונה · ברכי בנועם שיחי ומתק דברך את שמו ונשמת כל חי תהלל תברך : חזק

Next comes נשמת. *Without vowel points.* [No. 15.]

h. Prayers for מוצאי שבת, beg. missing, beg. גדלו אמצו חזקו קיימו קיים עצתו קיים עליו קרא דכתיב האשימם . . . תעטרנו (Ps. v. 11 to end) ברוך המפיר עצות רעות מעלינו ומעל כלל עמו בית ישראל ויקיים עלינו עצת הצדיקים לטובה אליה הנביא אליה התשבי אליה הגלעדי אליה הכרמלי במהרה יבוא אלינו עם משיע (so) בן דוד אליה אליה הנביא שלח בזכות טוביה ומשיחה בר דור עם רצן ותמניא :

אלה רמא דר רומא דשכנתך בשמיא ברי כל ומרי כל עליא ושפליא גברא וציירא אף גלי רזיא דיינא ועניגא ובדינא לית שניא הייתך אלהותך עד עלם עלמיא · אליה הנביא . . .

ולית דכוא אף הכה דבדילן הוא מצלי זכות אבא דחביבא קיים לן בדלדולי חסינן דהוינן כטביעי בנחשול טבותא וזכותא דעמילי בפילפולי יאילן כטלטולן לאהדרא משביא · אליה הנביא . . .

כנשתא דגלותא אתבדר בעממיא לחוד דתך ואוריתך לא ידעין רחומיא מעולבנין ועלבנין משעבוד מלכיא ניר טעין וניר להכרא וקורליא סלח ומחול שבוק חובן לכל סורחן וכל עויא · אליהו הנביא . . .

עויתן וחובתן דסגאו דתקיפו פלביא ומלביא אדבר דצקיפו (so) צפי על כן טפי גבן נבותך דאעדיפו קימיא ואומיא בנין דילך אעליפו רעי אחיי לכל מיתי בשופרא דטריפו שליוליתא שקיעתא שלח ושלח מר אסיא אליה הנביא . . .

תנאי וספריא יהון גורסין באוריתן אמהן ואבהן בדיון עלמן בחדותן הואי

והכראי ידי פרסין בצלותן רחומאי יהודאי חסין קלן בתושבחתך נשיו בידן דכל עדן כביקירא וביקרא • אליה הנביא . . .

בנך בברך בבריתך קריתא לן אלהנא יציבא הלא עדבא לך אנן ואחסנא חקליא וטוריא יהון פצחין ברנונא יתערון מיתיא ושכמיא רחומיא חייהון ויומיהון עד דרי דריא אליה הנביא . . .

שנת ישע נאולה ועת רצון ותהלה קרא נא לי בגדול אלוה רב עלילה • אליה אליה אליהו הנביא.

מחה דמעה מפנים ואף תסיר מבנים ותן עצמה לאין אונים ועז ויקר ותושיה אליה . . .

וגיל חדש ומלוכה לאום סורה ונבובה אליה . . .

ועטר לה ברצונך הוציאה לרויה אליה . . .

אדום יהיה כנבבה ובית יעקב אש לבה ובית יוסף להבה ואכלו את בני איה אליה . . .

לבוש ההוד והמשרה והכבוד ותפארה יעטו אז בני שרה נקראים שלשיה אליה . . .

בני ציון היקרים ברננות ובשירים זכואון אל מרום הרים ירושלם הבנויה אליה . . .

רום ישאו דגליהם לאסוף את חיליהם עת מלכם לפניהם יעמוד עוד בהדרת יה אליה . . .

בשמחות יצאון ובשלום יובאון על צד עם ינשאון ובכרכי מלכיה אליה . . .

יכירום רואיהם כי זרע ברוכים הם עת אליה . . .

ירדו לנו גשיהם בפרך ובשאיה אליה . . .

בקול ששון וקול שמחה מכל עם ומשפחה יביאמו במנחה כנם האל לישעיה אליה . . .

רון ישאו מטוב לב וגיל כל עלב כי יאכלו את חלב הארץ וטוב פריה אליה . . .

והנשבע בארץ ישבע ברום ערץ כי ידרך מפרץ כוכב על בני שביה אליה . . .

כל מלכי העמים ממלכי נזעמים כימות כל קמים צרים לי בצדיה אליה . . .

חי לעד יושיע את עמו וירגיע רוב אליה . . .

שלום יביע במבשר אליה זאב ירעה עם טלה ונמר עם גדי יעלה וכל גרון רון מלא וכל שפה תהלליה אליה . . .

קול רנה וישועה צור עמו ישמיעה גם הודו יופיעה לסוערה ועניה אליה . . .

ויתקע בשופר להקיץ שוכני עפר וינערו מעפר השוכנים במאפליה אליה . . .

אז יושב לב אבות על בנים בנדבות ולב בנים על אבות ויתן עוז לשבויה אליה . . .

ממשלת משיח וצין (so) נזרו יצמיח אלהינו וירויח לעגלה היפיפיה אליה . . .
צבאות ישראל lacuna.

Next follows the הבדלה with פסוקים, ending with ברכת כוהנים, and concludes with Numbers xxv. 10–15. [No. 8.]

i. Prayers for שבת and ר״ח, like . . ., with the following formula for announcing the new moon:

אציתו שמאעו כהניא וליואי תקאעו קבאעו רבנן ראש ירח דפלן חדא בשבא דהוא חד בירח יהי סימן טוב עלאנא על כל ישראל השתא בעגאלא ויקומון שכנה (so) עפרא מן עפרהון ויכנש מבדריא ויחזואן עננא ובעיניכון בבניאנה דמקדשא ובשכלוליה דהיכלא ובמלכות משיח בר דוד ובנחמתא דקרתא דירושלם השתא בעגלא חבירים כל ישראל ואמרו אמן

חדה בשבה . . . חמשה בשבה מעלין בשבה שבה (so) בשבה

אדר ואדר ניסן . . . מרלכשון (so) . . . שבט

[No. 6.]

j. מוסף, מנחה, and מעריב for שבת, beg. מחיה את כלם to ימלוך לעולם ועד, followed by *a* of No. xv, headed רשות לר׳ אלעזר זצ׳ל (stained), followed by ברוך שאמר (Sephardic rite); Ps. xcii, headed אגר באשד שבת אפתד שבת מועד בכאנד with the other Psalms to ויברך דוד, followed by the hymn beg. איך (see xv), headed רשות. Next come נשמת to על כל ברכה ותהלה. Next come אין וקתי נמאז גמאעת באשד ברכה גויד · מרשות רבותינו : גמאעת גויד : עושה שמים (lacuna?) ברוך . . . להתעטף בציצות (so) : אמן. Next come קדיש, יוצר אור, ש״ע (ולמשומדים for ולמלשינים everywhere), the same headed קול רם (everywhere), some Psalms, דכירין לטב (see I. *f*) Ps. xix; the blessing for reading the Law (ישראל יעמוד במקום כהן, also elsewhere) מנחה, headed by והוא רחום, with some Psalms, end missing. *Mostly without vowel points*, obliterated. [No. 2.]

II. ראש השנה.

a. שׂע׳ of מוסף of ראש השנה. *Folded form.* [No. 27.]

b. שׂע׳ for רׂה׳ and נעילה, headed אין כפור נעילה בכאנד. There is the following hymn, *folded form:*

לר׳ אביתר זצ׳ל ראש השנה בכאנד

צבאות מקודשים הם מעריצים לו מודים ומקדישים :

אומרים קדושתו כל מלאכי מרום בנגונים · רצים לקראתו בנעים שבח חיות ואופנים · תומכים תהלתו כל עת בקול זמרה וברננים · עושים ומרעישים עולם במו אותות שמו פי נועמו יהיו בשיר דורשים: צבאות . . .

במקום מכון שבתו עומדים כרובי רום ושרפים · עושה למלאכתו מאש ושלג הם ורשפים · שמם למרכבתו מול כם יקר עפים ומקיפים: חושים ונגשים לראות כבוד ציר רם מאד נערץ בסוד אישים ותרשישים · צבאות . . .

יחד בני אלים יודו ויקדישו לשם קדשו בשבח וחשמלים נראים כעין חשמל סביב אשו · כל עת וארואלים הם נבהלו מזיו מאור שמשו: הוד אל מלובשים בם יחנה שוכני סנה עת יענה עירין וקדישים · צבאות . . .

הוכן ברום רוחות עושים באימה את רצון קונם · ובעת נשחלות דאים כעוף נודד מן קנם: ובגיל ושמחות חיל רום יבקשוהו והוא בינם: נמצא לנדרשים · קול ישמעו שם אל דעו בו תפגעו צור בקדושים: צבאות . . .

חיים החיות כברק יקוד לעשות רצון קונם · ובצלו להיות מתעדינים מזיו יקר יוצרם · ובען צורפיות אל כם מהודר בהדר אל רם: קדוש בשלישים · עת קוראים מתנשאים . פת נושאים כסאו עלי ראשים: צבאות . . .

גדלו ליהוה אתי ונרוממיו שמו יחדיו:

וג׳ יתגדל [No. 3.]

III. יהב.

a. כפור מעריב, prayers of כפור. *Without vowel points.* [No. 9.]

b. שחרית for יהב. Ends with Ps. ciii. *Folded form.* [No. 19.]

c. Morning prayer for יהב, at end Neh. viii. 1, 2, 5, 6, 18; ix. 3. At beg. the following hymn is to be found:

נערץ בסוד רבה יגדל ויתקדש שמיה רבה: נערץ בסוד רבה:

חונה עלי ארבע חיות ובהם בם יקר אבן · רק זה לזה יתבע אין והוא תוכם בוכם נקבע · זה שיר ורון יבע נוצץ כעין קלל בזיו נצבע · לו מי יקוד לבה יעוף בשש כנף ויש מים באש בער ולא נכבה: נערץ בסוד רבה

רנה ושיר נערב עורכים בלא קנאה ולא מדון · אך הגליל הרב סובב ועל כל היצור ידון · הליום לעד לבה מערבא פרוץ עבר אלי אדון · נקי כלי רבעה יקוד להוד סוד היסוד בו יעמוד שלום קובה: נערץ בסוד רבה

יוצר אם תחקור סודו בתוך קרבך · שים שכבם סולם עד תעלה אליו ויפגע בך · אם מעותה נעלם הוא תוכך ובשערי לבך יוצא ופעם בא למשוחריו גם בוחריו ולחוקריו נגלה אבל נחבה · נערץ בסוד רבה

יומם קנות חכמא (so) שכלך וחכמתך כקוץ חדק · אם לא ביד תומה לנוי חסידים תחזיק בדק · וחרוס נוה אשמה ובנה בבית מועד דביר צדק · ופחד ליום הבה (so) ונתוץ מכון עון ואון עד שוב מעון התאוה חרפה · נערץ בסוד רבה

חיים ימים רחק לשוב גבור צדק לנכן · יורדין ירחק יום לחשוף הקץ ציום · שוכני שחק לקפוץ פזורים הלו · יגאל אביר נשפה · כמו אלו צור גואלו כי מאל היום היתה · נערץ בסוד רבה

גדול יהוה ומהלל מאד לגדולתו[1] אין חקר גדלו ליהוה אתי ונרממה[2] שמו יחדיו יתי ונרממיו

[No. 22.]

d. Prayers for יֹהֹכֹ, partly indicated by the last words; few ועל חטא. This is followed by prayers of סכות, headed סוכה מעד בכאנד, also only indicated. *Without vowel points.* [No. 13.]

e. מוסף for יֹהֹכֹ, slightly differing from the Sephardic rite *Almost without vowel points.* [No. 17.]

f. מוסף for יֹהֹכֹ. *Folded form.* [No. 25.]

IV. שלש רגלים.

a. Fragments of הלל and ש״ע originally for עצרת (so) שמנים, but between lines is written חג המצות and חג השבועות. *Partly with vowel points, folded form.* [No. 29.]

b. Morning prayers as xx for סכות, ברכו, שׂעׂ (between the lines שמנים עצרית), followed by הלל, קדיש, Neh. viii. 1, 2, 5, 6, 18; ix. 3; and Ps. cxxii. *Folded form.* [No. 26.]

c. Fragment of הלל and מוסף for שלש רגלים as No. 29. *Folded form.* [No. 16.]

d. Fragment of prayer for פסח, beg. with the following hymn, beg. missing. Acrostic [אל]עזר.

ומרע ועצת פרעה ושרי פרעה ולבית יעקב ים סוף קרע כי הם זרע ברך יהוה · ואמרו פסח הוא ליהוה

עֹשה בפרעה ועמו נקמה וסוס עם רוכבו בים רמ[ה] והוציא אותי וידי רמה והפיל על כל רודפי אימה מה גדלו מעשיך יהוה · ואמרו כי פסח הוא ליהוה

[1] MS. לגדורתו. [2] MS. ונרממיו.

זדים לרדוף עם אל יצאו וכראות אותם חלו ויראו ובלב נשבר אל אל קראו ועזרא בצרות אותו מצאו המה ראו מן מעשי יהוה ואמרו פסה הוא ליהוה הנו וצהלו בסוף כברוש ושתו בשמחה יין ותירוש והכינו לב פני אל לדרוש הללו ואמרו פעמים ושלש קדוש ק ק ק קדוש יהוה • ואמרו פסה הוא ליהוה

ככתוב ואמרתם זבח פסח . . .

Followed by ככתוב Exod. xii. 27, a verse of Psalms, יתגדל וגו, שחרית of שע. [No. 7.]

V. *Varia.*

a. Ritual for פורים, headed מגלה רזי פורים תמיד דו רוז סונה נמאז בכאנד, קדיש, ברכו to שע (also קול רם) with על הנסים, the reading of the Law, followed by מוסף, viz. קדיש, והוא רחום Ps. cxx, and אין כאלהינו. *Without vowel points, more modern.* [No. 24.]

b. Mostly prayers for the reading of the Law: (1) fol. 1. יהי רצון מלפני אלהי השמים שיקים לנו רבותינו מנהיגי (מה היגי MS.) דורנו את בניהם ואת תלמידיהם בכל מקומות מושבותיהם אב הרחמן יהיה בעזרם ובעזרנו יציל אותם (אותנו MS.) ואותנו מכל צרה ויגון ואנחה (והנחה MS.) בשנותינו יבוא מבשר נר ישראל לא יכבה לעולם ואמרו אמן ; (2) beg. ואני חסדך, רוממו, followed by Biblical verses, chiefly from Neh. viii, the blessing beg. רבנן ברכו ; (3) for חנוכה, headed (so) חנוכה הוע, the blessings ending with Biblical verse, beg. תנו כבוד לתורה ויהי בנסוע. Some Arabic words. [No. 14.]

c. Morning prayers, probably for the ninth of Ab, since the reading of the Law is indicated by כי תוליד, and the אפטרה is indicated by אסף אסיפם. Next comes מוסף (מנחה in other rites); מנחה is indicated by אז רחום והוא, קדיש, רוממו, the reading of the Law by פרש[ת] כי תשא ויחל משה • פסל לך דו ברכו וירד יוי סה ברכו ויהי בו, followed by קדיש and Ps. cxi. [No. 1.]

d. Various prayers (beg. missing): (1) Deut. xxx. 11–15 and xxxiii. 4; (2) קידוש for Sabbath, followed by various Biblical passages; (3) קדיש דרבנן; (4) על הנסים for חנוכה and פורים; (5) יעלה ויבא for ר"ח; (6) ברכת המזון (Sephardic rite), followed by various Biblical verses; (7) names for הזכרות נשמות (beg. missing), begins with בן לוי בן ישראל בן שדיאר בן בתואל יצחק בן יהושע: most of the names are followed by Chinese words, ending with the following words—תחם (תהי ?) נפשו [צרורה] בצרו[ר] החיים עם שבע כיתות של

צדיקים וחסידים עם אברהם יצחק ויעקב משה אהרן אליהו ואלישע תחת עץ החיי[ם] בגן עדן. Next comes the remembrance of women, headed נור כ בת אדם פנינה כ בת אדם מרים כ בת וון האשה, beginning with אדם (here the Chinese names are scarce), ending תחם נפשה בצרור החיים עם שבע כתות של צד[י]קים וחס[י]דים עם שרה ורבקה רחל ולאה יוכבד מרים צפרם (so) תחת עץ החיים בגן עדן, followed by Biblical verses. [No. 4.]

e. הגדה דליל פסח, beginning with blessings: (1) בורא פרי הגפן; (2) בורא עצבי בשמים; (3) בורא מורא (so) האש; (4) המבדיל; (5) קדוש (different from the German rites); (6) בבהילו. After עשר מכות follows רבן גמליאל, הלל and אשר גאלנו, and Seadyah אתה גאלת with Persian translation of each strophe, followed by the blessings פרי הגפן, המוציא לחם, בורא פרי האדמה, אבילת מרור, with the two words (so) זכר לטית, בורא נפשות, על נטילת ידים, with the indications in Persian. Next come Pss. cxv—cxviii, followed by יהללוך, and finished with the blessing על הגפן ועל פרי הגפן. Nearly similar to the Yemen ritual. *Without vowel points.* [No. 12.]

f. The same, beg. missing (?), beg. with *b*, with vowel points up to the blessing פרי הגפן. [No. 5.]

So much for the liturgical literature of the Chinese Jews, which is near to the Yemen rite. We have also to state that the vowel points are arbitrarily, if not ignorantly placed.

We have already mentioned (see above, p. 127) their Biblical literature, which consisted of the Pentateuch and some Apocrypha, as far as these can be traced by those who visited them. At present, we may say that there are Pentateuch scrolls in the Bodleian Library (No. 49 of the *Catalogue of Hebrew MSS.*), and another in the Cambridge University Library. They are written on white leather, and are not provided with titles, and, of course, not with vowel points and accents. In book form, with vowel points and accents, the following sections exist in the Library of the Society for Promoting Christianity among the Jews:

a. Parashah I (Sidrā) בראשית, containing 146 verses. There is a colophon in Persian in which it is stated that it was written in the year 1930 Sel. = 1619 A. D.

b. ויגש (Gen. xliii. 18—xlvii. 7), 106 verses (see No. 11 of the list in the *Jewish Intelligence*, January 1883, No. 217).

c. Parashah I ואלה שמות, consisting of 124 verses; the colophon has the name of the scribe, slightly obliterated.

d. The last of Exodus אלה פקודי, at end צַבּ קדש ליהוה, with the following colophon: בנוישת נדר רבי פינחס המלמד בר ישראל בן יהושע בן בנימין לישועת קויתי יהוה: אמן. The expression המלמד does not point to a Qaraite. Facsimiles a. and c. were produced in 1851 by the London Missionary Society's Press at Shanghai, with the following titles: a. Facsimile of the Hebrew Manuscripts obtained at the Jewish Synagogue in Kai-fung-fu; c. 23rd Section of the Law, Exod. xxxviii. 21—xl. 38 inclusive. The following note is appended to the last page: "Holiness to Jehovah. The learned Rabbi Phinehas, the son of Israel, the son of Joshua, the son of Benjamin, heard the reading. I have waited for thy salvation, oh Jehovah. Amen."

e. Parashah I במדבר, consisting of 159 verses, with colophon of the scribe.

f. The last Parashah of Deuteronomy, 45 verses. At the end we read in Persian as follows: "The Thorah of 53 Parashah was finished at the feast of Tabernacles (?) in the year 1932 Sel. = 1621 A. D., in the month of Tebeth, the 24th of it."

From these dates, it seems that at the beginning of the seventeenth century a restoration of the synagogue of Kai-fung-fu took place, when the Pentateuch was re-copied by several persons, of whom many bear the title of השליח, "the messenger." From whence did those come to China, or is השליח simply "the messenger of God"? Perhaps when the Persian passages which occur in the translation of liturgies (see above, p. 137) and those in the colophons of the Pentateuch fragments will be correctly read and explained, we may hope to advance in the knowledge of the history of this scattered colony. We may mention that Professor D. S. Margoliouth intends to publish them with an English translation and a philological commentary. Meanwhile we have to thank Dr. Paul Horn, of the Strasburg University, for some hints given to us. It is certain the

Persian Jews had a ritual[1] and literature of their own, which we at present know only through a few MSS. of the Bibliothèque Nationale, the British Museum, and in the Imperial Library of St. Petersburg[2].

A. NEUBAUER.

[1] See Dr. Harkavy's description of Hebrew MSS. in the East (No. 6 of חרשים וגם ישנים), p. 2, MS. in Jerusalem, which contains, amongst other matter, hymns. It was written at כוא between 5525 to 5535 A.M. = 1765 to 1775 A. D.

[2] See the *Times* of July 10, 1888, p. 4, col. 4, and the notice of the Rev. G. Margoliouth in the JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, vol. VII, p. 119 sqq.

IBN EZRA IN ENGLAND.

ABRAHAM BEN MEIR IBN EZRA is one of the Jewish scholars that visited this island in the twelfth century. His name is not met with in commercial records (Sh'taroth), or in any other annals of the business transactions of contemporary Jews. He might have said in the words of the prophet, with a little variation, "I have not borrowed nor lent money, and yet will my people remember me for many generations." It is a rich legacy that Ibn Ezra left—even an *embarras de richesse*. It is difficult to assign to each of his numerous writings its exact date, place, and purpose; but however interesting the discussion and solution of these problems may be, they do not concern us here, as we have only to deal at present with a visit paid by this famous scholar to England, and with the works that he produced while he stayed in this country.

As to the life of Ibn Ezra, I have written what I had to say in a paper read before the Jews' College Literary Society, in the year 1872, and published by the Jewish Association for the Diffusion of Religious Knowledge in one of the Sabbath Readings[1]. A short biography of Ibn Ezra also precedes my *Translation of Ibn Ezra's Commentary on Isaiah*. But there is one point that is not yet cleared up. When did Ibn Ezra come to England? What kind of public or private reception was arranged for him? When did he leave England? I am sorry to say that I am perfectly ignorant on these matters; the Jewish annals seem to have passed over these questions with silence—perhaps a just

[1] It is to be regretted that these publications were discontinued, and it is to be hoped that they will be resumed under the auspices of the successor of the Association.

retribution to this scholar. History herein pays him measure for measure, for the study of geography and history were not treated by Ibn Ezra with due respect; in the curriculum of studies recommended by him they occupy an inferior position[1]. According to his own statements, he was in Rome in 1140; he was in Lucca in 1145; in the years which follow he visited various places in Italy, and wrote Grammars and Commentaries, without giving place and date of the compositions. From Italy he went to France; the earliest work written there is the *Commentary on Exodus*, 1153, the latest is the *Commentary on the Minor Prophets*, written in the year 1157[2]. In the month of Tammuz, 1158, he was in London, and began to write the *Yesod Mora*. This is the first mention of Ibn Ezra's stay in London, but it is within the bounds of possibility that this was not his first visit. Negative evidence is inconclusive. At all events the *Yesod Mora* is the first work known to us which Ibn Ezra produced in England, directly for the benefit of a pious patron residing in this country.

Let us now hear what Ibn Ezra has to say about this book, and in it. The title is—

I. *Yesod Mora vesod Torah*[3].

"The foundation of the fear of God and the essence of the Torah." Ibn Ezra wrote for a Maecenas who had studied

[1] Comp. *Yesod Mora*, ch. i: "The knowledge of the names of the towns in Palestine, the history of the Judges and the Kings, the building of the first Temple, that of the future Temple, or the prophecies that have already been fulfilled, can only be acquired by hard work and is of little benefit."

[2] See *Essays on Ibn Ezra* by M. Friedländer, p. 195.

[3] This title is mentioned in the superscription; but I doubt whether it is Ibn Ezra's choice. The title is probably taken from the following sentence that occurs in the first chapter: "The knowledge of Hebrew Grammar enables us to understand יסוד התורה וסוד המורא 'The foundation of the Law and the essence (lit. secret) of the fear of God.'" Although the two terms סוד and יסוד are employed here as synonyms, the originator of the title thought it necessary to interchange them, so as to apply סוד to Torah in accordance with the use of the word by Ibn Ezra in his Commen-

under his direction other works composed by the same author[1]. Ibn Ezra "took the trouble to write a book for him, on the divine precepts, because he had found him to be a truthful and godfearing man above many." The name of this pupil is not mentioned here[2], but the fact that Ibn Ezra had written other books for his pupil, which the latter studied in the presence of Ibn Ezra, suggests the name of Joseph of Maudville, the same who states in a postscript to Ibn Ezra's *Commentary on the Minor Prophets:* "I, Joseph, son of Rabbi Jacob of Maudville, copied it from the original autograph of the author, and added such remarks as I heard him make viva voce, when I was with him." Here Ibn Ezra calls his pupil *nadibh*, "generous," and in one of his poems he attributes "generosity" (*nidh'bhath rua'h*) to this same Rabbi Joseph. The book "was commenced in London, in the island Angleterre, in the month of Tammuz, and finished, after four weeks, in the month of Ab, 4918 (1158)[3]." Although it is not said that

taries. The correct title is probably that given in MS. Poc. 296, viz. ספר המצות "On the Divine Commandments." Comp. end of ch. i: "And now I will continue to speak on the Commandments," and again in ch. ii: "I took the trouble to write for him a book on the Commandments (ספר במצות)."

[1] This statement suggests either that Ibn Ezra had already been staying in England for some months, or that he came to England together with his disciple.

[2] In several MSS. the dedicatory poem has the following additional line:—

אודה בהשלימי לאל ולידידו יוסף בנו יעקב על מתנת ידו

"When I finish it I shall give thanks to God, and to his beloved, Joseph son of Jacob, for his support."

[3] A postscript to the book runs (see *Orient*, XI, p. 301): "I, Abraham, the Sefardi, son of Meir, called Ibn Ezra, commenced to write this book in London, in the island Angleterre; and it was finished in the month of Ab, after four weeks, in the year 4919." In the book itself the name of London is not given, nor is the date mentioned. But when the author says: "Between Jerusalem and this island there is a difference of four hours as regards the time of sunrise," he probably meant between Jerusalem and England. He does not state on what authority he assumed a difference of four hours. The difference in degrees of longitude is only 35°, causing a difference of two hours twenty minutes. On the

the book was finished in London this was probably the case, as, according to Ibn Ezra's own statement, he was in London five months later, in the month of Tebeth, 4919, if this statement is not altogether a fiction.

The *Yesod Mora* is not quoted in any of the works of Ibn Ezra. On the other hand it contains references to the Commentaries on Exodus (short edition), Leviticus, Psalms, and Daniel. The following is an abstract of the contents of the book :—

In the Preface Ibn Ezra reminds the reader that man is distinguished from the rest of the creation by his intellect, by the spirit that comes from God and returns again to him when man has faithfully fulfilled his mission, viz. to study the works of his Master, and to live in accordance with his precepts. The acquisition of knowledge, of whatever kind, is a step upwards towards the knowledge of the Most High. The author then proceeds, in the first chapter, to recommend certain branches of learning as auxiliary knowledge, as means for an end, but which must not be treated as the aim of man's life. Such are the study of Masora and Grammar, the Bible, Talmud, Casuistry, and Midrash. When studying these things man must never lose sight of our principal aim, "to obtain a knowledge of the works and the will of the Creator;" and in order to attain this end, he must add to the above studies Natural Philosophy, Logic, Mathematics, Astronomy, and Psychology.

Logic, Ibn Ezra says in the next chapter, enables us to define and to arrange things properly by correct classification; and in the study of the Torah logic leads us to distinguish correctly between general principles and those individual precepts that emanate from them, and between the real precept and the fence round it. Incidentally[1] he

shortest day the number given by Ibn Ezra may approximately be right, if we take into account the difference in the length of the day, at least for the shortest day.

[1] So it seems; but it is possible that the rejection of such compositions as the *Azharoth* (a rhymed enumeration of the 613 precepts) is an essential

censures the authors of *azharoth*, who enumerate the 613 precepts without being guided by these logical rules—counting identical precepts each separately, and general principles side by side with the detailed precepts contained in the former.

The importance of these general principles shows itself in many ways. If they collide with certain individual precepts the latter are set aside. Only in three cases is the neglect of a positive precept (מצות עשה) visited with *kareth*, and one of these is the neglect of a positive general principle (ch. iii)[1].

The general principles are easily distinguished from the rest, which are dependent on time, place, and circumstances (ch. iv), whilst the former are in force everywhere, at every time, and under all circumstances. They are implanted in man's heart; and the psalmist's praise of "the commandments[2] of the Lord, which are upright, making the heart glad" (Ps. xix. 8), applies especially to them (ch. v). The precepts are in part fully explained in the Torah, partly they are only indicated there, and are fully described in the Oral Law; there are also precepts which originated altogether in post-biblical times (ch. vi): all these may be divided into such as concern our actions, such as concern our words, and such as concern our thoughts or our heart (אמונת הלב). The latter must accompany every performance of a precept, without them the practice of the precept (מצוה) is meaning-

point in this work of Ibn Ezra. He may have been asked by his pupil to write for him a kind of *Azharoth*; but Ibn Ezra refuses to do so, exhorting his pupil to remember the general principles and to have constantly the chief aim of man's perfection before him; he might then dispense with a minute study of the individual precepts.

[1] Neglect of positive commandments is threatened with *kareth* only in the case of circumcision and the passover-offering. Ibn Ezra seems to consider the term ארור "cursed be" as identical with *kareth*, and explains Deut. xxvii. 26 to refer to him who neglects to conceive the earnest resolve *in the heart* to be loyal to the Torah.

[2] The Hebrew term is פקודים, and according to Ibn Ezra the word is derived from פקד "to entrust" (comp. פקדון "trust"), and signifies the things entrusted to the heart.

less. The source of all the general principles is the fear of the Lord, which inspires us with the desire to abstain from that which is prohibited and to do that which is commanded. From another point of view Ibn Ezra considers loyalty to the words, "the Lord thy God thou shalt fear" (Deut. vi. 13), as the source of man's obedience to the divine prohibitions (מצוות לא תעשה), and the first step towards his perfection, whilst man's obedience to the positive precepts (מצוות עשה), which are comprehended in the words "and him thou shalt serve" (ibid.), leads him gradually towards the highest degree of man's perfection, i.e. the love of God or the cleaving to him (דבקות בשם יתברך). When this degree is reached, man's soul will in his life-time "be filled with the fullness of joys in his presence," and will eternally enjoy the "pleasures for evermore at the right hand of God" (Ps. xvi. 11). Although man's physical constitution greatly influences his moral disposition, strict obedience to the divine precepts minimizes that influence, so that his perfection does not depend on a predestined order of things, but on man's own free will, in accordance with the Talmudical saying, "Everything is in the hands of heaven, except the fear of the Lord" (ch. vii).

How the single precepts affect man's moral faculty is not clear in every case; but in many cases the reason for the precept is stated in the Law. But whether the reason of the precept is clear to us or not, strict obedience is demanded in every case, the divine commandments being just "statutes and commandments" making the "people wise and reasonable" (Deut. iv. 6, 8) (ch. viii).

There exists, according to Ibn Ezra, a certain analogy[1] between the Kosmos and some of the divine precepts (ch. ix). Such analogy suggests a thorough study of the Kosmos, and such study leads to a knowledge and love of God. But in order to attain to this end, it is necessary for man to abandon earthly pleasures, and to devote himself

[1] Ibn Ezra frequently refers to that analogy in his *Commentary on the Pentateuch*. Comp. *Comm. on Exodus* xxv. 40, xxvi. 18, xxviii. 8.

exclusively to the service of God, every one according to his faculties (ch. x).

Other mystical relations are pointed out in the eleventh chapter between the properties of the four letters of the divine name, the Tetragrammaton [1], and various mathematical and astronomical problems. He whose soul is filled with the knowledge of mathematics and astronomy advances greatly towards a knowledge of the divine Being, and secures for it eternal existence, becomes like the angels [2] who minister unto God, and sings praises to him together with his angels.

Not long after the *Yesod Mora*, Ibn Ezra is said to have written in England another essay, *The Letter of Sabbath:*

Iggereth hashshabbath.

The personification of the Sabbath is frequently met with in Hebrew literature. In the well-known hymn of the Friday evening service, beginning לכה דודי, Sabbath is welcomed as a bride; in the *zemiroth*, Sabbath is introduced as a queen; in the Sabbath morning service, Sabbath is the author of Psalm xcii, for "the seventh day praises and sings 'a psalm, a song of the day of the Sabbath.'" In the same way Ibn Ezra introduces here Sabbath as the writer of a letter. In this letter, which is addressed to Ibn Ezra, Sabbath presents herself as the crown of the religion of the distinguished people, which occupies the fourth place in the Decalogue, and is "the sign of an everlasting covenant between God and his children." She is proud that she brings the blessing of rest to all who sanctify the seventh

[1] Comp. *Sepher hashshem;* and *Comm. on Exodus* iii. 15.

[2] It seems that Ibn Ezra thought of the ideal reconstruction of the Kosmos in the scholar's mind, and compared this construction with that of the real Kosmos by the angels, spiritual beings, created, according to Ibn Ezra, for the purpose of forming and ruling the universe, so that to some extent these angels are the same as the forces that act in nature, and are in their combined action identical with the Demiourgos of Philo. In Hebrew they are called *elohim*, which term, by way of metonymy, signifies also "God."

day, and feels satisfied with the way she has hitherto been honoured. But a change has recently taken place in the conduct of Ibn Ezra, of which she bitterly complains, and that is the chief object of her letter. Ibn Ezra, who has in his younger days always been a strict observer of the Sabbath, has become lax in his old age; for he allows books to remain in his house in which the profanation of the eve of Sabbath is suggested, and does not at once write letters to all congregations in order to show them the error of that suggestion.

Ibn Ezra tells us that one Friday evening (the 14th of Tebeth, 4919), when he happened to be in England, "in one of the cities of the island called 'the corner of the earth' (Angleterre), and forming part of the seventh zone," he had a dream, in which a letter from Sabbath was brought to him. His attention was called to books which were left by his pupils in his house, and which contained a heterodox interpretation of Genesis i. 5. He soon found the corpus delicti: it was a note on Genesis i. 5, which verse was explained to mean: It was evening and it was morning, and then one day had passed; for the night is counted with the preceding day. The first day must consequently have commenced in the morning and ended the next morning. It being admitted by all commentators, says Ibn Ezra, that the object of the biblical account of the creation is to explain the institution of Sabbath, the suggestion would not be unreasonable, that the beginning and end of the Sabbath should be determined in accordance with this account[1]. Ibn Ezra's indignation would almost have induced him to destroy the book at once, even on the Sabbath, in order to prevent others from being misled by

[1] If the Commentary referred to were that of Rashbam, it would not have been necessary for Ibn Ezra to show the inference that readers might draw as regards the observance of the Sabbath; it is clearly stated in the Commentary itself: "And it was evening and it was morning (i. e. dawn commenced) and thus one of the six days referred to in the decalogue ended." If Ibn Ezra had seen this Commentary, he would have quoted these words. See below.

it. Reason, however, conquered passion, and Ibn Ezra contented himself with a solemn vow to write on the subject immediately after the Sabbath, and with the utterance of a curse against any one who would accept that explanation, or would read it aloud, or would copy it and enter it into a commentary on the Torah.

Whose Commentary was it that was thus condemned by Ibn Ezra? If the author's name was known to Ibn Ezra, why does he not mention it? Did he purposely withhold the name, because he feared lest the wrong comment be, to some extent, sanctioned by the great authority of the commentator? Or did he perhaps avoid offending an author that was generally respected? Graetz (*Geschichte der Juden*, VI, p. 447, note 8) believes that the Commentary of Rabbi Samuel ben Meir (רשב"ם) on the Pentateuch was meant, and, in fact, the impugned remark on Genesis i. 5 is found in that Commentary. If this view is correct, we can well understand the fear of Ibn Ezra that the force of his own arguments might be counterbalanced by the piety and learning of Rashbam. But why does Ibn Ezra employ the plural form "books" (ספרים), "commentaries" (פירושי התורה)? and why are the disciples introduced as having brought them into the house of their master? Furthermore, the various ways in which Genesis i. 5 was explained by different authors were not unknown to Ibn Ezra. In his commentary on Exodus xvi. 22, as well as in his remark on Genesis i. 5, he criticizes the impugned interpretation of Genesis i. 5. The shock which he says he received at the sight of it must have been caused rather by the circumstances connected with the copy found in his house than with its contents. It seems that the disciples had brought to their master for revision copies of explanations of biblical passages, in which the master found, to his great surprise, the very interpretation of Genesis i. 5 which he had always opposed. The Commentary of Rashbam could not have shocked him greatly, as a few lines' more reading would have convinced him of this Rabbi's loyalty to the tradi-

tional interpretation of the Biblical precepts. He says distinctly (on Genesis i. 14), "The time from one appearance of the stars (צאת הכוכבים) to the next is called one day [1]," so that no one could honestly charge him with heterodox views concerning the beginning of the Sabbath. But for the disciples who, in spite of their master's strong opposition, copied the interpretation quoted above, it might prove dangerous as regards the right observance of the Sabbath. Hence the indignation of Ibn Ezra [2].

The account of the dream, and the resolve of Ibn Ezra to write the "letter" (אגרת) concerning the Sabbath, seems to have been written sometime after the event, and somewhere far from England. If the letter were written in England he would not have said, "in one of the towns of the island called Angleterre," but "in one of the towns of this island," and would probably have named the place; nor would he have further described the island as situated in the seventh zone [3].

I doubt whether the whole account of the dream, which is intended as a poetical introduction to the three essays on

[1] It is difficult to see how this dictum can be reconciled with the quoted interpretation of, "And it was evening," &c. We must either assume that the Rabbi only intended to define the *length* of the day as consisting of twenty-four hours, and did not intend to fix the *beginning* of the day; and this explanation is supported by the fact that the important sentence, "The night is counted with the preceding day," quoted by Ibn Ezra, is absent from the Commentary ascribed to Rashbam. Or we must assume that this Commentary is a compilation of notes from various books, and was not written by Rashbam, or that either of the two contradictory explanations was interpolated.

[2] Abraham ibn 'Hiya ha-nasi, in his *Sefer ha-'ibbur* (I, ch. ix), says that the Christians count the days from the morning, and support their theory by pointing to passages in the Bible in which the day is mentioned before the night, and especially to the fact that light was first created. Also Ibn Ezra seems to ascribe this view to the Christians; for he fears "Lest we become a mockery in the eyes of the Christians" (by adopting the impugned explanation of Genesis i. 5 and yet beginning Sabbath in the evening). Discussions on the subject must frequently have taken place between Jews and Christians.

[3] Note especially the phrase: ואני הייתי בעיר אחת מיערי האי וגו'.

the beginning of the year, of the month and of the days, was written by Ibn Ezra himself. Some of the ideas contained therein seem to be foreign to the spirit of Ibn Ezra. This scholar does not at all lay stress on the use of wine for *kiddush* and *habhdalah*[1], as is done in this introduction. Ibn Ezra does not believe that the Sabbath is a day of rest for the dead more than any other day; his idea of the future life of our soul is entirely different[2]. The three essays themselves are by no means new; they are a modified and expanded form of notes occurring in Ibn Ezra's *Commentary on the Pentateuch*[3]. Ibn Ezra himself may have recast them, but it is also possible that one of his pupils wrote them in the name of the master; and the principal object of these essays may have been the same as described in the Introduction, viz. to refute, in the fullest possible way, the above-mentioned heterodox interpretation of Genesis i. 5. The title given to the three essays is *Iggereth hashshabbath*, in a double sense of the word *Iggereth*, as the author states. First, it signifies a *collection* (from אגר "to collect") of arguments for the right observance of the Sabbath, and secondly, it reminds the reader of "the letter of Sabbath" that gave the impulse to these essays. From this statement we might infer that the original sense of the title was "a collection of arguments concerning the Sabbath," and that the term *iggereth* suggested the idea of "the letter of Sabbath[4]."

The three essays are preceded by a few preliminary remarks on the connexion that exists between the course of the sun and the various seasons of the day and of the year.

Ibn Ezra then proceeds, in the first essay, to show that the

[1] Comp. *Yesod Mora*, ch. ii. [2] *Ibid.*, Introd. and ch. x.

[3] See Comm. of Ibn Ezra on Exodus xii. 2 and on Genesis i. 5.

[4] The title *Iggereth* was suggested in the letter of Sabbath; comp. 'Why do you not at once vow that you would write letters in defence of our faith?' In this postscript Ibn Ezra seems altogether to ignore the poetical introduction; and the second explanation of the title is probably a later interpolation.

year of the Torah (שנת התורה) begins in the spring, in the month *Abib*, which is "the first of the months of the year." An exception is made with regard to the year of release (שמטה) and with that of jubilee (יובל), which commence in the autumn in the month of Tishri. In the second essay the beginning of the month is explained as depending on the first reappearance of the moon after the conjunction. The year is called in Hebrew *shanah*, because in every year the course of the sun through the ecliptic is repeated without any change, whilst the light of the moon is renewed every month, and a month is therefore called in Hebrew *'hodesh*, "renewal." If the term "month" is applied to the twelfth part of a solar year the name is borrowed from the lunar month, which is almost equal in length; in the same way we give the name "year" to twelve revolutions of the moon, because the period of twelve revolutions of the moon is nearly equal to a solar year. The Jewish Calendar is based on a combination of both systems, on account of the month Abib, which is to be the first month and must be in the spring. Taking the length of the solar year to be 365 days 5 hours 55 m. $45\frac{2}{5}\frac{5}{7}$ s., and the length of a month to be 29 days $12\frac{7}{10}\frac{9}{8}\frac{3}{0}$ hours, 19 solar years are equal to 235 lunar months.

In the third essay Ibn Ezra approaches the chief question, the beginning of the day. The annual course of the sun, the ecliptic, is divided into four parts; the four points of division are the two points of intersection of the ecliptic with the equator, and the two points midway between the former. Similarly is the day circle of the sun divided into four parts by its two points of intersection with the horizon, and two points of intersection with the meridian, midway between the former. The four points in the ecliptic mark the beginnings (תקופות)[1] of the seasons of the year—spring,

[1] There are two kinds of *t'kufoth*, those of R. Samuel and those of R. Ada; the former are based on the theory that the length of a year is $365\frac{1}{4}$ days; according to R. Ada 19 solar years are equal to 235 lunar months. Incidentally Ibn Ezra blames those that still continue to notice

summer, autumn, and winter; and the points of division in the day circle of the sun mark the beginnings of the four seasons of the day—sunrise, noon, sunset, and midnight. Just as each of the four beginnings of the seasons of the year has found its advocates for its selection as the beginning of the year[1], so also has each of the four moments of the day found its supporters that fixed it as the beginning of the day[2]. As the autumn has been fixed by the *Torah* as the beginning of the *year* of rest (שבת), so is the evening, which corresponds in its properties to the autumn, the beginning of the *day* of rest.

Ibn Ezra then proceeds to criticize the various biblical passages that have been adduced in support of the theory that Sabbath begins in the morning, such as Exodus xvi. 23–25[3]. Chief among these passages is Genesis i. 1–5, which, according to Ibn Ezra, is the source of the dissension about the beginning of the Sabbath. His opponents hold that "the light" was the first object of the creation, and explain the passage thus: In the beginning, when God created heaven and earth, the earth was not in existence (*tohu va-bohu*) and darkness was (i.e. there was no light), &c. Consequently day came first in the Creation, and then followed night. Ibn Ezra rejects this interpretation, and explains the first paragraph of Genesis thus: In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth (i.e. the whole universe); but the earth was not as we see it at present; it was *tohu va-bohu*, empty, without living beings; and *darkness* was there, &c.; darkness consequently preceded the creation of light, and night was before the day. This interpretation of Genesis i. 1–5 fully

the *t'kufoth* of R. Samuel, and especially those who superstitiously ascribe to them certain influences.

[1] The Greeks (יונים) count the years from the spring, the Persians from the summer, the Chaldees from the autumn, and the Christians from the winter. (*Igg. hashshabbath*, ch. i.)

[2] Astronomers start from midnight or midday, when the sun passes through the meridian; Christians begin the day with sunrise, and we begin with sunset. (*Sefer ha-'ibbur*, I, ch. x.)

[3] Other passages are found in *Sefer ha-'ibbur*, l. c.

agrees in sense and in expression with the latest (French) recension of Ibn Ezra's *Commentary on the Pentateuch*, extant on the first seventeen chapters of Genesis[1]. It is remarkable that in the *Iggereth hashshabbath* references occur to the commentaries on Isaiah and on Daniel, but the *Commentary on the Pentateuch* is never quoted. The reason for this circumstance is probably this: the arguments given in the earlier recensions were not considered satisfactory by those for whom they were chiefly intended, and the new recension was still fragmentary and unpublished. In the present letter Ibn Ezra sought, by fresh arguments, to defend the traditional law of Sabbath from the attacks of the heterodox, the מינין[2] who rejected the theory that the day began in the evening.

It seems that our author has not yet exhausted all his store of arguments, for he adds, in conclusion, "This letter has been finished in haste," and thereby implies that in case of emergency he might produce further arguments. He does not give any reason for the haste, nor does he tell us in how far there was *periculum in morâ*.

A story-book in Judaic-German (מעשה בוך) contains an account of Ibn Ezra's dream, but substitutes "Arnon" or "Aragon" for "Angleterre."

Besides these two compositions, Ibn Ezra does not seem to have produced any further work in England; but the result of his teaching may be noticed in the literary attempts of his pupil Joseph ben Jacob of Maudville (מאוידויל), who wrote notes on the Sidra, ויחי[3], and added

[1] See *Essays on Ibn Ezra* by M. Friedländer, p. 160, and Appendix, p. 10 sqq.

[2] Ibn Ezra designates by this term a Jewish sect, that observed the Sabbath from morning to morning; we do not know whether there were such Jews in England or France in the time of Ibn Ezra. Dr. Gaster called my attention to the fact mentioned by Benjamin of Tudela that they existed among the Jews of Cyprus. (*Travels of Benjamin of Tudela*, I, p. 25 (Hebrew) and 57 (English), ed. A. Asher, and note 119, vol. II, p. 56).

[3] *Essays on Ibn Ezra*, &c., p. 204, and Appendix, p. 65.

some explanatory remarks to Ibn Ezra's Commentaries on Exodus and on the Minor Prophets [1].

Ibn Ezra continued to live after the date mentioned in the *Iggereth hashshabbath* about ten years; but the question where he lived these years, and where he died, has not yet been satisfactorily settled. In the year 1161 Ibn Ezra was in Narbonne, where he calculated the nativity of a child [2]. There is no trace that he returned after that to England, but there is a story [3] that he died in England, surrounded by *shedim* in the form of black dogs. A traveller coming from England brought the story to Moses Tachau of Vienna. Moses Tachau, an ardent opponent of Ibn Ezra's writings, was only too glad to hear stories of this kind about Ibn Ezra, and the traveller probably knew it; and, according to the rule הרוצה לשקר ירחיק עדותו, the name of England was connected with the story.

Ibn Ezra died seventy-five years old, and the words "Abram was seventy-five years old when he left 'Haran'" (i.e. the troubles of this world) were applied to him, according to some writers, by himself when he felt the approach of death [4]. Others ascribe to him the following words, uttered before his death, and containing sentiments which are more congenial to the spirit of Ibn Ezra: "My soul rejoices in the rock of my strength; in his might he bestowed benefits on me according to my righteousness; in his kindness he has taught me his ways, and kept me alive till I knew the object of my longing; and if my flesh and my heart is spent, the Lord remains my rock and my strength."

M. FRIEDLÄNDER.

[1] *Essays on Ibn Ezra*, &c., p. 155, note 2, and p. 166.

[2] See Steinschneider, *Shene ha-meoroth*, p. 4.

[3] See *Ozar Nechmad*, vol. III, 97.

[4] See *Anecdota Oxoniensia*, Semitic Series, vol. I, part 4, *Mediaeval Jewish Chronicles*, edited by Dr. A. Neubauer, p. 131.

CRITICAL NOTICES.

Philo about the Contemplative Life, or the Fourth Book of the Treatise concerning Virtues. Critically edited, with a defence of its genuineness, by F. C. CONYBEARE, M.A., late Fellow of University College, Oxford. With a facsimile. (Oxford: Clarendon Press.) 1895.

EVEN if we cannot fully assent to Mr. Conybeare's proposition that "the treatise of Philo on the Contemplative Life is the most important of all his voluminous works" (Preface, p. v), it is undoubtedly one of great interest; and the interest in it which was somewhat damped by recent attacks upon its genuineness will be once more aroused by the masterly defence which is now before us. Its attractiveness for the student of human thought and custom is not found in its exposition of Philo's philosophy, but in its description of a peculiar body of ascetics, for whom Philo professes an unbounded admiration, though he himself was content to follow a less stringent rule. Before giving some account of Mr. Conybeare's edition it may be well to remind the reader of the principal features of the treatise itself.

It begins by referring to a previous work descriptive of the Essenes, who cultivated "the practical life"; and the writer, following the proper order of his investigation, now turns to those who had devoted themselves to "contemplation," and declares that he will give a perfectly true account. The character of their philosophy was indicated by their name, *θεραπευταί* and *θεραπευτρίδες*, which, however, was not without ambiguity. It might refer to their office of tending the soul when overwhelmed with pleasures and desires, and the multitude of other passions, or to their service of pure Being (*θεραπεύειν τὸ ὄν*). For the latter they had received instruction "from nature and the sacred laws,"—a distinction which may refer to Jews, who were monotheists by race, and to proselytes, who received their monotheism from a study of the Mosaic Law (p. 293). Their exalted spirituality is contrasted with the worship of those who honoured the elements, under the invented names of divinities, or the sun, moon, and stars, or the whole cosmos—for these required a fabricator,—or the demi-gods, with their contradictory attributes of mortal and immortal, and the impure and impossible origin which was assigned

to them, or images of wood and stone, to say nothing of the beast-worship of the Egyptians. Such men must remain incurable, the eye of the soul, by which truth and falsehood are discerned, being blind. But the Therapeutic race longed for the sight of Being, and adhered to the rank which led to perfect blessedness, not going to it through custom or advice, but rapt by a heavenly love and enthusiasm. Hence, owing to their desire of immortal life they count themselves already dead to that which is mortal, and leave their substance to sons or daughters or other relatives, or, if they have no relatives, to companions and friends, thus yielding their blind wealth to those who are still blind in understanding. Here Philo interposes a little bit of his worldly shrewdness. The Greeks celebrated Anaxagoras and Democritus, because, when they were smitten with a love of philosophy, they allowed their property to be turned into sheep-walks. The men deserved admiration for their own superiority to the attractions of wealth; but it would have been much better, instead of leaving their possessions to feed cattle, to have ministered to the necessities of men, and raised kindred or friends from poverty to comfort. Enemies can do no worse than create an artificial penury; and therefore the Therapeutae are more admirable, who are swayed by no inferior impulse towards philosophy, and by giving away, instead of destroying, their wealth, benefit others as well as themselves. Having disposed of their property, they forsake brothers, children, wives, parents, even the countries in which they were born and reared. But they do not remove to another city, like slaves who ask to be sold, and so obtain a change of masters, but not freedom; for every city, even the best governed, is full of disturbances and worries which are intolerable to him who has once been led by wisdom. But they make their abode in gardens or lonely fields, not from misanthropy, but because they know the danger of intercourse with men of dissimilar character.

This class of people was found in many parts of the world, but abounded in Egypt in each of the so-called nomes, and particularly in the neighbourhood of Alexandria. Their favourite resort was a low hill above Lake Mareotis, a spot selected both for the sake of security and on account of the delightful temperature of the air. Security was afforded by the surrounding country-houses and villages; and the air was rendered agreeable by constant breezes from the lake and the sea, which, mingling together, produced a most healthy condition. Their houses were of the cheapest kind, being intended simply for a protection against the weather. They were not close to one another, as in cities, for this would have interfered with the desired solitude; nor were they far apart, because the inmates wished for communion

with one another, and for mutual defence against robbers. Each house was provided with a sacred room, called σεμνεῖον and μοναστήριον, in which the Therapeutae celebrated in solitude the mysteries of the holy life, introducing nothing that related to the necessities of the body, but laws, and oracles delivered through prophets, and hymns, and the other things by which knowledge and piety are increased. For they continually remembered God, so that even in dreams nothing was imaged in their minds but the beauty of the Divine virtues and powers, and many spoke forth in sleep the dogmas of the sacred philosophy. They offered prayer twice a day, at dawn and in the evening; when the sun was rising, asking that their understanding might be filled with heavenly light, and, when it was setting, that the soul, freed from the senses, might follow the steps of truth. They spent the interval in reading the scriptures and turning them into allegory. They had also compositions of ancient founders of the sect, who had left models of allegorical interpretation, which they imitated; so that they were not only given to contemplation, but composed songs and hymns in every kind of metre.

Thus six days were spent in the lonely study of philosophy, and during these days they did not even cross the vestibule. But on the seventh day they assembled in a common sanctuary, where they reverently took their seats according to age, having their hands folded in their garments, the right between the breast and the chin, the left hanging at their side. The eldest and most learned in their doctrines then addressed them in words which, unlike those of the rhetoricians or sophists, reached the soul and remained securely there. The rest listened in silence, and signified their approval only by looks and nods. The sanctuary was provided with two enclosures; for women also, animated by the same zeal as the men, were present at these services. The partition between the two chambers was sufficiently high to meet the requirements of feminine modesty, but was open above so as to offer no obstacle to hearing.

Self-restraint was the foundation on which they built their virtues. None of them would partake of food or drink before sunset, since they deemed philosophy worthy of the light, but the bodily necessities of darkness. Some remembered to eat only after three days, and some were so feasted by wisdom that they refrained from food for double that period, and scarcely after six days partook of the necessary nourishment. The seventh day was an exception. They regarded this as a high festival, and when they had attended to the soul they fattened the body with cheap bread and salt (which the very luxurious seasoned with hyssop) and with water from the spring. They ate enough not to be hungry, and drank enough not to be thirsty. Their

clothing also was of the cheapest kind, and used simply as a protection against wet and cold.

Our author now desires to contrast the festivals of the Therapeutae with the luxurious banquets of others, and proceeds to give a long account of the gluttony and excesses which prevailed in wealthy circles. Those who had devoted themselves to knowledge and contemplation according to the sacred precepts of Moses observed a very different rule. Then follows a description of a feast which Mr. Conybeare identifies with the feast of Pentecost. The chief difficulty that suggests itself is in the interpretation of δι' ἑπτὰ ἑβδομάδων, which we must translate "after an interval of seven weeks." This has been frequently understood in the sense of "every seven weeks," or, more properly, every fiftieth day—a meaning which might seem justified by the failure to mention any point of time from which the seven weeks were reckoned. We may perhaps explain this omission as due to inadvertence on the part of the writer; but I cannot agree with Mr. Conybeare that the ordinary interpretation is untenable. This, however, is a subordinate point, and we may proceed with the description of the feast. First, the Therapeutae assembled together after seven weeks, expressing admiration not only for the simple seven, but also for its power ($7^2=49$). This was the eve of a very great festival, which was celebrated on the fiftieth day, fifty being a most holy number and most closely connected with nature, being made out of the power of the right-angled triangle, which is the beginning of the genesis and substance of the universe [1]. When on this day they assembled, clad in their white dress, they first of all stood in rows, and with uplifted eyes and hands prayed that their feast might be acceptable to God. The elders then, following the order of their election, reclined on cheap cushions of papyrus, their age being reckoned by the number of years they had spent within the guild. Women also feasted with them, most of them being aged virgins, who had been moved by their zeal for wisdom to devote themselves to a life of celibacy. The men were placed apart on the right hand, the women on the left. They were waited upon by the younger members, whose garments flowed loosely, in token that the service was one of affection, and not such as was rendered by slaves. The viands were those already mentioned. "In those days" no wine was brought in, but only the most transparent water, cold for most, hot for those among the oldest members who lived delicately. The table was pure from things containing blood. When they had taken their places, reclining in the aforesaid order, the president carefully expounded some portion of Scripture, drawing

[1] This refers to a triangle with sides in the proportion of 3, 4, and 5, the sum of the squares of which is equal to 50.

forth its allegorical meaning, for the whole legislation appeared to these men to resemble an animal, the literal precepts being the body, the invisible meaning laid up within the words being the soul. He was heard in rapt silence, but was greeted with applause when he had finished. Hymns were next sung, partly solo, partly choral; and then the attendants brought in the table before-mentioned, on which was placed leavened bread seasoned with salt and hyssop, to distinguish it from the shew-bread in the Temple, which was unleavened and unseasoned, and of a sanctity that was not to be rivalled. When the banquet was completely over, the whole night was spent in singing and dancing. The men formed a chorus on one side, and the women on the other; and in strophe and anti-strophe they sang their hymns to God. At length they blended in one chorus, in memory of the commingling at the Red Sea, when Moses and Miriam led the thanksgiving hymns to God the Saviour. At dawn they stood fronting the east, and when they saw the sun rising, they stretched their hands towards heaven, prayed for truth and the sharp sight of reason, and withdrew once more to their several cells.

Such is an abridged account of this singular sect. The *De Vita Contemplativa* is our sole authority for the existence of the Therapeutae; and this circumstance has become the occasion for some strange hypotheses. Eusebius[1], accepting the work as genuine, leaps to the conclusion, which he declares must be manifest to every one, that Philo intended to give a description, and a very accurate description, of Christian ascetics. In forming this judgment he relies upon a few superficial resemblances, and takes no notice either of fundamental differences or of chronological probability. In alluding to the renunciation of property, he appeals to Acts iv. 34 sq., and does not observe that in the case of the Christians the property was brought together into a common fund for the benefit of the Church, whereas the Therapeutae handed over their property to their relatives, and cultivated among themselves a universal poverty. The writings of ancient founders of the sect he takes to be the Gospels and Apostolic Epistles, including that to the Hebrews, though he must have known very well that these Christian Scriptures did not exist in the time of Philo, and that the Apostles, instead of being ancient founders of the sect, had recently entered on their mission and were the living leaders of the movement. He fails to notice the fact that the Therapeutae observed the Sabbath, though he admits that being apparently derived from the Hebrews they observed most of the ancient customs in rather a Jewish fashion. Jewish Christians might observe the

[1] *H. E.*, II, 16–17.

Sabbath; but the total silence in regard to the "Lord's day" is not compatible with Christianity. Finally Eusebius substitutes the Paschal feast for that which was either Pentecost or a special festival recurrent every fifty days, and turns the modest banquet and joyful night into fasts and vigils. When we add to these difficulties the fact that there is not a single feature in the description which points to anything distinctively Christian, we can have no hesitation in rejecting the Eusebian hypothesis, either in its original form or with the modifications which some modern writers have given to it. The word μοναστήριον alone makes us pause; but a moment's reflection satisfies us that even here we are not on Christian ground. The term does not describe the abode of a society of monks, but the private chamber in each house which was dedicated to solitary study and prayer.

Eusebius must have been moved by his eagerness to find early and authentic evidence of the presence of Christianity in Alexandria, and accordingly had no reason for calling in question the genuineness of his document. But Grätz[1], accepting the hypothesis that the Therapeutae were Christians in disguise, believed that the work was a Christian forgery written in the interests of monasticism. His arguments, though pronounced by Jost[2] to be "perfectly convincing," failed to command the general assent of scholars, and Zeller's refutation was deemed satisfactory[3]. Kuenen[4], however, lent the high authority of his name to the hypothesis of forgery. But he relied not so much on the arguments of Grätz as on the general "impression of untruthfulness, and, consequently, of spuriousness," which the work itself leaves upon the mind, and on the improbability of several of the details. He also thought it very unlikely that Clement of Alexandria should not have mentioned the Therapeutae, if they existed. He therefore attributed the treatise to a Jewish writer of the third century after Christ, and supposed that his object was to give an ideal picture of ascetic life. Nicolas[5] arrived independently at a similar result, and Derenbourg[6] also supported this side of the question. It was reserved, however, for Lucius[7] to bring about, for a time, a widespread reversal of scholarly judgment. He arrived at the conclusion that the treatise appeared not long before Eusebius, who is the first to cite it, at the end of the third or in the opening years of the fourth

[1] *Gesch. d. Juden*, III, 463 sq.

[2] *Gesch. des Judenthums*, I, p. 214, note 2.

[3] *Phil. der Griech.*, 2nd edit., III, ii. p. 255, note 4.

[4] *Religion of Israel*, III, p. 217 sq.

[5] *Revue de Théol.*, 3ième série, VI, 25–42. See Conybeare, p. 343.

[6] *Journal asiatique*, 1868, p. 282 sq.

[7] *Die Therapeuten u. ihre Stellung in der Gesch. der Askese*, 1879.

century, and that it was the composition of a Christian educated in literature and philosophy, and enamoured of the ascetism of his time, his object being to glorify the ascetic practices of Christians which prevailed everywhere, but especially in his own land of Egypt. For this purpose he assumed the authority of Philo, and hence was obliged to avoid mentioning anything specifically Christian. Zeller, in the third edition of his great work[1], admitted the conclusive character of the arguments adduced by Lucius. Schürer, in a careful review[2], considered that the negative part of the thesis—that the *De Vita Contemplativa* did not proceed from Philo—was proved, and that the positive part—the assertion of Christian authorship—was at least rendered probable. Mr. Conybeare[3] refers to other scholars who acknowledged themselves convinced. In the list I find my own name; and I may be permitted to add a few words in explanation of the quotations which are given from my *Philo Judaeus* on p. 393. These brief sentences were not intended to express any deliberate judgment of my own. My object was not to discuss the genuineness of Philo's writings, but to describe his philosophy as set forth in treatises the genuineness of which was acknowledged. My work was written on the supposition that the *De Vita Contemplativa* was genuine, and the hypothesis of Lucius appeared to me, on the face of it, to be exceedingly improbable. The question, however, had no appreciable effect on my particular line of study, and, being otherwise engaged, I did not give it a very serious examination, but acquiesced provisionally in the opinion of scholars of high repute, whose judgment carried all the more weight because it was pronounced in opposition to their previous conviction. Mr. Conybeare, therefore, finds in me one fully prepared to admit the force of the arguments which he adduces in support of the genuineness of the work. These arguments move upon several lines of evidence, which may be here briefly indicated, while for details recourse must be had to the author's learned dissertations.

The first line of defence rests upon the history of the text. This history is gathered from a careful examination of four sources,—the Greek manuscripts, the excerpts in Eusebius, the ancient Armenian Version, and the old Latin Version. The majority of the Greek manuscripts fall into two groups, called respectively β and γ, the former comprising six, and the latter eight codices. There are, in addition, four manuscripts which have to be considered individually. The whole of these manuscripts are proved by a lacuna, which is filled up in the Armenian Version, to be descended from a common archetype, Σ. On page 483, at the beginning of § 10, Mangey's text

[1] III, ii. p. 307. [2] *Theol. Literaturz.*, 1880, No. 5, 111 sqq. [3] Pp. vi and 326.

is unintelligible. The passage is thus restored by Mr. Conybeare, the words supplied from the Armenian being in square brackets:—*Μετὰ δὲ τὸ κατακλιθῆναι μὲν τοὺς συμπότας ἐν αἷς ἐδήλωσα τάξεσι, στῆναι δὲ τοὺς διακονουμένους ἐν κόσμῳ πρὸς ὑπηρεσίαν ἑτοίμους, [ὁ πρόεδρος αὐτῶν, ὅτε κοινὴ ἡσυχία γέγονεν]—πότε δὲ οὐκ ἔστιν; εἴποι τις ἄν· ἀλλ' ἔτι μᾶλλον ἢ πρότερον, ὡς μηδὲ γρύξαι τινὰ τολμᾶν ἢ ἀναπνεῦσαι βιαιότερον—ζητεῖταί τι τῶν ἐν τοῖς ἱεροῖς γράμμασιν ἢ καὶ ὑπ' ἄλλου προταθέν τι ἐπιλύεται.* The importance of this fact in the present connexion is that it establishes the separate genealogies of the Armenian and our existing Greek codices. We must now take a further step. The Latin Version, although it is fragmentary and inaccurate, is proved by its readings to be the corrupt descendant of Σ. It probably dates from about the middle of the fourth century, and thus Σ is thrown back to a comparatively early period. If now we return to the Armenian Version, it becomes apparent that at least as early as the time of Eusebius there were divergent types of text, which indicate a considerable lapse of time during which the divergences arose. This argument is confirmed by the fact that the Eusebian text points to a third independent type, which on the whole is nearer to the Armenian than to the Greek codices. The argument seems valid that Eusebius did not make his extracts from a work which had been recently sprung upon the market, but from one which had already undergone a long process of transcription. Thus the history of the text is adverse to the hypothesis of Lucius.

The second line of evidence meets us in the *testimonia* which are placed under the text of the treatise. These consist of a vast collection of extracts from the works of Philo, illustrating the language and ideas of the *De Vita Contemplativa*, and tending to show, from the identity of style and thought, that the author is no other than Philo himself. With this valuable body of material we must connect the Commentary, which not only makes some additions to the store, but illustrates the diction of the author by ample quotations from nearly contemporaneous writers, the general result being, in Mr. Conybeare's opinion, to show that the language of the *De Vita Contemplativa* "bears exactly the same relation to that of these writers, as does that of the rest of Philo's works. That is to say, it thoroughly belongs to what Liddell and Scott term the Roman Period of Greek Literature." The language has the closest relations with Plutarch (p. 354). Other important facts are also pointed out. Several words are almost, if not quite, peculiar to Philo. A much larger number, used in the treatise and in the rest of Philo's works, are otherwise rare, except in contemporary authors ("contemporary" being evidently used not in the strict sense, but in that of belonging to the same period of

literary history). Some words are found nowhere else, even in Philo. And lastly, there is a considerable list of "syntactical and other usages, which, being characteristic of Philo in general, are also found in the D.U.C." All this constitutes an important body of evidence; and Schürer, who has derived from it decisive confirmation of his previous scepticism, has nevertheless to admit the strong impression which it leaves that the author of the treatise has "received Philo's language and world of ideas deeply into his own flesh and blood[1]." Schürer further alludes to the fact that the younger philologists in Germany who are most thoroughly acquainted with Philo are satisfied that the work is genuine. In this investigation Massebieau led the way in two excellent articles in the *Revue de l'histoire des religions*[2]. Mr. Conybeare has added enormously to the store of parallels there presented; and as the illustrative passages are fully printed in Greek, the reader has all the material before him which is necessary for forming his own judgment.

The purely literary evidence will affect different men differently. To those who have no difficulty in attributing to the forger a boundless power of refined imitation it will carry little weight. To others who act upon the proverb, *ex pede Herculem*, and believe that successful forgery in the name of an author, if not of high genius, at least of unusual ability and distinguished style, is an exceedingly difficult art, this line of evidence will come with almost overwhelming force. It is easy enough to imitate tricks of style, or to borrow some peculiarities of phrase; but to write in a required style, without betraying any signs of imitation; to introduce perpetual variation into sentences which are nevertheless characteristic; to have shades of thought and suggestion, which remind one of what has been said elsewhere, and nevertheless are delicately modified, and pass easily into another subject; in a word, to preserve the whole flavour of a writer's composition in a treatise which has a theme of its own, and follows its own independent development, may well seem beyond the reach of the forger, and must be held to guarantee the genuineness of a work, unless very weighty arguments can be advanced on the other side.

The third line of evidence is traced in the earlier part of an elaborate "Excursus on the Philonean authorship of the De Uita Contemplatiua." Mr. Conybeare there points out various allusions, in the undoubted works of Philo, to the kind of ascetic life which was led by the Therapeutae, and claims to have established from these allusions the existence of recluses who had withdrawn from

[1] See his review in the *Theol. Literaturz.* for July 20, 1895.

[2] XVI, 1887, pp. 170–198 and 284–319.

Alexandria, and devoted themselves in their solitude to the kind of life which is described in detail in the treatise before us.

Lastly, the same Excursus contains a reply to the various objections which have been brought, especially by Grätz and Lucius, against the genuineness of the work; and, in my judgment, it is shown conclusively that at least several of these are quite untenable, and have no better origin than misapprehension or oversight.

It is impossible here to test the force of these several lines of argument; for the impression which they make depends upon a vast accumulation of material, and an examination of minute questions of thought and language, the discussion of which would carry one far beyond the legitimate bounds of a review. The reader who wishes to form an independent judgment must work through the book for himself; and I must be content with expressing my own opinion that an exceedingly strong case has been made out in defence of the Philonean authorship, and that this ought to command our assent unless very formidable difficulties are presented on the other side. Schürer, in the review already referred to, formulates a series of objections which have confirmed his previous opinion; and as these are probably the strongest which can be still relied on, I may conclude my notice by an attempt to estimate their weight.

In the first place, the collection made by Mr. Conybeare of allusions to the Therapeutic life has satisfied Schürer that Philo knew nothing of the Therapeutae, not only because he fails to mention them where you would expect him to do so, but because he uses expressions which are inconsistent with statements and ideas in the *De Vita Contemplativa*. He appeals, first, to *De Mutatione Nominum*, § 4 (Mang. I, 583). Philo, he says, "speaks here of the perfectly wise, who voluntarily renounce riches and comfort. But he does not betray by a syllable that he is acquainted with a whole colony of such in his immediate neighbourhood; on the contrary, he says such are scarcely to be found (*σπάνιον δὲ καὶ τὸ γένος καὶ μόλις εὑρισκόμενον, πλὴν οὐκ ἀδύνατον γενέσθαι*)." The *De Vita Contemplativa*, on the other hand, says that such people exist in many places, being especially numerous in Egypt, and most of all in the neighbourhood of Alexandria (*πολλαχοῦ μὲν οὖν τῆς οἰκουμένης ἐστὶ τὸ γένος . . . Πλεονάζει δὲ ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ καθ' ἕκαστον τῶν ἐπικαλουμένων νόμων, καὶ μάλιστα περὶ τὴν Ἀλεξάνδρειαν*). The argument from silence may, I think, be dismissed; for it is a form of argument which is always precarious; and there are many curious instances of failure on the part of writers to mention what must have been quite familiar to them. Here, however, we are not without special evidence of Philo's mood; for it is equally strange that he fails to mention the Essenes, who were

probably a much more numerous sect than the Therapeutae. We must not be misled by Schürer's description of the latter as "a whole colony." Philo estimates the number of the Essenes as exceeding four thousand; respecting the number of the Therapeutae we have nothing but probability to guide us. One or two hundred would abundantly satisfy the description which is given of the settlement near Alexandria, for the members are represented as all meeting together, and having a common meal, and it is certainly implied that there was only one assembly in a single room. The apparent contradiction also vanishes on a nearer inspection. Whether you look upon a number as large or small depends entirely on the standard of comparison. In relation to the population of the globe a certain class of men may be exceedingly small, and scarcely to be found; in relation to what you might expect, and compared with total absence, there may be a good many. Now in the passage under consideration, Philo is speaking of those who had absolutely renounced the things of the body, and devoted themselves entirely to pleasing God. There might conceivably be thousands of such men, and nevertheless, considered as a constituent part of the human race, they would be very few. Some went so far as to say that the wise man, and therefore wisdom, were non-existent, for no one had ever been blameless, or ever could be, while bound to a mortal body. Philo contends that wisdom is a real thing, and also its lover, a wise man; and he has a Scripture passage which justified his position—"Enoch pleased God, and was not found." Thus both the thought and the language in this passage are explained by the context, and are not inconsistent with the use of a different kind of language in a different connexion. We may usefully compare some statements in the *Quod omnis Probus Liber*, §§ 10 sqq. (II, 455 sqq.). It is there said that it is not surprising if the truly free do not come forward in great herds; first, because τὰ λίαν καλὰ σπάνια, and secondly, because such men have to avoid the life of cities. But τὸ ὀλίγον, εἰ καὶ σπάνιον, οὐκ ἀνύπαρκτον: for there were the seven wise men of Greece and others; the Magi of Persia; the Gymnosophists of India; the Essenes in Palestine, and they exceeded the number of four thousand. Here we have the contradiction, such as it is, fully exhibited within the limits of the same passage, and Grecian and barbarian lands alike proclaiming that the rare, almost non-existent, race was, after all, pretty numerous. I think, therefore, that Philo's undoubted statements are not inconsistent with the existence of little bodies of recluses scattered over the Roman Empire, forming a very minute fraction even of the Jewish population, and nevertheless, if considered simply by themselves, sufficiently numerous to justify the description in the *De Vita Contemplativa*.

Next, Schürer finds an absolute contradiction between the views expressed in the treatise and the genuine opinions of Philo, as enunciated in *De Profugis*, §§ 4-9 (I, 549-554). I must own myself quite unable to perceive the contradiction. In both treatises the ideal of perfect life is the same, *τὸν ἄμικτον καὶ ἀκοινώνητον μονότροπόν τε καὶ μονωτικὸν βίον*, to use the words of the *De Profugis*; or, to quote a more express statement, *ἄριστον δέ, τὸ ἀνάθημα, τὸ γὰρ θεραπευτικὸν γένος ἀνάθημά ἐστι θεοῦ, ἱερωμένον τὴν μεγάλην ἀρχιερωσύνην αὐτῷ μόνῳ*. So far, then, there is perfect agreement. But in the *De Profugis* this perfect life of contemplation is reserved for the mature man, who has gone through the experience of practical life, and it is said that the truth would properly blame those who inconsiderately forsake (*ἀνεξετάστως ἀπολείπουσι*) the duties of civil life; for they are acting as braggarts, and when without being perfectly purified they come to the courts of Divine service, they will start away from it more quickly than they approached, not enduring its austere way of living and its continuous toil. Of this reserve, says Schürer, there is no mention in the *De Vita Contemplativa*. But why should there be? There Philo is simply describing the Therapeutae; but nowhere in the treatise does he recommend their ideal life as the pattern to be forthwith imitated by all mankind. This alone would form a contradiction. Schürer, however, contends that there were among the Therapeutae some who from their earliest manhood (*ἐκ πρώτης ἡλικίας*) devoted their youth and bloom to the theoretic portion of philosophy, which is most beautiful and divine; and the author evidently finds this not blameworthy, as Philo does, but highly commendable. This is perfectly true; but then the men whom Philo is admonishing in the *De Profugis* are those who had not devoted themselves to either the practical or the theoretic side of philosophy, but were animated by an empty spiritual ambition, and were likely to turn in disgust from a life for which they were totally unprepared. You may blame men for doing a thing "inconsiderately," and without any adequate preparation or natural gift, and praise other men for doing the same thing, if they act advisedly, and in obedience to the call of nature. I may remind the reader that this is a distinction of frequent occurrence in Philo. Jacob represents the *ἀσκητής*, the man who is only striving after the better life; and this is the character with which Philo is dealing in the *De Profugis*, the whole passage being an exposition of the story of Jacob's flight from Esau. But Isaac was the symbol of "self-taught wisdom," and represented the rare souls who seem to live by nature in a diviner atmosphere. For these two orders of mind different rules are necessary. The mass of men must strive like Jacob, and win the right to withdraw from the world and its cares, and give themselves

up to the contemplation of eternal reality; but the few may be offered to God in their childhood, and live from their earliest years in the society of wisdom. It seems to me, then, that the contradiction on which Schürer lays so much stress is purely imaginary. We must add that, as Mr. Conybeare abundantly points out, such admonitions as are contained in the *De Profugis* prove that there must have been among the Jewish youth of Alexandria a disposition to adopt a life of solitary self-renunciation, and an opportunity of doing so must have been afforded by some such society as is sketched in the *De Vita Contemplativa.*

The next point need be noticed only so far as it affects one of the objections of Lucius. Lucius contended that the *De Vita Contemplativa* had all the appearance of a spurious appendix to *Quod omnis Probus Liber;* for it refers to an earlier sketch of the Essenes which is contained in the latter treatise. But the latter itself professes to be the complement of a treatise *Quod omnis Insipiens Servus,* which is no longer extant. These two essays treated the opposite sides of the same philosophical theme, and the Essenes were introduced only as a cursory illustration of the general truth, and accordingly the description of them occupies only a small part, and that not the concluding part, of the extant work. An appendix, therefore, entirely devoted to a panegyric of the Therapeutae is totally out of place. In order to rebut this argument it is not necessary to discuss Mr. Conybeare's view of the *De Vita Contemplativa.* It is sufficient to say that he accepts the suggestion of Massebieau that the description of the Therapeutae followed that of the Essenes which, as we learn from Eusebius, was contained in the Apology. There is no reason for connecting it with the account in the *Quod omnis Probus Liber,* whereas it bears strong marks of being a portion of an apologetic work. Otherwise the prolonged contrast between the Therapeutae and other professors of piety, and between their feasts and those which were held by heathen clubs and celebrated by Greek philosophers, would be quite out of place. The only difficulty which occurs to me in this suggestion arises from the large amount of space devoted to the Therapeutae in comparison with that which is accorded to the Essenes; but this might be explained by the fact that the Essenes were better known to the general public, and were less known to Philo himself. Besides, much as he admired the Essenes, he thought that the Egyptian sect had reached a higher stage of perfection. Whether these suggestions be altogether correct or not, the argument of Lucius at all events rests upon pure conjecture, and must therefore be set aside.

The question whether the feast which took place after forty-nine days was Pentecost or not has no bearing on the reality of the feast

itself or the genuineness of the description. I think Schürer is correct in his remarks on δι' ἑπτὰ ἑβδομάδων, to the meaning of which I have already referred. Massebieau understands the phrase in the usual way, and translates "après chaque intervalle de sept semaines," and points out that other clubs were in the habit of meeting for a common meal a certain number of times every year, so that there is nothing strange in the statement (if that be the correct interpretation) that the members of this ascetic society met together seven times a year.

Finally, Schürer points out what he believes to be serious divergences from the thought of Philo, having first, however, conceded that the monastic ideal of the *De Vita Contemplativa*, be it Jewish or be it Christian, rests almost entirely on the premises of Philo's philosophy.

First he calls attention to an apparent contrariety between the view expressed in regard to the abandonment of wealth in the *De Vita Contemplativa* and in *De Prov.* II, §§ 12–13. In the latter Philo cites the example of Anaxagoras and Democritus to show that the wise man can voluntarily renounce his wealth, and relates only of Anaxagoras the story that he gave up his estates to his cattle. But the author of the former, though he commends these philosophers for giving up their wealth, blames them for not handing it over to their relatives, and extends the story of the cattle to Democritus. Even so; but in both cases the treatment is precisely suited to the object in view. In the *De Prov.* the philosophers are mentioned solely with the view of proving that the miseries which wise men have been forced to endure ought not to shake our faith in Providence; for men like Anaxagoras and Democritus have *voluntarily* renounced the pleasures of life for the sake of virtue. Here it would have been quite out of place to interpose a word of blame. But in the *De Vita Contemplativa* the object is to show the superiority of the Jewish ascetics, and the passage says in effect—"It is all very well to praise your Greek philosophers for giving up their wealth: so far their conduct was right, but they did it in a foolish way, and *our* men acted much more judiciously, following the dictates of benevolence towards others no less than the acquisition of wisdom for themselves." In regard to the story about the cattle we should observe that in the *De Prov.* the two philosophers are referred to separately in successive sections, and it was not necessary to repeat in the case of Democritus what had already been told of Anaxagoras. In the *De Vita Contemplativa* the two are mentioned together, in a couple of lines, as men whom the Greeks celebrated because they suffered their property to be turned into sheep-walks. The story is actually told of Democritus as well as of Anaxagoras, and references to no very recondite authors may be seen in Mr. Conybeare's

notes. A reference to the context, therefore, seems to dissipate entirely the force of this particular criticism.

Next, Schürer affirms that the allusion to fasting, like the grasshoppers which live upon air, betrays a different tendency from Philo's; but he does not show in what way, and I have not discovered the inconsistency. On the other hand, Mr. Conybeare has an interesting textual argument founded on this very passage, in which he tries to prove that the *De Vita Contemplativa* must have been written before the *Quod omnis Probus Liber*; but for this I must refer the reader to the book itself[1].

But Schürer reserves what he considers to be the strongest argument for the end. This is founded on the alleged difference in the estimate of Greek philosophy. Philo learned directly from Plato, and speaks of him only with respect. This of course is a familiar fact, and hardly requires a reference to Siegfried. But the author of the *De Vita Contemplativa*, it is said, heaps insults upon Plato on account of his *Symposium*. I can find nothing in the text to justify such language. The author is anxious to prove that the feasts of the Therapeutae surpass in their temperance and their spirituality not only the wild orgies of some of the heathen clubs, but even the most celebrated banquets among the Greeks, banquets in which no less a man than Socrates took part. For this purpose he selects the *Symposium* of Xenophon and that of Plato, on the ground that they were deemed worthy of memory by men who, both in character and in words, were philosophers. This is the language of compliment rather than of insult, and it is the only thing that is said directly of Plato. The criticism of what took place at the banquet itself is another matter; and from this we can only *infer* an unfavourable judgment to this extent, that Plato would have been better advised not to have recorded it; but even this is not said. And surely, any one who knows the *Symposium* must admit that, in spite of its wonderful literary art and dramatic power, and in spite of the splendid rhapsody of Socrates, leading his hearers up to the love of absolute and eternal beauty, it contains much that would have been utterly repulsive to Philo, and treats without any definite rebuke a vice which was as loathsome to an ancient as to a modern Jew or to a modern Christian. The most ardent admirer of Plato may wish that part of the drunken speech of Alcibiades had never been written, and that it had never been placed on record that even the moral authority of Socrates was not adequate to protect him from the foulest insult, and may deem it strange that Plato betrays no consciousness that there was any insult in the case. If in saying this I am "heaping insults" on Plato, I nevertheless

[1] See p. 277.

regard him with genuine and unaffected admiration; and it may have been possible for an ancient writer, whose morality was not that of the Greeks, to entertain a similarly mingled judgment.

Finally, Schürer is especially struck with the difference observable in a particular point, to which he called attention in 1880, but which is once more emphasized on account of its importance. "According to Philo the ideal man was created without sex, neither man nor woman, or man and woman at the same time (*De Mundi opificio*, § 24 *fin.*; *ibid.* § 46: οὔτ' ἄρρην οὔτε θῆλυς. *Leg. allegor.*, II, § 4: τὸν γενικὸν ἄνθρωπον ἐν ᾧ τὸ ἄρρεν καὶ τὸ θῆλυ γένος φασὶν εἶναι . . .). He follows in this the lead of Plato, who has put forward the same view in the *Symposium*. And like Plato, Philo too explains the love of man and woman as the natural attraction of two separated parts of one living being (*De Mundi opif.*, § 53: ἔρως δ' ἐπιγενόμενος καθάπερ ἑνὸς ζώου διττὰ τμήματα διεστηκότα συναγαγὼν εἰς ταὐτὸν κ.τ.λ.). The author of the *De Vita Contemplativa* mentions also this very myth out of Plato's *Symposium*, but expresses in the strongest possible words his own aversion to such misleading fancies." I quote this statement in full that I may do no injustice to an argument which has been maturing for fifteen years, and which we must therefore suppose to be serious, though it makes one wonder whether Schürer has ever read the *Symposium*.

In the first place, we may remark, so keen a sense of inconsistency might have noticed the flat contradiction in the two passages cited from the confessedly genuine Philo. In one the generic man is said to be neither male nor female, in the other he is said to be both. Verbally no contradiction could be more complete, and if we did not exercise a little criticism we might pronounce it impossible that both statements could have proceeded from the same author. The contradiction, however, is easily resolved. We have only to remember that we are dealing with logical and immaterial ideas, and not with concrete objects. In one aspect the logical genus includes all its species, and therefore the genus man may be said to be both male and female, the two species into which it immediately resolves itself. In another aspect it is without the distinctive marks which belong only to the species, and therefore if you rigidly confine your view to the genus, you may say that it is neither of its species. I mention this example simply to show that care and discrimination must be exercised in judging of seeming contradictions.

And now let us test the alleged difference of opinion. The view which is gravely set down to Plato is expressed in the wildly comic and irreverent speech of Aristophanes. It is at least possible that Philo did not regard Aristophanes as the accepted exponent of Plato's

views, and it is pretty certain that his mind was cast in such a different mould that he would not appreciate the drollery of the man who set the company laughing even before he began to speak, but would rather be repelled and disgusted by this ludicrous way of treating a serious subject. What, then, is the view, not of Plato, but of Aristophanes? One would suppose from Schürer's account that it was a grave Socratic description of the ideal and incorporeal genus of humanity, neither male nor female. But it is nothing of the kind. It is a whimsical account of human nature as it was long ago. The kinds of men were then three, not two as now, namely male and female, and a third common to these two. Every man was round, and had four legs, and four arms, and two faces, with four ears, belonging to one head which was supported on a circular neck. He could walk upright when he liked; but when he wanted to go very fast, he rolled round on his eight limbs like a tumbler. These men were so strong that they were dangerous to the gods; so Zeus hit upon the happy expedient of cutting them in two, as people cut sorb-apples when they are going to preserve them, or as those who cut eggs with hairs. The result was the present race, with its different tendencies in love, which, if the reader likes, he may learn from the Greek. This is what Schürer gravely puts before us as the opinion of Plato adopted by Philo—except indeed that I have not introduced all the absurdities; and it is for passing over in silence this sort of myth that the author of the *De Vita Contemplativa* is pronounced to be other than Philo.

But let us suppose that all this was Plato's opinion, and compare it with Philo's language. The description in the *Symposium* does not use the word σῶμα, but it is perfectly clear that real men of flesh and blood are meant; and accordingly the author of the *De Vita Contemplativa* refers to them as δισωμάτους. Where in Philo is there any intimation that either the primitive man or the generic man had two bodies? Philo's generic man is νοητός, ἀσώματος, . . . ἄφθαρτος φύσει. This alone is sufficient to prove that the two conceptions are utterly different. Philo is moving amid the world of eternal ideas, describing man as he is in the thought of God; the *Symposium* draws a picture of exceedingly fleshly animals. According to Philo himself there is a διαφορὰ παμμεγέθης between the concrete and the ideal man; but the former is ἀνὴρ ἢ γυνή, the human being that we now know, and not the farcical creations of Aristophanes. But what of the two parts of one animal? Philo here simply uses a comparison, καθάπερ ἑνὸς ζώου, as is apparent not only from the phrase itself, but from the context. He is here speaking of the first man, not of the ideal man; and there is no hint of his being, physically, anything but man as we know him now. For a time he was single (εἷς), and impressed

with the characters of the Cosmos and of God. But when woman too was fashioned, he recognized a kindred form, and she on her side saw no other animal more like herself, and modestly welcomed his approach, and so they were brought together like the separated parts of a single animal. How the keen discoverer of contradiction can think this the same as the opinion of Aristophanes passes my comprehension.

Thus it appears to me that Schürer's arguments break down one after another, as soon as they are subjected to a little of that criticism which is so apt to be applied to ancient books, and not to modern hypotheses. Mr. Conybeare's arguments, of which I have only given the broad outlines, remain with undiminished force. To see them in all their details the reader must have recourse to the volume itself, where he will find a wealth of material, a width of scholarship, and careful editing, which are a credit both to the author himself and to the University Press.

JAMES DRUMMOND.

Documents de Paléographie Hébraïque et Arabe publiés avec sept planches photo-lithographiques par ADALBERT MERX. (Leyde, E. J. Brill, 1894.)

ATTEMPTS at reproducing facsimiles were made as early as 1702 (see Prof. M. Steinschneider's essay, headed, *Zur Literatur der hebräischen Palaeographie* in the *Centralblatt für Bibliothekwesen*, IV, pp. 155–165, edited by Dr. O. Hartwig). Naturally, as facsimiles they are more or less successful, but they cannot give an accurate idea of the shape of letters. This could only be completed by the process of photography, an invention which is comparatively recent. We must therefore date photographic reproductions of Hebrew MSS. from the publication of *Facsimiles of Manuscripts and Inscriptions* (Oriental Series), by Dr. W. Wright (*The Palaeographical Society*, 1875–1883). Here a choice was made of early MSS., found in various libraries, beginning with 1073.

These facsimiles are not classified according to the characters employed by Jewish scribes in various countries; moreover, this collection does not pretend to offer specimens of Hebrew writing after the fifteenth century.

An attempt was made to represent the different kinds of Hebrew scripts in the *Facsimiles of Hebrew Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library illustrating the various forms of Rabbinical Characters with Transcriptions*

(Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1886), which is arranged according to the various countries where the Jews gradually brought about the transformation of the original square characters into cursive writings. The following is the classification :—Square, Cursive, and Rabbinic written in Syriac, Arabic, Yemen, Qaraitic, Persian, Greek, Italian, Spanish, Provençal, French, German countries, without regard to dated MSS. This collection represents MSS. in the Bodleian Library which are not always dated. Professor Merx has chosen, in his present publication, to represent Jewish writing in Egypt, of legal documents, by publishing facsimiles, together with transcriptions and French translations, dated 1095, 1115, 1116, 1124, and 1164, acquired during his travels in the East. This publication will be welcomed by specialists in palaeography, also for its legal phraseology in Rabbinic language, as well as for the historical data of the parties, witnesses, and the judges. Prof. Merx does not mention another document in the same writing published by Professors D. Kaufmann and D. H. Müller in the *Mittheilungen aus der Sammlung der Papyrus des Erzherzog Rainer*, Fünfter Band, p. 127 (Wien, 1892).

The forms of the characters in these Egyptian documents are the same as those given in the Oxford Facsimiles as Rabbinic in Syria, and the continuation of the Bodleian catalogue will reproduce documents recently acquired in Egypt, both dated and undated. The same will be the case with the Persian Rabbinic characters. The Oxford publication does not claim to be a manual of Hebrew palaeography in general, but only as far as concerns MSS. possessed by the Bodleian Library, with one exception. It is, indeed, difficult to assign dates to Hebrew MSS., more especially to those written in square characters, a fact which Professor Merx proves in the second chapter, when he refers to a Bible in the Cambridge Library, and which is dated 856 A.D. in the printed catalogue, whilst Kennicott and Zunz refer it to the end of the twelfth century. Professor Merx has forgotten to mention that a facsimile of the page in which the date is found is given in the *Studia Biblica*, where the date assigned to this MS. is fully discussed. The same is the case with the MSS. of the Bible in Cairo and Aleppo. The third chapter contains Hebrew epitaphs found in Egypt, dated the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and he observes that surely older and perhaps very old epitaphs may be found in Egypt for the benefit of Hebrew palaeography. The words אויפי גדר remain a riddle if rightly read. The fifth chapter of Professor Merx's book seeks to show that the Arabs have in some degree accepted the Roman Law as used in the East, with which they became acquainted through the medium of the Jews. Chapters six to eleven are devoted to the four Hebraico-

Arabic documents already mentioned. Here also some expressions are translated in a doubtful way, being technical terms often used in the Talmud, and many post-Talmudic, which are known only to specialists. But these inaccuracies do not lessen the general value of Professor Merx's publication, viz. for Hebrew palaeography. The eleventh chapter gives tomb-inscriptions of the ninth to fourteenth centuries, to be found at Worms and Mayence. To complete his task of Hebrew palaeography, Professor Merx gives a document written at Spires in the fourteenth century. The last chapter treats of a fragment of an Arabic document on a papyrus, dated 691 A. D., which is at present the oldest specimen of its kind.

For the benefit of our readers who are interested in Hebrew palaeography we reproduce a Hebrew epitaph recently found in the province of Valencia in Spain, explained by the indefatigable Don Fidel Fita in the *Boletin de la real Academia de la Historia*, t. xxv, December, 1894 (Madrid), not generally known to our readers. The inscription runs as follows:—

1 This is the tomb of R. Samuel,	1 זה קבר של ר׳ שמואל
2 son of R. Shealthiel the *Nasī*,	2 בר שאלתיאל הנשיא
3 upon whom the house fell and he died	3 שנפל הבית עליו ונפטר
4 under it, Tuesday (may he rest in the garden of Eden!)	4 תחתיה יום שלישי נ״ע
5 the sixteenth day of the month of	5 ששה עשר יום בירח
6 Elul in the year four	6 אלול שנת ארבעת
7 thousand and 800 [years]	7 אלפים ושמונה מאות
8 and fifty seven [years?]	8 וחמשים ושבע ש׳
9 of the creation. May he repose in Eden!	9 ל[בריאת] עולם נ״ע

In spite of some irregularities in this inscription (e. g. the sixteenth of Elul was not on a Tuesday in the year 4857 A. M., and הבית l. 3 is considered as feminine: see the note of M. Israel Levi in the *Boletin*, p. 491), it is certain that we have before us an epitaph written in Spain in the year 1097 A. D., three years prior to that of Leon (see Dr. Chwolson, *Corpus Inscriptionum Hebraicorum*, St. Petersburg, 1882, p. 187).

All these photographic documents will be useful for the history of Hebraico-Rabbinic writings, in so far as they will complete many lacunae in Professor Euting's excellent table of Hebrew alphabets, appended to Professor Chwolson's above-mentioned work. With such publications as we have before us we shall soon emerge from the infancy of Hebrew palaeography. We hope that Professor Merx will continue what he has so well begun, and, moreover, that he will not

be too much annoyed by critics, who take pleasure in finding faults, and pointing them out in rather passionate language. Are these severe critics always accurate in their own publications? we doubt it! Let us take as our motto "laboremus," despite these few malcontents. A. N.

Assab'īniyya, a philosophical poem in Arabic by Mūsā b. Tūbi, together with the Hebrew version and commentary styled Bāttē Hanuefeš by Solomon b. Immānuēl Dapiera, edited and translated by HARTWIG HIRSCHFELD. Abstract from the Report of the Montefiore College. (Luzac & Co.)

WE take great pleasure in congratulating the Montefiore College on the regular continuance of the yearly *Program*, issued by the Principal and Dr. Hirschfeld. After monographs on the historic *Halakhah* by the former, the latter has chosen for his subject a didactical poem in Arabic with a Hebrew translation and commentary. We must not forget to mention that both authors of the *Programs* have used MSS. belonging to the Library of the College, and more especially of those 400 acquired within the last four years. The Arabic poem, composed in the Maghribine dialect, viz. the dialect spoken chiefly in Morocco, is, according to the superscription in the unique Bodleian MS., by Abū Amrān Mūsā b. Tūbi al-Israēli of Sevilla, i. e. by Moses b. Tobiyah of Sevilla. The Hebrew translator and commentator gives as author Moses b. Tūbi, a Maghrebi Jew. If he is correct, and we have no reason to doubt his statement, Moses or his family emigrated from Sevilla to Maghreb: whether voluntarily or forced by persecution, he does not say. Moses, anyhow, composed in the Maghrebi-Arabic dialect, and Dr. Hirschfeld was right in publishing his poem in this dialect, instead of converting it into classical Arabic. He says judiciously, in his prefatory remarks, that "Instead of restoring the classical readings and correcting mistakes in the text itself, I thought it more expedient to leave the latter unchanged, and to place my suggestions in the notes." He was also right in printing the Arabic text in Hebrew square characters, saying that "a transcription in Neskhī would wrongly impair its peculiarity." There was no occasion for the apology for the reproduction of the Hebrew, with which Dr. Hirschfeld begins his Prefatory remarks, "Although the following Arabic text is taken from a unique MS., the evident consistency of its orthography and grammatical forms lends sufficient

philological interest to justify its publication. It was therefore a *conditio sine qua non* that the Hebrew version, which is only a few decades younger, should accompany its reproduction, although it is not distinguished by great literary importance nor handed down by reliable scribes." The Hebrew translation and commentary is by Solomon b. Immanuel ממקומי דפירא לאפטא; the last word, being an abridged formula of the last six words of Deut. xxx. 11, ought to be provided with points. דפירא is given by Dr. Hirschfeld as "of Piera" without saying where this locality is to be found. There is a discussion on the various readings of this word in MSS. in *Histoire littéraire de la France*, t. 27, p. 728 sqq., without coming to any satisfactory result. The word לפטא is explained by Dr. Hirschfeld as the Arabic (in Maghreb) אלאפטא, which means *a hollow-backed, broad-chested man.* However, if פירא is a Romanic word, לפטא, according to our opinion, must also be one, perhaps *lapida.*

The Hebrew text is according to the MSS. in the Montefiore College and in the Royal Library of Munich. The Arabic title mentioned above means 70, the poem consisting of 70 strophes and a postscript, containing, "moral and religious exhortations, in which are interspersed the chief philosophical ideas ripe at the time of the author. It begins with the Aristotelian axiom, adopted by Arabic and Jewish philosophers, that perfect happiness can only be gained by means of perfect metaphysical training." The author closely follows Maimonides' Guide, which is often pointed out by the translator's commentary. As to the date of the author of the poem Dr. Hirschfeld speaks as follows: "We have no direct information as to the age in which the author lived. Steinschneider places it in the first half of the fourteenth century, probably basing his inference on the period of the translator. Considering the probability that the latter was never in personal connexion with the author, it may perhaps be fixed somewhat earlier." We quite agree with Dr. Hirschfeld as to the earlier date, for the reason that the author does not seem to know the similar poem in Hebrew, by the Provençal Levi ben Abraham, composed in 1276 with the title of בתי הנפש והלחשים (see *Histoire littéraire de la France*, t. 27, p. 633 sqq.). Perhaps we might even put the Hebrew translation of Moses' in the thirteenth century by reason of the similarity of the Hebrew title, which is also בתי הנפש.

It would be superfluous to mention that Dr. Hirschfeld gives in the notes his emended readings of the Arabic text from a unique MS. as well as the various reading in the Hebrew text according to the two MSS. Having recently studied many Jewish-Maghrebi texts, which

were published in the JEWISH QUARTERLY and elsewhere, he was able to give a list of grammatical, lexicographical, and metrical peculiarities occurring in this dialect. At the end the reader will find the translation of the Arabic text of the poem, with many useful notes concerning the text, as well as parallel passages of philosophers to which Moses alludes. Thus Dr. Hirschfeld's monograph will prove useful for Jewish bibliography, for Jewish-Arabic philosophy, as well as Arabic grammar and lexicography in the Maghrebine dialect, more especially that of the Jewish writers.

A. N.

Moses b. Samuel hakkohen ibn Chiqitilla nebst den Fragmenten seiner Schriften. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Bibelexegese und der hebräischen Sprachwissenschaft im Mittelalter von Dr. SAMUEL POZNANSKI. (Leipzig, J. C. Hinrichs, 1895.)

THIS monograph of 200 pages has for its object the life and works of the well-known Moses Jiqatilla, exegete, grammarian, and poet. If we say that of our author's works, there exists only a Hebrew translation of Judah Hayuj's grammar composed in Arabic, the reader will be astonished at the material Dr. Poznanski must have collected in various authors in order to accomplish his task. And we may say at once he has well mastered the documents concerning Moses Jiqatilla, which are scattered in the works of successors who quote him. They are chiefly Judah ben Balam, Abraham ben Ezra, the Qamhis, the Qaraite Aaron ben Joseph, Tanhum ben Joseph, David hay-yavani (the Greek), and many others who quote him not very frequently. Our Moses, who lived in Spain towards the end of the eleventh or beginning of the twelfth century, may be considered the first translator of Jewish-Arabic works, viz. the grammar of Hayuj, except his treatise on Punctuation. It seems that our Moses, like the Thabbons at a later time, was called to France (Provence), to do his work for Isaac ben Solomon. This translation was published by the Rev. J. W. Nutt, of All Souls College, Oxford, in 1870. There exists another translation by Abraham ibn Ezra, which had less success than that of Jiqatilla. To judge from quotations which are collected with skill and discernment by Dr. Poznanski, we can say for certain that our Moses wrote commentaries on the Pentateuch, the Prophets, the Psalms, Job, and Canticles, possibly on other books also, although no direct quotations are at present found. Our author seems inclined to critical exegesis like Abraham ibn Ezra, who quotes him often. This subject we hope

to treat in detail on another occasion. That our author wrote poetry we know from Moses ben Ezra and Judah Harizi, who both speak of his excellent poetry, but neither his Arabic nor Hebrew poems have survived, except a couple of lines preserved by the former. This is the subject of the first part of Dr. Poznanski's monograph. The second part treats of Ibn Jiqatilla as exegete. Next comes a chapter in which Moses is appreciated as translator of Hayuj. This is followed by a chapter which contains fragments of our author, viz. from his commentaries of the Bible, of his translation of Hayuj's book of Punctuation, and finally the four poetical lines are repeated for completeness sake. Copious notes to these parts follow, concluding with additions and corrections. They show how well read Dr. Poznanski is in spite of his youth. The introduction gives a summary of the grammatical and exegetical literature before Moses Jiqatilla, which is brief but exhaustive. We congratulate the young author upon his deep learning, and we hope to meet him soon again in the same field.

A. N.

אנשי שם. By SALOMON BUBER. (Krakau, 1895.)

THIS monograph of 250 pages in Hebrew contains biographies and epitaphs of rabbis, chiefs of schools, sub-rabbis, and of the chiefs of the Jewish community, who acted or taught during an epoch of 400 years (1500 to 1890) at Lemberg (Galicia), arranged alphabetically, with additions concerning the history of Lemberg, by the well-known editor of many Midrashim, Herr Salomon Buber. He being connected with the administration of the Jewish community of Lemberg naturally has access to its archives: with the help of these he has been able to master the tedious task. Histories of towns, congregations, and localities are interesting to a limited public, but always to those who are natives of or somehow connected with them. Thus Herr Buber's monograph will have interest for those who live in Lemberg, and perhaps for all Jews in Galicia. The enumeration of the works composed by many of the rabbis and laymen in Lemberg may prove a welcome addition to Hebrew bibliography, if not to Hebrew literature in general. The books composed by the rabbis at so late a period are merely casuistic. Herr Buber is desirous that the tomb-inscriptions extant, or to be found after searching, should be published, and the proceeds of the present book will be devoted to this purpose. Herr Buber is indefatigable; he has just edited a

collection of Midrashim on the five scrolls with his usual excellent method and notes. May he completely recover his health, which is sometimes failing, and thus be enabled to continue editing Midrashim.

A. N.

Midrash Suta. Hagadische Abhandlungen über Schir ha-Schirim, Ruth, Echah und Koheleth, nebst Jalkut zum Buche Echah. Von SALOMON BUBER. (Berlin, 1894. pp. 172, 8vo.)

THE Committee of the Mekizé Nirdamim must have been in great straits for matter to edit when it agreed to include among the publications for this year the *Midrash Suta*, by Herr Buber. The readers of this Review are probably acquainted with Herr Buber's redaction of various Midrashic pieces, and they feel themselves under great obligation to him, especially for his edition of the Pesikta d'R. Kahana.

Herr Buber's work, however, has shown signs of an evident haste, the effects of which students could not fail to observe. Those who read, for instance, the reviews, by specialists, of Herr Buber's editions of the *Midrash Tanchuma*, the *Midrash Mayan Ganim*, and the *Midrash Agadoth*, need no further details. But the most marked effects of this haste are seen in this *Midrash Suta*, which has just now appeared under the auspices of the Mekizé Nirdamim. As the *Midrash Suta* includes also the אגדת שיר השירים, the text of which, with a part of the notes, appeared in Volumes VI and VII of the JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, it need scarcely be said that there is something of a priority controversy between Herr Buber and the writer of these lines. However, priority questions are tedious, and might perhaps lead to personalities in which the writer does not care to indulge. Suffice it to say that Herr Buber, in his haste, did his work in a careless way, every page of his edition betraying the superficial method with which he approached his work.

First, as to his introduction. Students who are acquainted with Herr Buber's introductions, know what delight he takes in carrying them to almost unconscionable and unbearable length. Now if there ever was a work at whose editing the enumeration of the authorities who knew or made use of it was imperative, it was this Midrashim Collection, especially the Agadath Shir Ha-Shirim; for, not only was the world quite ignorant of its existence for centuries, but the only complete copy in which the text has come down to us, is in a most corrupt state. Every quotation made from it by the earlier authorities is therefore not only important

on account of its bibliographical value, but also, because it might prove helpful towards emending the text. But just when every philological and bibliographical consideration required it, Herr Buber chose to be short. Of all the authorities who quoted the Agadath Shir Ha-Shirim, he knows only a paltry half-dozen.

The use made of this Midrash by R. Tobyah b. Eliezer, the author of the לקח טוב, the Paitan, R. Solomon ben Jehudah, and the commentators of the Piyutim, Rashi, R. Moses Tako, the anonymous author of יחוסי תנאים ואמוראים, R. Eliezer of Worms, R. Simon Duran and the author of the מדרש אגדות, has altogether escaped Herr Buber. In addition, Herr Buber, who also possesses a copy of the Yalkut Machiri on the Psalms, must also know that this MS. contains many passages which are only to be found in our Midrash; but he makes no mention of this fact. With regard to the commentary on Canticles, by R. Moses ben Tabun, Herr Buber shows, by his remarks on p. x, that he never read it properly; otherwise he would have known that this commentary contains, besides the one whose acquaintance he evidently made through Herr Epstein, a goodly number of quotations from ב״ר פ׳ ויצא which are only to be found in the Chasitha and in our text. That Herr Buber in his description of the MS. omits to state the fact of the writer's having published the text of Midrash Shir Ha-Shirim in this REVIEW, as well as that of the Seder Olam Suta in the *Monatsschrift,* is perfectly conceivable, since any allusion to these publications and to the writer's name would have amounted to a virtual confession of a lack of originality, which was clearly Herr Buber's earnest desire to evade. But is there any reason why Herr Buber did not mention Zunz, who was the first to refer to this MS. in his *Gottesdienstliche Vorträge* (p. 277, note i, 2nd ed.)? Again, why did he not mention poor Brüll? All the learning displayed in par. 13, p. xvii, is directly copied from Brüll's *Jahrbücher*, VI, 100, and VII, 278, without acknowledging the source. Nor did Herr Buber refer to Ozar Nechmad, I, 10, where it is clear that Reggio was in the possession of a MS. which, among other pieces, contained also the Midrash Ruth in another version, פנים אחירות. What is even worse, he omitted to refer to and make use of the Bodleian MS., No. 152; a MS. of the importance of which Herr Buber speaks in the Mabo to his edition of the Tanchuma, p. 71 b, note 7.

And how did Herr Buber deal with the text? To enumerate all his oversights would require a treatise; to amend them, it would be necessary to reproduce here all the Corrections and Notes to the Midrash Shir Ha-Shirim, contained in the July number of the JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, which has just appeared, as well as those

which are still in the Press. A few specimens, therefore, must satisfy the reader.

In the first place, it is necessary to remark that Herr Buber did *not* give a faithful copy of the text he proposes to edit. It is true, as has been said above, that our text is in a deplorable state. But the recognized rule in such cases is to leave the text intact and indicate the emendations, either by means of brackets, or by giving them in the notes. I adopted the latter alternative as the only possible way of furnishing students with an exact copy of the original MS., without the slightest deviation from the only complete text of the Midrash Suta yet found. For this reason, naturally enough, there will be found occasional divergences between the text published in this REVIEW (JEWISH QUARTERLY) and that contained in the Midrash Suta of Herr Buber. But that is solely due to the fact that Herr Buber took most unpardonable liberties with the text. Thus Herr Buber has quite altered the orthography of the MS. without drawing the least attention to the fact. Our MS. having been executed in France, the scribe writes in the usual way of the Ashkenasim—always *plena*, as מיטתו, עיצה, אילו, שיני, מיכאן, תחילת, הנייה. Herr Buber substitutes the modern orthography, thus destroying the original character of the MS. for the student. Our copyist also writes לישבע for which Herr Buber gives להשבע. In other places—to the number of about fifty—Herr Buber omits or adds words without indicating it. P. 7, l. 14, after יקבנו both the MS. and the Machiri have the words אלו שמות ציון, but Herr Buber omits them. P. 8, l. 14, after חנון ורחום the MS. has the words נפרש של הק״בה, which are all the more important as they indicate that all the proofs from the Bible accompanying the various groups of the seventy names are later additions, but the words are omitted by Herr Buber. On P. 9, l. 9, after the word נתנה Herr Buber leaves out a whole Derasha, שיר חדש . . . ד״א שה״ש, occupying in the MS. about four lines (ed. Schechter, ll. 203–206). P. 13, l. 5, after הזיתים, the Derasha of בראשם . . . ד״א נגילה occurs (ed. S. ll. 338–340) which is guaranteed also by Yalkut Shimoni, but is omitted by Herr Buber. On p. 38, par. 3, there is, after the word נסכים, a blank in the MS. which is followed by the words בטנך ערימת חיטין סוגה בשושנים. Herr Buber found it convenient not to indicate the blank by the customary dots and also omitted the Hebrew words just given. Of course these words are important, showing as they do that some Derasha on this part of the verse is missing—and this Derasha *is* actually to be found in MS. 621. But on p. 36, par. 9, Herr Buber introduces, after the word כלב, a blank which is *not* to be found in the MS. This Buber-made blank

is filled in the MS. by the words סם תסם שמטה. Of course these words have no meaning, but they suggest something like סר צלם שמעו as F nearly has it. Again, on p. 27, Herr Buber omitted a whole Derasha, consisting of four lines from יונתי up to האלהים (ed. S. ll. 889–892), without giving any reason for it or in any way indicating that he is the author of the *lacuna*. To hide his offence, he leaves out the words ד"א at the beginning of par. 14 before יונתי as well as eight lines later, before בחנוי.

Secondly. Can Herr Buber explain why he did not make use of MS. 626, Codex de Rossi, which I quote in my Corrections and Notes as E? This MS. contains fragments which, as will be seen from my quotations, cover about two-thirds of the whole Agadath Shir Ha-Shirim. These not only offer innumerable better readings, but also contain many Derashoth omitted by the neglectful copyist of MS. 541. What excuse can Herr Buber offer for this carelessness? He cannot even plead ignorance, for he refers to this identical MS. in his Introduction to the Midrash Mishle, p. 14 b, under כתב יד ב׳, where he says מן דף 1 עד דף 4 מאמרים קטועים מן מדרש ש׳ ה"ש והם מדרשים אחרים מאשר הוא לפנינו במדרש ש׳ ה"ש. Did Herr Buber write these words or not?

Thirdly. Brevity is not the soul of Herr Buber, and students know how fond he is of giving references, even when he could easily rely on the Masorath Hammidrash. But in our text he was exceptionally short and hasty, to the incalculable damage of his work.

Here are a few instances:—

Page 4. We have the passage מתנה לשלמה . . . ד"א ש׳ ה"ש. Herr Buber in his notes 17 and 18 refers to Aboth and Yadayim, which, of course, "every school-boy knows." But the real parallel to the whole sentence is Midrash Mishle, ch. I,—a book edited by Herr Buber himself!—at the beginning.

Page 9. The passage commencing אמר ר"א בן עזריה and finishing נסלתה מכולם Herr Buber, in note 34, refers to Chasitha, which, as he himself confesses, has a totally different version. The only place where a version similar to ours is to be found is the Midrash Agadoth (p. 170 b), edited by Herr Buber himself!

Ibid. We have the passage of the two angel-songs to which Herr Buber gives no reference whatever, whilst an exact parallel is to be found in Tosephta Sota, VI, Cr. B. T. Sota, 30 b.

Page 10. With regard to the נשיקה על הפה Rashi and the Lekach Tob ought to have been mentioned.

Page 11. Here we have the strange Derashoth of ר׳ חדקא; Herr Buber refers only to the Yalkut. Passing by his neglecting MSS. we can certainly not overlook his omitting to refer to the

פרק ר׳ יאשיה in Jellinek's Beth Hammidrash, V, pp. 112 and 113. The parallel to this latter is the more important on account of its showing the close affinity of the Agadath Shir Ha-Shirim with that class of Messianic Midrashim or Apocalypses to which the פרק ר׳ יאשיה belongs.

Page 14. We have the Derashoth on שמוני נוטרה את הכרמים. The passage is, on account of its enumerating the various eras known to the redactor, of great historical importance, but is unfortunately very corrupt. All that Herr Buber has to say of it is that it "requires explanation," but without feeling any call to supply it. But why did not Herr Buber, at least, look up the partial parallels in Mechilta, 61 a and b, and Seder Olam, ch. XXX, and Chasitha to the same verse, which prove greatly helpful towards correcting the text?

Page 18, note 96. Herr Buber refers to Peah, I, 11. Of course one knows this Mishnah, but the real parallel is Aboth d'R. Nathan, chap. XL, where the words ארבעה דברים occur.

Page 20. ר׳ יונתן העושה מצוה מדוחק וכו׳. Herr Buber has nothing to say about it, though parallels to these passages are to be found in Aboth, III, 7 and IV, 9, and Sabbath, 151 b. But he ought at least to have remembered *his own* Mabo of the Tanchuma, p. 62 b, where the real parallel is to be found. The importance of this parallel consists in the fact that it suggests to us the source of this whole long Zedakah Midrash, extending over nearly seven pages (16–23), which is, as may be seen in my Corrections and Notes, the ילמדנו.

Page 25. Herr Buber reads לו מטב, which is nonsense, but the MS. has מנום, which ought to be corrected into מאונם.

Page 26. ד״א למה נמשלו. Herr Buber omits to give a parallel to Chasitha, yet it would seem that he should have given some sign to his readers that he had not forgotten his own edition of the Pesikta d'R. Kahana (p. 101 b), a reference to which is the more instructive, since it shows the way in which our redactor employed the old Midrashim. R. Tobijah b. Eleazar uses here our text.

Page 27. אחזו לנו שועלים. Herr Buber is silent. But he ought at least to have thought of the Midrash Mishle (c. XIX) also edited by himself, which offers the only real parallel to the passage. Of course we must read ומוסרו למיתה instead of ומייסרו. Herr Buber shows a lack of acquaintance with the works edited by himself, which is strange and surprising.

P. 32, verse 14. Herr Buber reads אורי for אהליאב, but the latter is guaranteed by the Paitan R. Judah b. Menachem, who (in a MS.) has: נרד וכרכום אהליאב ובצלאל הם חנבונים אושרו במלאכת המשכן לשבח ולא לגנאי.

P. 36. The Derasha concerning שישק is given by Rashi in the

name of Midrash Shir Ha-Shirim ; but Herr Buber does not mention this important fact.

The reader is assured that the list of Herr Buber's sins of commission and omission in the single Agadath Shir Ha-Shirim could be easily trebled, not to speak of the other Midrashim contained in the MS. But the reviewer fears to trespass too much on the space of this periodical.

S. SCHECHTER.

CONTRIBUTIONS TO BIBLICAL EXEGESIS BY RUDOLPH VON IHERING.

THE unfortunately unfinished work *Vorgeschichten der Indoeuropäer*, found among the literary remains of the famous lawyer and jurist, Rudolph von Ihering, contains a considerable number of interesting notes on and expositions of Biblical themes which deserve attention, both on account of the author's celebrity as well as for their own intrinsic value. I deem it particularly necessary to call attention to them, because, being the work of one who was not a professed biblical critic, they might easily escape notice.

In harmony with the general purpose of his book, Ihering has specially dealt with the contents of the first chapters of Genesis, the account of the Creation.

One of Ihering's leading conceptions is the theory that the Aryan (the Indo-German) was originally a shepherd and the Babylonian (the Semite) was a tiller of the ground. With this idea he connects the story of Cain and Abel.

"What is the import of the statement that Cain cultivated the soil? The fact placed in the foreground of this legend is true only in regard to the Jewish people; with the dawn of *their* history, agriculture already begins. Cain, i.e. the Jews, in contradistinction to other nations, have always been an agricultural people" (p. 109).

Again: "Cain slays Abel. What is this precisely intended to tell us. If the object of the narrative were only to stigmatize the heinous crime of fratricide, why specially emphasize the circumstances that one of the brothers is a shepherd, the other a husbandman?

"The purpose of the details in the story is obvious. If Cain typifies the early appearance of agriculture, his brother's murder symbolizes the fact that husbandry—the most efficient method of making the earth yield up her wealth—supplants and drives out of the field that less perfect pursuit—the tending of flocks and herds.

"On land suitable for pasture and tillage, the shepherd and husbandman cannot both exist, Abel must give way to Cain" (p. 110).

Ihering might also have added that the shepherd's easy and enviable mode of existence, in its sharp contrast to the toilsome and distasteful occupation of the field labourer, is shadowed forth in Cain's hatred of his brother.

Another wide and brilliantly developed generalization made by Ihering is that the Semites, the agricultural people, were the founders of cities and thus originators of the higher civilization. This is Ihering's explanation of the verse (Gen. iv. 17): "And Cain built a city" "it embodies the conception that among the Semites both agriculture and towns are very ancient, and date from the beginning of history.

"In addition to this assumption of the early antiquity of cities, the legend also involves another assertion which is deserving of the closest attention, viz.—'that it was the farmer who built the towns.' The aim and object of the statement that Cain the tiller of the ground also founded a city, is to my mind as indubitable as that of the detail of his occupation noted in the story of his brother's murder.

"Cain's mental superiority over Abel, evidenced in his choice of agriculture as a profession, is again manifested in the weighty discovery that the town is a necessity to him" (p. 111). Compare also the remarks on the Sacrifices of Cain and Abel (p. 338, &c.).

Ihering also has several notes on the scriptural accounts of the Flood (pp. 191–195), the tower of Babel, and the Confusion of Tongues (pp. 129–134).

His glosses on the Fourth and Fifth Commandments are copious.

Of these I select as noteworthy his explanation of the addition to the Fifth Commandment. "In order that it may be well with thee and that you may live long on earth[1]." This, according to Ihering, means: "If you do not show honour to your parents, then your children will refuse you respect. The evil example set will be copied by your descendants, and thus you will fail to prosper nor will you live long; your children will be as reluctant to provide for you in old age as you have shown yourself toward your parents and thus your days will be shortened" (p. 54, note 56). The objection that the commandment was not addressed to the individual but to the whole nation and that the promise of long life refers, not to each Israelite, but rather to Israel's lengthy tenure of Canaan, Ihering dismisses as devoid of foundation; on the ground that, according to that view, the text should not have read "that you should live long," but "that you should live in the land for ever." That Ihering is totally wrong here may be gathered, at a glance, from the use of the word היום in Deut. v. 30, vi. 6, ii. 3 and similar passages.

On the Fourth Commandment Ihering has a curious hypothesis. Most peculiarly, he explains the words in Deut. v. 15, "Thou shalt remember that thou wast a slave in Egypt," to mean that Israel should rest on the Sabbath, bearing in mind that even in Egypt he

[1] This is Ihering's somewhat free rendering.

was permitted to rest from his hard toil, every seventh day of the week. Ihering briefly remarks (p. 143): "The Israelites' overseers who superintended their tasks (2 Mos. i. 11) allowed them cessation from their labours one day every week." Further on (p. 149) he adds: "The Egyptian task-masters showed no mercy to the Jewish bondmen, but yet they allowed them the seventh day of rest." Starting from this totally unfounded hypothesis Ihering challenges the religious character of the Mosaic Sabbath, and ventures to contend (p. 146) that "the Sabbath was originally only intended as a secular holiday for physical recreation and not a religious festival on which Israel might have the opportunity of glorifying God; it was the Church which first transformed it into the Lord's Day, a conception and an institution of which even the Apostles had not the remotest idea." I only mention this to show into what absurdities deficient knowledge of the sources can mislead even so sound a student and—in his own branch—so profound and acute a scholar as Ihering undoubtedly was.

How little he penetrated into the spirit of the Religion of the Bible and the conceptions of the prophets is also shown in his Excursus on the Monotheism of the Hebrews. To account for his want of breadth and to follow his course of reasoning (p. 299, &c.), one should know the second-rate authorities on which Ihering relied for his information and from which he drew his inspiration.

The reader may with advantage be referred to his remarks on the social and political laws of the Mosaic Code (p. 147), the prohibition of usury (p. 252), the penalty of stoning (p. 177), the sacrifice of the firstborn (p. 342), the fiery furnace into which Daniel was cast (p. 129).

Very fine are the explanations of the two Minatory Addresses, Lev. xxvi and Deut. xxviii (p. 139): "In the list of punishments with which God threatens His people for disobedience to His commandments, fire is not named. All kinds of evil are threatened with the exception of that most destructive visitation. I cannot remember a single instance of a conflagration recorded in the whole Bible or in the Babylonian and Assyrian histories. How significant is this silence, need hardly be discussed. It points to the Semitic custom of erecting edifices of stone while the Aryan was long content with wooden huts." Ihering might also have referred to the enactment concerning leprous houses (Lev. xiv. 33–53), where only stone dwellings are mentioned. Incorrect is his statement (p. 160) that in the Old Testament, the Temple is called Mount of God in allusion to Ps. xlviii. 2, Ezek. xxviii. 14. The latter text does certainly not refer to the Temple, and if the Sanctuary in Jerusalem is called

Mount of God, the title is perfectly justified by its topographical position.

Ihering makes a curious archaeological statement, and indicates the authority which, however, I have been unable to trace. "The ox-skin," he says (p. 32), "was the Roman's most primitive blackboard. The Jews in David's time also made similar use of the bull's hide." Where is the evidence ? Does he find it in the phrase (Ps. xl. 8, במגלת ספר כתוב עלי) perhaps which the authority on whom Ihering relied thought meant a roll of parchment. But why just an ox-hide ? Perhaps some reader will find the solution to the riddle.

One could quote several weighty observations having no direct and immediate bearing on the Bible, but yet relating to the People of the Book. Unfortunately, the paragraph (p. 35) in which he proposed to sketch the characteristics of the Semites is not worked out. But in the sections before us the author found the opportunity of formulating his views on the important rôle the Semite played in the history of civilization; and I cannot deny myself the pleasure of quoting the following passage *in extenso* (p. 281): "The Semite has become the teacher of the Aryan as every one inevitably must become who comes into contact with a mental inferior. Without the Semite's aid, the Aryan would have needed thousands of years to attain his present grade of culture. The Aryan is the heir of the Semite. It was not necessary for him to commence from the beginning, and to learn everything for himself; without effort he has appropriated his teacher's culture."

The following specially concerns the Jewish community, but is not absolutely correct, and almost sounds like an echo—of course well meant—of the social-economic sentiments of the Anti-Semites. It is unnecessary to say that the author of the *Kampf um Recht* condemned unjust attacks on the adherents of Judaism. His remarks are as follows (p. 107): "The Jew is no spendthrift; he takes care of his pence. Hence, riches acquired by a Jewish house are seldom lost by it, while Christian families after a few generations retain little if anything of their acquisitions. . . . It would be interesting to determine statistically in what relative proportions to their numbers Jews and Christians take shares in the state lotteries. I should imagine that the percentage of Jews must be very small." Ihering could have mentioned, had he known them, the Rabbinical Regulations against Gambling, which place games of chance in the same category with theft and plunder.

W. BACHER.

BUDAPEST, 1895.

THE

JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW

JANUARY, 1896

JOSEPH DERENBOURG.

Two years ago it fell to my lot to write a short obituary of my friend Isidore Loeb (JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, V, p. 1). With a sense of grief that deepens as one after another is added to the list of lost friends, I have now to record the death of Joseph Derenbourg, which occurred suddenly on the 29th of July last at the age of eighty-four years, when he was זקן ושבע ימים. The deceased was born at Mayence, and he had to seek the means of making a livelihood which would allow him to continue his studies in Rabbinical literature, as well as in other Semitic languages, like his senior Salomon Munk, since at that time Germany had closed the door of the Universities to Jews. After having accomplished the course of Latin and Greek in the Gymnasium of his native place, he went to the Universities at Giessen and Bonn to begin the study of Semitic languages, and took his degree of Doctor of Philosophy under the famous Professor Freytag in 1834. Simultaneously, as was then the custom with the Jews, he followed the course of instruction of the Jewish schools in the Talmud and its commentaries. J. Derenbourg then accepted a tutorship in a rich family at Amsterdam, but left this lucrative post for Paris, as Munk did, in 1839, where he continued his Oriental studies under Quatremère, Caussin de Perceval, and Reinaud. During his sojourn in Holland, he began his

literary career by articles which appeared in Geiger's *Zeitschrift*. The most important is that on the writings of Isaac ibn Giyath (or Gayath), and extracts from the University library at Leyden, of which Steinschneider afterwards compiled the Catalogue. It is probable that Derenbourg wrote the following essays when still in Holland: (1) with the title *Ueber das letzte Paschahmahl Jesu* (1841), a subject taken up lately by Prof. D. Chwolson in the *Mémoires* of the St. Petersburg Academy, 1892; (2) *Notes on Hebrew Grammar* (1846), both of which appeared in the *Orientalia*, edited by Juynboll, signed *Dernburg*. At the same epoch the deceased began his Arabic publications, which we shall not enumerate, since Mahometan subjects have only a remote right to entry into a Jewish Quarterly. The new edition of Lokman's *Fables*, with a French translation and notes (Berlin, 1847), by the deceased, has an interest for Jewish readers, since Derenbourg identifies Lokman with the name of Balaam.

Between 1848 and 1860 the deceased was obliged to slacken his literary energy, having been forced to seek his daily bread. However, he wrote a notice on Maimonides' *Guide*, which Munk was editing, and went on with his Arabic labours, editing together with M. Reinaud the famous work of Hariri. About 1862 he took up his old studies in Hebrew literature, writing many valuable reviews in the *Journal Asiatique*; he also published notices on Semitic epigraphy, and reverted to his old love, viz. Hebrew Grammar and Massoretic studies. His great knowledge of the last subject he showed by publishing critically with a commentary the famous Yemen Grammar, found in MS., as a kind of Massoretic guide, with the title of *Manuel de Lecture*, which appeared in the *Journal Asiatique* in 1867. M. Derenbourg then turned his attention to Jewish history. He published in 1867 his great work on Jewish history, which appeared under the title of *Essai sur l'histoire et la Géographie de la Palestine d'après les Talmud et les autres sources rabbiniques*, vol. i (history), now out of print.

He planned a second edition, enlarged by recent research, and with the addition of an index which readers missed in the first volume, but we know not how far his revision went, or whether it is found among his papers. The second volume (geography) did not appear at all, and as far as I know only the slips of it exist. For curiosity sake I may mention that after 1871 he entered into a political controversy with Geiger, the latter siding with Germany, while Derenbourg was heart and soul for France. This correspondence exists in print. We cannot enumerate all the minor articles which he wrote after 1870 in the *Journal Asiatique*, of which he was one of the committee of publication, nor those in other periodicals, more especially the *Revue des Études Juives*, his contributions to which would make more than a big volume. Here he tried his hand on Biblical criticism, Hebrew palaeography, on the Mishnah, on grammar. The most important publication was the glosses of Judah ben Balam on Isaiah, according to a MS. at St. Petersburg. He was also member of the committee of the *Revue*, sometime President, and an assiduous contributor. It is curious to mention that Derenbourg did his most important work after his eyes began to fail, and he became, alas, completely blind. He published in this state the Himyaritic part of the *Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum*, issued by the Académie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres, of which he was elected a member in 1871. The same was the case with the publication of Abul Walid's (Jonah ben Jannah) *Opuscula* (1880) and the *Grammar* (1886), both in Arabic ; the former with French translation and with collaboration of his son, M. Hartwig. Others of Derenbourg's publications are the two Hebrew versions of *Calila ve Dimnah*, which appeared in 1881 amongst the publications of the *École des Hautes Études*, where he taught Rabbinic. In this collection he published, also in 1887, *Johannis de Capua Directorium Vitae Humanae*, which is the Latin translation of *Calila ve Dimnah*.

The last great work of the deceased was the edition of

Se adyah Gaon's collected works as far as they exist, in honour of Se adyah's Millennium which fell in 1892. Generous subscriptions came in after the appeal of the octogenarian Derenbourg. He himself published in Stade's *Zeitschrift* a revised translation of Isaiah by Se adyah. At present the edition of the Pentateuch by the deceased; the translation and commentary on Proverbs aided by M. Lambert are published; and, we understand, Isaiah as far as the commentary exists, are ready. Derenbourg chose the collaborators of this arduous work, but M. Lambert will be the pilot now that the master's hand is removed. Our consolation is in the words of the prophet כי לא אלמן ישראל, and the collaborators are of vigorous age.

Derenbourg was for a time member of the Consistoire de Paris; an active member of the Alliance Israélite Universelle, and of the Sociétés des Études Juives. He took part in preparing the Catalogue of the Hebrew MSS. in the National Library, begun by Munk, and continued by him and Adolphe Franck. The deceased was for a long time reader of Semitic for the *Imprimerie Nationale*; in this capacity he was very useful to authors, and especially to beginners. M. Derenbourg was kind hearted in every way, benevolent, and never despaired of the future, despite his terrible affliction. In that respect he was a Jew of the old type, having confidence in the future. He encouraged young students to work. Isidore Loeb, Lambert, and Israel Levi are in some respects his pupils, and those who survive will not easily forget him. To me he was a dear friend for nearly forty years. תנצבה

A. Neubauer.

P. S. I understand that the Committee which is directing the Se adyah publications has placed the continuation of the work in the hands of Prof. H. Derenbourg, son of the deceased. Unfortunately the funds at the disposal of the Committee are almost exhausted.

ON SOME MISCONCEPTIONS OF JUDAISM AND CHRISTIANITY BY EACH OTHER[1].

I ACCEPTED the invitation to become the Honorary President of your Society for the ensuing year with considerable hesitation. In ability and in learning I should cut a poor figure if compared with many of the distinguished men who have been your Presidents in years gone by. But the liberality of spirit manifested in your invitation, and the compliment contained in it both to me personally and through me to the religious community to which I belong, seemed alike so novel and so striking, that I dared not refuse your offer.

Whether you will rue your choice remains, however, to be seen.

Now in casting round for a subject on which to address you, I tried to find one in which my defects of learning might least appear, and in which, on the other hand, my qualities, or may I say, my peculiarity, would have the fullest opportunity and field.

Running the risk of seeming unduly personal, may I briefly state to you wherein that peculiarity, as I suppose, consists?

I will put it to you as impersonally as I can. Let me suppose that one of you, a Christian, lived in a country where the vast majority of the inhabitants professed the Mahommedan religion. Assume, further, that this country was highly civilized, and that in all matters political, social,

[1] An Address delivered before the Theological Society of the University of Glasgow, November 25, 1895.

and even ethical, you were thoroughly identified in interest and feeling with your Musulman fellow-citizens. Imagine, further, that some, perhaps the majority, of your dearest friends were Mahommedans, that you had graduated in a Mahommedan university where all your teachers had been Musulmans, at all events in name, and that the man to whom even religiously you owed the deepest debt of gratitude and enlightenment was, if I may say so, a Broad-mosque Mahommedan priest. Let me further suppose that the literature you read and loved was, in the wide sense of the word, distinctly Mahommedan—so that a Moslem Browning was your favourite poet, or a Moslem 'In Memoriam' your favourite poem;—and finally let me assume that, as would be only natural, you were interested in the history and development of that Mahommedan religion which formed so important and subtle a part of your own intellectual and spiritual environment, and that you had read reverentially, if critically, its sacred writings and early records. Your position, at least to yourself, would be a curious and complex one. For to continue my analogy, I must ask you to make the monstrous and unhistorical assumption that Mahommed and his chief apostles had been themselves Christians, and that Mahommedanism was often regarded as the true development and perfect efflorescence of Christianity. It was an axiom of Mahommedan theology, it almost seemed an axiom of Mahommedan culture, that Christianity was a religion of preparation, or a religion of childhood, or a religion for the hardness of men's hearts, or a religion of contradictions, or a religion of onesidedness, but that Mahommedanism was the religion of fulfilment, the religion of manhood, the religion of love, the religion in which onesided abstractions were united and reconciled in a higher and more truthful unity. Christianity indeed, for all the Musulman divines and philosophers seemed to know or care, had ceased to be when Mahommedanism was born of it.

Now if, in spite of all these arguments and assumptions,

you still remained a Christian and felt no need of change, if, while refusing to believe that the perfect or absolute religion either existed or could exist, you still considered that, in certain important respects, Christianity was, or might become, truer, purer, and wider even than Mahommedanism itself,—if, I say, *this* was your belief, while what we have heard just now were your training and environment, your position might perhaps be regarded as curious by your Mahommedan friends and fellow-citizens as well as by yourself. They would probably add to curious the less gratifying adjectives of unstable and untenable. This, however, by the way. What I wish to indicate is that, with such a belief and such a training, you would approach the *critical study of both* Christianity and Mahommedanism with certain special peculiarities. Many and many a Mahommedan professor and divine would be far abler and far more learned than yourself. But in the study and appraisement of Christianity, would you not have this advantage over them, that you would know it from within, so that much which seemed evil or irrational to them might seem reasonable and ethical to you? The same idea which, when expressed in a Mahommedan form, they understood and loved, they might fail to recognize in its Christian envisagement. But your mingled and complex training, half-Christian and half-Mahommedan, might lead you well, if your mind were open, while maintaining a full allegiance to your own faith, to acquire a truer knowledge and therefore a more impartial admiration for both Mahommedanism and Christianity.

I can even imagine it possible that just because of these very peculiarities, and not because you were very able or very learned, a liberal Mahommedan theological society might invite you to deliver among them a Presidential Address.

Now dropping my rather forced analogy, I naturally ask myself how can I best use or exploit my own peculiarities for *your* benefit?

The answer seems to me to be partly contained in the familiar lines of your own great poet:

> O wad some Pow'r the giftie gie us
> To see oursels as others see us.

It is perhaps no less useful for Christians to know what Jews think of Christianity than for Jews to know what Christians think of Judaism.

But to consider the, if I may say so, *insularly* Jewish conception of Christianity, and the *insularly* Christian conception of Judaism, would be obviously too great a task for a single address. I therefore only propose to touch upon some misconceptions of one by the other, and, in conclusion, upon certain peculiar excellences of either which are commonly claimed as their own special characteristics by both.

There are several obvious reasons why the adherents or expounders of one religion should misrepresent and misconceive another. There is prejudice, there is ignorance, there is the natural habit of ascribing all the virtues to one's own party, nation, or creed. If our party possesses all the virtues (and why else do we belong to it?), nay more, if its virtues are its characteristics, what can there remain for the other party to possess but vices? In vices, or at least in defects, its characteristics lie. Over and above all these natural and obvious reasons, there is the following: the habit we all have of using another religion as a foil to our own.

Comparisons are odious, says the proverb; but just because of their sting therefore are they made. The object of comparisons is to draw contrasts. But the simplest kind of contrast, as well as the most violent, is the contrast between good and bad. The deeper the shadow, the brighter the light. We therefore pick out in the contrasted religion those rites, laws, sayings, and dogmas which best set off the excellence and beauty of our own. All others we neglect. In our own religion we ignore the evil as accidental or

temporary: we accentuate the good as essential and abiding. In the opposed religion, on the other hand, the defective and the evil elements are typical, and the age, where they are most apparent, is for our purposes the most typical age in that religion's history.

And yet, of a truth, religions are much too complicated and delicate for such crude and clumsy comparisons. We cannot squeeze them into our systems and theories and contrasts without doing them violence. Nay, we often misrepresent—it may be by indiscriminate laudation, it may be by philosophic but inaccurate exegesis ('making the implicit explicit')—our own religion, as well as the religion to which and with which we contrast it.

But if I have, by implication and innuendo, accused both Jewish and Christian divines of unhistorical exaggeration, let me hasten to add that in this very address, while reprobating their exaggeration, I shall exaggerate myself. For in order, within my short compass of time, to explain the procedure I deprecate, I must exaggerate it. To make you see it clearly and quickly, I must depict it on a scale which as a fact it rarely assumes, and I must ignore all varieties of manner and degree.

With this caution and proviso, let me put the following question: when a Christian theologian, like Professor Pfleiderer or many another, is comparing and contrasting Christianity with Judaism, what is the Judaism to which he refers? It would be, I believe, most accurately described as a lifeless abstraction obtained by collecting together every feature of the Rabbinical religion, which either is or seems opposed to some characteristic excellence of Christianity. These features massed together he regards as Judaism. Such others as do not agree with them are either entirely ignored or summarily dismissed as exceptional, untypical, uncharacteristic. And by this method he gets a most serviceable and attractive foil.

In using the Old Testament, as an illustration and a proof of the Judaism thus obtained, Christian theologians

seem often to forget that all its twenty-four divisions and not merely the Pentateuch and the book of Esther constitute the Jewish Bible. The procedure they adopt is to regard every sentence which dovetails with modern Christianity, as *not* characteristically Jewish. What *is* typical of Judaism is the remainder. And it is just this remainder, *plus* its monstrous exaggerations and fungoid outgrowths in the Rabbinical literature (while all but these are rigorously ignored) which is *Judaism*.

For example, the fundamental command, "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself," is not characteristically Jewish, but the trivial ordinance, "Thou shalt not sow thy field with two kinds of seed," is delightfully typical. The fifty-eighth chapter of Isaiah, describing the prophetic conception of a fast, is *not* characteristically Jewish, but the formal ritual enjoined in the sixteenth chapter of Leviticus *is*. The omnipresence of God taught in the 139th Psalm is *not* characteristically Jewish, but "I hate them with perfect hatred" *is*. Ecclesiastes is without question the most un-Jewish book in the Old Testament, but I have often seen the pessimism of Ecclesiastes described as characteristic of Judaism, and the pessimism of Judaism proved by an appeal to Ecclesiastes.

The Rabbinical literature is dealt with on similar lines. If one Rabbi says, "Be not like servants who minister to their master upon the condition of receiving a reward," that is *not* characteristically Jewish, but if another says, "According to the labour is the reward," *that* is typical Judaism. If one Rabbi speaks tremblingly of the awful and holy God, before whom all men must bow the knee in fear and awe, you can quote it as characteristic; if another speaks of the forgiving and merciful God before whom fear may be driven out by love, you must ignore it as an unfortunate and accidental intrusion.

In fine, the method of contrasts forbids its employers to attempt a critical appreciation which shall do justice to the varied elements of a complex phenomenon, or to

consider how far the elements of good may throw light upon the elements of evil; it induces them simply and solely to collect the dross and to fashion the foil.

But I must not spend all my time upon one series of misconceptions. Let me therefore now proceed to ask, What does the Jewish divine mean when he contrasts Christianity with Judaism? First of all, what does he mean by Judaism? He means by it not the Judaism of the Rabbis, Christ's contemporaries, but modern Judaism, cleansed, purified, and widened by the progress of the centuries. Or if he does not mean this, he means that precise combination of good and noble elements in the Old Testament and the later literature which constitute the basis of his own religion. By Christianity he means those specific dogmas of the church, which are opposed to *his* Judaism, in their crudest and baldest form. Or again, he means by it those particular passages and incidents in the New Testament which form a foil to his own conception of Judaism. Elements which are common to his own Judaism are not characteristically Christian, nor does he ever pause to inquire whether any of these elements may not indirectly have been either acquired, or at any rate clarified and isolated, for Judaism through the action and influence of Christianity.

Any deep utterance of Jesus, however integral a part of his doctrine as a whole, if it can but be paralleled by a chance adage of the Old Testament or the Talmud, is at once dismissed as wholly untypical. By a combined process of disintegration and parallelism the most essential and certainly the best elements in the moral and religious teaching of the Founder are denied to the credit either of himself or of Christianity. But whatever in the New Testament is most opposed to modern Judaism, that is characteristically Christian. The barren fig-tree and the Gadarene swine, the demons and evil spirits, these are typical. The forced and inaccurate exegesis, the miraculous cures, the doctrine of the end of the world and of the right

neglect of all earthly affairs, the depreciation of family life, the furnace and the gnashing of teeth, the hypocrites and vipers and serpents and children of hell, the spirit of God descending like a dove; these things and all that they imply are characteristic and essential. "Forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive those that trespass against us," is not characteristically Christian, but "These shall go away into everlasting punishment" assuredly is. The beauty of charity is constantly extolled in the Talmud, and therefore the thirteenth chapter of the first Epistle to the Corinthians is not specifically Christian, but if St. Paul asserts that no man can be saved except by believing in Christ, *that* is typical, and perhaps the most characteristically Christian sayings in all the world are the damnatory clauses of the Athanasian Creed.

It is not my purpose in this address to estimate the degree of inaccuracy in the various specific misconceptions of Judaism by Christianity or of Christianity by Judaism. But I shall now proceed to mention some of the misconceptions individually, not to adjudicate upon their measure of error as treated by the Judaism and the Christianity of this or of any bygone age, but in order to show you that the very same misapprehensions which are made by Christians about Judaism are also made by Jews about Christianity! I will not ask whether there now are phases, or whether there have been periods in the history of both religions in which these misapprehensions contained some truth as well as much error, and whether therefore the moral of the whole story is that people who live in glass houses should not throw stones. But through the close similarity of the charges, I will simply draw the moral of toleration and mutual respect on the one hand, and of the grave necessity for the utmost caution and circumspection in religious criticism and theological comparisons upon the other.

1. Apart from its alleged "abstract" and therefore erroneous idea of unity, the Jewish conception of God is commonly

criticized as ethically and spiritually inadequate. The God of Judaism is a God of justice, but he is not a God of love. Moreover, partly because of the external way in which he is regarded—he is without but not within—and partly because the only relation which Jews can know towards him is that of slaves to their lord, while their only service is that of an endless and unfulfillable series of disconnected and arbitrary commands; in virtue of all these reasons the God of Judaism is distant and remote, unapproachable, unattainable, ever sought for, never found. Such, with endless varieties of detail and expansion, is the Christian conception of the Jewish God. Side by side with it let me now place the Jewish conception of the Christian God in its contrast with the God of Judaism.

To the Jewish mind God is a father in very deed—"like as a father pitieth his children, so the Lord pitieth them that fear him"—to *his* mind God is merciful and gracious, slow to anger and plenteous in mercy; to *his* mind God himself, the Father everlasting, is always accessible and near to his human children. Between the child and his Father in heaven there is, and there needs to be, no mediator or go-between. Great as the Father is, he is also ineffably gentle and tender; wherever the Bible mentions God's greatness it also mentions his humility, as the Talmud says: and therefore God the father is ever ready to hearken and to save. Whereas to the Christian, God is so distant and so terrible, that he can only be approached and appeased through a mediator or intercessor, half human and half divine. He will have blood for blood, even if the blood be that of his own son. The justice and love of God are arbitrarily severed from each other: the Father is just, the Son is loving, so that the unity of the divine attributes is weakened and destroyed. The Christian believes in a horrible dogma called the Fall of Man, in virtue of which because our first parents sinned, every subsequent human being is liable to be damned everlastingly with real and material pains. The only method by which this frightful

issue could be averted was by the incarnation of a part of the Deity in the shape of a man, and by his self-chosen death upon the cross. Yet even this strange expedient only partially cancelled the evil effects of God's cruel and unjust decree, for he further arranged that none but those who believed in the dogma of the incarnation should reap its benefits. All others, and most certainly all Jews, Turks and Infidels who, living within the range of Christian influences, are yet not inclined to become Christians, God will surely consign to everlasting damnation in real and unquenchable fire.

2. For a second and very simple misconception of modern Judaism by Christians and of modern Christianity by Jews, let us take the conditions which either religion is supposed to lay down for man's attainment of eternal bliss. The Christian appears to think that the sole condition which Judaism imposes is the external one of race. The future life is the prerogative of the Jew, who will find in heaven ample recompense for his prolonged sufferings upon earth. The heavenly gates are shut upon the Gentile. The Jew, on the other hand, supposes that the Christian idea of salvation is restricted and immoral, his own liberal and generous. For, according to him, Judaism teaches that God looks to character and conduct, and to these only in his capacity as judge. The religious dogmas which a man happens to have been taught and to believe are of no account or importance in this regard: the good life is all. "The righteous of all nations shall have a share in the world to come:" that, according to the Jewish divine, is the doctrine of the Talmud and of modern Judaism[1]. Whereas the Christian, or at least the Protestant, has devised and believes in a terrible dogma called justification by faith, according to which orthodoxy of belief is the

[1] It is certainly the doctrine of modern Judaism. Whether it is the doctrine of the Talmud, I will permit myself to doubt. The mediaeval Talmud in this respect is no better and no worse than the mediaeval Church.

standard by which human destiny beyond the grave is reckoned and adjudged. Conduct is at best an adjunct; without right belief it will, however noble, be wholly without avail. Only true believers may enter at the gates of heaven.

3. No charge is more frequently brought against Judaism than that of a superficial and outward conception of sin. First of all the Jew does not really understand the full heinousness of sin, but secondly—and this is the only point I will make to-day—he adopts an erroneous mental and moral attitude towards it. This is partly due to the fact that he has never realized the true nature of goodness. He thinks goodness is doing; he knows nothing of being. Moreover, good doing is to him the legal performance—neither more nor less—an end of an endless series of isolated commands. Some of these commands are ritual, some are moral, but he puts them both on precisely the same footing of importance. He does not fulfil the moral commands because they are moral, but because they happen to be on the list, as also, by the way, because he hopes by means of them to gain a reward. The consequence is two-fold. Either he obeys a whole string of these commands, and is puffed up with pride and self-righteousness, or he is conscious that there are a number of them which he has been unable to discharge, and is cast down by self-reproach and self-despair. Both these attitudes of mind, be it the proud and Pharisaic sense of "merit" or the apparently equally Pharisaic feeling of despair, serve alike as delightful foils and contrasts to the Christian's conviction of his own personal unworthiness combined with a humble and sustaining belief in his reconciliation to God through Jesus Christ.

An equally delightful contrast is afforded to the Jew by his conception of Christianity in these particulars. The Jew, he says, is humble and yet cheerful. What the all wise and all good God has revealed to him as his duty, that he seeks to do. God has given him the capacity to be

good and to do good, to choose the right and avoid the wrong, within certain limits, but God has made all men frail, and to sin in greater or less degree is a necessity for us all. Hence the Jew throws himself upon the mercy of God, and he believes that that mercy will be freely vouchsafed to him. Much he cannot do: very good he cannot be, but then he is but dust, and his heavenly Father will judge him according to his meagre powers. So simple and so encouraging is the religion of Judaism. Whereas Christianity teaches that the natural man can accomplish nothing, and that his utmost endeavours are nothing worth. All must be done for him supernaturally; by himself and through himself he is powerless. All those who feel no personal and inward assurance of salvation through the accuracy and vividness of their faith can but regard themselves as sinners before God. Their moral virtues avail them nought. Whereas they who have this inward and saving conviction are, and know themselves to be, the salt of the earth: what need for them to labour and to sweat in the heat and dust of social service and moral endeavour? For them the goal is gained; the prize is won. They are filled with smug and puritanic satisfaction in the certainty of their own salvation, in the assurance of their neighbour's doom. Self-righteousness or self-despair, these are the logical issues of Christian theology.

The contrast, you observe, is in this instance, both for Jew and Christian, almost identically the same!

4. A fourth amusing and yet highly instructive misconception may be found in the respective views of Judaism and Christianity (as interpreted by one another) of the relation of this life on earth to another life beyond the grave. It used to be commonly asserted by Christian theologians that Judaism knew nothing, in any proper and spiritual sense, of a future life. The true desire and longing of the Jew were for success and happiness upon earth: his ideal future was of a time when his own people should be restored to Palestine, and, with their feet

upon the neck of their enemies, should be possessed of all imaginable goods—real, tangible, material goods. Here was a capital foil to the Christian's longing for heaven, to his yearning towards that unearthly life where his treasure abides for ever and where his heart is also even now.

The Jewish divine, on the other hand, was (and is still) wont to claim that Judaism assigns to each life its proper value and place. "This world," says the old Jewish rabbi (and our Jewish authorities tell us that he is but giving voice to the general doctrine of Judaism), "this world is like a vestibule before the world to come; prepare thyself in the vestibule that thou mayest enter into the hall." But though the future life, spiritually conceived and interpreted, is as much a dogma of Judaism as of Christianity, yet the life of the vestibule must not be disregarded or treated lightly. We are put in the world to make it better; it is not, and it should not be, as Christianity esteems it, a vale of tears. It is no merit (as Christianity teaches) to despise the innocent joys of earth or to be gloomy and sorrowful: it is as much our duty to laugh with those who laugh as to weep with those that weep, to accompany the bridal procession as to walk beside the funeral bier. Above all, no thought of heaven to come must prevent us from doing all we can to lessen earthly evils, to fight against oppression and cruelty, to rectify social wrongs, to establish social well-being. A kingdom of heaven upon earth must be the aim of man upon the earth: and that too is his best preparation for the life of the world to come.

Such till quite recently was the nature of the contrasts drawn by Jewish and Christian divines on this question of worldliness and other-worldliness. But upon the Christian side the contrast is slowly changing, so that the Jews, who take their cue from their neighbours, will, I suppose, change their contrast likewise.

For the true essence of Christianity is now said to consist not in a life to come, in the ordinary sense of the

word (that is slightly too supernatural for our present moods), but in a regenerate life on earth. "The kingdom of heaven is within you," "The kingdom of heaven is among you;" and these phrases are interpreted to mean that the new Christian principle is slowly to regenerate, in orderly and stable evolution, the life of man upon the earth.

A new contrast is therefore needed, and in these cases where a new contrast is needed it is speedily found! Judaism despaired and despairs of this world: it could and can only hope for improvement and redemption by violent, supernatural interference from an external *Deus ex machina.* This world is bad: man is corrupt: the future is hopeless, unless God in an arbitrary and lawless manner suddenly interposes his rearranging hand from without and creates a new heaven and a new earth. The divine spirit and grace, working from within, and slowly transforming man and his world by orderly sequence and rational law, the human drama regarded as the gradual evolution of God in man to better and fuller self-consciousness—all this, the distinctive note and teaching of true Christianity, is wanting utterly in Judaism.

So Judaism which erewhile loved this world too much, now despairs of it; and Christianity which before took no thought of this world or of the morrow, is now declared to be the religion which teaches gradual evolution and orderly social progress. It is probable that the former and the present contrast will thus be reconciled: it will be said that since abstraction on the one side easily topples over into abstraction upon the other, the Jewish despair of the world was really material love of it in another shape, for all that the Jews hoped to get by the irregular and mechanical interference of God was but another earth, on which they, made righteous by miracle but with hearts unregenerate and unpurified, should wash their feet in the blood of their enemies and exult in riches and prosperity for evermore.

5. As my fifth and last item in the list of misconceptions

I will mention one which properly covers a large ground, but of which I can only just touch upon the fringe or outskirt. I have already mentioned the fact that the Christian theologian is wont to regard Judaism as the preparatory stage of a religious process the culmination or fulfilment of which he sees in Christianity. In Judaism there accordingly inhere all the imperfections characteristic of such a preparatory creed. Christ fulfilled the law. And that is the best thing that can be said of it. Christ, moreover, was a veritable touchstone. The recognition of his divinity, of his higher teaching, of the fact that he did fulfil and thereby supersede the law, marked off, at the time of his earthly career, the open-eyed, humble and unprejudiced Jew from his dull, proud, and jaundiced fellow-countrymen. Even as the few good Jews of his age believed in Christ, so the few good elements of Judaism were absorbed in Christianity, while its remaining elements which were not thus absorbed continued to form and to fashion the characteristics of Rabbinic Judaism from the first century to the present hour. Let me here add that a great and signal instance of imperfection in the Judaism superseded by Christ is its hopeless confusion of ritualism with religion, as exemplified by its dietary laws, its rite of fleshly circumcision, its material sacrifices, and its horror of outward and bodily uncleanness.

How far truth and misconception are here mingled together I stay not to inquire. Without comment I place alongside of this criticism of Judaism the following criticism of Christianity. To the Jewish divine, Christianity rests upon a perversion of scripture only excusable in the ignorant and the unlettered. When God gave his law as "an ordinance for ever," he did not juggle with words and mean for a season. When God said the advent of Messiah should usher in the permanent reign of justice and of peace, he was not deceivingly alluding to a second advent, by which Messiah might perchance make good the fiasco of the first. Christianity is an accommodation and watering-

down of pure ethical monotheism for the benefit of the heathen. It was intended by God as a stepping-stone for the nations on the road to Judaism. The man-God, the Virgin Mary and her worship, the adoration of saints and images and relics are all accommodations. The doctrine of Judaism was too spiritual and pure for the heathen to adopt. A purely spiritual God, without mediator or intercessor, was beyond their ken and comprehension. In other ways, too, Christianity shows how the pure ore of Judaism was mixed with baser metal. An alloy may have been necessary, but it is none the less real. Judaism boldly grapples with the problem of evil, and rests in absolute ideal faith upon the goodness of God. Its trust is unconditioned, though there be nothing between Evil and the Divine Omnipotence. But Christianity attempts to make things easier to the popular mind by the fiction of a Devil, who whether as Satan or Beelzebub or Prince of this World, plays so important and integral a part in Christian religion and theology. The Mosaic sacrificial rites were instituted because nobody at that time could dispense with sacrifices and blood, but Judaism has risen superior to all such conceptions, nay, it rose superior to them even in the teaching of the Prophets. Christianity was, however, compelled to return to the general and popular point of view of the heathen world—"without shedding of blood there can be no remission of sin;" and hence it presented to the heathen mind the materialistic but attractive doctrine of the atonement of Christ. The keynote of the Jewish and Rabbinic theory of Atonement is Repentance, the keynote of the Christian theory is Blood. Thus the same immaturity and prelusiveness which the Christian discerns in Judaism the Jew recognizes in Christianity.

In all the misconceptions which we have been here considering, it would, I think, be shown by an impartial historian of religion that truth and falsehood are strangely blended together. But if you, as Christians, are fully convinced that in these appreciations of Christianity which

I have ventured to submit to you, there is a large percentage of error, of prejudice, and of direct misstatement, I beg of you also to believe that such a percentage is at least as great in the current estimates of Judaism by Christian theologians and philosophers. Shall we do rightly if we say that neither side attempts to understand the other: each seems to move along a separate plane, and the high estimate of its own creed, obtained by a process of elimination and selection, seems to bear no reference and to contain no answer to the weighty attacks involved in the criticisms of the other. And yet perhaps such a creature as the "impartial historian" of religion, to whom I have just alluded, can hardly exist. For can you estimate and understand a religion aright unless you have grown up in it or unless you believe in it? Are not certain aspects, whether of persons or of religions, only knowable by familiarity and by affection? Has not Love peculiar powers of criticism that are all his own? Even faults may have in them a soul of good, and become cherished for what they imply as well as for what they seem and are. May we not to some extent apply to our religions what the wife said of her husband:

> The man was my whole world all the same,
> With his flowers to praise, and his weeds to blame,
> And either or both to love.

And now let me, in the few moments that remain, pass away from misconceptions to something at once more doubtful and yet more positive. Let us imagine that there existed now, or that there should come to exist, a religious community, of which the adherents called themselves neither Jews nor Christians, but simply Theists, like Mr. Voysey's congregation in London, or used some other similar appellation. Let us further imagine that this community had been equally recruited in its formation both from whilom Jews and whilom Christians, and that they attempted to ascertain which among the various tenets of their faith were due more distinctively to

Christianity, and which of them were due more distinctively to Judaism.

I fancy that about some of them they would find it very difficult to come to any final agreement. On a division the numbers would be equal on either side. Assuming that each section still retained a deep affection for the mother faith, it is likely that either party would claim the source of certain common tenets for its own original creed. Thus the Love of God, the deep sense of sin, the need and nature of a true atonement, might probably be claimed alike by both Christian and Jew. Yet with regard to certain other of their tenets, we might perhaps assume a sufficient detachment from the religions of their earlier life to enable them to arrive, by an adequate majority, at some satisfactory understanding.

1. The first entry upon the Jewish list would be the conception of Deity. The love of God which is also justice, the justice of God which is also love: the Unity, manifested alike in God's transcendence beyond the world and in his immanence within it, but most of all in his own self-consciousness, the eternal harmony and changelessness of the divine nature, the absence of intermediary upon the one hand or of enemy upon the other between the human child and the Divine Father, — these things, in which our new community *ex hypothesi* believe, they will regard as a debt they owe not to Christianity but to Judaism.

2. Next to this fundamental conception of their faith, they will regard as Jewish the relation which they believe to subsist between Religion and Morality. Not through belief but through conduct lies the best and surest approach towards God, and in the last resort, however dangerous the opposition, man *is* "justified" of works rather than of faith. "Religion," says Robertson somewhere, "is goodness. To love God and to love man is Christianity: all else is only husk and shell." A Jewish Robertson would say precisely the same, putting Judaism in the place of Christianity, and in the opinion of our latter-day theists, he would say it

with greater truth. To believe in God according to certain metaphysical formulae, to believe in the accuracy of certain narratives or in some particular interpretation of their most doubtful and difficult parts, to believe in three rather than in two or in four fixed "aspects" or ὑποστάσεις of Deity,—these things do not constitute the substance of religion, but rather "to do justice, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God."

3. Hence, as the third entry on the Jewish side of the account, will come that practical desire to redress social wrongs, and to maintain and develop social right, which is so permanent a characteristic of our own age. I know that Christian writers are at present actively engaged in claiming this feature too of an unsectarian and labelless religion as purely Christian, but a truer view of history would, I think, regard it as essentially Jewish, reflected and manifested alike in Jewish legislation, in Jewish prophecy, and in the Jewish life and literature of the later and post-biblical periods. "Seek judgment, relieve the oppressed, judge the fatherless, plead for the widow." "Let judgment run down as waters, and righteousness as a mighty stream." Yes, justice and ever again justice: yes, righteousness and ever again righteousness: these watchwords of religion are intrinsically and essentially Judaic. "Pure religion and undefiled before God and the father is this, to visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction, and to keep himself unspotted from the world." So says St. James. Yes, but does not Luther say that St. James is a Judaizer?

4. A fourth element which the Jewish members of our imaginary religion seem to have contributed to the common stock is the love of the community. Their ideal of life is social: first the home, with all its sanctities—and the Jew always prides himself upon the cohesion and purity of his home life—and then the home broadening out into the wider brotherhood of the religious community. The Jewish idea and ideal of the relation of the individual to

the community come strangely near to the Hellenic idea and ideal of the relation of the citizen to the state. There is nobody and there is nothing between man and God: and yet man is hardly human in isolation, whether from the point of view of politics, or from the point of view of religion. The hermit, or the ascetic, or the monk could never have become religious ideals to any pure development of Judaism, uncrossed by alien influences from without.

5. There is a quality of which modern Jews often boast as regards their own religion, which many thinkers would not regard as a quality at all, and yet our theistic community might be inclined to set it down as a good thing to the credit of the Jewish list. It is simplicity. Our theists and modern Jews seem alike in this: they have few dogmas; and those they have are, in a certain sense, comprehensible by all. "Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God; the Lord is one." "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God." "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself." "Through thy light we see light,"—the doctrines or dogmas contained in verses such as these, which are the common property both of the theist and the Jew, seem to appeal at once to the sage and to the clodhopper, and to be capable of uniting them actively together within a single community. The clodhopper need not feel that his religion is other than the sage's: the sage need not feel that his religion is too hopelessly removed from the clodhopper's. The philosopher will fill out those great and simple sayings with a wider and a deeper meaning: but, in order to accept them as his own, he will not have to explain them away. Simplicity and comprehensive unity, as thus explained and defined, will therefore be put down to the credit of Judaism.

6. A sixth and final Jewish excellence may be found in a quality a little difficult to explain, but yet perfectly real. We might paraphrase it as the religious transfiguration of the natural life. Religion in everyday life is a characteristic Jewish ideal. The profound utterance of the Midrash that "man must serve God with his evil

inclination no less than with his good" contains within it a vital element of Judaism. It means that those sides and elements in life which rest fundamentally upon mere animal impulse—eating and drinking, the procreation of children, the acquisition of wealth—must be transfigured by religion, and become themselves part and parcel of our service of God. Nor, so far as they are themselves a pleasure to the "natural" man, shall they cease to be a pleasure to the man transfigured. For Judaism is essentially a religion of joy, and the Jews have ever found in their service of God, however strangely manifested to unaccustomed eyes, a joy and a beatitude, upon the average, in all probability, deeper, more constant, and more pervading than has accompanied the service of any other religious brotherhood or community. It is customary, in books of Christian theologians, to label only the casuistical dialectic of St. Paul or any other feature of his teaching which is unsympathetic to the writer as specifically Jewish. But there is no more Jewish verse—and we may take it even in a wider or more general sense than he originally meant it—through all his epistles than this: "Whether therefore ye eat or drink, or whatsoever ye do, do all to the glory of God." Even sleep may be turned into a service of God, says Maimonides, quoting the adage of the Talmudic doctors, "Let all thy doings be wrought in heaven's name."

I pass now to those elements in their theistic faith which the members of our imaginary community would ascribe to the influence and credit of Christianity.

1. First of all will come a high and spiritual estimate of suffering and sorrow. "Adversity is the blessing of the New Testament." No race has shown so high a capacity for martyrdom, or has produced so many martyrs, as the Jews. "If there are ranks in suffering, Israel takes precedence of all the nations: if the duration of sorrows and the patience with which they are borne ennoble, the Jews are among the aristocracy of every land." Nevertheless, the adequate appreciation of sorrow and of suf-

fering, and of their place and value in human life, is due rather to Christianity than to Judaism. The philosophic idealism of Plato which taught that it is better to suffer wrong than to inflict it, that the misery of wickedness is greater far than the misery of pain, and that the highest joy may be realized in a life of suffering consciously incurred for the sake of goodness and of truth, was first preached as a religious faith by Jesus and his disciples.

2. And, secondly, they would decide that their conception of sacrifice and self-sacrifice was originally or distinctively Christian. These two items are also mentioned by Paulsen in his delightful *System der Ethik* among the three or four great truths which Christianity has graven on the spiritual life of man. For the honour of the other two Jew and Christian might justly wrangle, but if, as Paulsen puts it, the world realizes that it lives through the voluntary self-sacrifice, even unto death, of the innocent and the just, this should, I fancy, be put down to the distinctive glory of Christianity. It is true that if, as Paulsen also says, the history of humanity be the history of martyrdom, and if the text of the sermon which is constituted by that history be the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah, the ultimate source which we seek is in the Old Testament and not in the New. But it is a singular fact that even as that wonderful chapter is almost unprepared for by what precedes it and wholly fails to influence what follows, so it seems to have had comparatively little effect upon the general trend and development of Jewish theology and religion. If the spring, therefore, lies on Jewish soil, the fructifying river is Christian.

3. Perhaps our imaginary community would put as a third item upon the Christian list their religious views about enemies. They would not fail to allow that the assertion "Thou shalt love *thy* neighbour and hate *thine* enemy," by whomsoever made, was an unfair misrepresentation of Old Testament teaching; but they would agree that the injunction "Bless them that curse you, do good to them

that hate you, pray for them which despitefully use you," and the dying appeal "Father, forgive them; for they know not what they do," suggest an ideal of conduct which, though by none perhaps more conspicuously neglected than by the nominal disciples of their Master, has sunk deep into the human consciousness, and will never lose to the mind of civilized man either its value or its truth.

4. For the fourth item on the Christian side of the account, they would put down the value which their religious tenets compel them to assign to the human souls of all men, whether wise or stupid, bad or good, civilized or outcast. Every man, black or white, cultured or savage, is a child of God, and must therefore have independent value in our own eyes and in the eyes of Deity. Before God the difference between saint and sinner fades away. Even as a unit or a million subtracted from infinity leaves equally infinity, so when we bring our best unto him, we feel that we are unprofitable servants still and no merit pertains to us. The yearning pity for the sinner and the outcast, the humility of the true saver of souls who, while never ceasing to accentuate the horror of sin, bridges over and even annuls the moral chasm between the basest criminal and himself, have been delightful characteristics of both the two great branches of Christianity in their highest and purest forms.

5. As a fifth item they would certainly reckon the absolute freedom of their religion from any connexion with race. "There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: all are one before God." "Before God" the adherents of our imaginary religion are wont to say, and they count it higher than the words of the original: but none the less, they recognize and acknowledge the debt.

6. Then finally, as a sixth and last item (though perhaps the majority might here be smaller), they would assign to the credit of Christianity the very subordinate place occupied in their religion by ritual, and the complete

avoidance by their creed of all possible confusion between outward and inward purity. They would freely allow that the original impetus, nay more, the very terms of their tenet, are prophetic and Jewish: "I desire mercy and not sacrifice," with its many parallels in Old Testament literature, contains the whole doctrine in a nutshell; but at the same time these great sayings were never allowed to exercise adequate influence upon the laws and customs and ritual of the Jewish religion until quite modern days. Christ took up the teaching and enlarged it, so that, upon the whole, his great maxim, "Not that which goeth into the mouth defileth a man: but that which cometh out of the mouth, this defileth a man," must be regarded as original to himself, and the doctrine which is based upon it must be set down to the credit of Christianity.

The members of our imaginary community would do wisely to raise no further debate as to the comparative worth and excellence of the half-dozen items which have been respectively assigned to Jewish and to Christian sources. They will rather be grateful to both religions for the elements of good and truth which they have contributed to the common store. Some of them they will recognize as complementary to each other, none, I think, as antagonistic. Most of them, in a greater or lesser measure of purity, are now possessed alike by both the religions which first produced them; and if either is eager to claim them as its own children and property, that only shows how satisfactorily they have been absorbed by both.

Let us hear the conclusion of the whole matter: the way by which one pilgrim travels seems strange and rugged to another, and yet perhaps it is well for him to learn something of his fellow-pilgrim's road. At least let him realize that the many pathways may all lead Godward, and that the world is richer for that the paths are not a few.

C. G. MONTEFIORE.

JEWISH INFORMERS IN THE MIDDLE AGES.

In the Jewry of the Middle Ages, the Informer was the one person excluded from the consideration for which the Jew is proverbial. With the extinction of the Jewish polity, the administration of the criminal law was long removed from the Jewish people: yet, as regards the informer, it was still in vogue and permitted. In other cases, it was contrary to the spirit of the Jewish law to inflict punishment without due warning; but in the instance to which we refer, punishment was forthwith and summarily dealt out. As a rule, too, the accused had the privilege accorded by law of being present while the testimony of witnesses was being taken; but in this instance, the trial might be conducted and the verdict pronounced in the absence of the accused.

The severity of the rules which governed this exceptional instance found, it is true, its fullest corroboration in the Talmud; but, apart from this consideration, it was a necessity, a social measure, a sort of justice demanded by the exigencies of social life. The Jewry of the Middle Ages resembled a beleaguered city, which had to treat every attempt at betrayal with the utmost rigour. The informer was outlawed, for he it was who increased of his own will the danger into which the community was unwillingly plunged. Thus, according to the Hebrew equivalent in which active and passive form are identical [1], the one who delivers up becomes one who is delivered up.

[1] This is already observed, if not in the actual words, by the hohe R. Löw, and handed down by his pupil R. Jom Tob Heller (תוספות יום טוב, *Nedarim*, X, 3).

The justice which was exercised in this connexion was naturally one without annals. A burial-ground of nameless ones in the midst of the vast burial-place of the Past—such appears retrospectively this piece of silent history. Moreover, evidence is not wanting that in every age there was cause for setting in motion this last sad remnant of the Jewish penal code. We have to thank specially the Responsum-literature of the Hispano-Arabic epoch for our information concerning these obscure incidents, and for the almost unbroken survey of a department of Jewish social life which has remained in the dark.

The earliest accounts with regard to informing among Jews come to us from countries under Arabian rule. Jewish history has handed down in Khalfa Ibn Al-Agâb and his son Chajjim the names of informers who, about 1089, forced a man like Isaac Alfâsi, in consequence of their denunciations, to leave his North-African home and to flee to Spain[1]. Here we see his great pupil, Joseph Ibn Migosh, carrying out with inexorable rigour the rules concerning informers. Two hundred years later, it was still fresh in the memory of Spaniards that the great Talmudic scholar of Lucena had an informer stoned at the outgoing of the Day of Atonement which fell on a Sabbath[2].

Maimûni may just as well, therefore, have had in mind the extreme Maghreb, i.e. Morocco, as Spain, his home in the West, when he from Egypt hands down in his Code of Laws the statement of fact that in the cities of the West the punishment of informers is a matter of daily occurrence[3]. In the Statute which the representatives of the Jewish communities of Catalonia and Valencia signed on Sept. 25, 1354, the extirpation of informers is decided upon as a

[1] Abraham Ibn Daûd (v. *Mediaeval Jewish Chronicles*, ed. Neubauer, p. 75) says: והלשינו בו בארצו כלפה בן אלעגאב וחיים בנו. The North African S^eadyah Ibn Danân (חמדה גנוזה, p. ל) adds רשעים מרשעי ישראל.

[2] זכרון יהודה (*Responsa* of Juda b. Ascher), f. נה: וכן שמענו שסקל ר"י הלוי בן מיגש למסור אחר באליסנה ביוה"כ שחל להיות בשבת בשעת נעילה.

[3] ה' חובל ומזיק, VIII, 11: ומעשים בכל יום בערי המערב להרגם ולמסרם ביד גוים להרגם להכותם ולמסרם כפי רשעם.

public business, for the regulation of which taxes are to be levied[1]. The Jews of Navarre adopt the same measures in 1363 by the Statute of the Aljama of Tudela[2]. The application of this decree against the royal farmer of taxes, Joseph Pichos in Seville, who, with the assent of the king, Don Juan I, was beheaded in his own house on August 21, 1379, was the cause for withdrawing from the Jews of Castille the right of adjudicating in criminal matters[3]. Nevertheless, the resolutions concerning informers remained in force. One of the first measures for which the Spanish exiles, after the persecution of 1391, banded themselves together in North Africa, was directed against such informers[4]. Even those Jews who were natives of North Africa found themselves compelled to turn to the same precautionary measures[5]. Isaac bar Sheshet, who had fled to them across the straits, assured inquirers in Constantine that in the communities of North Spain, Aragon, Valencia, and Catalonia the extirpation of informers was regarded as a sacred duty[6]. Asher ben Jechiel of Toledo, accordingly, does not hesitate one moment to pass sentence of death upon an informer[7]. In like manner, without any scruple, does his son Jacob, in conjunction with the Tribunal of the Rabbis of Toledo, with Joseph

[1] החלוץ, ed. Schor. I, 28: ולכן לשם ה' אלהינו במועל ידים · אורנו כנגד הלצים · וראשונה הסכמנו לבער כל מלשין ומסור אשר ימצא באחת הערים או להדיח עליו הרעה כדי רשעתו לפי ראות עיני הנבררים · ולהפריש כנגד המלשין ההוא מטעם כל הקהלות ולהוציאתם · אמנם שיהיה דבר המלשינות ההיא בדבר כללי יגיע בו נזק הלילה לכלל בני עמנו לא במלשינות פרטי שלא יצא ממנו נזק לכלל. The sense of ולהפריש, which is wrongly explained ib. n. ה, is cleared up by the *Responsa* of Isaac bar Sheshet, No. 79, ונעשו כלם אגדה אחת וכיס אחד יהיה לכלם לבער המלשינים מן העולם.

[2] Kayserling, *Die Juden in Navarra*, p. 76, &c.

[3] Graetz, *Geschichte*, VIII, ed. 3, 40 f.; Kayserling, *Jahrbuch für die Geschichte der Juden*, IV, 272 f.

[4] *Isak bar Scheschet Responsa*, No. 79, וזה כמו שלש שני' עשו כמותם כל קהלות זה המלכות הבאים מארץ אדום.

[5] *Ibid.*

[6] *Ibid.* וזה היה דרך הקהלות הקדושות בספרד בארגון בבלינסיאה וקטלוניא ומצוה גדולה היא זו.

[7] שו"ת הרא"ש, XVI, 1.

Ibn Crispin[1], Joseph ben Joseph Ibn Nahmias, and Moses ben Abraham Ibn Nahmias[2], condemn to death the dreaded informer Joseph ben Samuel, who already in the lifetime of Asher ben Jechiel was declared a prey to the executioner[3]. But though the informer was declared an outlaw, it was yet customary in every case to obtain the assent of the king, and to carry out the death-sentence by means of the authorities of the land. Thus we see in the statute which was decided upon by the Court Rabbi Abraham Benveniste[4] in 1432, that as regards one guilty of repeated acts of betrayal, after judgment had been passed upon him by the Court Rabbi, it was only at the hands of the authorities of the land that the judgment could be carried into effect[5]. And as in Castille, so in North Africa was justice administered in the case of the class of informers. In the same manner as Isaac bar Sheshet, who introduced this practice from Spain[6], do we behold men like Simeon ben Zemach Duran, and even his son Solomon[7], condemn informers to death with relentless determination.

The only gap which occurs in this piece of evidence, extending over four centuries, is in the thirteenth century. So thoroughly had the Almohad persecution crushed the intellectual life of the Jews in Spain, that its traces are to be found in this great gap, evident even in their literature, from the middle of the twelfth till far beyond the middle of the thirteenth century.

We have, nevertheless, preserved to us a monument of this interval of history, which goes far to prove that this evil of Jewish social life in Spain, viz. treachery, was still rampant during that period, that it was a source of anxiety and concern to the community, and helped to keep up the administration of criminal law among the Jews. Solomon

[1] Zunz, *Zur Geschichte*, p. 424 ; Kayserling, *Jahrbuch*, IV, 292, n. 2.

[2] Zunz, *ibid.*, 430 ; Neubauer, in JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, V, 709.

[3] זכרון יהודה, f. 55 b.

[4] Kaufmann, in בית תלמוד edd. Weiss and Friedmann, II, 118.

[5] *Jahrbuch für die Geschichte der Juden*, IV, 311 ; Is. Loeb, *R. E. J.* XIII, 192.

[6] *Responsa*, Nos. 234–39.

[7] שו"ת רשב"ש, No. 177.

Ibn Adret, who otherwise has the merit of illumining by his *Responsa* the dark period of history preceding his appearance, has the further merit of contributing information bearing upon our immediate subject,—information which has hitherto remained in MS. owing to the fear of publishing this memorable *Responsum* together with the many *Responsa* which have appeared in print. The Codex Pococke 280 b in Oxford (now No. 2218), rich in similar choice extracts, has also preserved for us this source of information.

The occurrence with which we are therein made acquainted was rich in dramatic points, rather hinted at than fully described. The mighty conqueror and founder of kingdoms, James I, was yet reigning over Aragon. His long reign was for the Jews under his rule a period of welfare and security[1]. It is true that even he did not withstand the insinuations of the clergy, as is proved by that religious discussion at Barcelona[2], in which, during July 20 and 31, 1263, Moses ben Nachman proved himself so heroic a debater against the convert Pablo Christiani; yet the king even on this occasion showed his sense of justice, and Pope Clement IV had to use his efforts in 1267 to induce James I not to entrust public offices to the Jews[3]. We observe how, in addition to the foes which attacked from without, treachery raged within, and came to the aid of the perpetrators of mischief. Out of Barcelona came the miserable man who, evidently towards the close of King James' life[4], became a source of danger, by reason of his informations, to the community of Catalonia. Descended from a respected family, of a wealthy house, and having lost his possessions early in life, he betook himself to the declining road of

[1] Cf. Steinschneider, extracts from Tourtoulon, Jaime, I, in *Fränkel-Graetz Monatsschrift*, 33, 498 f.; Sal. Kahn, in *Revue des Études Juives*, XIX, 261 ff.; Is. Loeb, ib. XIII, 239; H. Schäfer, *Gesch. von Spanien*, III, 281.

[2] Is. Loeb, *Revue des Études Juives*, XV, 1–18.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 18.

[4] Ibn Adret's words בימי אורגנו המלך הזקן יר"ה refer to this.

criminal ambition, the object of which is to gain power as the prize of wickedness, and to inspire terror when it is no longer possible to command respect. In vain were warnings and threats sent him: he could no more leave the path he had once elected to tread. King James I died at Valencia on July 27, 1276, after a reign of sixty-three years, and his son Pedro III ascended the throne of Aragon. As soon as the Jewish communities of his three kingdoms, Catalonia, Valencia, and Aragon, were suddenly bidden to the presence of the new king, they got scent of the treachery which could have proceeded from no one but the informer in Barcelona. In vain they conjured him to desist at least on this occasion: he clung to them like a gloomy shadow.

His courage increased, for he found favour with the authorities. But there yet lived at the Royal Court, holding positions of influence, the noble pair of brothers, Joseph and Moses Abrabalia[1] or Ravaya, whose names Jewish history has as yet neglected to inscribe upon the roll of honour. It was especially Joseph Abrabalia who, on account of the high station which he occupied (it appears that he was Minister of Finance to the King), knew how to oppose the evil influence of the informer. Both brothers had the ear of the king, and they drew his attention to the machinations of the evil-doer of Barcelona who was deserving of death. At the king's command he was thereupon suddenly seized, and proceedings instituted against him. A royal judge took the depositions of the communities, and they poured forth before him all the complaints which they had long suppressed.

Solomon Ibn Adret had as yet remained away from the lists, though attempts were not wanting to draw him in.

[1] Would this patronymic be derived from the old Spanish Ibn Albalia? The representatives of this family appearing in literature are noticed by Steinschneider, *Hebr. Bibliographie*, XI, 135, n. 1. Concerning Samuel Abravalia, vide Graetz, *Geschichte*, VIII, ed. 3, 60 and 128, n. 1. The inscription on the tomb of Joseph b. Baruch Abrabalia in Cod. Oxford. 215. 7 runs thus according to the information of Dr. H. Brody: ר׳ יוסף בר ברוך אב רב אליה חמשת אלפים וארבע ושמונים ינוח על משכבו אמן.

His peaceable and retiring nature kept him back as long as possible from mixing in public affairs. It was only after years, when an old man, that he was prevailed upon by Abbamare to pronounce a ban against the early study of philosophy and natural science. But the family of the informer himself was anxious to shake him off, and insisted that proceedings be taken against him. In agreement with the congregations, they effected a royal mandate, by which the aged Rabbi Jonah of Girona was ordered to investigate the matter. He was nephew, a brother's son, to the other Rabbi Jonah of Girona who, as pupil of Moses ben Nachman and teacher of Solomon ben Adret, as also as opponent to Moses Maimûni, had gained such considerable renown[1]. Solomon Ibn Adret was to be added to him in the work of investigation; but he would only consent on the condition of an amicable arrangement in the matter: he saw but too clearly the fatal denouement of the proceedings, should justice be allowed to run its course. The matter had, however, gone too far to admit of the possibility of saving the shedding of blood. It had already been laid before the Supreme Judge, and he did not allow the matter to drop. Jonah Ibn Girona, and, as it appears, also Solomon Ibn Adret, were summoned to the king, who bade them take the evidence of the congregations preferring the charge. In vain did they endeavour for a whole year to drag the matter on, and to bring about an understanding between the congregations. They were refused an audience of the king, which they desired for the said purpose: in fact, the delay in the proceedings had so incensed the king, that, from the confines of his kingdom where he happened to be, he gave strict orders that the dilatory Rabbis should be

[1] Asulai's conjecture as regards the two R. Jona Girundi finds support from this passage (v. שם הגרולים): and we also now know whence comes Samuel Shullam's remark in *Juchasin* (ed. London, p. 222 a). The letter in which he read the account of this second R. Jona of Girona, was this *Epistle of Solomon Ibn Adret*, which he must have seen in manuscript. The words וכבר מאר became שמן with Shullam. The passage must be emended thus: ושלח לר' יונה לגירונא ובא בעמל גדול בעבור שניו ור' יונה היה אדם שמן.

brought before him, unless they forthwith announced to the Supreme Judge their decision, which was to be carried into execution by the State authorities. As the family, too, specially one brother of the accused, was bent upon putting an end to the matter, Rabbi Jonah Girundi and Rabbi Solomon ben Adret felt themselves compelled with heavy hearts to allow justice to run her course, and to deliver up the guilty one, who had long forfeited his life, to the king and his judges. Even the death of the chief judge was unable to save him, for the king appointed a successor, who had the sentence carried out. Upon the square in front of the Jewish burial-ground in Barcelona[1] the informer was executed, the veins of his two arms having been opened.

Three years had elapsed since the sorrowful episode which had convulsed all the communities of Aragon. Joseph Abrabalia, who had obtained the sentence of execution from the king, had also been gathered to his fathers: and now that the most powerful advocate of Jewish interests at court had departed, calumny was at work again, and a fresh head added to the hydra of accusation. As though the evil spirit of the condemned could not rest even in death, as though, similar to the vampire of the legend, it had left the tomb to suck the blood of the living, the family of the departed which had insisted upon his condemnation now bethought themselves, and found out that their brother had been innocently destroyed. They gave it out that the Jews had for a long time forfeited the right, according to their own law, of condemning to death, and specially not unless before a tribunal of twenty-three, and where the evidence had not been taken in the presence of the accused. It is true the case was soon quashed: the fresh accusers, who had hoped to triumph over the judges of their executed brother, were refused a hearing by the authorities who had taken part in the sentence: yet for Solomon Ibn Adret the

[1] In Cod. Oxford. 1984 H 12 we read לעשות עור בפרין בית החיים נקרא מון גואיק די ברצלונה.

necessity increased for silencing within the community the attack which had been made and to disclose its groundlessness, to reclaim the memory of so worthy a character as Joseph Abrabalia from the breath of reproach and posthumous calumny. With this end in view, he placed the matter before the Rabbis of North France, to which, according to Spaniards, Germany is sometimes reckoned [1], giving the question with all its details and circumstances, as to whether the sentence of death which had been passed upon the informer of Barcelona had been fully justified according to the Talmud. But one answer has been preserved: it stands, however, for a hundred. No less a personage than the most respected head of the Rabbinate in Germany, Rabbi Meir of Rothenburg, ranked himself clearly and decidedly on the side of Ibn Adret.

Though no date whatsoever has been handed down to us, yet we can fix the time of these events with approximate certainty. We have to confine ourselves within the narrow limits of the reign of Don Pedro III, within the nine years between 1276 and 1285. About the turn of the year 1280 the incident of this execution in Barcelona may be placed: so that we should not go far wrong in fixing 1283 as the date of the death of Joseph Abrabalia. The war of King Philip of France against Catalonia had not yet begun: the Jewish community of Girona, one portion of which (according to the evidence of Ibn Adret [2]) had of its own accord, before the invasion of the French, i.e. before June 27, 1285, fled to Barcelona, was still in peaceful ignorance of the sad event at that city, and flourished under the lead of the aged teacher, Rabbi Jona.

The theme proposed by Solomon Ibn Adret is transformed in his hands into a comprehensive expression of opinion,

[1] In his letter, *Israel. Letterbode* (ed. Roest, IV, 127), Ibn Adret distinguishes between חכמי צרפת and רבני אשכנז.

[2] מנחת קנאות, p. 179, No. 101: וזכור אני כשיצא קהל גירונא מעירם כשצר עליהם מלך ערפת והיתה העיר קרובה ליר"פש (?) אותם שהגיעו הנה חדשו כתובותיהן לנשיהם. Cf. Fr. W. Schirrmacher, *Geschichte von Spanien*, V, 51.

which passes in review the Talmudic principles of the last remnant of Jewish criminal law as advanced against the accusers concerned, adding citations from recent literature and from examples of the law as applied in practice. In addition, we gather from it that during the period for which all proofs have hitherto been wanting, viz. the thirteenth century, the rigid prosecution of informers did not fall into desuetude in all the kingdoms of Castille and Aragon, as well as Catalonia: and for this information we are indebted not alone to the examples which Ibn Adret quotes of his own times, but also to those of a former generation which were at his command[1].

The evidence itself of Catalonian communities against the informer of Barcelona, which had accompanied the question submitted by Ibn Adret, the true historic material, has not been preserved: yet we have his epistle with objections added, which a learned copyist did not dare suppress. Rabbi Meir of Rothenburg, however, was so fully satisfied with his exposition that he attached himself to his views. He knew by experience in Germany the dangers of informing too well not to join issue in the attempt to employ measures for the suppression of the evil. And though his Responsum to Ibn Adret is not preserved in his own collections, yet there are extant a sufficient number of expressions of opinion on his part[2], to testify to the growth of the evil of informing in his own land. In very truth, in Germany, where the government did not come to the help of the Jews in combating this evil amongst them, matters were much worse than in Spain and among the Arabs. For was not Samuel Schlettstadt, Rabbi of Strassburg, constrained in 1370 to have sentence of death against an informer carried into execution, bringing

[1] וכן עושים מעשה בכל יום בארץ קסטיליא ונהגו לעשות כן בבני גרולי הדור שהיו שם וכן במלכות אראגון גם מעשים היו בקאטלוניא בדור שלפנינו גם ברורנו זה.

[2] Cf. שערי תשובות מהרם בר ברוך, ed. M. Bloch, Nos. 277, 278, 313, 317. Cf. Güdemann, *Geschichte des Erziehungswesens und der Cultur der Juden in Frankreich und Deutschland*, p. 139.

upon himself troubles, which resulted in his flight to the East[1]? One need but glance at the sorrowful account given by Joselmann of Rosheim[2], the splendid patron of the German Jews, to see what terrible results followed such denunciations in cities and countries. The expulsion of the Jews in Bavaria, the well-known expulsion from Augsburg, Nuremberg, Regensburg, persecutions in Posen, Frankfurt[3], and Worms, he traces to the work of informers, whose cursed names he transmits. Does it not suffice to mention that of Pfefferkorn to remind us of one of the saddest epochs in the history of German Jewry, so ripe in suffering? As far as the seventeenth century, we have instances of the dreaded rule of individual informers, such as a Kräusche[4], concerning whom the saying is yet in vogue — Kräusche makes denunciation after death; for, with his dying breath, he did the base act of calling the attention of the authorities to the manner in which the Jews would deal with his corpse, with regard to which he had previously, acting as a hypocrite by feigning repentance, requested that the four modes of death referred to in the Talmud should be dealt out to it. To the same list should be added Hirschel Meyer[5], of the Ghetto of Vienna before the expulsion in 1670.

This canker of Jewish social life, namely, denunciation, seems to have held out longest and to have worked its dreadful effects in Poland. Notwithstanding that, when the last trace of the independent administration of criminal law among the Jews had died out elsewhere, and punishments like cutting out the tongue, blinding, and cutting off the ears were freely carried here into practice, with the assent of the

[1] Vide Joselmann of Rosheim's unfortunately corrupt account in Frankel-Graetz's *Monatsch.* 1875, p. 409; and Graetz's *History*, VIII, 3, 12, n. 2.

[2] Edited by Neubauer, in *Israel. Letterbode*, VI, 137–41.

[3] Cf. the *Responsum* of R. Moses Alschaich, which Perles in Frankel-Graetz, *Monatsch.* 1879, p. 287, rightly refers to Frankfurt.

[4] Cf. B. H. Auerbach, ברית אברהם, p. 25*; Carmoly, in *Ben Chananja*, III, 512–14.

[5] *Die letzte Vertreibung der Juden aus Wien*, p. 55, n. 1.

authorities[1], it is yet a fact that the work of the informer with all its dire concomitants, died hardest in this country. It is said that, as late as the close of the last century, a Jewish informer in Posen was condemned by a tribunal of Rabbis, and justice administered in his case[2]. As a survival of that gloomy phenomenon of mediaeval history, there had long existed in the Ritual of Congregations a prayer, which was repeated on Mondays and Thursdays and at other times, against this social evil, and which in various lands was extant in manuscript for the use of the readers of congregations[3]. Excommunication and execution had thus yielded to prayer and imprecation, until even this last trace of medieval times, reminding us of the action and reaction of oppression, vanished from view as the shades of night before the dawn of the morning.

D. KAUFMANN.

אגרת להרש"בא ז"ל

Cod. Pococke 280 b, ff. 159 b–165 b (No. 2218).

זאת האגרת שלח רבינו הגדול מורנו הרש"בא זלה"ה על ענין מסור קרה בעיר ברצלוֹנָה בימיו והיה מן המשפחות המעולות אשר שם וקרוביו שלמים וכן רבים ודנוהו הקהלות למיתה כי הוקז משתי זרועותיו ברחוב אשר לפני בית הקברות אשר בעיר ברצלונה · ואחר פטירת הפרנס הגדול השר ומעולה ה"ר יוסף אַבְרַאבַאלְיָא נ"ע קמו אהבי המסור ההוא באמרם שלא כדין ושלא כהלכה דנוהו למיתה · וקם הרב הנ"ז זלה"ה ושלח את האגרת הזאת לרבני צרפת להודיעם דבר המשפט ואשמת המסור ההוא להשקיט ריבות קרוביו · ולחתום פיהם למען לא יהיה נדד כנף ופצה פה ומצפצף עליו ועל השרים האחים הפרנס הגדול ר" יוסף ור' משה בני אברבאליא העמדים על (פה) פקידות הממלכה אשר סָבבו השיגו מיתת

[1] Perles, *History of the Jews in Posen*, p. 97, n. 85. According to Jacob Emden, his father R. Zebi Aschkenasi had, as Rabbi in Lemberg, the right of sentencing to death; cf. Ch. N. Dembitzer, כלילת יופי, I, צח a.

[2] Perles, *ibid.*

[3] Cf. Kaufmann, in *Berliners Magazin*, 17, 291, and Samson Wertheimer, p. 67 n.

המסור ההוא בעצת הקהלות הקדושות אשר הסכימו כלם על דבר מיתתו ומשפטו :

אין הדור מתקלקל אלא לגדוליו · ואם יתנכר במעלליו · מי יחוש יותר מבעליו · ואם עלה שועל ופרץ אמרים לגדולי ישראל גדור ולנסיכי אדם בלא לב ולב לעדור · אין שעירים ירקדו שם · יקומו השרים ויעבור מלכם לפניהם וה׳ בראשם · ואל מי מקדושים נפנה כי אם אליכם · ומי יקום לנו עם מרעים כי אם יד עזרתכם · אם אתם בירכתי מדרש ובפאתי היכל קול מהיכל עובר בערים · ומוראכם וחתכם חקוקים בששר בשערים · כמה יפרצו ויעבורו · כמה יאבלו על ימין ועל שמאל יגזורו · לולי שם ומורא תעבור על ראשם · על כן מלכינו ושרינו אדירנו כל חפצינו מורינו ורבינו אם תראו שועלים מעפרים בעפר (כ)[ב]שעלים · עוקרים את התחומים · ומשיגים את הגבולים · אל תאמרו למוסרכם ומקלכם את החבלים אסוף ידיך · קראו למקלכם את נעם רבה צבאיך וצאה וגדודיך · זרוק מרה והכה וּרְבה כי עתה לולי אתם תחרישו ולא תבנו טירת כסף על החומה · ולא תרחצו הליכות בחמה · ירבו הפרצים · מקולות מחצצים · ועתה רבותינו שמעו אלינו וישמע אליכם אלי״ם · הארץ הזאת שלמה היתה ומקרוב חפרוה עכברים · צלולה היתה ועכרוה בערים · גדורה היתה ופרצוה מלשני סתרים · חוריה ואין שם פורץ בפניהם מוסרים · ואחרי מות הזקנים קמו הנערים · לאמר עצתנו תקום וכל חפצנו נעשה עד שקם אחד בארצנו ארץ קטלוניא נער היה ומקטנותו יצא לעורר מדנים לא נשא פני זקנים · ואינִי מספר אחריו ולא אאריך בענינו · בשכבר קבל דינו · ואתם גם אתם תעמדו עליו מתוך העדות אשר העידו עליו בבתי דינים שבכל הארץ מקצה המלכות ועד קצהו וְעלה עשנו בעיני הקהלות · כי לפי הנשמע יצאו להם מתחת [ידו] הרבה תקלות · ואם המכשלה לרבים בימי אדוננו המלך הזקן יר״ה · גם אחרי מלוך אדוננו זה יר״ה העמיק ועשה עד שגבה לבו להשחית הכל ולהיות הוא באפס יד דין ואדון בלי כסף כי ביתו ריקן · ובן עשיר היה ונתרוקן · וחשב לבוקק הארץ ולהכות אותה חרם והרבה קָצו בו הקהלות לתקלות הראשונות · ולא תכיל הארץ את דבריו על האחרונות · והתרו בו לשוב מאחריהם פן מרה תהיה לו באחרונה על אשר חשב · ואמר לשוב ולא שב · ויהי היום נקראו כל הקהלות לפני אדוננו המלך יר״ה קהלות קטלונייא וקהלות מלכות ואלינצי״יה וקהלות מלכות אַרַגון וחשבו באמת שהוא גרם להם והלשין כי איש לשון היה מאד וּבררו כל קהל וקהל אנשים מגדוליהם

ובלכתם קראו את זה ובקשו ממנו לבלתי לכת אחריהם והודה להם ·
וכמעט שעבר מהם שב במרוצתו והלך אחריהם והתרו בו פעם שניה ולא
נכנע מפניהם אך הקשה את רוחו ואמץ את לבבו כי פח יקוש על כל
דרכיו · גם שלוחי הקהלות ראו כי רודף היה ונועצו לב יחדו עם השרים
הגדולים האחים הפרנס הגדול הסוכן רבי יוסף אברבא״ליה ור׳ משה
אברבאליה אחיו העמדים על פקידות הממלכה ואמרו לאדוננו המלך יר״ה
כי בן מות הוא על מה שעשה הרבה פעמים · גם אדוננו המלך יר״ה אהב
משפט ותפשו וענה בכבל רגלו · גם טוענ׳ הקהלות וברוריהם נאספו עליו
והרבה דנו עליו במצות הקהלות לפני אחד מחכמי המלך ויועציו ושפטיו
ובכל זה ידי לא היתה בו · יוצא ובא הייתי בין הקהלות ולא יכלו עמהם
שאכנס ביניהם כלל עד שירדו להם כמה קהלות עם אחי האיש וקרוביו
שיקחו חותם[1] מאת אדוננו המלך יר״ה שיבא הענין ביד החכם הגדול ר׳
יונה בגירונדא בן אחי אביו של מורי הרב ר׳ יונה זצ״ל · וזקן ויושב
שישיבה הוא · גם אנכי הצעיר בררו אותי להיות עמו אמרתי אני לא
לכנס לעולם לדון עליו מן הדין כי אם מדרך פשרה אם אוכל לפשר
והתריתי בקרוביו לפשר באותו חותם שיבא הענין לידינו בפשרה כי מדעת(ו)[י]
אם מן הדין בן מות הוא והם פרעו כל עצתי ולקחו חותם שנראה אם
עשה דבר שראוי למות עליו ונגד עצתנו · לאותו חכם דַינו של אדוננו
יר״ה ואנכי לא ידעתי אשר כן עשו וקרוב אני לומר שגם הם היו רוצים
במיתתו מפני שאף הם הרבה שתו[2] מידו · סוף דבר שלח אדוננו המלך
יר״ה אחר החכם הגדול ר״ יונה הנ״ז ובא בעמל גדול כי זקן האיש וכבד
מאד וצוה אותנו אדוננו לקבל עדויות וצוה לכל הקהלות להחרים שכל
מי שיודע עליו עדות שיבא ויעיד לפני כל ב״ד וב״ד שבכל עיר ועיר וישלחו
לנו ולפי מה שנראה נגיד עצתנו לו או לדיננו הנ״ז · ואנחנו דחינו הרבה
לעשות כן עד קרוב לשנים עשר חדש שחרים רצון מן הקהלות להטיל
פשרה ולא אבו שמוע ויראתם אם יחבל לקעקע כל הבירה · עוד השתחוינו
לפני המלך אדוננו יר״ה על הדבר הזה ולא קבל עד אשר בעם המלך וצוה
[ל]קחת ולתפוש אותנו ולשלוח אותנו אסורים לפניו והוא בקצה המלכות
או נשלח עצתנו על דינו · גם אחי האיש היה אוחז בכנף מעילנו תמיד
לעשות ברצון אדוננו ולהגיד אליו מה דינו כי טוב שימות הוא משימותו

[1] Comp. ההלוץ, I, 29 ; להוציא חותם, להפיק חותם, 31, 32, 33 ; ספר בר ששת, Resp. 228 ; יש להם חותם מאדונינו המלך ; and so often.

[2] Kethuboth, 8 b.

אחריו כל בית אביו ברוב יגיעות והוצאות מרובות הוצרכנו להגיד לאדוננו יר״ה מה שנראה בעינינו · שיכול הוא לעשות כדינו וראינו כי בן מות הוא אם ירצה להמיתו לפי מה שאמר הוא בעצמו בפנינו ולפי מה שהעידו עליו בכל ב״ד וב״ד מלבד מה שהוחזק בכך והנני שולח אליכם טופסי העדויות שהעידו מקצתם בפניו ומקצתם בפני מי שמנה תחתיו לדון בפנינו ולקבל העדויות כי הוא היה אסור בזיקים · ומקצתם בפני שלוחיו ושלוחי הקהלות בכל עיר ועיר · ואחרי כל זאת שלח אדוננו המלך יר״ה הדַּיָן הנ״ז אשר לו לדון אותו על פי שיעצנו אנו · והוא חזר וטען כי עוד יש לו טענות לטעון ונתן לו הדין הנ״ז טיעון עם מורשי הקהלות וברוריהם ונסתלקנו אנו · ובנתים מת הדין ה״נז אשר למלך ולקץ ימים שלח המלך וצוה לפקידו להמיתו וכן עשה · ועתה אחר עבור ענין זה כשלש שנים נפטר בעון הדור הפרנס הגדול השר העומד על בני עמנו בחצר אדוננו המלך יר״ה הוא הפרנס הסוכן ר׳ יוסף אברבא״ליה נ״ע וחשבו אחי הנדון כי לא ימצאו עוד הקהלות יד חזקה בחצר ועמד אחד מאחיו וקם תחת אחיו מלשני ואמר לאחד מדַּייני המלך כי אנו יעצנו שלא כדין מפני שאין לנו לדון דיני נפשות וכ״ש בח״ל ואף בכל זמן צריך ב״ד של כ״ג ושיקבלו העדות בפניו · ותהלה לא בוש ממעשיו כי חשב להגביר ללשונו ונפל ואמר למַעט קלונו וכפל · הפך את הגלל וקרע בגדיו מתוך השל · ואמנם שלא יעמד מלשני אחר ויעמד ויערער ויחתור בכותל ובאו בו פריצים ושלא יעשה אחד מוכס כל המשפחה מוכסים ואני כותב מה שסמכנו עליו ליתן עצתנו לאדוננו המלך יר״ה על דינו:

ואתם רבותינו עליכם לגדור את הגדר בפני הארי פן יבאו וירשו ארץ בינינו וביניכם בית המרי אם לא נקדם בפניהם במקלות ורועים · ירבו הצבועים · אנא תנו עיניכם ב(כ)[ב]ירה [1] פן ירבו עוברי עבירה וראו ראיותנו והתחכמו עליהם · אם ראיתם אותם ישרות כלם או מקצתם וידענו כי אחרי הסכמתכם לא יהיה מורד ומפטפט · כי אין אחד מחכמי(ה)[כ]ם נשפט אלא שופט · ויהי עד דובר שקר במתג ורסן בלום · שהטוען אחר מעשה בית דין שלכם לא אמר כלום · תחלת כל הדברים אמרנו זה רודף היה ורודף נהרג בכל זמן בין בארץ בין בח״ל וא״פי שלא בב״ד מדר״ שילא בפ׳ הרואה [2] ומדאמר לו דוד לשאול מן התורה מותר להרגך מאי טעמא רודף אתה והתורה אמרה הבא להרגך השכם להרגו ואפ״י רודף למסור ממון מדרב כהנא בפ׳ הנזל בתרא דאמר ליה לא תחוי ואמר

[1] Jer. Pes. VII, f. 38 a. [2] Berach., f. 58 a.

מחוינא [ו]מחוינא ושמטיה לקועיה[1] · ומי שאינו מוחזק בכך אין ממיתים אותו אלא אחר מעשה אבל מי שהוחזק בכך ממיתים אותו בין בשעת מעשה בין לאחר מעשה וכל הקודם זכה להרוג את המורגלים להזיק וכדתניא המינין והמסורות והמשומדין והאפיקורוסין מורידין ולא מעלין[2] ואפי׳ להרגן בידים שהרי הם כנחש ששני אלו מוקשין שנא״ אם ישך הנחש בלא לחש ואין יתרון לבעל הלשון[3] שאין לשני אלו לחש ואינם בני תרבות כלל אחר שהורגלו בכך · וכדתניא במ׳ ב״ק[4] נחש מועד לעולם ולפיכך נחש כל הקודם להרגו זכה וכדר״ עקיבא בפר׳ דיני ממונות קמא[5] א״עג דפליגי עליה דרבנן כותיה קי״ל מדקיימי מיהו ור׳ אליע״ בחדא שיטת׳ וכן פסקו הגאונים ז״ל וכן עושים מעשה במסור מוחזק להרוג אותו בידים בהרבה מקומות שבישראל וכן כתב והעיד הרמ״בם ז״ל בחבורו[6] שכן עושים מעשה בכל ערי המערב · וכן עושים מעשה בכל יום בארץ קסטיליא ונהגו לעשות כן בפני גדולי הדור שהיו שם · וכן במלכות אראגון · גם מעשים היו בקאטלוניא בדור שלפנינו גם בדורנו זה · ואפי״ היתה ההלכה רופפת בידינו היינו יכולים לעשות ע״פ מה שעשו הראשונים וגם מחזיקים בו האחרונים אע״פ שאינם נביאים בני נביאים הם[7] ואמרו בירושלמי[8] כל הלכה שהיא רופפת בידך ואינך יודע מה טיבה צא וראה היאך צבור נוהגים ונהוג כן · ואיזהו מוחזק כל שנודע לרבים שהוא כן לא שהוחזק בב״ד של כ״ג · ושקבלו עדיו בפניו שא״כ אין לך מוחזק עכשו שאין לנו ב״ד מומחים · והרי החכמים מחברי הספרים שהעידו וכתבו שהמסור המוחזק הורגים אותו בכל זמן והנעשה עַנְוָתן ומרחם על או נעשה אכזר על דורו וכמ״ש בהנ(זי)[יו]קין בעו למקטליה כי היכא דלא לימא א״ר יוחנן ענותנותו של ר״ זכריה בן אבטולם שרפה ביתינו וחרבה היכלנו והגלַתנו מארצנו[9] · עוד אחרת כי בעון הדור התחילו קצת אנשים ללמוד האומנות הנפסדת הזאת כי אין מדה מחזקת כל הרעות כזאת כי היא היתה אם מיתת כל חי · וכל שהשעה צריכה לכך מכין ועונשין שלא מן הדין בכל מקום ובכל זמן לגדור את הדבר · כאותו שרכב על הסוס בשבת בימי יונים והביאוהו לב״ד ורגמוהו[10] · וכמעשה דר׳ שמעון בן שטח שתלה

[1] Baba K., f. 117 a.
[2] Aboda sara, f. 26 b.
[3] Eccles. x. 11; cf. Taanith, f. 8 a, and Arachin, f. 15 b.
[4] Baba K., I, 4.
[5] Sanhedrin, f. 15 b.
[6] ה׳ חובל ומזיק, VIII. 11.
[7] Pesachim, f. 66 b.
[8] J. Pea, VII, f. 20 c.
[9] Gittin, f. 56 a.
[10] Sanhedrin, f. 46 a.

שמונים נשים באשקלון[1] א ״פ שאין תולים נשים ואין דנים שנים ביום אחד · וכן עושים מעשה בכל יום ובכל מקום וכן כתבו הגאונים מחברי הספרים ז״ל ובאלו ובכיוצא באלו אין משגיחין בב״ד של כ״ג וסמוכים ולקבל עדיו בפנינו ולכלכל כל הדברים הצריכים בדיני נפשות שאין הולכים בכל אלו אלא אחר ידיעת האמת ולסלק הנזקים ולעשות גדרים בפני פרצות והם כעין הוראות אלו דרב הונא קץ ידא כדאיתא בפ״ כל היד[2] וריש גלותא דא״ל לרב אחא בר יעקב פוק חזי אי ודאי קטל נפשא ליכהייו לעיניה כדאיתא פ״ הבורר[3] · ומוסף על זה לענין מה שאמרו שאין לקבל עדים שלא בפני בעל דין אנו אומרים שאפ״י בדיני נפשות אין מקבלים לפעמים שהרי אמרו[4] היה הוא חולה או עדיו חולים או שהיו רצופים ללכת למדינת הים מקבלים שלא בפניו ואפ״י בשלא שלחו ולא בא היה המימרא וכן פירשה הרא״בד ז״ל והוא הנכון וכ״ש זה שהיה אסור בזיקים ואין לומר לעדים שילכו אצל העדים בכל עיר ועיר עם זה ושיקבצו כלם כאחד · ואם נפשך לומר שלא אמרו כן אלא בדיני ממונות אבל בדיני נפשות אין מקבלים אלא בפניו משום שנ״א והועד בבעליו והראיה מדאמרינן בשלהי שור שנגח ד׳ וה׳ בפלוגתא דר׳ יעקב אי מהדרת ליה ניהליה כשלא נגמר דינו הוה מע(קר)[רק]נא ליה לתורא לאגמא[5] · אלא אלו הוה באגמא לא הוה אפשר להו לגמור דיניה ולא היא דהתם מחמת דין קאמר וגמר דין שלא בפניו לא אפשר משום דדלמא אי הוה הכא הוה טעון ושור לאו בר טענתא הוא גזרת הכתוב הוא דאקשיה לבעלים וכטעמיהו דרבנן ור׳ יעקב אבל בקבלת עדות לא איכפת לן כל שיש צריך לכך במי שהיה חולה או עדיו חולים שהרי לאחר קבלתם יכול הוא לטעון ולפסול עדיו · וכ״כ הרב רבינו יצחק בעל העטור משמן של גדולי ישראל[6] ותדע לך דהא בודאי דיני ממונות נמי מוהועד בבעליו נפקא להו כדאית׳ בהדיא בפ״ גוזל בתרא[7] · וכיון דתרוייהו מקרא נפקא להו מאן פליג לך בין האי להאי ועוד דאפ״י במקום שצריך בפניו אפוטרופוס שלו כמהו דקא מוקמינן אפוטרופוס לשור של יתומים לשווייה מועד כדאיתא בפ״ שור שנגח ד״ ו״ה[8] ושליח כאפוטרופוס כדתני׳ בפ״ נערה המאורסה[9] האומר לאפוטרופוס כל נדרים שתדור אשתי עד שאבוא ממקום פלוני הפר לה והפר יהיו מופרים ת״ל אישה יקימנו ואשה יפרנו א״ל ר״ יונתן מצינו

[1] Sanhedrin, VI, 6.
[2] Nidda, f. 13 b.
[3] Sanhedrin, f. 27 a, l. וה בורר.
[4] Baba K., f. 112 b.
[5] Ibid., f. 45 a.
[6] Ittur, ed. Venedig, 1608, f. 33 d.
[7] Baba K., f. 112 b.
[8] Ibid., f. 39 b.
[9] Nedarim, f. 72 b.

בבל התורה כלה ששלוחו של אדם כמותו וכן ב״פ השולח [l. השואל][1] מוקמינן האומר לשלוחו צא והשאל על פרתו כפלוגתייהו משום דהתם נמי כתיב מעוט בעליו עמו בעליו אין עמו הא בכל התורה מודו ששלוחו של אדם כמותו:

זה איני מן הרש״בא זל׳ ואני תמה מה יעשה הרב ז״ל בההיא דשלהי החובל[2] ׳ דתניא מועד שהמית והזיק דנים אותו בדיני ממונות וחוזרים ודנים אותו בדיני נפשות ואי קדמי ודנוהו בדיני נפשות נסתלק דינו בדיני ממונות ׳ וכי קדמי ודנוהו בדיני נפשות ניהדר ונידייניה דיני ממונות ׳ ופריק רבא בגון שברח בעליו של שור ופרש״י ז״ל הילכך אי אפשר לחזור לדיני ממונות דאין חבין לאדם שלא בפניו ׳ פ״ לפי דבעינן והועד בבעליו ר״ל יבא בעל השור ויעמד על שורו וליכא ׳ ואקשינן אי כשברח מיירי מעיקרא היכי נדייניה בדיני נפשות ופריק בגון דקבילו סהדי בפניו וברח ושמעינן מהכא דקבלת עדות בעינן בפניו בדיני נפשות אע״פ שברח דיש צורך לכך ׳ ואע״פ שא״א לומר לב״ד שילכו אחריו עם העדים ׳ ואין מקבלים עדות שלא בפניו ולפיכך אי לאו דמסתפינא אמינא שאין מקבלין עדות בדיני נפשות שלא בפניו כדמשמע הכא וה״ה שאין דנין שלא בפניו והוא דנקט הכא[3] כגון דקבילו סהדי וברח דלא אמר״י נמי כגון דקבילו סהדי וגמרו דינו וברח הכי נמי קאמר ונקט מילתא דעבדי בקמיתא וה״ה לגמר דין דעבדי ליה בתר הכי ׳ או אפשר דקבלת עדות עקר ובעינן בפניו בדיני נפשות ובגמר דין דשור לא איכפת לן אי דנין שלא בפני בעליו כיון דאיתיה לשור קמי דינא ע״כ:

עוד הגה״ה עליה ׳ דברי הרב ז״ל מן המתמיהים בעיני מי דמי ואם אמרו שלוחו של אדם כמותו היינו שכל כה שיש למשלח יש לשליח כגון שעשאו שליח וכל מה שהוא יכול לעשות בשלו שלוחו יכול לעשות דשלוחו כמותו ׳ אבל מה שהוא עושה בשל אחרים אין שלוחו יכול לעשות כן הילכך לענין קבלת עדות בפניו שאנו אומרים דטעמא דקרא כדי שיראה אותו העד ויתביש ממנו להעיד עדות שקר אין הכח הזה נתן לשלוחו דא״ע״ג שאין אדם מעיז פניו בפני מי שיודע בו שהוא משקר מ״מ במי שאינו יודע מעיז ומעיז ׳ ע״כ נחזור לדברים הראשונים שלוחו של אדם כמותו ואם תאמר מעשה דינאי מלכא בפּ כהן גדול[4] דעבדיה קטל נפשא ושלחו ליה עבדך קטל נפשא ושלחיה ושלחו ליה תא את נמי

[1] Baba M., f. 96 a.
[2] Baba K., f. 90 b.
[3] Ibid., f. 91 a.
[4] Sanhedrin, f. 19 a.

דכתיב והועד בבעליו אמאי לא שוייה שליח דהוא מקפד הוה קפיד כדקאמר ליה שמעון בן שטח עמוד על רגליך ויעידו בך · אמר ליה לא כמו שאתה אומר · יש לומר אין הכי נמי אלא מעשה שהיה כך היה · וה״נ [l. וא״נ] כל היכא דאיפשר לא משוה שליח משום כבוד ב״ד והיינו נמי שאמר ליה עמוד על רגליך אע״פ שאפשר לי למחול משום כבודו כדרך שמוחלים לתלמיד חכם אלא שכבוד ב״ד היינו כבוד שמים שנא״ ועמכם בדבר המשפט[1] · וזה שאמר לו שמעון בן שטח לא לפנינו אתה עומד אלא לפני מי שאמר והיה העולם · וגדולה מכל אלו בנדון שלפנינו שאנו לא דננו אלא נשאל נשאלנו מאת המלך יר״ה לראות בעינינו ולהגיד לו עצתנו לפי מה שעשה ואמרנו שהוא יכול להמיתו לפי שלא נאמרו כל הדברים הללו אלא בדיני סנהדרין מגזרת הכתוב אבל בדינא דמלכותא אין משגיחין בכל אלו:

הגהה · גם זה פלא והרי כיון שהמלך הרגו על פי עצתם ועל פיהם לא היה להם להעוד לפני המלך הואיל ובדיני ישראל לא היה ראוי למות בשביל עדויות אלו שהרי בממון הקל אמרו בפ״ הגוזל בתרא[2] האי בר ישראל דידע בהאי דינא ואזיל ומסהיד בדיני הגוים לישראל חבריה משמתינן ליה מ״ט אינהו מפקי ממונא אפומא דחד סהדא כלומר הלכך כיוון שהם מפיקים ממון על פי עד אחד ובדיננו אין מוציאין נמצא שעד גורם לגזול ממונו של ישראל חברו והכא נמי לא שנא · ע״כ אין משגיחין בכל אלו · שאין דינם אלא אחר ידיעת האמת ונהרג בדיני המלכות אף ע״פ קרובים ואפי״ ע״פ עצמו ושלא בהתראה ושלא ב״כג שאין דין המלכות אלא אחר ידיעת האמת · כי אם אין אתה אומר כן אלא שאתה מעמיד הכל על דין תורה בדין סנהדרין היה העולם שמם שירבו הרצחנים והבריהת · וכדר׳ עקיבא אלו הייתי בסנהדרין לא היה אדם נהרג מעולם[3] · ואמרו כל הסנהדרין שהרגו שני פעמים נק״ קטלנית · ותדע שהרי דוד והרג שתי פעמים על פי עצמן של נדונים ושלמה דן והרג את יואב אע״פ שלא היה נהרג בדיני הסנהדרין כשהרג שני שרי צבאות ישראל וכו״ אע״פי שאמרו ב״פ נגמר הדין[4] אלא ההוא גברא מורד במלכות הוה · לטענתו השיבוהו שהיה טוען שהרג את עמשא ודנוהו כמורד במלכות · אבל דוד כבר פירש ענשו על אשר המית שני שרי צבאות ישראל ותדע דלאו מורד במלכות הוה שהרי לא מרד בדוד

[1] 2 Chron. xix. 6; cf. Sanhedrin, f. 6 b. [2] Baba K., f. 113 b.
[3] Maccoth, I, 10. [4] Sanhedrin, f. 49 a.

אלא שנטה אחרי אדוניה להמליכו אחרי מות דוד · ושלמה עדין לא מלך והמורד בו לאו מורד במלכות הוה באותה שעה · וגדולה מזו אמרה לו אביגיל לדוד עדין שאול קים ולא יצא טבעך בעולם והודה לה כדכתיב ברוך טעמך וברוכה את כדאיתא בפ״ק דמגילה[1] · ואלו היה מלך שואל אותנו יכולים היינו לומר שמן הדין יכול הוא להרגו אחר שחטא באיזה דבר מהדברים שחייב עליהם מיתה · אחר שנודע זה באמת אע״פ שלא העידו עליו בפניו ושהיתה עדות מיוחדת ושלא בב״ד של כ״ג שכל דברים הללו לא מעלה ולא מוריד לידיעת האמת ואין דין המלכות רק אחר ידיעת האמת ממי שאמרו ואפי׳ הוא עצמו או אחרים שלא בפניו ושלא בפני ב״ד · עוד גדולה מזו שהרי ר׳ אלעזר ברבי שמעון תפס גנבי ורשיעי בהרמנא דמלכא ועניש וקטיל להו וכן ר׳ ישמעאל ב״ר יוסי ואע״ג דאמר ליה ר׳ יאושע ן׳ קרחה חומין בן יין עד מתי אתה מוסר עמו של אלי״נו להריגה[2] · וכן אמר ליה אליהו ג״כ[3] מ״מ לא נשוי לר׳ אלעזר ולר׳ ישמעאל (ב)[כ]טועים גמורים בדינים מפורשים אלא שמחמת חסידותם היה להם להמנע מלהרוג על מה שלא חיבה התורה מיתה גמורה וכיוצא בה וזה שקראוהו חומין בן יין לומר שלא היו נוהגים בחסידות כאבותיהם ואלו היו טועים גמורים ועושים שלא כדין לא קראוהו חמין בן יין אלא טועים ורשעים גמורים · חלילה וחס לגדולי ישראל וחסידי עליון כמותם ור׳ אלעזר בר שמעון כבר בדק עצמו וכזהב יצא[4] · ועוד תדע מדאמר ליה ר׳ ישמעאל לאליהו מאי אעביד הרמנא דמלכא ואהדר ליה אליהו אבוך ברח לעַסְיָא ואת ברח ללוּדְקְיָא ואילו היה אסור גמור אמאי קאמר הרמנא דמלכא הוה היה לו ליהרג ואל יעבור כההוא דאמר ליה מארי דוראי קטיל לפלניא ואי לא קטילנא לך[5] · ואליהו נמי לימא ליה מאי חזית דדמך סומק טפי[6] אלא ודאי כדאמרנא · שכל שהוא ממונ׳ על כך מן המלך דן ועושה כאלו במשפטי המלוכה כי המלך במשפטים אלו יעמיד ארץ והא דתנן מלך לא דן ולא דנין אותו ואוקימנא במלכי ישראל אבל במלכי ב״ד דן ודנין אותו דכתיב בית דוד דינו לבקר משפט · והיינו דאלו רצה לדון בסנהדרין יושב ודן · ואינו נמנע והוא שאמרו בנבל שדן אותו דוד בסנהדרין והתחיל מן הצד כדאיתא בפ״ אחד דיני ממונות[7] · מיהו לאו לגמרי בדיני סנהדרין דנו שהרי דנו

[1] Megillah, f. 14 b. [2] Baba M., f. 83 b. [3] Ibid., f. 84 a.
[4] Ibid., f. 83 b. [5] Pesachim, f. 25 b. [6] Ibid.
[7] Sanhedrin, f. 36 a.

בלילה ומשום דחשיב ליה מורד במלכות כדאיתה בפ׳ק דמגילה[1] · ומה שכתוב באוריה ואותו הרגת בחרב בני עמון ואמרו בפ״ במה בהמה יוצאה[2] היה לך לדונו בסנהדרין לאו למימרא שיהיה המלך צריך לדון דינו בסנהדרין וכ״ש המורד במלכות אלא מסתברא שלפי שלקח את אשתו והיו מרננים אחריו היה לו להביא דינו בסנהדרין ולדון אותו בפניהם כמורד מ״מ אין המלך צריך בדיניו לכלל הדברים המסורים לסנהדרין לדון עכ״פ בכ״ג · וכשקבל התורה וע״פ עדים · ולכל שאר הדברים · שלמה בן אדרת:

וזאת היא תשובת הרב הגדול המפולפל רבינו מאיר מרוטנ״בורק זלה״ה:

יצאתי ללקט אורות אמרות אדני אמרות טהורות · בעליל מזוקקות מחורות בעמקי סברות · לכל פנים מנהירות · בעשית בדים ותשלח פארות · אענדם לראשי עטרות · בפי כצפיחית יערות · מה לבאר מים חיים נובעים ממקורות · לשחות מי נהרות בורות נשברים מימי מערות ושל רבנו מקואות טהורות · על ענין המסורות מנהג אבות ותורות · בכל מקומות ישראל שראינו ושמענו פשוטה הוראה זו להתר שהמסורות שהוחזקו למסירות והורגלו בכך עד שנעשה להם כהתר ויש עדים לדבר שכל הקודם זכה להורגו · ואע״פי שלא הועד בפניהם רק שהיה הדבר ברור בעדים · כי אע״פי שכתב הרמב״ם ז״ל וז״ל · עשה המוסר אשר זמם יראה לי שאסור להרגו עכ״ל · ולמדנו ממנו מה טעם שנתן להרגו על מסירת מעט ממון אלא דכי אמר מחוינא ומחוינא הוי רודף אחר חברו להרגו דכתיב כתא מכמר · מה התא הזה כשנופל למכמר אין מרחמים עליו אף ישראל ממונם כשנפלו ליד גוים אין מרחמים עליהם[3] וכאלו מסרו להרגו ונתן להציל הנרדף בנפשו של רודף וכאשר עשה אשר זמם תו לא חשיב רודף · הני מילי במי שלא הוחזק במסירות שלשה פעמים אבל אם הוחזק כך שלשה פעמים דאיתחזק בין לר׳ בין לרשב״ל ולא הרגשנו בו צד תשובה כל הקודם להרגו זכה · דגדולה חזקה הא אמרינן שורפין וסוקלין על החזקות והכל כמו שכתב רבינו נר״ו · ומדברי הר״יף ז״ל יש להביא ראיה שכתב בשלהי קמא דק״ל כמ״ד ממון מסור אסור לאבדו ביד מדאיבעיא לן בס״פ הכונס עשו תקנת ננזל כמסור או לא

[1] Megillah, f. 14 b. [2] Sabbath, f. 56 a.
[3] Baba K., f. 117 a.

ומסקינן בתיקו ואי כל מסור לאחר שעשה המסירות אסור להרגו מאי מייתי ראיה מהתם דלא קי״ל מותר לאבדו ביד · והא מאן דאמר מותר לאבדו ביד היינו טעמיה משום שלא יהיה ממונו חביב עליו מגופו · ואי איתא דלאחר שמסד אסור להרגו אף למי שהוחזק במסירות מאי ראיה מייתי מהתם הא בההיא דפ״ הכונס כבר מסר · אלא ש״מ דהיכא דהוחזק במסירות מותר לאבד גופו אבל לא ממונו · דמשמע עשו תקנת נגזל כמסור וכ״ · אפ׳ במסור שכבר הוחזק במסירו׳ ודברי רבנו ישרים ונכוחים בדין המסורות ואין להאריך רק שלום לרבינו ושלום לתורתו ולכל ישיבתו · כנפש סר למשמעתו נאמן משרתו מאיר בר ברוך זל״ה:

THE ROYAL CROWN.

From the Hebrew of Solomon ibn Gebirol.

[*Extracts from the Second and Third Parts.*]

I.

Beyond conception great
Thy power is, wherewith thou did'st create
From out thy glory's depths a radiant flame,
Hewn from the rock of rocks and wrought
Out of eternity, with wisdom fraught,
The soul, the living soul,—thus did'st thou call its name.
By thee, Omnipotent,
Formed of the spirit's fire, and sent
To guard and keep and serve awhile this earthly frame.

Beyond all recompense,
O Lord our God, is thy beneficence,
In that thou did'st enshrine
Within the body's cage the soul, that gift divine,
To give man life and light,
From evil rescue him and lead his steps aright.

Beyond all mysteries,
Lord, of thy wondrous works the secret lies,
In that thou gavest man
The power of sight thy mighty world to scan,
Gavest the listening ear
Of all thy glorious miracles to hear,
The mind to apprehend
A portion of thy wonders without end,

And speech wherewith to praise
Thy works, and tell of all thy wondrous ways.
Lo! even thus do I,
Son of thy handmaid, with humility
And faltering lips, proclaim
How thou exalted art, how glorious is thy name.

II.

Shame-stricken, bending low,
My God, I come before thee, for I know
That, even as thou on high
Exalted art in power and majesty,
So weak and frail am I,
That perfect as thou art,
So I deficient am in every part.

Thou art all-wise, all-good, all-great, divine,
Yea, thou art God; eternity is thine,
While I, a thing of clay,
The creature of a day,
Pass shadow-like, a breath, that comes and flees away.
What is my life, my strength, my righteousness,
That I should dare abide
Before thee, torn by passions numberless,
With soul unpurified!

III.

My God, I know my sins are numberless,
More than I can recall to memory
Or tell their tale; yet some will I confess,
Even a few, though as a drop it be
In all the sea.

I will declare my trespasses and sin,
And peradventure silence then, may fall
Upon their waves and billows raging din,
And thou wilt hear from heaven, when I call,
And pardon all.

I have transgressed and sinned and turned aside
From thy most holy precepts, day by day,
I have rebelled, thy law I have defied,
In scorn and folly, from the heavenward way
Have gone astray.

Corrupted are my paths, and prone my heart
To deeds of evil. Righteous, O Most High!
In all that has befallen me thou art;
For just and faithful hast thou been, but I
Did wickedly.

IV.

My God, if mine iniquity
Too great for all endurance be,
Yet for thy name's sake pardon me.
For if in thee I may not dare
To hope, who else will hear my prayer?
Therefore, although thou slay me, yet
In thee my faith and trust is set;
And though thou seekest out my sin,
From thee to thee I fly to win
A place of refuge, and within
Thy shadow from thy anger hide,
Until thy wrath be turned aside.
Unto thy mercy I will cling,
Until thou hearken pitying;
Nor will I quit my hold of thee,
Until thy blessing light on me.

Remember, O my God! I pray,
How thou hast formed me out of clay,
What troubles set upon my way.
Do thou not, then, my deeds requite
According to my sins aright,
But with thy mercy infinite.

For well I know, through good and ill,
That thou in love hast chastened still,
Afflicting me in faithfulness,
That thou my latter end may'st bless.

V.

Therefore, O Lord, let now thy mercies be
Inclined towards me, and my sins forgot,
And let thy wrath be turned away from me,
So that I perish not.

Mayest thou, O my God, to me return
With mercy, and in thy beneficence,
Cause me to seek thy face, the joy to learn
Of perfect penitence.

Incline thine ear to me my prayer to grant,
Prepare my heart thy mercy to implore,
Teach me thy law and in my soul implant
Thy fear for evermore.

O, may it be thy gracious will to guard
Me from all deeds of evil passions born,
From off my path the evil powers to ward,
Temptation, sin, and scorn.

Be with my lips in prayer and guard my way,
Lest with my tongue I sin. Save me from harm
And give me refuge through life's stormy day
Within thy sheltering arm.

VI.

My God, I know that those who plead
To thee for grace and mercy need
All their good deeds should go before,
And wait for them at heaven's high door.
But no good deeds have I to bring,
No righteousness for offering,
No service for my Lord and King.

Yet hide not thou thy face from me,
Nor cast me out afar from thee;
But when thou bid'st my life to cease,
O, may'st thou lead me forth in peace
Unto the world to come, to dwell
Among thy pious ones, who tell
Thy glories inexhaustible.

There let my portion be with those
Who to eternal life arose,
There purify my heart aright,
In thy light to behold the light.
Raise me from deepest depths to share
Heaven's endless joys of praise and prayer,
That I may evermore declare:
Though thou wast angered, Lord, I will give thanks to thee,
For past is now thy wrath, and thou dost comfort me.

VII.

Lord, thy heavenly love bestoweth
All the good my spirit knoweth,
All my life-long benedictions
From thy gracious hand they came.
May thy hallowed fear enfold me,
May thy perfect law uphold me,
That my soul in glad submission
To thy great and awful name,
Praise and prayer and thanks outpouring,
Sanctifying and adoring,
May exalt it, and extol it, and its unity proclaim.

Blessed, exalted, glorified,
Praised, extolled, and sanctified,
Art thou, O Lord,
And eternally adored,
And thy unity made known
By the righteous and the just,

By those risen from the dust,
By the angels round thy throne,
And by those who ceaselessly
Do proclaim thy unity.
For among the mighty none
Are like unto thee, nor one
Of their works is like to thine.
Thou by all the host divine,
By cherubim and seraphim,
Radiant spirits manifold,
Unto thee acceptable,
Art in heaven above extolled.
And thy people Israel
With awe and reverence proclaim:
"God is one and one his name!"

Thou art God in highest heaven,
On this earth, that thou hast given
Unto man, and none beside thee
Was, or is, or e'er shall be.
May my words of adoration,
May my inward meditation,
O my Rock and my Redeemer,
Prove acceptable to thee!

ALICE LUCAS.

JOWETT'S RELIGIOUS TEACHING.

A STUDY.

THE publication of the College Sermons of the late Professor Jowett, Master of Balliol College, Oxford [1], has been looked for with varied feelings by a large number of his pupils and friends. Which sermons will be included? Will they read as they sounded? Will the editor alter any passage? Shall we get the same little touches of humour and satire which used to fascinate us?—are the sort of questions which will have passed through the minds of his more ardent admirers. The volume now issued does not contain more than half, or possibly only a third, of the collection which will ultimately appear. The editor's task was a difficult one, and he has discharged it well, so far as it has gone. Whether he was best advised in proceeding upon lines which ignore chronological order is a question for difference of opinion. In most cases such a plan might be unsatisfactory, but in this case it does not much matter. The dates given to each sermon in the present volume appear to be a little haphazard. We are not sure whether they indicate the time of the first, or the last, or the second delivery, though in many cases it is certain that they do not mean the dates of the MSS. The sermon on "Sympathy," No. IX, preached at Balliol in January, 1879, may be familiar to some of us who heard it in London at St. Lawrence Jewry during an Easter vacation about two years later. It is probable that this sermon was altered or partly re-written. The same may be said of other numbers.

[1] Edited by the Very Rev. the Hon. W. H. Fremantle, M.A., Dean of Ripon. London; John Murray, 1895.

The sermon on the building up of the College, which bears the date October, 1870, was repeated with the slightest variations when the new Hall was completed in October, 1876. The text was the same, "Except the Lord build the house," &c. I was present on the second occasion, but not on the first. It might, on the whole, have been convenient if the dates on the MSS. had appeared. But these matters are unimportant, perhaps scarcely worth mention; and it is just possible that the MSS. were not dated, and the editor is merely recording the dates which he has personally associated with each sermon.

Before proceeding to consider the question of the sermons themselves, I may be permitted to express the regret that this volume, by limiting itself to addresses spoken to Oxford students, omits entirely the Westminster Abbey sermons, which were annually delivered from 1866 until the year of his death, 1893. But we are led to hope that they will appear in the next volume. I say this because the sermons which are most remarkable are just those which are of equal application to all sorts and conditions—not exclusively to college students. The general reader might be mistaken if he imagined that Jowett was in the habit of minutely classifying the people he sought to instruct. There is another reason why the limit to sermons delivered in the College Chapel and the University Church may be regretted. The contents of the volume are appropriate for all kinds of men and women, and are not, as a casual observer of the title might suppose, only of interest to youthful students. The value of this publication lies in its possible effect upon multitudes who never saw Jowett. Putting aside the feelings which are awakened among his many generations of pupils at reading his spoken words which were precious to them, it is of interest to consider what may be the possible effect of his religious teaching upon generations who will come after him. This opens up the larger and less personal question, What was the view of religion in general, and

of Christianity in particular, which will be recognized hereafter as the peculiar teaching of Benjamin Jowett? And here it may be said that the volume before us, more than any of his published works, might be appealed to as containing the definite record of Jowett's religion.

Jowett was popularly regarded by those who only knew him through hearsay as a person of heretical views, entirely unorthodox, and scarcely to be regarded as one who had a legitimate place among the clergy of the English Church as by law established. In this volume are found his writings upon "The difficulties of faith and their solution" (No. II), "The prospects of Christianity" (No. V), "Grounds of hopefulness" (No. VI), "The slow but sure working of the Christian Spirit" (No. VII), "Going to Church" (No. XVI), "God's judgment of us and our own" (No. XVI), and "The life of Jesus Christ" (No. XVIII). These seven sermons might be examined with the view to ascertain as nearly as possible his views about Christianity. They are all constructive, in spite of the fact that in almost every page in each of them there is a criticism of the popular and orthodox notions. We naturally turn to the last named, "The life of Jesus Christ," if we want to know what Jowett really thought about Christ. I would venture to say, with great diffidence, that this particular sermon, from the point of view of definite religious teaching, is the most striking in the present collection.

This sermon, like the closing passage of his introduction to Plato's *Republic*, deals with the moral value of the ideal of goodness as represented in the image of Christ. This is distinctly different from the traditional Christian doctrine of God being incarnate in the person of Jesus. And yet it bears a resemblance. The resemblance, however, is figurative rather than theological. Somehow there has taken hold of the imagination of the Christian mind a conception of an ideal humanity corporealized in a certain personality or figure called Jesus Christ. Sometimes he is called the "son of God" and sometimes the "son of man."

In a sense the figure is treated as historical because it is founded upon narratives in the New Testament. But it is not quite clear whether the element of fiction does not enter into Jowett's account of it. He says: "The record of the Gospels is fragmentary—we cannot exactly reduce it to a precise order; it is only by an effort that we produce the customs and opinions of the Jewish world at the Christian era. Neither is it the precise words of Christ that we desire to recover so much as His spirit and character." Jowett proceeds to delineate the character of Christ. He presents a living picture of some one whom it is possible to conceive, and whom, he suggests, ordinary men of our own day might "follow humbly and at a distance." It might be affirmed that Jowett's picture of Christ as a person is more vivid than that which can be read in the Gospel narratives. What Jowett presents as the description of Christ is certainly something which, if not exactly historical, is clearly intelligible to the understanding of ordinary men. How far the picture is drawn from imagination or from Jowett's own conception of human goodness appears to me an open question. At any rate the moral efficacy of presenting such a picture and the difficulties of the task seem to be best defined in Jowett's own words at the end of his introduction to the *Republic*. Here is the passage referred to: "We see Him in a figure only, and of figures of speech we select but a few, and those the simplest, to be the expression of Him. We behold Him in a picture, but He is not there. We gather up the fragments of His discourses, but neither do they represent Him as He truly was. His dwelling is neither in heaven nor earth, but in the heart of man. This is that image which Plato saw dimly in the distance, which, when existing among men, he called, in the language of Homer, 'the likeness of God' (*Rep.* VI, 501 B), the likeness of a nature which in all ages men have felt to be greater and better than themselves, and which in endless forms, whether derived from Scripture

or from nature, from the witness of history or from the human heart, regarded as a person or not as a person, with or without parts or passions, existing in space or not in space, is and will always continue to be to mankind the Idea of Good." This statement is in perfect consistency with the sermon under consideration and of those others in which Christ is described. Two questions naturally suggest themselves: First, Is this presentation of the *Idea of Good* affected by the decision of the doubt whether it is based upon an historical personage, or is merely a fictional creation? Secondly, Without such an image at all in concrete form, is it not possible for the human mind to conceive the same *Idea of Good*? These are important questions, not so much on account of their theological significance, as because of the moral consequences attaching to the answers which we might give to them. The theological difference between the old Hebrew Theism and this later development of Christian teaching is far less important than the moral contrast, if contrast there be, between possessing a corporealized ideal of human goodness and not possessing one. If it be true that history has produced the actual personation of this *Ideal of Good* it is still difficult to form any exact conception of this personified ideal, and, as Jowett says: "We know also that the life of Christ is so far above us that we cannot ascend to it. We can only follow humbly and at a distance." He says, "Let us see how far any *shadow* or recollection of it may exist among ourselves" (the italics are mine). Then we are told that "If anywhere, we must look for it not in extraordinary deeds or sayings, but in the daily occasions of life." So the image is focussed more and more within the vision of ordinary human experience. Indeed, in an earlier page of this same sermon, Jowett frankly recognizes the practical difficulty of conceiving of Christ at all and therefore of imitating him. He finds it necessary to reduce the ideal of the life of Christ to that of persons whom we have known and of whom we may say, as of him, "he or she went about doing good." He

describes such persons in simple yet vigorous words, and then he says of them: "Divided as we are by so many centuries from the age in which Christ lived, I think that the contemplation of such lives is the best preparation which we can make for the study of the life of Christ Himself. *As they are, so was He in this world*" (my italics). One is here struck with the difference between Jowett's conception of Christ and that of the dominant creed. I cannot escape the reflection that the Christ here spoken of was entirely human, and that the strength of his power lay in his humanity. The image presented is not at all that of the miracle worker or of the Incarnate God. In Sermon V, on "The prospects of Christianity," he deprecates any notions of Christ coming again in the sense commonly expected by Christians. On this subject Jowett says (p. 61): "For when men have fancies about religion, which, however natural in the Primitive Church and in the age of the Apostles, ought to have been refuted long ago by universal experience, they are apt to loose their hold on the main principles of Christian truth. The visions in which they indulge have an absorbing effect on their minds; they lead them into nonsense; they withdraw them from their fellow-men. While they are looking into a vacant and distant heaven for a sign, the real signs of the times, which are everywhere around them, seem to escape them. For we see furthest into the future—and that is not far—when we most carefully consider the facts of the present.

"And therefore I shall not attempt to explain what is the meaning of Christ's coming again; 'whether in the body or out of the body we cannot tell.' Nor shall I ask the question which was put to Christ by the mother of Zebedee's children, whether His saints and apostles shall reign with Him, sitting upon thrones and judging the kingdoms of the earth. These are questions which can never have an answer; we might as well argue about poetry or figures of speech."

Thus it is clear that Jowett dismissed some of those views of Christianity which are expressed in all the creeds. In what respect does the ideal which he presents of Christ differ from that which any philosophical mind, not Christian, might form of human goodness? In other words, does it appear that the religious estimate which Jowett has set forth of the possibilities of human character is inconsistent with simple Theism? Again, is it necessary to hold in one's mental vision the image of an individual Christ in order to form the best conception of human righteousness? Can we not arrive at the same result if we think only of the infinite moral righteousness of the Unseen God, and of our affinity with him? I put these questions not so much with the view of giving any definite answers to them, as for the purpose of submitting that the highest thoughts of righteousness are not necessarily dependent upon the belief that God actually descended upon the earth in order to show men how to live. The conception of Christ, disentangled as it is in this volume from its popular miraculous associations, is only an ideal. In saying this I do not suggest any doubt as to the bare historical data which may be derived from the Gospels. Nor would there be any gain to Theism in attempting to disprove that such a person—and that particular person lived and taught in Judea eighteen centuries ago. But all figures in history from which we are separated by an enormous gulf of time must necessarily become for later ages ideals only. The greatest figures of the Old Testament and of ancient Greece are all ideals. Anything like precise information about their actual doings and sayings is out of the question. It is yet possible to form a fairly correct idea of their spirit and their character. These observations apply more particularly to moral teachers and philosophers than they do to warriors and statesmen.

The conception of perfect goodness does not fade away with the diminution of the belief that God once took upon himself human nature. That belief is undoubtedly passing

away from the minds of many educated men and women. The difficulties of believing it appear to be greater than formerly. Of all miraculous statements in the New Testament or in the Old, that one seems to conflict most of all with human reason. The story of it is surrounded by circumstances and conditions which are not compatible with known facts of human experience. It is not unnatural for any one to whom the doctrine is strange, and for many indeed who have been in the habit of accepting it without question, to ask themselves reverently, "For what purpose is this most difficult dogma taught? What special boon does it bring to the advancement of human goodness?" It cannot be said that when it was held in those countries which professed it with universal assent and with the utmost tenacity that human character displayed itself at its best. Neither can it be urged that those Christians who have ceased to believe it, but have not become atheists, are less moral or less religious than they were before. Writing as a Jew who has never believed it, there seems to be but one possible use to which such a teaching might contribute. It is just conceivable that to those who are convinced that God once dwelt upon earth in human form, it might appear that he has himself demonstrated to mankind how men should live. This is an obvious reflection, but it is marred by another: "He was like unto us in all things, sin only excepted." Now this does not mean that Jesus, being an ordinary man, went through life without committing sin, but that not being an ordinary man, that is being God, he was incapable of sin. The immaculate nature is so completely differentiated from humanity as to render imitation hopeless and impossible. Not so, however, if Christ was entirely human.

The value of Jowett's teaching about Christ is that it seems to suggest another view which is independent of the belief in the Incarnation. In everything which he tells us about Christ there is the human picture. The accounts he gives of him are natural and simple, generally compared

with something with which we are familiar. "He had come into the world to fulfil His Father's will, to deliver men from evil, to reunite them to God, to lay the foundations of a new and spiritual kingdom" (p. 63). And again, "We know that the founder of a religion is not like the teachers of it in after ages; he is not bound by convention and tradition, and he has a high and different standard" (p. 68).

The conception of the highest moral life does not rest upon a single instance of it, whether to be found in history or in fiction. The dignity of human nature, the doctrine of the likeness of God in human character, dispense with the necessity of imitation or even example. Examples of human virtue are precious when we meet with them, but no perfectly formed character is really moulded in all its details upon any other. Influence, that subtle force in human relations, is not the same as the resemblance in the realm of matter which is effected by patterns. No two human beings are precisely alike. It is impossible to give any accurate account of the exact causes which have produced a well-developed human character. And even where imitation is possible it can only be possible in part. The mainspring of goodness and nobility will be found to rest not so much in our imitative tendencies as in the inherent moral capacity of the individual. It would be nothing to have before us the finest models or samples of human excellence if there were not in the individual nature the aptitude for righteousness, the conception of perfect goodness. The God-idea and not the recollection of any person is the invariable source of the higher aspirations. Even in the case which is presented to us of an imaged goodness in the person of Christ we see there that the motive power was Christ's genius for the God-idea and not the imitation of some one else. A Christian who mentally assents to the doctrine of the Incarnation as another expression for this image of human goodness, as of an idol always before him, does not rise above the average

merely by the example thus presented to him. The recollection of a great person does not make him great if the element of greatness is not within him. So too without having heard of Christ, without the conception of any corporealized goodness, we find in Socrates the highest virtues.

Illustrations of moral excellence are difficult to adduce for the very reason that they are more often to be found in obscurity than within the gaze of men. The value of examples in righteousness, great as it is, is apt to be exaggerated. And, after all, it is rather the words of Christ than his actual life which have helped those who have sought to imitate him. The great Master of Balliol is himself an instance of the individuality of moral excellence. I do not believe that his peculiar devotion to truth, and his special love for God and for his fellow-men, and his great unselfishness, were entirely or mainly due to the image of Christ or of Socrates, though they were so constantly before him.

Without the doctrine of the Incarnation, it is possible to conceive of Jesus as an illustrious example of human goodness, and to understand that the memory of him, as of other great persons, is capable of exerting a powerful influence upon the characters of men and women in different ages. But much more than this seems to be demanded by some Unitarians and others who do not profess the Christian dogma. They would have us think that his example, and his alone, is the actual motive power in the formation of the best spiritual human characters. It is not merely an influence they would claim, but a revelation, and perhaps the only revelation to the human heart of true righteousness. Such a revelation as this, by which I suppose is meant a kind of intimation to the human understanding of what righteousness really is, comes, I believe, from another and, in a sense, a far more mysterious source. The acquisition of the knowledge of righteousness, and of our aptitude for assimilating it, is something which involves a revelation

of the divine nature itself. It is a direct message from the Uncreated, the Unseen, the Incorporeal, to individual human souls one by one. This it is which may be fitly called the Image of the living God in which we are created and have our being. I know that I am only suggesting one dogma instead of another; but it seems to me to represent a higher plane of spiritual philosophy than the Christian dogma of the Incarnation. Here there is not the imitation of anything, but the building up of something upon its own foundation.

In the foregoing observations I have not sought to fix the limit or the nature of Jowett's views of Christianity. I have merely suggested some considerations which seem to arise out of his sermons. There are doubtless many other problems which could be discussed in studying his writings contained in this single volume. Whatever may be thought or said about Jowett's opinions on Christian theology, this volume suffices, if other records were wanting, to reveal a mind and soul which may be described as illumined by the divine spirit. Over and above the intellectuality which distinguished all his utterances and all his writings, there is a breadth of view which is not merely intellectual. No one can account for the higher characteristics of Jowett's incomparable personal influence without taking note of his genius for the spirit of religion. Some persons, who fancy, inaccurately I think, that Jowett's teaching was the cause which had precipitated them into a sea of scepticism out of which they felt themselves unable to emerge, wonder that he too was not an agnostic. They marvel, perhaps, that he was able to criticize popular beliefs and yet retain his faith in God and immortality. It is not a sufficient explanation to say that he was endowed with an exceptionally clear mental vision that made it easier for him than for most men to separate the real from the unreal elements of religious thought. The true explanation appears to lie deeper, for Jowett's strongest religious emotions seem to have had their root in his

character rather than in any process of reasoning. When he spoke of God, of death, of righteousness, and of immortality, it was not so much the logician we seemed to recognize as the one who was mysteriously endowed with the love of truth. He was always most simple when he was speaking or writing of the highest spiritual problems. He seems to have thought that there is an intuitive sense both of God and of goodness in very simple and humble lives. Speaking of such persons in one of these pages (317), he says: "Sometimes they have seen with superhuman clearness one or two truths of which the world was especially in need. They may have been scarcely known, or not known until after their death; they may have had their trials too—failing health, declining years, the ingratitude of men—but they have endured as seeing Him who is invisible." He speaks, a few sentences above, of such persons in these words: "They too have a hidden strength which is derived from communion with the Unseen; they pass their lives in the service of God. . . . Their way of life has been simple; they have not had time to accumulate stores of learning."

It is impossible to resist the conviction that Jowett regarded religion in its fuller and most enduring sense as a gift to human nature—something which the wisest and the simplest alike could find within their reach. Often he has stated that he believed it to be independent either of the belief in miracles or of the results of Biblical criticism. It was above the Bible, though revealed in it; beyond the field of scepticism, though accidentally concerned with it. It had a relation to all the circumstances of life, and yet it was in a manner independent of them.

Morality and religion were so combined in Jowett's teaching that it is impossible in his view to separate them. He distinguishes between theology and morality, but always connects morality and religion. Abstract speculation in the sphere of religion did not attract him; it was unpractical, he would have thought.

Another great principle of religious life with which Jowett was possessed was that of the union of those whose lives were dominated by true religion, of whatever creed or party. Speaking on this subject he says (p. 311): "Religious life will no longer be liable to be upset by small earthquakes, but will have a wider and deeper foundation. Good men of all parties will more and more see that so far as they had the spirit of God at all, they meant the same thing far more than they supposed. They will see that other religions and other teachers of religion had in them also the spirit of Christ; and that these anticipations of the truth, instead of impairing the force of Christianity, strengthen and extend it; as Christ also Himself seems to intimate when He says, 'Many shall come from the East and from the West;' or again, 'And other sheep I have which are not of this fold.' They will recognize that what has been sometimes regarded as the triumph of Antichrist is only the natural consequence of criticism and science, which, like the rising of the tide, can by no human efforts be driven back."

The revelation of religion was represented by Jowett as a direct communication to the individual conscience—not perhaps in any miraculous sense, but rather as a sort of intuition like the gifts of reason and perception. So far from being absorbed with the sense of the difficulties of religion, Jowett was most keenly sensible of the simplicity of it. "The truth for which we are seeking is not a labyrinth without a clue, nor yet a mist in which we cannot see where we are going, but plain as the sun at mid-day, having the body of heaven in its clearness. It is not a mystery but a truism which we are apt to forget and to deem commonplace, and because it is so little realized in our lives. It is the light which lighteth every man, which shines daily and hourly, and accompanies us in all our ways and is therefore scarcely remarked by us. And we see the same light under many aspects, as it mingles with the shadows and clouds of earth, or is

obscured by them ; or as it shines in its own unclouded beauty, far away from us in the blue sky" (p. 314).

It would be beyond the scope of this essay to attempt to survey in detail all the religious teachings of the great Master of Balliol; nor is it easy to circumscribe them. He himself has epitomized in various passages of his writings what it was he desired to teach in the sphere of religion and ethics. His views on these matters are spread among many volumes. They are to be found largely, and scattered over many pages, in his introductions to and commentaries upon Plato. Some of his most enduring essays remain in the two volumes which contain his critical notes and dissertations upon the Epistles of St. Paul. His sermons in the College Chapel and elsewhere (chiefly at Westminster Abbey) will naturally be regarded as embodying the most direct exposition of his religious views. Much more also remains to be learnt when his biography shall have been written. The life of Jowett was inseparable from his teaching, both in the religious and in the purely intellectual aspects of it. These two aspects appeared almost to merge into one. There was always traceable the ideal of human goodness and therefore of religion in his ordinary life, his personal transactions, his social intercourse. His views of life, and of politics, and of men and things, were penetrated with a spirit that was a religious one, just in like manner as his religious views and the expression of them were characterized by his strong intellectuality. I have often thought that if Jowett had devoted himself to the profession of the law, he must have become one of the greatest judges who ever lived. His mind was peculiarly a judicial one. Of all men he appeared to be most free from the taint of prejudice or bias, and he had an extraordinary insight into human nature and consequently a real knowledge of the world. These traits are discernible in his sermons as they were in his conversation. His sermons were as much the expression of his personality as were all the incidents of his

life. In other words, he was in the pulpit as unconventional and as much himself as he was in his study or in the lecture-room. Never was there a life more harmonious, more consistent, despite the fact that he was occasionally misunderstood and even misinterpreted.

OSWALD JOHN SIMON.

A COLLATION OF SINKER'S TEXTS OF THE TESTAMENTS OF REUBEN AND SIMEON WITH THE OLD ARMENIAN VERSION.

In restoring the archetype of the Armenian Version the following MSS. have been used:

B = Armenian MS. Bible belonging to the London Bible Society. c. Saecl. XVI.

V = Venice Codex of Armenian Testaments. c. Saecl. XII.

Z = Zouche Codex of the Armenian Bible. c. Saecl. XVII.

Vat. = the Vatican Armenian Codex of the Bible containing the Testamenta. Saec. XVII.

Note.—Where V omits Greek words, which however appear in BZ or vice versa, it is certain that the Armenian Archetype had the words so omitted. Such lacunae I therefore often ignore, as mere accidents of certain of the Armenian Texts.

An asterisk affixed to an Armenian reading indicates that the Armenian MS. is corrupt.

R, P, and Ox. are the Greek Codd. collated by R. Sinker.

"All" signifies the consensus of the Armenian MSS.

The figures give the page and line to Sinker's edition.

Page 129. Title in Arm. Z = Liber Paralipomenôn. Sermo Rubeni. Testamentum Primi; in V = Testamentum et Sermo Rubeni ex paralipomenôn libro; in B simply: Testamentum Reuben Primi. Both families omit *περὶ ἐννοιῶν.*

Line 1. Ῥουβέν. ὅσα] ὡς V: ὃ BZ.

2. πρὶν ἀποθανεῖν . . . ζωῆς αὐτοῦ] om. all.

4. οἱ υἱοί] + αὐτοῦ all. Καὶ Ῥουβὲν εἶπεν V.

7. ἀδελφοί μου all.

10. ἀδελφοί μου BZ: υἱοί V.

11. tr. σήμερον τὸν θ. τ. οὐρ. ZB: om. σήμερον V. τοῦ μὴ π.] ? ὅπως μὴ πορευθῆτε all.

12. om. καὶ πορνείᾳ all.

13. Λέγω γ. ὑ. ὅτι] Διὸ καὶ λέγω ὑ. and om. ὅτι all.

P. 130. 1. ἐνεπληξάμην πληγὰς μεγάλας all. om. ἐπί all.

2. ὁ π. μου all. om. ὅτι all.

4, 5. καὶ μετὰ τοῦτο ἐν. all. So R.

5. ἑπτὰ ἔτη after κυρίου all. Καὶ οἶνον all. So R.

7. ἐγευσάμην] ἔφαγον all. So R.

8. οὐ μὴ γένηται. . .] οὔ ποτε ἐν τῷ Ἰσ. γέγονεν οὕτως all. So R.

10. ἐπειδὴ ἑπτά or ἑπτὰ οὖν (with R) all.

11. κεφαλαί all. So R.

12. καὶ ἕτερα (or αὖθις) ἑπτά all. om. αὐτῷ and read ἐπὶ πάσης κτίσεως all.

13. μεθ' ἧς . . . κτίζεται] = in quo stabilitae sunt omnes creaturae (*or* omnis creatio) all.

14. μεθ' ἧς] ἐν ᾗ and om. γίνεται all.

15. ἀφ' ἧς *ἀκούεται διδασκαλία all. om. πνεῦμα and read ὄσφρησις ἀφ' all.

16. ? read ὁλκήν all. om. πνεῦμα all.

17. pr. μεθ' ἧς] ἀφ' ἧς all. alt. μεθ' ἧς] ἀφ' ἧς BZ: ἐν ᾗ V.

18. βρῶσις βροτῶν καὶ πότον all. ἐν αὐτῷ all. So R.

18, 19. ἐν βρ.] βρῶσις or βρώματα all.

22. νεωτερισμόν all. With Ox.

24. ἐπὶ π. δὲ τ. all. With R.

25. ἔκστασις] *"establishment" all. ? ὑπόστασις. τοῖς ἑπτὰ πν. all.

26. πορνείας πνεῦμα all. With Ox. and R.

27. ἔγκειται] ἐστι or ἔνεστι all.

28. τῇ χολῇ] ἐν τῇ γλώττῃ all.

P. 131. 1. om. ἵνα διὰ περ. (? per homoiotel. of Greek) all.

2. καυχᾶται all. With Ox. and R.

3. ψεύδους] σκληρολογίας all. The Arm. word is *chsta-*

banouthean, but the sense ψευδολογίας would remain, if *ch* were dropped and *stabanouthean* read instead.

3. after λόγους add καὶ κρύπτειν ἔργα all. Cp. Ox.

4. tr. αὐτοῦ after οἰκείων all. ἀφ' ἧς all.

6. δοσοληψίας all. With Ox. and R. ἐπὶ π. δὲ τ. all.

7, 8. τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ὀγδόῳ ἄλλο πνεῦμα συνάπτεται ὅ ἐστι πλάνη καὶ φαντασίας all. Cp. R. and Ox.

8. Arm. renders as if πᾶσα νεότης had stood in the Greek, which is (?) a Hebraism.

9. ἐν τ. ν.] τὸν νόμον all.

10. ἔπαθον] ἐπλάνων, "I erred," all.

11. τέκνα μου all. With R.

12. καὶ μή all.

13. γυναικῶν or, more probably, γυναικείαν all.

15. οὐκ ἂν ἔπιπτον all. With R (probably).

16. om. ὑπνῶσαι all.

17. ? ἀπιόντος all. With R. ἡμῶν] μου all.

18. καὶ ὄντων all.

19. om. οἴκου, and for Βηθλεέμ read Βενιαμίν all. καὶ ἦν κοιμ. καὶ ἦν ἐν τῷ all.

22. ἄγγελος Κυρίου all. With Ox.

23. after μου add ἦν ἔπραξα all. καὶ ἐλθὼν Ἰακώβ all. for αὐτῆς read τῆς Βάλλα all.

26. ἐν ἔργοις + δικαιοσύνης καὶ ἀποπειρώμενοι (or ἀπερευνῶντες or similar) ἐν γράμμασι (potius διδασκαλίας) all. Perhaps μοχθοῦτε . . . καὶ ἐπισκέψασθε ἐν should be read, if we cp. R.

27. θέλῃ all.

P. 132. 1. ὅτι ἀχρί all. With Ox. and R. ἡμῶν] ἐμοῦ all. With R.

2. Ἰακὼβ πατρός μου all. τινι τ. ἀδ.] παρρησίᾳ τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς μου all.

3. ὀν. ἐμούς all.

4. καί γε πολλάκις all. Cp. R. ὅτι εὐξ.] καὶ εἶπεν ὅτι εὔξαιτο all. π. ἐμοῦ] π. σου all.

5. om. π. κύριον all. ἀπ' ἐμοῦ] ἀπό σου all.

6. οὖν] μετανοίᾳ all, and cp. Ox.

7. om. πάντα all.

8. ὅλ. γὰρ *φθάσει, ψυχῆς ἐστιν ἡ π. ἡ χωρ. all.

9. ἐστιν ἡ πλ. all. With Ox. and R.

12. om. αὐτόν all.

13. γάρ] οὖν all. πασῶν γυναικῶν all.

14. ἐκαθάρισεν all.

15. ? προσεκάλεσε all. With R "besought." V adds a gloss = to *ἡ Αἴγυπτία περὶ Ἰωσήφ.

16. ἀλλὰ οὐκ all.

19. πορνεία] πονηρία all. ἐννοίαν ἡμῶν BZ, cp. R. (But V adds ἀνδρῶν instead of ἡμῶν.)

20. καθ' ἡμῶν all.

21. καὶ ὅτι μὴ ἔχουσιν all.

22. αὐτούς BZ, but V ἄνδρας. οὐδὲ δύναμιν ἐπὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων all.

23, 24. ? ἰσχύουσι . . . καταγωνίζονται all (and cp. R).

24. ὅτι καίγε π. αὐτῶν] om. all. After εἶπέ μοι add καὶ περὶ τούτου all.

25. V has πλέον for ἥττωνται. Cp. P.

27. om. αὐτῶν all.

28. καὶ πρῶτον διά all.

P. 133. 3. αὐτῶν καὶ τὰς ὄψεις πρὸς ἀπάτην διανοίας all. With Ox.

4. After κόλασιν add κακίστην V only.

6. om. αὐτάς all. ἐγένοντο] suscitabantur, *or* prouocabantur, all. ? ἠρεθίζοντο in the Greek. ἀλλήλων] αὐτῶν all.

9. ? τῆς φαντασίας all.

10. ἕως κ.τ.λ.] ὡσεὶ φθάνοντες εἰς οὐρανόν all.

12. αἰσθήσεις ὑμῶν BZ. With Ox. and R. But V alone has τὰς ψυχὰς ὑμῶν καὶ τὰς αἰσθήσεις.

13. ἀνθρώποις αὐτῶν all.

15. ἀνίατος] μεγάλη all. ὑμῖν all. With Ox. and P. om. τοῦ B. αἰώνιον all.

16. οὔ τε σύνεσιν] om. all. οὔ τι εὐσέβ. all.

17. αὐτῆς] αὐτῶν all. διὰ τοῦτο + καὶ ὑμεῖς ζηλώσατε and om. τοὺς υἱοὺς Λευί all.

18. ἀλλ' οὐ δυν.] ἀλλὰ κἂν ζητήσητε, οὐ δυνήσεσθε ὑπὲρ αὐτούς all.

19. ἐποίησεν all. τὴν ἐκδ. αὐτ.] = "his choice among them," all. καὶ ἀποθ. θ. π.] om. all. τῷ γ. Λ.] τῷ δὲ Λ. all.

20. τῷ 'I. μετ' αὐτῶν] μετ' αὐτὸν τῷ' I. all. So Ox.

21. τοῦ εἶν. ἐπί] καὶ μετ' αὐτούς all.

22. διαστελεῖ] διατελέσει all. So P.

23. εἰς κρίσιν] + καὶ δίκας all. καὶ θυσιάσει all. Cp. R and P.

24. ἀρχ. Χρ.] "to be priest of the lot of Christ" is the sense of V and B, as if the Greek ran ἱερατεύειν κλήρῳ Χριστοῦ. The other MSS., e. g. Z, have for Χριστοῦ a word χαροζι = κήρυκος, which is probably due to a corruption of text; for the Vatican Codex has χανζι, which makes nonsense.

25. ποιῆσαι ἀλήθειαν] πορεῦσαι ἀληθείᾳ all. after αὐτοῦ add καὶ ἀγάπην ἔχειν πρὸς τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς ὑμῶν all. Cp. Ox. and R and P.

25. V alone has πρὸς τοὺς υἱοὺς Λευί.

27. αὐτοῦ] αὐτῶν V only.

28. παντὸς τοῦ λαοῦ all, as in R.

P. 134. 1. ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἀποθανοῦνται all, except V, which has ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἀποθανεῖται.

2. ἔσονται all. βασιλεῖς αἰώνιοι all. B V &c.

3. ἐντειλάμενος ταῦτα all.

4, 5. om. ἐν Χεβρών all.

6. B Z agree with Greek title, but V has "Testament of Simeon son of Jacob son of Isaak son of Abraham."

7. λόγων] + διαθήκης BZ: V has διαθ. without λόγων.

7, 8. πρὸ . . . αὐτὸν] so BZ: V = "when he was near to die," a paraphrase.

8. ἑκ. εἰκ.] "in his 127th year," all.

9. γάρ om. all: V adds οἱ υἱοὶ αὐτοῦ before ἐπισκ. Cp. Ox.

10. καὶ Συμεὼν ἐνισχ. all.

11. ἀκούσατέ μου V only. τέκνα μου all. So R and P.

12. καρδ. μου ἀναγγέλλειν ὑμῖν V only. Cp. R.

13. ἐκάλεσε τὸ ὄνομά μου V only.

17. πᾶσι τοῖς ἀνθρ. all.

18. καὶ ἐγὼ ἐν all.

19. ἡμῶν BZ: μου V with R.

20. ἄρχων] ἄγγελος all. ἀποστ. . . . ζήλου] V paraphrases κινήσας με εἰς ζῆλον καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα ζήλου. But note that R and P omit ἀποστείλας.

21. μὴ δοὺς (or ἀφεὶς) προσέχειν all, but perhaps we have here a paraphrase.

22. μου] V alone adds γηράσκοντος. αὐτοῦ bis] αὐτῶν BZ: αὐτοῦ V.

23. καὶ ἐρρυσ. all. With R.

24. γάρ] ? οὖν all. V alone paraphrases "to bring the drug (*or* medicine) of sheep to our flocks."

25. ἀπόθεσις] + ἡμῶν BZ only.

P. 135. 1. αὐτόν] Ἰωσήφ V only.

2. Ῥουβέν] + ὁ ἀδελφὸς ἡμῶν V only. διασῶσαι] + καὶ καταγαγεῖν V only. Cp. R.

3. πρὸς τ. Ἰ.] ἐπὶ αὐτόν V: ἐπὶ Δάν BZ.

3, 4. ἐποίησα . . . αὐτῷ] καὶ ἐποίησα (or ἦν) σὺν αὐτῷ μ. π. ὀργ. B: but V = καὶ οὕτω ὠργίσθην αὐτῷ μ. π.

4. θεός] κύριος all.

5. om. ἀπ' ἐμοῦ all. δράσιν] BZ = "stealing"; V = "violence." χειρῶν] χειρὸς ἐμοῦ all. ξῆρος BZ "dried up": but V paraphrases thus "and dried it up for thirty days," omitting the Greek from ὅτι . . . δεξιά.

6. ἑπτά] *sixty* in BZ: *thirty* in V. Ox. has *sixty*. tr. συν. μοι τοῦτο BZ, but V om. τοῦτο.

7. κυρίῳ BZ: θεῷ V. Cp. R. ἵνα ἀποκατασταθῇ ἡ χεὶρ μ. V, with R: but BZ = καὶ ἀποκατέστη ἡ χ.

8. ἀπεσχόμην all. ἀπὸ φθ. κ. π. μολ. V: ἀπὸ π. φθ. κ. μολ. BZ.

8, 9. καὶ ἀπὸ π. ἀφρ. om. all.

9. κυρίου] θεοῦ V only.

10. om. διὰ Ἰωσήφ V only. φθόνησας τὸν ἀδ. μ. and om. αὐτῷ in l. 11, all.

12. τέκνα μου all. With Ox. φυλ.] + τὰς ψυχὰς ὑμῶν V only.

13. πασ. τ. διαν. τοῦ] παντός V only.

14. om. αὐτὸν . . . πιεῖν οὔτε all, ? per homoiotel.

15. ἀλλὰ παντ. all. With Ox.

16. παντ. κ.τ.λ.] V alone paraphrases "he indeed the blessed one is ever like unto a blossom, but I faded consumed with envy." om. ἡμερῶν all.

18. θεοῦ] κυρίου all. ἐὰν γάρ all. With Ox. and R.

19. ἀποτρέχει . . . αὐτοῦ] so V, but BZ paraphrases "he is relinquished by the bad spirit." καὶ γίνεται . . . l. 21 οὕτως] V omits, but retains "and he ceases from envy," i.e. παύεται τοῦ φθόνου. On the other hand, Z omits these last three words, but retains the preceding words lost in V. B retains the entire passage according to the Greek, so no change is implied by the Version.

22. om. περί all. So R.

22, 23. καὶ ἔλεγον . . . ἐγώ] BZ = "and I made answer to him and related the pains of my liver": but V = "why mayest thou be exceeding sorrowful, and I told him by way of pretext (*or* cause) the pains of my liver."

23. πάντας] + τοὺς ἀδελφούς μου V only.

24. ὅτε γάρ V: ὅτε BZ.

25. καὶ Ἰωσὴφ ἔδησέ με μόνον V only. πάσχω τοῦτο all.

27. om. καί *sec.* all. So R.

28. ἀδελφοὺς αὐτοῦ all. οὖν] + ὑμᾶς ἀδελφοὶ καὶ τέκνα μου all.

P. 136. 2. ἀγαθῇ] καθαρᾷ BZ: *V om. ἐννοῶντες τὸν Ἰωσὴφ τὸν ἀδ. ὑμῶν all. om. καὶ ὑμῖν all.

4. ἐν αὐτῷ] BZ αὐτόν: V ἐν Ἰωσὴφ πραχθέντα. Cp. R. πάσας γὰρ ἡμέρας ζωῆς αὐτοῦ all. π. τ. λογ.] so BZ: but V οὐδὲ ἐποίησεν ἡμῖν κατὰ τὸν λόγον τοῦτον (or τοὺς λόγους τούτους). ? A Gloss.

6. ? πλοῦτον κτηνῶν καὶ καρπῶν all.

7. om. οὖν all. With Ox. and R. om. ἀγαπητά all. With Ox. and R.

7, 8. *ἀγαπήσατε . . . καρδίᾳ om. V alone.

8. ἀποστήσεται ἀφ' ἡμῶν BZ, with R P: but *ἀποστήτε ἀπὸ κακοῦ φθόνου ὅτι φθόνος V.

9. ἀγριοῖ τ. τὸ σῶμα κ. φθ. τὴν ψυχήν BZ: *ἀγρ. τὸν ἄνδρα καὶ φθ. τὴν ψυχήν V.

10. *ὅτι ὀργὴ κ. πόλεμός εἰσι τὸ διαβούλιον αὐτοῦ* BZ. **ὀργὴν . . . παροξύνει* om. V alone. *εἰς αἵματα*] *θύμον* BZ.

11–22. *καὶ οὐκ ἐᾷ . . . ἀνθρώπων* om. V only.

11, 12. *καὶ οὐκ ἐᾷ . . . ἐνεργεῖν* om. BZ. Cp. R and P.

14. *φαντάζων* or *φαντάζεται καί* BZ. *διαταράσσει*] *παραπέμπει* BZ.

15. *διυπνίζει* BZ. So R.

16. *ἔχων ἐν ἑαυτῷ, οὕτως* BZ.

22. **καὶ ἔσεσθε . . . ἀνθρώπων* om. BZ. ? per homoioteleuton, for P also omits.

25. *μεθ' ὑμᾶς* BZ, with Ox.: V om. with R.

26. *ἀδικήσουσιν* BZ: *"shall go" V. *δυνήσονται*] + *στῆναι*, or similar, all, with R.

27. *ἐπολέμησαν* or *ἐπολέμουν* all. om. *πᾶσαν* all.

28. *καὶ ἔσονται δοξαστοί, ὑμεῖς δὲ ὀλιγοστοί* and om. *ἐπιμερ.* V only. *καὶ οὐκ ἔσται* all. With R and P.

P. 137. 1. *μου*] *ἡμῶν* all.

2. *εὐλογίαις αὐτοῦ* all.

3. *εἴρηκα* all. *ὅπως . . . ὑμῶν*] *τὰ σκάνδαλα τῶν υἱῶν ὑμῶν* V only.

4. om. *τῶν ψυχῶν* all. With R. *τὸν φθ. κ. π. σκλ.*] *τοῦτο* V only.

5. *τὰ τέκνα ὑμῶν καὶ τὰ ὀστᾶ μου* V only.

6. *ἡ σάρξ μου* om. V only.

7. *πληθυνθήσονται* BZ, with Ox.: but V = *"shall be honoured" *τιμηθήσεται. αὐτῶν*] *αὐτοῦ* BZ: *"of Judah" V.

9. *καὶ . . . Καππάδ.*] BZ omits: V has *καὶ πᾶσι τοῖς ἀλλογενέσι*, and then omits as far as *τότε* in l. 12.

10. *ἐκλείψει*] *ἐξολοθρεύσεται* all.

12. *Σήμ*] *Σήθ* V only.

13. *θεὸς ἡμῶν φανήσεται ἐπιγ.* V, omitting *μέγας τοῦ* 'I. With R. *φαιν. ἐπὶ γῆς*] *δοξασθήσεται ἐπὶ γῆς καὶ φανήσεται* all.

13, 14. *καὶ σώζων . . . Ἀδάμ*] om. BZ: but V = *καὶ ἀνασώζων ἑαυτόν*, omitting *τὸν Ἀδάμ*. Cp. Ox.

14. *πλάνης*] + *τοῦ Βελιάρ* V only.

15. *εἰς ὄλεθρον* V only. *πάντων τῶν* all.

16. ἀναστησόμεθα . . . κ. εὐλογήσομεν all. ἐν τοῖς θαυμ. om. V only.

18. ἔσωσεν ἀνθ.] *om. V.

20. After λυτρωθήσεσθε V alone adds the following gloss: *ὅτι ἐκ γένους αὐτοῦ γεννηθήσεται κύριος ὁ θεός. δύο ἀδελφοὺς τούτους all. ὑμῖν] ἡμῖν.

21. om. τοῦ θεοῦ all.

22. καὶ θεόν BZ only. οὗτος BZ, with Ox.: καί V.

23. πᾶν τὸ γένος καὶ τὰ ἔθνη ἀνθρώπων and om. τοῦ Ἰσ. BZ: V has πάντα ἄνδρα καὶ ἔθνη ἀνθρώπων, also omitting τοῦ Ἰ. alt. πάντα om. all.

24. om. ἵνα BZ only. ὑμῶν] V only adds ἵνα καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐντείλωσι τοῖς τέκνοις αὐτῶν.

25. αὐτά] τὰς ἐντολάς all.

27. ἕκατον εἴκοσι] BV have "in the 125th year": Z* "in the 127th year." ἐτῶν τῆς ζωῆς αὐτοῦ all.

28. τὰ ὀστᾶ αὐτοῦ] αὐτόν V only.

P. 138. 2. ταμείοις] so BZ: but V = "in the *dwellings*."

3. οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι καὶ οἱ ἐπ. all. Ἰωσήφ] + ἐξ Αἰγύπτου Z only.

4. Αἰγ.] γῇ all. So R, cp. Ox.

4, 5. καὶ πλ. μεγ. σ. τ. Αἰγ.] om. V only.

5. om. ἕκαστος V only.

7. υἱοὶ Σ.] ἀδελφοὶ Σ. καὶ υἱοί BZ only.

7, 8. κατὰ τ. ν. τ. π.] om. all. With R.

8, 9. ἀπ' Αἰγ.] om. all. With R.

F. C. CONYBEARE.

(To be continued.)

Two of the Sabbath Morning Hymns, recited between Passover and Pentecost.

A SONG OF REDEMPTION.

From the Hebrew of Ibn Gebirol.

Captive of sorrow on a foreign shore,
A handmaid as 'neath Egypt's slavery:
Through the dark day of her bereavement sore
She looketh unto thee.
Restore her sons, O mighty One of old!
Her remnant tenth[1] shall cause man's strife to cease[2].
O speed the message; swiftly be she told
Good tidings, which Elijah shall unfold:
Daughter of Zion, sing aloud! behold
Thy Prince of Peace!

Wherefore wilt thou forget us, Lord, for aye[3]?
Mercy we crave!
O Lord, we hope in thee alway;
Our King will save!

Surely a limit boundeth every woe,
But mine enduring anguish hath no end;
My dreary years are spent in ceaseless flow,
My wound hath no amend.
O'erwhelmed, my helm doth fail; no hand is strong
To steer the bark to port, her longed-for aim.
How long, O Lord, wilt thou my doom prolong?
When shall be heard the dove's sweet voice of song[4]?
O leave us not to perish for our wrong,
Who bear thy name!

[1] Isa. vi. 13. [2] Isa. xix. 24. [3] Lam. v. 20. [4] Song of Songs ii. 12.

Wherefore wilt thou forget us, Lord, for aye?
Mercy we crave!
O Lord, we hope in thee alway;
Our King will save!

Wounded and crushed, beneath my load I sigh,
Despised and abject, outcast, trampled low;
How long, O Lord, shall I of violence cry,
My heart dissolve with woe?
How many years, without a gleam of light,
Has thraldom been our lot, our portion pain!
With Ishmael, as a lion in his might,
And Persia, as an owl of darksome night[1],
Beset on either side, behold our plight
Betwixt the twain.

Wherefore wilt thou forget us, Lord, for aye?
Mercy we crave!
O Lord, we hope in thee alway;
Our King will save!

Is this thy voice?
The voice of captive Ariel's[2] woe unhealed?
Virgin of Israel, arise! rejoice!
In Daniel's vision, lo! the end is sealed[3]:
When Michael on the height
Shall stand aloft in strength,
And shout aloud in might,
And a Redeemer come to Zion at length[4]!
Amen, amen, behold,
The Lord's decree foretold.
E'en as thou hast our souls afflicted sore,
So wilt thou make us glad for evermore[5]!

[1] Alluding probably to the persecutions which Jews suffered both under the Crescent and the Cross.

[2] Isa. xxix. 1, 2. [3] Dan. xii. [4] Isa. lix. 20.

[5] Ps. xc. 15.

Wherefore wilt thou forget us, Lord, for aye?
Mercy we crave!
O Lord, we hope in Thee alway;
Our King will save!

NINA DAVIS.

A SONG OF LOVE[1].

From the Hebrew of Rabbi Isaac ben Reuben Alfasi.

My noble love!
O dove of wondrous grace!
What aileth thee that thou dost weep in woe?
Messiah cometh unto thee: then go,
Fly to thy resting-place.
I am thy Saviour, who will ransom thee;
Thy hope from ancient day:
Know that in truth I say,
I, thy Redeemer, I will set thee free[2],
My noble love!

My Mighty Love!
Where is thy troth of yore,
The vision of the seers of ages gone,
Proclaiming to the lone, the outcast one,
Whose glory is no more,
That she shall yet be sought, again shall shine,
A very great delight?
Thine is redemption's right,
Yea, and the power of sole possession thine[3],
My Mighty Love!

My noble love!
I found delight in thee,
O fair one! when I saw thee in thy youth,
And passing o'er thee with my bond of truth,
Betrothed thee unto me.

[1] A dialogue between God and Israel. [2] Ruth iii. 12. [3] Jer. xxxii. 8.

Yet will I gather thee to mine abode,
The dwelling of my rest,
My habitation blest,
Which I have builded and on thee bestowed,
My noble love!

My Mighty Love!
The faithful envoy haste.
Thy knowledge he shall spread, and strength instil
To keep the word that bade me do thy will,
And said to me, "Be chaste:"
And did ordain, "If thou wilt not obey,
To exile shalt thou go."
It hath, alas! been so;
That doom foretold hath come to pass this day[1],
My Mighty Love!

My noble love!
Tried in the furnace blaze
Of dire affliction[2]; thou with shackled feet,
Shalt yet adorn thy form with joy complete,
Gird thee thy song of praise.
The crown of beauty, diadem divine,
It seemeth good to me
To give it unto thee[3],
That sanctified perfection may be thine,
My noble love!

My Mighty Love!
Nought of my fame is left,
Though erst I dwelt in regal robes of grace,
My sons lie slain, the scions of my race,
Of kin I stand bereft.
Behold me wrapt in darkness deep and fell,
Sunk in the loathsome pit,
By ray of light unlit,
The great stone lieth heavy o'er the well[4],
My Mighty Love!

[1] Gen. xli. 13. [2] Isa. xlviii. 10. [3] Gen. xxix. 19. [4] Gen. xxix. 2.

My noble love!
My friend, come forth to me:
Yea, from the grasp of foes be thou relieved,
From them, who full of guile, have thee deceived,
That speak false words to thee;
Because thou wilt not strangers' paths pursue,
And didst not go astray
Along their erring way,
Nor seekedst thou new loves[1], but still art true,
My noble love!

My Mighty Love!
Stern bondage holdeth me,
And grievous woe; though vainly evermore
The foe allureth and doth press me sore,
With keen words, ceaselessly,
To turn aside from thee, the fount of bliss,
Yea, to forsake thy Name,
Transgressing to my shame
The word revealed. My God! have I done this?
My Mighty Love!

My noble love!
I by myself have sworn
To summon thee, my servant, unto me;
And shall not kings bring presents unto thee[2],
Thy glory to adorn?
A witness have I made my holy one,
For nations to behold,
For peoples manifold,
For lo! of Jesse have I seen a son,
My noble love!

NINA DAVIS.

[1] Ruth iii. 10. [2] Ps. lxviii. 29.

MEGILLATH MISSRAIM, OR THE SCROLL OF THE EGYPTIAN PURIM.

I.—Introductory Remarks.

In the course of my examination of the British Museum MS. Or. 67, my attention was arrested by an interesting historico-liturgical document, which, on a closer study of its contents, proved to be the long-lost Megillah of the Egyptian Purim. My principal guide in the identification of the document was the late Professor Graetz's reference to it in Volume IX of his *Geschichte der Juden*[1], and an examination of the sources to which he refers has helped to throw a good deal of fresh light on the subject. After narrating the events connected with Ahmed Shaitan's revolt against Sultan Soliman in 1524, and the deliverance of the Caïrene Jews from the destruction which the rebel had designed for them, Professor Graetz states, in an elaborate note[2], that "there once existed a complete Megillah on these events," and he then proceeds to name the "secondary sources," which in default of the original Chronicle, he had consulted. These are, (1) the "anonymous" work, entitled מאורעות עולם[3]; (2) David Conforte's קורא הדורות; (3) Joseph

[1] Dritte verbesserte und vermehrte Ausgabe. Leipzig, 1891.

[2] *Op. cit.*, p. 22.

[3] To this work Dr. Gaster drew my attention before I consulted Graetz, and as it is not identical with the booklet bearing the same title in Zedner's *Catalogue of the Hebrew Books in the British Museum* (see under "Abraham Moses," page 32), he kindly lent me his copy of the Hebrew text, together with a Spanish translation of a part printed in the

Ibn Verga's *Additamenta* to שבט יהודה; and (4) *The Chronicle of Joseph Sambary*, published in Dr. Neubauer's *Mediaeval Jewish Chronicles*. To these may be added Joseph Cohen's עמק הבכא (Wien, 1852), pp. 95–6, and the short reference to the subject in the same author's דברי הימים למלכי צרפת ובית אוטאמאן (Lemberg, 1859), part II, fol. 5a. As students will, no doubt, proceed to examine these secondary sources for themselves, I will here only remark that special mention is made of the Megillah by Joseph Sambary[1], who finished his work in 1672, by David Conforte, whose קורא הדורות[2] was written between 1677–83[3], and also in מאורעות עולם, fol. 19 b (under ספור מלכי עותמנלים). It may also be useful to notice that Joseph Sambary's account is on the whole in fuller agreement with the Megillah itself than Joseph Ibn Verga's *Additamenta*, which were written over a hundred years earlier[4]. This is accounted for by the fact that Joseph Sambary was a native of Egypt[5], and had himself taken part in the celebration of the Caïrene Purim. Some further references to several of the secondary sources will be found in the notes added to the translation of the scroll, and a fuller and wider view of the historical events[6] connected with

Hebrew character. The former appears to have been published at Smyrna in 1756, and the title-page of the latter shows that it appeared at Constantinople in 1767.

[1] Dr. Neubauer's *Mediaeval Jewish Chronicles*, p. 145.

[2] Edit. Venice, 1746, fol. 33 a.

[3] See Dr. Steinschneider's *Cat. Lib. Hebr. Bibl. Bodl.*, p. 858.

[4] Completed in 1554.

[5] See Neubauer, *op. cit.*, p. xvii: "The writer (i.e. J. Sambary) is well acquainted with Egypt, his native country."

[6] It is interesting to notice that the British Museum also possesses a printed contemporary Latin News-letter in which Ahmed's revolt, together with certain subsequent events of Soliman's reign, are described. This letter, which was written within a few months after Ahmed's death (dated June 29th, 1524), was addressed by Michaelis Bocignolus to Gerardus Planias, "Caesareae Maiestatis secretarium." The writer does not, however, appear to have possessed a very accurate knowledge of the events on which he wrote.

Ahmed's revolt may be gained by a perusal of the account given of it in Hammer-Purgstall's *Geschichte des Osmanischen Reiches*[1].

There is at present no reason to doubt the statements of Joseph Sambary, David Conforte, and the author of מאורעות עולם, who looked upon the Megillah as the composition of contemporaries of the events narrated therein, and it is also only reasonable to suppose that the "savants of Egypt" (חכמי מצרים) of the former, and the "savants of the generation" (חכמי הדור) of the two latter, include David Ibn Abi Zimra[2], under whose Rabbinate Ahmed's revolt and hostility to the Jews broke out, and Samuel Sidillo, who conducted the special "prayers and supplications" in his own Synagogue (ק"ק מסחערב)[3].

It is, at any rate, certain that a composition to which a definite place was for a long number of years assigned in the Egyptian liturgy, could only have been put forward under the direct sanction of the spiritual heads of the community, and it therefore follows that the Megillah must have borne the "imprimatur" of the two honoured names just mentioned, if it was not actually composed by them.

With regard to the style in which the scroll was written, it can be seen at a glance that it was purposely composed in close imitation of the Book of Esther; and although it is not quite free from non-Biblical words and constructions, it reads almost entirely like a Biblical narrative. The imperfect with the "waw-consecutive" is regularly employed in exact conformity with classical usage, and the document is also singularly free from involved constructions, which form one of the marks of the Rabbinic and the semi-Rabbinic Hebrew style.

[1] Zweite verbesserte Ausgabe. Pesth, 1834, vol. II, pp. 36-8.

[2] See Graetz, *op. cit.*, pp. 19-21.

[3] See קורא הדורות, fol. 32 b. Comp. Neub., *op. cit.*, p. 145, where it is stated that the Synagogue is called ק"ק כידיליו עד היום.

II.—The Text.

[מגלת מצרים][1]

[2]ויהי בימי המלך שלמה הוא המלך שלמה המולך במלכות תוגרמה וארץ המזרח וארץ יון ובמחנות[3] רבות: בימים ההם כשבת המלך שלמה על כסא מלכותו אשר בקוסטנדינא העיר הגדולה ויתבונן בכל מדינות מלכותו וישלח לכל מדינה ומדינה שר אחד לשפוט את עמה בצדק ובמשפט · אחר הדברים האלה גדל המלך שלמה איש אחד משריו ושמו השטן הידוע וישם את כסאו מעל כל השרים אשר אתו · וישלה אותו שר על ארץ מצרים ויצו אותו לאמר מצרים נתתיה לך ובה תשב ועל פיך ישק כל עמי רק הכסא אגדל ממך · רק חזק ואמץ מאד לשפוט בצדק ולהרחיק הבצע והמטבע תשים על שמי · ויבא השטן הידוע אל ארץ מצרים ויעל הפסגה וישב בה · ויתחיל לעשוק ולבצוע ויעש הרע בעיני השם ויירב בימיו המס ויטוש השטן הידוע דבר המלך ויקבוץ הון רב ולא שבעה נפשו ועינו כי רחב נפש היה עד מאד · ותגבה נפשו מאד ויתן בלבו למרוד על המלך ויאסוף הון רב מכל אנשי מצרים ויתלקטו אליו אנשים רקים ופוחזים ויספרם וימצאם כשני אלפים איש · ויכרות ברית עמהם וישם להם הנחות ויחלק להם מעות כל אחד לפי ערכו · וישלח ידו תחילה בקצינים אשר היו בפסגה וגם מחיל המלך שלמה הרג כשלשים נפש · ויקח את כל החיל אשר באו אליו וילך וישם אהלו[4] על שפת היאור · ויהי כאשר ראו חיל המלך שלמה הנשארים כי נהרגו הקצינים[5] אשר היו בפסגה וכי השטן הידוע מרד במלך שלמה ויתקבצו כל החיל ויעלו אל הפסגה ויסגרו דלתותיה עליהם וישבו[6] שמנה ימים בתוכה · ויהי כראות השטן הידוע כי חיל המלך שלמה לא שמעו בקולו וכי עלו לפסגה ומרדו בו ויתיעץ השטן עם יועציו ויאמר להם מה נעשה · ויאמרו אליו אם תקבל עצתינו ותעשינה אז נעשה אותך[7] מלך · עתה לך והלחם עם חיל המלך שלמה ותקח הפסגה ותשב בה אז תקום הממלכה בידך · ויהי כשמוע השטן הידוע את הדבר הזה ותיטב בעיניו עצתם וילך וילקט מהעבדים אלף עם החיל אשר עלו עמו ונאספו אליהם

[1] There is no heading in the MS., but the title prefixed to this edition seems suitable.

[2] Or. 67, fol. 260 b.

[3] The right reading is probably ובמדינות.

[4] MS. אהולו. [5] MS. בקציגים. [6] MS. וישב (?).

[7] The MS. has לעשות אותך for נעשה אותך, or נעשיך.

כשני אלפים מעם הארץ ויעל הוא וכל עמו מאחורי הפסגה אל ראש ההר ·
ויתקן שם את כלי המשחית ויהיו נלחמים עמו שלשה ימים ולא יכלו לבא
אל הפסגה · ויהי ביום הרביעי וישלך עליהם[1] את כלי המשחית ויבא על
כותל אחד מן החומה ויפלהו לארץ · ותפול החומה על חמש מאות איש
מחיל השטן הידוע ויוציאום מתחת החומה פגרים מתים · ויהי ביום ההוא
בנפול החומה ויעלו חיל השטן הידוע אל הפסגה ויהרגו מחיל המלך שלמה
תשעים נפש · והנשארים מחיל המלך שלמה ברחו ונמלטו ולא נתן השם
בלב חיל השטן הידוע לרדוף אחריהם עוד · ביום ההוא בעת עלות השטן
הידוע אל הפסגה וישימו אותו כל חילו מלך עליהם · ובעת שעשאוהו מלך
עליהם ויזעקו ברחוב מצרים וכל עריה כי נעשה[2] השטן הידוע מלך · ויהי
בהעשותו[3] מלך וישם מס על כל האנשים אשר במצרים כי בקש לקחת את
כל ממונם · ויבואו חיל השטן הידוע ויאמרו אליו אדונינו המלך אתה ידעת
מה עשו עבדיך לך והמלכנוך עלינו מלך במצרים · ועתה אם מצאו עבדיך
חן בעיניך ואם על המלך טוב תנתן דת להשמיד להרוג ולאבד את כל
היהודים מנער ועד זקן טף ונשים וללם לבוז ולהנקם מהם כי הם אויבינו
וצרינו: [4]ויאמר אליהם השטן הידוע היהודים נתונים לכם ועשו להם כטוב
בעיניכם · ויהי כאשר שמעו היהודים הדבר הזה ויעשו אבל כבד מאד ויזעקו
צעקה גדולה ומרה · ויקראו צום ויבכו ויעלו על ראשם עפר ויחגרו שקים
מקטנם ועד גדולם ותאבל הארץ ואומלל כל יושבי בה · ויהיו בכל יום ויום
צמים וצועקים עד שעלתה בכיתם השמימה · הרצים יצאו דחופים בדבר השטן
הידוע והדת נתנה בחצר היהודים וכל היהודים נבוכו · ויהי כשמוע חיל השטן
הידוע את דבר מלכם ויאספו מהם ומעם הארץ אלפים איש · ויבואו על
העיר בטח ויבזו את כל אשר להם וישללו מהם שלל רב · והיה כל מי שימצא
יהודי מבקש להרגו והרגו חמשה יהודים · והיהודים היו בורחים רצים ואצים
למלט את נפשותם כי אמרו כולנו מתים · ותהי צעקה גדולה במצרים וימת[5]
יהודי אחד מרוב הפחד · ותעל שועת בני ישראל אל השם השמימה ויזכור
להם בריתו אשר כרת עם אברהם ועם יצחק ועם[6] יעקב · אי"ש יחידי[7] היה
בפסגת הבירה והאל שלחו עזרי ומושיעי ותומך[8] ביד ימיני · והיה בהיות
היהודים צועקים ויוגד הדבר לשר משרי השטן הידוע ויעמוד לפניו כי היה
משנה לו · ויאמר לו המלך אם נא מצאתי חן בעיניך המלך ואם על המלך

[1] MS. עלהם. [2] MS. עשה. [3] MS. בעשותו. [4] Fol. 261 a.
[5] MS. ומת. [6] MS. ועים. [7] The MS. appears to have יחידו.
[8] The MS. appears to have ותומה.

טוב הניח ליהודים כי מה פשעם ומה חטאתם כי תמסרם ביד מבקשי רעתם ·
ואם על המלך טוב יותן כספם וזהבם אל גנזי המלך אנוכי אערבנו מידי
תבקשנו · ויאמר השטן הידוע אל המשנה לך עשה כאשר תחפוץ וכל העם
לעשות בו כטוב בעיניך כי מצאת חן בעיני · ויבא המשנה ויכרז בחצר היהודים
כה אמר המלך אל יפשוט איש ידו ביהודים · ויאמר המשנה ליהודים שלום
לכם אל תיראו כי המלך צוה עליכם · ויהי כאשר שללו חיל השטן הידוע
את היהודים ויקחו את כל השלל ויניחו אותו בבית אחד השרים · אחר
הדברים האלה בקש השטן הידוע מהיהודים מאה וחמשים אלף פרחים זהב
גדולים ואמר גם כן אם לא תביאום במהרות אמתכם בחרב · וכשמוע
היהודים את הדבר הרע הזה ויתאבלו ולא יכלו לענות אותו כי נבהלו מפניו ·
ויהי כאשר ראו בני ישראל כי יד השם נגעה בם ויזרקו עפר על ראשם
ויתקעו בשופר ויקראו עצרה וישובו איש מדרכו הרעה ויצעקו אל השם בקול
גדול ובבכיה · ובהיותם בוכים ומתחננים לפני צורם ויעלו מהם אנשים ויפלו
לפני השטן הידוע ארצה ולא שמע אליהם · וישם השטן הידוע מס על
הארץ ועל אנשי מצרים ועל הסוחרים ואמר אליהם תביאו לי כסף וזהב בלא
מספר · ויקח השטן הידוע מהיהודים אשר היו במצרים ממון רב והיו נתפשים
ביד אויביהם להכות אותם מכה רבה ועצומה · וכאשר תקפה עליהם הצרה
והגזרה ויחבאו מקצת מהיהודים ותנתן דת לכל אנשי מצרים כי כל יהודי
אשר יחבא יתלוהו על פתח ביתו · ובכל יום ויום הנוגשים פושטים יד
ביהודים ליסרם ולהכותם מכה רבה עצומה · ויבואו אנשים מחיל השטן
הידוע ויתפשו היהודים לקחת מהם כספם וזהבם וכל אשר להם · ויצעקו
אל השם בצר להם וממצוקותיהם יושיעם · ויתחננו אל השם בקול גדול
ושמע השם נאקתם ולא היה בית במצרים אשר אין בו בכי והספד[1] ואנחה ·
ובתשעה עשר לחדש אדר בקש השטן הידוע להאביד את כל היהודים אשר
במצרים מנער ועד זקן טף ונשים ושללם לבוז · [2]ובשמונה עשר לחדש אדר
נקבצו היהודים לעמוד על נפשם בתפלה ובתחנונים ובצעקה גדולה ובצום
ובכי ושק ואפר יוצע לרבים · ותעל שועת בני ישראל אל השם וישמע את
נאקתם ויזכור להם בריתו · וירא אלקים את מעשיהם ואת תעניתם ואת שקם
ולא בזה ענותם וישלם ישעם פתאום ויושיעם מיד אויביהם ומבקשי רעתם:
בלילה ההוא עלתה שועתינו לפני האלקים ונכתבו תפילותינו בספר הזכרונות
ויהיו נקראים לפני המלך · ויאמר ראה ראיתי את עני[3] עמי אשר במצרים
ואת צעקתם מפני נוגשיו כי ידעתי את מכאוביו · ביום ההוא נתיעצו השרים

[1] So the MS. ומכפד would be better. [2] Fol. 261 b. [3] MS. בני.

הנשארים מחיל המלך שלמה אשר היו מדברים עם[1] השטן הידוע בלב ולב ·
ויועדו לתפוש השטן הידוע ויקחו עמם מחיל המלך שלמה הנשארים שלשים
איש · ויעלו הפסגה ולא מצאו השטן הידוע בפסגה כי היה בבית המרחץ ·
ויוגד להם לאמר הנה הוא במרחץ וילכו אליו כדי לתפשו וישמע ויברח
מפניהם · (וירדפו חיל המלך שלמה אחרי השטן הידוע וישמע[2] ויברח
מפניהם)[3] ויעלו ולא מצאוהו · ויהי כראות שרי המלך שלמה כי השטן
הידוע ברח ויעלו על הפסגה וישבו בה · וימהרו ויזעקו בכל רחובות מצרים
שלום והשקט יהיה לכם ואל תפחדו · ויאמרו יחי אדונינו המלך שלמה
לעולם ותהי שמחה גדולה עד מאד ומצרים צהלה ושמחה · ליהודים היתה
אורה ושמחה וששון ויקר · ובתשעה עשר לחדש אדר נתועדו ונתקבצו חיל
גדול וילבישום כלי זיין ויקחום[4] עמם ויחלקום[4] שרי המלך שלמה לשלשה
חלקים וירדפו אחרי השטן הידוע וינוסו מחיל השטן הידוע אנשים ויחבאו
בשדי הקנים · ויוגד לחיל המלך שלמה כי אנשים ברחו והם נחבאים בשדי[5]
הקנים וישליכו עליהם אש וישרפו אותם ואת שדי הקנים · ויבואו חיל המלך
שלמה ויראו אותם שרופים באש · ויוגד לחיל השטן הידוע כי חיל המלך
שלמה רודף אחריהם וימת[6] לבם בקרבם ויעזבו את סוסיהם[7] ואת חרבותיהם[8]
וילכו[9] ויברחו מהם אנשים רבים וישליכו עצמם אל תוך היאור ויטבעו ·
ויבואו עליהם חיל המלך שלמה ויראו אותם מתים על שפת היאור · וינם[10]
השטן הידוע וכל חייליו אל עיר מערי מצרים ויכרתו להם ברית ויאכילום
וישקום · וירדפו חיל המלך שלמה אחרי חיל השטן הידוע וישיגו אותם
יוצאים מן העיר ויחרימו את העיר וישללו [אותה] וישרפו מקצתה[11] באש ·
והיהודים אשר היו בעיר שללו[12] אותם ולא הרגו מהם איש · וביום שמונה
ועשרים לחדש אדר רדפו חיל המלך שלמה אחרי השטן הידוע וישיגו אותו
ויתפשוהו ויחתכו את ראשו · ויביאו חיל המלך שלמה את ראש השטן
הידוע תלויה על רומח ויתלו אותה על שער החוילה לעיני כל העם · ויהי
בעת בא חיל המלך שלמה למצרים ועמם ראש השטן הידוע וישמחו אנשי
מצרים שמחה גדולה · וכראות היהודים את ישועת השם ואת הניסים אשר
נעשו להם כבימי[13] המן האגגי אשר בקש להשמיד להרוג ולאבד את כל

[1] MS. עים. [2] MS. וישמח.
[3] The words within ( ) appear unnecessary.
[4] MS. ויקחו . . . ויחלקו. [5] MS. משדי. [6] MS. וימות.
[7] MS. סוסהם. [8] MS. חרבותם. [9] Fol. 262 a.
[10] MS. וינוס. [11] MS. מקצתם. [12] Probably so, but not certain.
[13] MS. בימי.

היהודים מנער ועד זקן טף ונשים ושללם לבוז · כאשר יעץ העמלקי כן יעץ השטן הידוע לעשות והפר השם עצתם וקלקל מחשבותם ושב עמלם בראשם · על כן נקהלו היהודים והסכימו להתענות ביום שבעה ועשרים לחדש אדר ולעשות יום שמנה ועשרים משתה ושמחה ומשלוח מנות איש לרעהו[1] ומתנות לאביונים · על אשר עשה עמהם השם נסים ונפלאות והושיעם מיד מבקשי נפשותם · על כן קיימו וקבלו היהודים היושבים במצרים עליהם ועל זרעם ועל כל הנלוים עליהם להתענות ביום כ״ז לחדש אדר ולקרות המגילה הזאת בכ״ח בו ולעשות אותו יום משתה ושמחה · על כן קראו לימים האלה ימי נסים על שם שעשה עמהם נסים ונפלאות והושיעם מיד אויביהם · כן יאבדו כל אויבי השם ואויבי סגולתך כמו המן האגגי והשטן הידוע שבקשו להשמיד להרוג ולאבד את כל היהודים מנער ועד זקן טף ונשים ושללם לבוז · והשם ברחמיו הפר עצתם וקלקל מחשבותם ותלו אותם ואבדה רוחם ונשמתם ואוהביו כצאת השמש בגבורתו ותשקוט הארץ · ונזכור נפלאותיו וחסדיו אשר הוא עשה עמנו בכל יום ויום ובכל שעה ובכל זמן הושיענו ואנחנו עמיך[2] אביך ואביך

[3] · · · · על ישראל

III.—Translation.

And it came to pass in the days of King Soliman[4] (this is King Soliman who reigned in Turkey, and the Levant, and Greece, and in many [other] provinces[5]), that in those days, when King Soliman sat on the throne of his kingdom, which was in Constantinople, the great city, he considered all the provinces of his kingdom, and he sent to each province a chief to judge its people in righteousness and equity. After these things, King Soliman promoted one of his chiefs, whose name was Ahmed Shaitan[6], and he placed his seat above all the chiefs

[1] MS. לריעהו.

[2] The ׳ in עמיך is evidently intended to mark the vowel of the מ (עַמָּךְ, on account of the pause), and not to indicate a plural form.

[3] In the MS. a word that looks like גדיש (probably some unknown abbreviation) stands here. In the translation I have assumed the word שלום "peace."

[4] Sultan Soliman (or Sulaiman) I, surnamed the Magnificent, reigned from 1520 to 1566.

[5] The text has: "and in many military camps."

[6] The Hebrew has: "the well-known Satan" all through the Megillah. By the term הידוע, the Arabic name אחמר was probably meant to be

that were with him. And he sent him to be a ruler over the land of Egypt, and he commanded him, saying, Egypt have I given to thee, and in it shalt thou dwell, and according to thy word shall all my people be ruled; only in the throne will I be greater than thou. Only be thou strong and very courageous to judge in righteousness, and to discard unjust gain, and the coinage[1] shalt thou issue in my name. And Ahmed Shaitan came into the land of Egypt, and he went up to the citadel, and dwelt there. And he began to oppress, and to exact money, and he did that which was evil in the sight of the Holy One[2], and the taxes increased in his days, and Ahmed Shaitan forsook the command of the king, and gathered together much substance, and his spirit was not satisfied, neither was his eye satisfied, for he was a man of very great greed. And his soul was greatly lifted up, and he determined to rebel against the king; and he collected much substance from all the people of Egypt, and vain and light persons gathered round him, and he numbered them, and found them about two thousand men. And he made a covenant with them, and remitted them [their taxes], and he distributed money among them, to each man according to his value. And he first stretched out his hand against the wealthy men who were in the citadel, and he also killed about thirty persons of the force of King Soliman. And he took all the armed men who came to him, and he went and fixed his dwelling on the banks of the Nile. And it came to pass, when the remainder of the king's force saw that the wealthy men who had been in the citadel were killed, and that Ahmed Shaitan had rebelled against King Soliman, that the whole force assembled themselves, and went up into the citadel, and closed its gates upon them, and they stayed in it for eight days. And it came to pass, when Ahmed Shaitan saw that the force of King Soliman listened not to his voice, and that they had gone up into the citadel, and rebelled against him, that he consulted with his councillors, and said unto them, What should we do? And they said unto him, If thou wilt accept our counsel and act accordingly, then shall we make thee king. Now, go and fight against the force of King Soliman, and take the citadel, and dwell in it; then shall the kingdom be established in thy hand. And

vaguely represented. In Turkish history, Ahmed bears the name of "traitor."

[1] The two most important sovereign rights of the Sultan were the coinage and the خُطبة, i.e. the mention of his name in the public prayers at the mosque.

[2] The divine name is generally avoided in the Megillah. In the translation, the term השם is rendered by "the Holy One," wherever it occurs.

it came to pass, when Ahmed Shaitan heard this saying, that their counsel was well-pleasing in his eyes, and he went and collected a thousand men from among the slaves, together with the force that had gone up with him; and there assembled themselves unto them about two thousand of the people of the land, and he and all his people went up from behind the citadel to the top of the hill. And he prepared there the instruments of destruction, and they continued to fight against him for three days, so that they[1] could not enter the citadel. And it came to pass on the fourth day that he hurled upon them the instruments of destruction, and he scaled one wall of the fortification, and brought it down to the ground. And it fell upon five hundred men of Ahmed Shaitan's force, and they drew them out from under the wall dead bodies. And it came to pass on that day, when the wall fell, that the force of Ahmed Shaitan went up into the citadel[2], and killed ninety men of the force of King Soliman. And the remainder of King Soliman's force fled and escaped, and the Holy One did not put it into the heart of Ahmed Shaitan to pursue them further. On that day, at the time when Ahmed Shaitan went up into the citadel, his whole force made him king over them. And at the time when they made him king over them, they proclaimed in the streets of Cairo[3], and in all the neighbouring cities, that Ahmed Shaitan was made king. And it came to pass, when he had been made king, that he laid a tax upon all the inhabitants of Egypt, for he wanted to take away all their money. And Ahmed Shaitan's force came and said unto him, Thou knowest, O our lord the king, what thy servants have done unto thee, and that we have made thee king in Egypt. And now, if thy servants have found favour in thine eyes, and if it please the king, let a decree be given to destroy, to kill, and to cause to perish, all Jews, both young and old, little children and women, and to take the spoil of them for a prey, and to take vengeance of them, for they are our enemies and adversaries. And Ahmed Shaitan said unto them, The Jews are given unto you, and do unto them as is pleasing in your eyes[4]. And it came to pass when the Jews

[1] I.e. the force of Ahmed Shaitan.

[2] According to Hammer-Purgstall's (*op. cit.*) account, Ahmed entered the citadel by an old disused water-conduit, which had been pointed out to him. This statement agrees with the circumstantial details of Ahmed's entry into the castle as narrated in מאורעות עולם, fol. 18 b.

[3] It is well known that مصر (מצר) is also used to designate Cairo, and מצרים is, therefore, here translated sometimes by "Egypt," and sometimes by "Cairo," according to the requirements of the respective passages in which it occurs.

[4] Both Joseph Sambary and David Conforte report that Ahmed

heard this thing, that they made a very grievous mourning, and they cried with a loud and bitter cry. And they proclaimed a fast, and they wept, and they put earth upon their heads, and they put on sackcloth, from the least amongst them even unto the greatest, and the land mourned, and all the inhabitants thereof languished. And they continued fasting and crying every day until their weeping rose up to heaven. The posts went out, being hastened by the commandment of Ahmed Shaitan, and the decree was given in the quarter of the Jews, and all the Jews were perplexed. And it came to pass, when the force of Ahmed Shaitan heard the commandment of their king, that there assembled themselves together of them and of the people of the land about two thousand men. And they came upon the city securely, and they plundered all that belonged to them, and they took much spoil. And it was so that every one who found a Jew sought to kill him, and they killed five [1] Jews. And the Jews fled, running in haste to save their lives, for they said, We be all dead men. And a great cry arose in Cairo, and one Jew died from great fear. And the outcry of the children of Israel rose up to the Holy One to heaven, and he remembered his covenant which he had made with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob.

There was *one* [2] man in the citadel of the city, and God sent him to be my helper and deliverer, and the supporter of my right hand. And it was so that when the Jews were crying, the matter was reported to one of Ahmed Shaitan's chiefs, and he stood up before him, for he was second to him [in rank] [3]. And he said unto him, If I have found favour in thy sight, O king, and if it please the king, let the Jews alone, for what is their transgression, and what is their

Shaitan's anger against the Jews was caused by the part which Abraham de Castro, who was set over the Egyptian mint, took in making known to Sultan Soliman the designs of Ahmed with regard to the coinage. In מאורעות עולם, fol. 19a: וגם על היהודים אשר במצרים היה להם צער גדול על אודות הנגיד ה"ר אברהם קאשטרו. Bocignolus writes: "Erat Cayri quidam Judaeus vir satis amplae mercaturae, hic nescio quonam modo defectionem hanc non solum olfecerat, sed pene manifestis argumentis comprehenderat. Quamobrem Constantinopolim veniens . . . quid Axmatus moliatur exponit."

[1] It is plain from the Megillah itself that plunder was the main object of the enemy, and that massacre was only resorted to as a means to that end.

[2] Note the play on the words יחידי and יהודי (Esther ii. 5). Joseph Ibn Verga states that the name of this councillor was מאני.

[3] The word משנה, which is here translated literally, is rendered by "Grand Vizir" in the passages which follow.

sin, that thou shouldst deliver them into the hand of those who seek to do them evil. And if it be pleasing to the king, let their silver and their gold be given into the treasuries of the king; I will be surety for it, at my hands thou mayest require it. And Ahmed Shaitan said to the Grand Vizir, Go and do as thou desirest, and do to the whole people as is good in thine eyes, for thou hast found favour in my sight. And the Grand Vizir came and proclaimed in the quarter of the Jews: Thus said the king, Let no man stretch out his hand against the Jews. And the Grand Vizir said to the Jews, Peace shall be upon you; fear not, for the king has given orders concerning you. And it came to pass when the force of Ahmed Shaitan had plundered the Jews, that they took all the spoil, and carried it into the house of one of the chiefs.

After these things, Ahmed Shaitan desired of the Jews a hundred and fifty thousand great gold pieces[1], and he also said, If ye bring them not quickly, I shall kill you with the sword. And when the Jews heard this evil thing, they mourned, and could not answer him, for they were terrified before him. And it came to pass, when the children of Israel saw that the hand of the Holy One had touched them, that they threw earth upon their heads and blew the trumpet, and they convoked an assembly, and every one returned from his evil way, and they cried unto the Holy One with a loud voice and with weeping. And whilst they were weeping and making supplication before the Almighty, some men from amongst them went up, and fell down to the ground before Ahmed Shaitan, but he listened not to them. And Ahmed Shaitan imposed a tax upon the land, and upon the people of Egypt, and upon the merchants, and he said unto them, Bring unto me silver and gold without number. And Ahmed Shaitan took from the Jews of Cairo much money, and they were being seized by the hand of their enemies to smite them very sorely. And when the tribulation and the evil decree pressed heavily upon them, some of the Jews hid themselves, and the command was given to all the people of Cairo that they should hang every Jew, who should hide himself, on the door of his house. And every day the task-masters stretched out their hands against the Jews to smite them

[1] This agrees with the accounts given by Joseph Sambary, and the author of מאורעות עולם. Joseph Ibn Verga has מאתים ככרי כסף. The two former appear to have taken the words מאה וחמשים אלף פרחים גדולים from the Megillah itself, only leaving out the word זהב, which indeed mars the construction of the different terms. Illustrations of the term פרחים, lit. "flowers" or "blossoms" will be found in e.g. H. A. Grueber's *Account of a Hoard of Coins found at Ephesus* (London, 1872). Compare the term "florin."

very sorely. And certain men of Ahmed Shaitan's force came, and seized the Jews, to take from them their silver and their gold and everything that belonged to them. And they cried to the Holy One in their trouble, and that he may save them out of their distresses. And they made supplication[1] before the Holy One with a loud voice, and the Holy One heard their groaning, and there was not a house in Cairo in which there was not weeping, and lamentation, and sobbing. And on the nineteenth day of the month Adar Ahmed Shaitan sought to destroy all the Jews that were in Cairo, both young and old, little children and women, and to take the spoil of them for a prey. And on the eighteenth day of the month Adar, the Jews assembled themselves to stand for their life in prayer and supplication, and great crying, and in fasting and weeping; and sackcloth and ashes were spread under many. And the cry of the children of Israel went up to the Holy One, and he heard their groaning, and he remembered his covenant with them. And God saw their works, and their fasting, and their sackcloth, and he did not despise their humiliation, and he sent them help suddenly, and he saved them from the hands of their enemies and of those who sought their hurt.

In that night our cry went up before God, and our prayers were written in the book of remembrances, and they were read before the king[2]. And he said, I have surely seen the affliction of my people which are in Egypt, and have heard their cry by reason of their task-masters, for I know their sorrows. On that day was a council held by the chiefs who remained of King Soliman's force, and who had been addressing Ahmed Shaitan with a double heart. And they agreed to seize Ahmed Shaitan, and they took with them thirty men of those who remained of King Soliman's force. And they went up to the citadel, but they found not Ahmed Shaitan in the citadel, for he was in the bath. And it was told to them, saying, Behold, he is in the bath, and they went to him, in order to seize him; but he heard of it, and fled before them. (And King Soliman's force pursued Ahmed Shaitan, and he heard of it, and fled before them); and they went up, and found him not. And it came to pass, when Sultan Soliman's chiefs saw that Ahmed Shaitan had fled, that they went up into the citadel, and dwelt therein. And they hastened, and proclaimed in all the streets of Cairo: Peace and quietness be unto you, and be ye not afraid. And they said,

[1] Samuel Sidillo, the venerable chief of one of the Cairo Synagogues (vide *supra*), took a very prominent part in the arrangement and conduct of these services. See the accounts of Joseph Sambary, David Conforte, and מאורעות עולם.

[2] Note the not very happy allusion to Esther vi. 1.

May our lord, the King Soliman, live for ever; and there was very much joy, and Cairo rejoiced and was glad. The Jews had light, and gladness, and joy and honour. And on the nineteenth day of the month Adar, there was collected and assembled a great force, and they put armour on them, and they took them with them, and King Soliman's chiefs divided them into three parties, and they pursued Ahmed Shaitan; and certain men of Ahmed Shaitan's force fled, and hid themselves in the plantation of reeds. And it was reported to King Soliman's force, that certain men had fled, and that they were hidden in the plantation of reeds, and they threw fire upon them, and burnt them together with the plantation of reeds. And King Soliman's force came, and they saw them burnt in the fire. And it was told the force of Ahmed Shaitan that King Soliman's force was pursuing them, and their heart died within them, and they forsook their horses and their arms, and they went away; and many of their men fled, and threw themselves into the Nile and were drowned. And King Soliman's force came, and they saw them dead on the banks of the Nile. And Ahmed Shaitan and all his hosts fled to one of the cities of Egypt[1], and they made a covenant with them, and they gave them food and drink. And King Soliman's force pursued the force of Ahmed Shaitan, and they overtook them, as they were coming out of the city[2], and they destroyed the city, and they plundered [it], and burnt a part of it with fire. But the Jews who were in the city they plundered, but did not kill one of them. And on the twenty-eighth day of the month Adar, King Soliman's force pursued Ahmed Shaitan, and they overtook him, and seized him, and cut off his head. And King Soliman's force brought Ahmed Shaitan's head fixed upon a spear, and they hung it up on the gate of Zuwailah[3] before the eyes of all the people. And it came to pass, when King Soliman's force entered Cairo, [carrying] with them the head of Ahmed Shaitan, that the people of Cairo rejoiced with a great rejoicing. And when the

[1] In Hammer-Purgstall's account (p. 38), the tribe of the Benu-Bakr is stated to have sheltered the rebel.

[2] In Hammer-Purgstall the city is named Mahallel.

[3] The Hebrew has זוילה, but زويلة is the correct designation of the gate. See e.g. G. Zaidan, in his كتاب تاريخ مصر لحديث (Cairo, 1889), part ii, p. 72. In Niebuhr's *Reisebeschreibungen nach Arabien* (Kopenhagen, 1774), Band I, p. 111, a باب السويلي (suêli) is mentioned as being "ein sehr schönes Thor, jetzt fast mitten in der Stadt." I must express my thanks to my colleague, Mr. A. G. Ellis, for directing my attention to several of the authorities to which I have referred.

Jews saw the salvation of the Holy One, and the wonders which were done to them, as in the days of Haman the Agagite, who had sought to destroy, to kill, and to cause to perish all Jews, both young and old, little children and women, and to take the spoil of them for a prey—for as the Amalekite had counselled, thus counselled also Ahmed Shaitan to do; but the Holy One brought their counsel to nought, and caused their thoughts to perish, and their violent dealing came down upon their own pate—the Jews were assembled, and agreed to fast on the twenty-seventh day of the month Adar, and to make the twenty-eighth day a feast and rejoicing, and for sending portions one to another and gifts to the poor. Because the Holy One had done to them marvels and wonderful things, and had helped them out of the hands of those who had sought their life. The Jews, therefore, who dwell in Cairo ordained and took upon them, and upon their children, and upon all who join themselves to them, to fast on the twenty-seventh day[1] of the month Adar, and to read this scroll on the twenty-eighth day[1] of it, and to make it a day of feasting and rejoicing. They, therefore, called these days the Days of Marvels[2], because he had done to them marvels and wonderful things, and delivered them out of the hands of their enemies. Thus may all the enemies of the Holy One and the enemies of thy peculiar people perish like Haman the Agagite and Ahmed Shaitan, who had sought to destroy, to kill, and to cause to perish all Jews, both young and old, little children and women, and to take the spoil of them for a prey. But the Holy One, in his mercy, brought to nought their counsel and caused their thoughts to perish, and they hanged them, and their spirit and their breath of life perished; but those that love him are like the rising of the sun in his strength; and the land had rest. And let us remember his wonderful deeds and his acts of loving-kindness, which he is doing unto us every day, every hour; and at all times he has saved us. And we are thy people. Amen. [Peace] be upon Israel.

G. MARGOLIOUTH.

[1] Joseph Sambary, David Conforte, and the author of מאורעות יולם, correctly give the twenty-eighth day of Adar as the date of the festival. In Joseph Ibn Verga's account, the fast of the twenty-seventh appears to have become confused with the feast on the following day. The chronological difficulty is clearly stated by Professor Graetz.

[2] The feast was known as the Caïrene Purim. In Graetz: "Kairoanische Purim. Furim al-Missrajin."

CORRECTIONS AND NOTES TO AGADATH SHIR HASHIRIM.

(*Concluded from Vol. VII, p.* 754.)

L. 801–802. אני . . . האומות. YS. 177 a, § 985.

L. 802–803. העולם . . . ד״א. Quoted in the Commentary attributed to Nachmanides as אמרו רז״ל. So also Recanati, 38 c.

L. 803–804. העמקים . . . שושנת. CH. II, 1, § 3.

L. 804–10. העולם . . . כדרך. YS. 177 a, b. See also *Mishneh Bikkurim*, III, §§ 2, 3, 4. According to these parallels we might correct our text in the following way: . . . ד״א כדרך שהשושנה מביא והשור בראשו ועטרה של זית בראשו . . . בכוריהן ענבים וכו׳ הקרובים היו מביאין והחליל היה מכה לפניהם.

L. 810–22. השרון . . . ד״א. See *Mechilta*, 30 a, 31 b, and parallels (especially *Midrash Tillim*, cxiv, אמרו לו האיך נעבור בין החומות הללו). In l. 816 we must correct ואו׳ מה ממתינים אנחנו שמא הטעה כל י״א לא. Perhaps we should also correct in l. 820 עשו כן containing a Derasha of an opposite tendency on וימרו. See *Sifre*, 64 b, and Chapters of R. Eliezer, c. 42 and note 36.

L. 822–25. אריות . . . ד״א. See above, l. 195, with regard to Abraham. See also Apocrypha to the O. T., The Song of the Three Holy Children, who are חמ״וע. Perhaps the שירה of Daniel has some connexion with the well-known legend of Habakkuk's visit to Daniel in the lion's den. Cp. Neubauer's ed. *Book of Tobit*, 39; Brüll's *Jahrbücher*, VIII, 29, note 1; and Epstein, *Bereschith Rabbathi*, pp. 14, 15.

L. 826–30. בשושנה . . . מבים אתה. See CH. II, 1, § 1; and 2, § 5. The MS. Commentary to the *Machzor*: יתנני רון מצהלת . . . ד״א ראיתי באגדת ש״הש אני חבצלת השרון כיון שעלו ישראל מן הים אמרו שירה ועל דבר זה יסד הפייטן יתנני רון מצהלת וראיתי מדרש בשושנה

בין החזיתים כדרך שהשושנה נאה בין החוחים כך ישראל נאים בין האומות אימתי הם נאים בשעה שעלו ממצרים כחבצלת והוא שיסד נאים עריבי ניחוחים ד״א אימתי השושנה נאה כשהיא למעלה מן החוחים ואם נתחייב׳ השושנה הרוח מנשבת בחוחים ומנקרין אותה.

L. 831–34. ונשמע . . . כתפוח. See CH. II, 3, § 1; VIII, 5, § 1.

L. 834–39. נמצא . . . ד״א. See Rashi to this verse: הדוגמא כך הק״בה מכל האלהים נבחר. Something like this Derasha must have been in our text, but it is difficult to say what the exact words were in l. 836 (ברקונו . . . וצידון). L. 838 read מאונם instead of מונם.

L. 840–41. האבות . . . הביאני. See above, l. 345, and cp. GR. XCVIII, 8, 9. The ל״ט to this verse: בזמן שישא הק״בה נס לגוים ונפוצות יהודה יקבץ. See also CH. II, 4, § 1, א״ר ברכיה the reference to יעקב, to which perhaps the האבות in our text alludes.

L. 842–45. חכמים . . . סמכוני. Perhaps we should correct l. 844 מיני תענוגים or ריכוכים. Cp. CH. II, 5, § 1; *Pesikta K.*, 101 b, and parallels. See also the quotation from the ל״ט, given by Salfeld, p. 39, note 1, which is taken from our text. The MS. Commentary to the *Machzor*: וכן דורש במדרש סמכוני באשישות אלו דברי אגדה שנוחין לשומען כאשישות של יין שנוחין לשתותן למה נמשלו ד״ת לחולה מה חולה אינו אוכל אלא דבילה ולא פת צונן אלא פת חם כך הדור הזה אינן מבקשין מסכתות חמורות אלא אגדות ושיחות חכמים וזהו כוונתי חולת חששות.

L. 846–49. ומלמטה . . . שמאלו. YS. 177 c, according to which the words זה אהרן must be completed after לראשי in l. 846. The ל״ט to this verse: שבח לפני השם שהשמאל מרחקת והימין מקרבת. Cp. also Targum to this verse.

L. 850–58. וכאייל . . . השבעתי. YS. 177 d, a part of this passage (וכאייל . . . כך, l. 854–58), after which we have to complete the words במה השביען בצבאות in l. 854, and read או באיילות (instead of בו בא׳) in l. 856. YM.Is. 105 quotes the l. 850–53 from הגדת שה״ש. The השבועה שלא ימרדו במלכות שאם ימרדו הרי דמכם נשפך has ל״ט כצבי וכאיל. The שבולי הלקט, § 282, quotes to this verse a Derasha from מדרש שה״ש which is to be found neither in CH. nor in our text. See CH. II, 7, § 1.

L. 859–63. קול . . . מחבירו. YS. 177 d (ד״א . . . מחבירו, l. 860–63). See *Pesikta R.*, 4 b.

L. 864–65. דומה . . . אומרה. See CH. II, 9, § 1, and parallels; see also *Aruch*, s. v. אמיר״ה (the quotation from the *Mechilta*, 36 b ועשיתיו אימרה). This is then the answer to יפה את רעייתי.

L. 865–68. ד״א . . . ומפיע. Probably some corruption in the text which makes the sense so obscure. I can only guess that we have here some allusion to YS. I, 243 c in the name of the *Yelamdenu* and *Targum Jerushalmi* to Num. xxxiii, which Derashoth seem to read עֹפֶר יעקב = בחורי ישראל or עולימהון. The ד״א . . . יעקב would then be only another version of the preceding Derasha, whilst the citation הנה זה עמד אחר כתלנו should be put before מלמד in l. 866. The last words of which נראה מציל ומפיע remind somewhat of נגלה וחוזר ונכסה. See CH. II, 9. In the רוקח to this verse: מה הצבי והאיל חוזר למקומו כך השבינה תחזור למקומה.

L. 868–78. ד״א . . . הדרום. YM. Is. 150 in the name of הגדת שה״ש, after which we may correct here l. 871 והמשיח (זה המשיח); l. 872 שהוא באילו (בולו); l. 876 רוח סערה (גדולה); l. 878 אלו (אלא). See CH. IV, 16 and DR. I, 19. Cp. also CH. VIII, 12 מה צבי זה בשעה שהוא ישן עינו אחת פתוחה וכו׳.

L. 879–85. ענה . . . יענה. See CH. II, 11, 12, 13, and parallels.

L. 885–87. ד״א . . . יענה כדרכים (Jer. xxv. 30). The passage is defective. See ER. XXX, 1, and *Jerushalmi Berachoth*, 13 c.

L. 887–88. ד״א . . . צורים. See CH. II, 13, §§ 2, 3, and parallels, explaining הזמיר = זמנה של ערלה שתזמר.

L. 889–92. יונתי . . . האלהים. Perhaps we should read in l. 890 בזמן נענה שהציבור תחילה or מרוצה תחילה. See CH. II, 14, § 2.

L. 892–900. ד״א . . . ורכב. See CH. *ibid.* Cp. also *Mechilta*, 37 b.

L. 900–904. ד״א . . . לישראל. See CH. II, 14, §§ 2, 4, and 1; ER. XXI, 5. Instead of לאחר כך read לפיכך אמר. Still the passage is very corrupt.

L. 904–10. לאחר כך . . . במצות. Perhaps we should insert at the beginning of the passage ד״א בעולי רגלים הכת׳ מדבר (CH. *ibid.* § 7; cp. also § 25) to which the following story would serve as an illustration. In l. 908 we should perhaps read קרוא בור תמרה.

L. 910–14. בתפילתם . . . ד״א. YS. 178 b in a shortened form. Cp. *Mechilta*, 14 b, where he speaks of מ׳ יום. In l. 912 read במצר׳ instead of במער׳. Perhaps we ought to read במ״ת. See *Mechilta*, 65 b.

L. 915–18. הנשיאים . . . דודי. See CH. II, 16, § 1. The ל״ט: הרועה בשושנים כשרועה את ישראל שנ׳ רועה ישראל האזינה ואמר ידוע תדע פני צאנך אלו שאר העם עדרים אלו גדולי הדור.

L. 919–22. הבתרים . . . עד. See CH. II, 17, § 1. L. 920 read לתוך (for ליתן). In the ד״א the word סב is urged. Cp. Midrashim to Deut. ii. 3.

L. 923–28. העולם . . . אחזו. YS. 178 b. See *Midrash Mishle*, XIX, according to which our text must be corrected. Cp. CH. II, 15, § 2. The order of the verses is here disarranged.

L. 929–33. עד . . . על. See *Sebachim*, 119 a; *Mechilta*, 1 b; the Derashoth on the verse from Ps. cxxxii. 14. See also YS. 178 c, about the end. The MS. Commentary to the *Machzor*: ציפיתי פה עיכובי הייתי סבור שהיה קדושת עולם כשנבנה המשכן ולא היתה אלא קדושת שעה אבל כשמינה צבי קדש הוא בית המקדש מקום מבחר אמנה ירושלים שכתוב בה העיר אשר בחרתי מכל שבטי ישראל באותה שעה אקומה נא היא היתה קדושת עולם וכן דורש במדרש על משכבי בלילות כאדם המעכב על משכבו ולא היתה אלא קדושת שעה אבל כשנבנה בית המקרש היא הייתה קדושת עולם שנ׳ אקומה. The end of the Derasha is accordingly in the next verse, which is missing in our text. See also *Pesikta R.*, 7 b, about the חנוכות ז׳.

L. 934–36. ברפידים . . . אקומה. Cp. the Commentary attributed to R. Saadyah, 12 b: וטעם מצאוני השומרים יציאת העמלקי והכנעני שנ׳ וירד העמלקי.

L. 936–41. תפוס . . . ד״א. L. 939 read במצדות instead of בין הבתולות.

L. 941–45. ישראל . . . ד״א. YS. 178 b. In l. 942 read הגורן (instead of הגרזן). Cp. *Jerushalmi Synhedrin*, 18 d, and parallels, with regard to ארונה or ארנן.

L. 946–48. מדבר . . . מי. YS. 178 c. The ל״ט to this verse: מי זאת עולה מן המדבר וכי מן המדבר העלה אותם · והלא ממצרים העלה אותם שנ׳ אעלה אתכם מעני מצרים · הלא על חבתו של ישראל

לפני הק״בה שהן חביבין עליו כמציאה הזו שאדם מוצא במדבר · וכה״א ימצאהו בארץ מדבר · ואו׳ כענבים במדבר מצאתי ישראל · כתמרות עשן מה העשן הזה בכל מקום שהולך מיצר כך היו כל האומות מצירין בשעה שעלו ישראל ממצרים · שנ׳ אז נבהלו אלופי אדום וכו׳ וכן אמרה רחב הזונה ונשמע וימס לבנו · מקוטרת מור זכותו של אברהם אבינו שהיה ראש אמנה ונמשל למור שהוא ראש לבשמים שנ׳ מור דרור חמש מאות · ולבונה זה זכותו של יצחק שכשם שמקטירין הלבונה ע״ג המזבח כך העלה יצחק את עצמו ע״ג המזבח כשעקדו אביו שיצאו ממנו כהנים מלכים וחסידים והוא שאבק עם המלאך ויוכל. See YS. I, 278 b. Cp. also Targum to this verse.

L. 949–57. זקינים . . . ד״א. YS. *ibid.* Cp. CH. III, 5, § 2. See also above, l. 459. Perhaps on account of the atoning office of אהרן.

L. 958–64. תפילה . . . הנה. YS. 178 c. See CH. III, 6, § 2, and GR. XCVII, 6. Cp. also חידושי הרד״ל to NR. XI, note 26.

L. 964–67. ד״א . . . יו׳. YS. *ibid.* The ששים גבורים are probably the ס׳ מסכתות. Cp. the Commentary attributed to R. Saadyah: ויש אומרים ששים מסכתות שבמשנה הידועות בתלמוד וכולם אחוזי חרב אלו ישראל אנשי מלחמה שהיא מלחמת התורה. See NR. XVIII, 21.

L. 967–69. הנה . . . וגו׳. Probably we ought to place the ד״א in l. 968 before הנה in the preceding line. The just quoted Commentary וטעם מטתו שלשלמה זה המשכן וכו׳. Cp. CH. III, 6, § 3.

L. 969–70. ד״א . . . בירושלים. Read ד״א הנה מטתו שלשלמה זה ירושלים.

L. 970–75. ד״א . . . רעות. See above, l. 70, CH. III, 6, § 5.

L. 975–76. כולם . . . מישראל. Insert ד״א before כולם in l. 975. Perhaps this Derasha has some reference to the well-known story of the excommunication of ר״א בן הורקנם in *Baba Mezia*, 57 b and 60 a. Cp. the parallel in *Jerushalmi Moed Katon*, 81 d, אם חברים מתלחמים. See also such phrases as נעצו חרב in *Shabbath*, 17 a.

L. 978–84. אפריון . . . להם. See *Pesikta K.*, 1 a, b; NR. XII, 4; CH. III, 7, 8, §§ 1, 2. Our text is corrupt and defective, and confuses the Derasha of the משכן with that of the ארון. The Commen-

tary attributed to R. Saadyah: ואפיריון הוא המשכן . . . מעצי הלבנון אלו הקרשים מרכבו ארגמן אלו היריעות . . . תוכו רצוף אהבה לוחות הברית . . . ואמר ע״כ אהבתי מצותיך . . . וטעם מבנות ירושלים הם שני לוחות אבנים ואמרו חז״ל כי התורה נקראת בת מלך שנ׳ כל כבודה בת מלך פנימה. See Aben Ezra to *Song of Songs:* י״א כי בנות ירושלים הם בנות אומות העולם . . . וי״א המלאכים.

L. 985–95. ד״א . . . רשעים. YS. 178 d, only a part of this Derasha, after which we have to correct in l. 987 טללו של עולם (instead of פעלילו ש׳ ע׳). L. 994 read מבנות ירושלים instead of מב׳ ישראל. The ל״ט to this verse: ד״א אפריון ע׳ ל׳ המ׳ ש׳ זו ברית העולם שהוא עשו כביפה מעצי הלבנון כאדם שבונה ביתו מעצי הלבנון עמודיו עשה כסף אלו ההרים שהם כעמודים רפידתו זהב זה הרקיע שהוא כזהב מרכבו ארגמן זה כסא הכבוד תוכו רצוף אהבה אלו נפשות הצדיקים שאין מתערבות בשל רשעים. YM.Ps. 557 b (cp. also 164 b): הגדת שה״ש תוכו רצוף אהבה אלו נפשות הצדיקים שהן נתונות עמו במרום שלשה הן שנכנסו זה לפנים מזה ומשה נגש אל הערפל ולפנים ממנו צדק ומשפט מכון שכה״א צדק ומשפט מכון כסאך ולפנים מהם נפשותיהם של צדיקים שנ׳ אשר בידו נפש כל חי ואו׳ והיתה נפש אדוני צרורה בצרור החיים וגו׳. The Commentary attributed to Nachmanides, I, 13: וכן אמרו זל במדרש שה״ש תוכו רצוף אהבה . . . במרום ג׳ נכנסו זה לפנים מזה וכו׳, whilst רוקח, *ibid.* on our verse, נפשות הצדיקים שתחת כסא הכבוד והן בנות ירושלים. MS. Bodleian, 2282 (*Commentary on Canticles*, by Abba Mari b. Aligdor?), 72 b, וע״ד זה אמ׳ נפשות הצדיקים יש להן כמו ארגז תחת כה״כ. Cp. also מגן אבות, II, by R. Simon Duran, 87 b, ובמדרש שה״ש אמר תוכו רצוף אהבה אלו נפשות הצדיקים, quoting the whole passage till בצרור החיים. With regard to the ג׳ מחיצות, see *Mechilta*, 72 b, and Friedmann's *Introduction*, LII; Lewy's *Ein Wort über die Mechilta des R. Simon*, p. 12. See also מדרש כונן (Jellinek's *Beth Hammidrash*, II, 29); Epstein's *Bereschith Rabbathi*, p. 16; as well as his R. Moses Haddarshan aus Narbonne, p. 44. See also Bachye to the Pentateuch, Lev. xxvii. 2.

L. 996–1000. צאינה . . . המלואים. YS. 178 d. Cp. *Pesikta K.*, 5 a; CH. III, 11, § 2; ER. LII, 8, and parallels. אוהל מועד in PK. = ימי המילואים.

L. 1000–7. המלוכה . . . ד״א. YS. *ibid.* in a shortened form. The ל״ט to this verse: באו כל האומות וראו נסים ונפלאות שהוא עושה לעמו והכבוד והעטרה שהוא מעטר ביום כינום כ׳ שנ׳ ה׳ מלך עולם ועד אבדו גוים מארצו ואו׳ ועלו מושיעים בהר ציון לשפוט את הר עשו YM. MP. 70 b, where the passage is more correct: מדרש צאינה וראנה צאנה וראנה כל האומות ניסי פלאים שהוא עושה לעמו והכבוד והעטרה שהוא מתעטר ביום כנוס הגלות שנ׳ ומלך ה׳ צבאות עליהם בהר ציון מעתה ועד עולם והלא שלו היא המלכות לעולם ועד שנ׳ ה׳ מלך עולם אלא שאמ׳ לישראל כביכול אין לי מלכות ולא חילות עד שעמדתם והמלכתם אותי אין אתה מוצא חילות בכל ספר יחזקאל לומ׳ כל ימים שאתם בגולה אין לי חילות ומלכות עד שתחזרו למלכותכם שנ׳ ועלו מושיעים בהר ציון לשפוט את הר עשו והיתה לה׳ המלוכה.

L. 1007–12. הבית . . . ד״א YS. *ibid.* (at the beginning of § 988) partly. Cp. the parallels given above to l. 969–1000. See also *Tanchuma*, אחרי מות, § 6.

L. 1014–18. הנך . . . כצמתה. YS. *ibid.* somewhat different. Instead of בצמתה, l. 1018, read בצנעה. In the Commentary of אבי סהולה to *Canticles* (MS. Bodl. 343), 44 b, ואמרו בילמדנו מבעד לצמתך כשהוא מצמתן לבתי כנסיות ושותין ד״ת בצמא. See אנ״ב, c. 79. See *Sukka*, 49 b, and *Sifre*, 94 a.

L. 1018–23. בהם . . . שערך. In a sort of an Appendix to F. giving passages omitted in the body of the now defective MS.: כתיב שערך כעדר העזים זה היה מעשה של נשים במשכן שבשעה שאמר הק״בה למשה מאת כל איש אשר ידבנו לבו היה מקבל נדבה מן האנשים ומן הנשים לא היה מקבל מה עשו הנשים לקחו מראה שלהם ושלמה שלהם והלכו אצל משה אמרו לו דבינו מפני מה אתה חושדנו ואם בשביל ערוה הרי שלמה שלנו ואם בשביל גזל הרי מראה שלנו שאין לבעלים רשות בהם אמר אימלך בהק״בה א״ל טול מהן ועשה כיור וכל אשה המקלקלה על בעלה תבא ותשתה ממי הכיור והם יבדקו מכאן משל להדיוט אומרים מינך ובך אנא בנווך ניזיל ברחא מלמד שהיה משה מכרין ואומר כל מי שרוצה להביא יביא והיו הנשים דחפות את האנשים ומביאות שנ׳ ויבאו האנשים על הנשים וכתיב ויעש כיור נחשת ואת כנו נחשת במראות הצובאות. We must, after this, correct in l. 1018 מעשה נשים (instead of ניסים). Cp. NR. IX, 14, and ל״ט to Exod. xxxviii. 8. The משל seems to be corrupt. See

Synhedrin, 39 b, מיניה וביה אבא ליזיל ביה נרגא. For the rest of the text (שנלשו . . . בהם, l. 1019–23), YS. 178 d partly. See also Rashi to this verse: ד״א כאותן שצבאו על מדין בעבר הירדן שהיא בארץ גלעד ולשון זה במדרש ש״הש. Cp. CH. IV, 4, §§ 3, 4. In l. 1023 read ממטה אלף instead of ממאה. Cp. the opinion of ר״ע in *Sifre*, 59 b.

L. 1024–28. כחוט . . . אהרן. YS. 179 a (from כחוט to הנביאים). Read in l. 1024 בין העם לכ״הג. See אג״ב, c. 79. Cp. also Targum to this verse.

L. 1029–31. כמגדל . . . המגן. YS. *ibid.* Read in l. 1030 הזיות (הודאות). Cp. CH. IV, 4, § 6, שכל הפיות מתפללות בו. The last words ונתן לש׳ בנו וכו׳ correspond with the Derasha in YS. אלף המגן זה בית יער הלבנון, where the מגינים were placed by Salomon (1 Kings x. 17).

L. 1032–33. שני . . . וכלב. MS. Commentary to the *Machzor*: שני שדיך דבוק אחים חסידים לרועים תיירים חסודים . . . ושני שדיך נדרש על משה ואהרן ולרועים נמשלו המרגלים הם תיירים טובים אשר תרו את הארץ הם יהושע וכלב שכן שנינו במדרש שה״ש שני שדיך כשני עפרים אלו משה ואהרן הרועים בשושנים אלו יהושע וכלב.

L. 1034–39. יעקב . . . אלך. YS. *ibid.* After שרה אשתו, l. 1037, insert וגו׳, alluding to אלון מורה in the succeeding verse (Gen. xii. 9). See CH. IV, 5, § 1; 7, § 1; NR. IX, 13.

L. 1040–47. אתי . . . ונמרים. YS. 179 b in a shortened form. Cp. CH. IV, 8, § 1; ER. XXIII, 5, and parallels. See also Rashi to this verse. R. Menachem of Recanate in his Commentary to the Pentateuch, p. 39 a: מד׳ שה״ש אתי מלבנון כלה כשהגליתי השכינה מבי״המק הגליתי אתכם עמה כשתחזור אתם חוזרים עמה שיתי לבבכם למסילה וכו׳, after which quotation our text is to be amended. The ל״ט has ממעונות אריות מהררי נמרים הם מלכיות שעבדו בהם בישראל שהם רעים מאריות ונמרים.

L. 1048–52. הבריות . . . לבבתני. On this verse F. commences again, in the middle of a sentence running thus: בהקמת המשכן שנ׳ וביום הקים את המשכן כסה הענן זה משה המיוחד שבשבטיך דא״ר נשי המדבר בשירות היו וכיון שהגיעו לאותו מעשה הרע עמדו ונמלכו על עצמן ולא נתנו כלום מנזמיהם למעשה העגל וכיון ששמעו

שהן אומרין להם מיד נעלו את דלתותיהם. Cp. CH. IV, 9, § 1, especially the reading אסורות for אומרין. F. continues, אית דאמרי ד״א לבבתני באחת מעיניך למה״ד . . . וראה אחת מעיניה ושיבחה . . . הבריות. See also YS. *ibid.* for the משל. MS. Commentary to the *Machzor:* לבבתני אחותי כלה . . . ובמדרש דורש באחד מעיניך למה דומה לבת תינוקת ששלח אליה המלך ראו באחת מעיניה ושבחה ד״א לבבתני אחותי: MH. IV. אילו ראו כל גופה על אחת כמה וכמה כלה שאמר לו הק״בה לאברהם אבינו אתה נתתה את לבך מלך על כל איבריך והמלכתני על השמים ועל הארץ שנ׳ ואשביעך בה׳ אלהי השמים ואלהי הארץ אף אני אתן כתר מלכות בראשם ואמליכם על כל באי העולם שנ׳ ונתנך ה׳ אלהיך עליון על כל גוי הארץ · לבבתני אחותי כלה באחת מעיניך מושלו משל למ״הד למלך בשר ודם שקידש את האשה והיתה נראת לו באחת מעיניה ונשתטה אלו ראה את כל הגוף שלה על אחת כמה וכמה לכך נא׳ באחת מעיניך, &c. The other Derashoth correspond with CH.

L. 1053–54. מה . . . מהבמות. In l. 1054 read מלאכתן instead of מלאתן. See Rashi to this verse: הוא שיסד הבבלי, &c. MS. Commentary to the *Machzor:* מה יפו דודיך אחותי כלה מנוחה ושאר ויעודים . . . פסיקתא מה אעידך ומה אדמה לך אמ׳ הק״בה ויעודים נועדתי לכם אהל מועד גלגל ושילה נוב וגבעון ובית עולמים ושמניך מכל בשמים ביום שנמרו מלאכתם מהבמות. Cp. *Pesikta K.*, 125 a, which is, however, somewhat different.

L. 1055–59. לבנון . . . נופת. F. יעקב כשבירך (l. 1058). YS. 179 b, c. The Derasha on וריח שלמותיך has probably to be supplied by CH. IV, 11, § 2, also relating to Jacob. See also YM.Is. 88 רוקח to this verse: שפתתיך כלה גי׳ הם משיח בן דוד ומשיח בן אפרים ובמדרש דרשו עליהם. MS. Commentary to the *Machzor:* נופת תטופנה שפתותיך כלה אחוות משוחים עומדים מבלי קנאה מצומדים במדרש נפת תטפנה שפתותיך זה משיח הצדיק שעתיד לעמוד מיהודה דבש וחלב תחת לשינך זה משיח מלחמה שעתיד לעמוד מיוסף ואין מקנאין זה לזה שנ׳ אפרים לא יצור וגו׳. The ל״ט to this verse: זה אהבה שבין משיח בן דוד למשיח בן אפרים.

L. 1060–61. החתום . . . גן. F. דניאל כדברי . . . הקץ שהוא נעול . . . גן. מעין חתום זה הקץ רוקח to this verse: ספר החתום. See also YS. *ibid.*

גן נעול נקום שנ׳ סתום וחתום דבר. MS. Commentary to the *Machzor:* ל״ט The ואין מנידים . . . במדרש גן נעול זה הקץ נעול ונעלם מישראל רבנן אמרי גן נעול . . . אלו עתי הקץ שהן נעולים וחתומים to this verse: שנ׳ כי סתומים וחתומים.

L. 1062–66. שלחיך . . . עליהם. F. שלחיך פ׳ ר׳ מה הפרדם הזה של רמונים שהוא נאה כך היו ישראל נאים ומעשיהם הולכין חוץ מהן · ולמה נמשלו כפ׳ רמ׳ אלא מה הרמון הזה גרעו פורעו ויוצא כך היו ישראל כובשין את עצמן במצרים ולזמן הקץ פרעו ויצאו · ד״א שלחיך פרדם השליח ששלחתי לכם נדמה כפרדם רמונים ד״א שלחיך פרדם רמונים עם פרי מגדים . . . כפרה עליהם. MS. Commentary to the *Machzor:* שלחיך פרדם רמונים שפר נאים והדורים · במדרש שלחיך פרדם רמונים זה משה וע׳ זקנים שנעשו שלוחים במצרים מה פרדם של רמונים שהוא נאה כך ישראל נאים ומעשיהם הולכים חוץ מהם ומה רמון הזה גזעו פודעו ויוצא כך ישראל כובשין עצמן וכשהגיע זמנן הב״ה פודען ויצאו. Cp. CH. IV, 12, § 4, and YS. 179 c, with regard to אליהו. Perhaps the ד״א השליח &c. have some connexion with this Derasha.

L. 1067–71. נרד . . . אחד. F. זה היה בצלאל ואהליאב שעלו להר סיני וראו מעשה המשכן כאילו עשוי למעלה · וי״א המקום הראהו למשה וירד משה והראהו לבצלאל והסכים בצלאל לדעת המקום. See GR. I, 14. In a פיוט to פסח (MS. by R. Judah b. Menachem): נרד וכרכם אהליאב ובצלאל הם הנבונים אושרו במלאכת המשכן לשבח ולא לגנאי. YS. 179 c.

L. 1072–80. מעין . . . המקדש. F. מעין . . . זה המעין . . . ד״א . . . לטהר בו את הצדיקים . . . ואת דמי ירושלים ידיח מקרבה ד״א מעיין גנים מה הטפה דם הזו׳ שהוא בכום או בקערה ונוטלין אותה ומדיחין את הכלי כך עתיד המקום לטהר את ישראל מע״ז ומש״ד . . . אבל לא על החמורות הא יחזקאל אומ׳ אל ההרים לא אכל וגו׳ ואמר לישראל בטומאת הנדה היתה דרכם לפני אילו הנביאים שהיו במקדש. The other words are omitted. YM. Is. 35, the whole passage from הגדת שה״ש, and reads (in l. 1074) מה הטבח נותן טיפה . . . ואמ׳ לישראל בטומאת הנדה . . . או אמ׳ בטומאת הנבילה ובטומאת השרץ לא היתה להם טהרה לעולם אלא מה הנידה שהוא טובלת במים ובשירה לביתה כך אתם טהורים לעולם ד״א וכו׳. The ל״ט to this verse: מעיין גנים זה המעין שעתיד השם לטהר בו ישראל בענין שנ׳ ואת דמי ירושלים ידיח מקרבה וכבר

נקראו ישראל ע״י יחזקאל בענין שנ׳ כטומאת הנדה היתה דרכם לפני לא קראם טומאת גבילה או טומאת שרץ אלא טומאת הנדה מה נדה זו שהיא טובלת במים ובשירה לבעלה כך בשירחצו ישראל במים טהורים וטהרו שנ׳ וזרקתי עליכם מים טהורים ס״א על הנבואה שנמשלה למים מלמד שעתידין הכל שתשרה עליהם רוח הקדש שנ׳ ונבאו בניכם ובנותיכם וגו׳. The MS. Commentary to the *Machzor:* מעיין גנים הדחת קלים וחמורים טבילת נקיות שמורים במדרש מעיין גנים באר מים חיים זה המעיין שהב״ה עתיד לטהר בו . . . ונוזלים מן לבנון מה טפה זו שנותן טפה אחת בכוס וקדירה וזוחלת כך הב״ה עתיד לטהר את ישראל מע״ז וש״ד ואם תאמר יכול על הקלות הוא מוחל ועל אינו מוחל הרי יחזקאל אמר אל ההרים לא אכל ועיניו לא נשא וגו׳ ואמ׳ לישראל כטומאת הנדה היתה דרכם לפני אלו אמר כטומאת השרץ לא היתה לכם טהרה עולמית. See *Tanchuma*, מצורע, § 9.

L. 1081–87. מכאן אתם אומרין שהצ׳ . . . רוח F. עורי . . . כלה צפון מכבדת ומזלת לפניהם כל בוסמי ג״ע ׳ ד״א . . . להכנים ובאות זו עם זו הדרום או׳ . . . גלות צפון וכל הגדר וכל הצפון וכו׳. YS. 179 c, d. See NR. XIII, 2; CH. IV, 16, § 1; *Pesikta R.*, 17 b. See also the quotation from the דרשות הרי בן שועיב, where the sentence in CH. finishes מתנות כהונה יזלו בשמיו אלו קטרת הסמים יבוא דודי זה השכינה ויאכל פרי מגדיו אלו הקרבנות (cp. בחיי, end of תצוה). This would justify us in supplying the passage in our text by the content of the next lines. In the said Appendix to F. we have on this verse the following passage:—כתיב יבא דודי לגנו ויאכל פרי מגדיו מכאן א״ר מאיר עתיד הק״בה לבנות פלטרין גדולים שהיא ארבעים ושמנה פרסאות וארבע נהרות נמשכין ויוצאין מגן עדן אחד של יין ואחד של דבש ואחד של חלב ואחד של אפרסמון וארבעה שמשים לפני כל אחד ואחד ובידיהן כ״ד כוסות של אבנים טובות ומרגליות ודמיהן (וימיהן?) של כוסות כימי השמים על הארץ ׳ יבא שמש אחד שהוא תופס בידו כום של יין אמר לו שלום עליך רבי ומרי אומר לו טול ושתה מן היין מגנתו של הקב״ה שעסקת בתורה שנקראת יין שנ׳ ושתו ביין מסכתי ואו׳ אשקך מיין הרקח מעסים כמוני (הרמון) ויטול וישתה ונותן הודאה לפני המקום. ואו׳ מה רב טובך אשר צפנת ליריאיך ׳ יבא שמש אחר ובידו ס׳ כוסות של דבש גנתו של הקב״ה שעסקת בתורה שנקר׳ דבש שנ׳ ומתוקים מדבש ויטול ויאכל ונותן הודאה למקום ואומ׳ רוממו ה׳ אלהינו ׳ יבא שמש

אחר ובידו ס׳ כוסות של חלב ואומר לו שלום עליך רבי ומרי ואומ׳ לו שתה כוס של חלב שעסקת בד״ת שנמשלו לחלב שנ׳ דבש וחלב תחת לשונך ויטול ויאמר כי ה׳ עליון נורא · יבא שמש אחר ובידו ס׳ כוסות של אפרסמון ואומר שלום עליך רבי ומרי ואומר סוך משמן של הקב״ה שעסקת בד״ת שנמשלו לשמן שנ׳ לריח שמניך טובים ויסוך ויאמר וישירו בדרכי ה׳ ד״א יבוא דודי לגנו לשמוח במעשה הטוב ויאכל פרי מגדיו להרבות לעולם במעשה הטוב. See *Beth Hammidrash*, VI, 150, 151.

L. 1090–91. אני . . . מצרים. Omitted in F. Perhaps we ought to read גאולת משיח. Cp. CH. VI, 10, § 1.

L. 1091–94. ד״א . . . ופתחן. F. אני ישנה ולבי ער זה היה העולם לפי שנדמה העולם לישן הזה והרתיק עליו המקום ועיררו · ר״ע היה אומר למה העולם הזה דומה לבע״הב שעושה כלים ולא פיתחן שהיו כרואין בכך חזר ופיתחן. The sense is obscure. See ER. XXXIII, 3, ולבי ער והק״בה מרתיק עלי, but it is quite a different Derasha. Perhaps we should read שהיו ברואים כבר בריאת שמים וארץ. See Chapters of R. Eleazar IV and parallels.

L. 1094–99. ויבשו . . . אני. F. ד״א א׳ יש׳ ול׳ ער זה הגאולה שהיא דומה לישן והמקום מעוררה כמו שנ׳ העירותי מצפון ויאת והמקום . . . המזרח ומן הצפון אלא הרי זה זוחל הצפון לדרום והדרום לצפון כל אילו רוחות ליבש את מעיינות המים חוץ משבעת הנהרות וכל עץ פרי שזבחו שם לע״ז מתיבשין. YM. Is. 125, the whole passage from הגדת שה״ש reading in l. 1097 הצפון אלא הרי רוח הצפון, &c. Cp. about the ז׳ נהרות the *Responses* of R. Hai Gaon in the טעם זקנים, p. 60 a.

L. 1099, 1100. ד״א . . . אסתר omitted in F.

L. 1100–1104. ד״א . . . באפילה. F. ד״א . . . המקום אומר לישראל פתחי לי רעייתי אחותי אר״א ביום שאמר כורש מלך פרס כל בית שהיה פתוח תהיו נכנסין ובאין בו וכל בית שהוא נעול אל תכנסו בו ונעלו ישראל בתיהן . . . לישראל ואמרו להם פתחו בתיהן עד אימתי אתם יושבין באפילה. Cp. CH. III, 4, § 2, and parallels, נתקבצו כל ישראל אצל דניאל, &c. It is not impossible that the two Derashoth have some connexion.

L. 1105–41. ד״א . . . ולא ענני. F. ד״א פתחי לי אחותי הרי זו לימי גוג ומגוג שישראל עושין טמונין במערות ומחילות והמקום הרתיק עליהן

שמעי בן זומא היה אומ׳ המקום לישראל פתחי לי אחותי והם מסתכלין והמקום עושה להן ניסין ורואין את המשיח . . . והמחילה נפתחת לה משם מהמדבר מואב לחורב וישראל נוטלין את הזין ממדבר חורב שהשם כתוב עליו ובאין ונוטלין עמון ומואב לקיים מה שנאמר עמון ומואב משלוח ידם ובני עמון משמעתם אמ׳ ר׳ יוסי בר יהודה כדרך שהלגיונות נעשו לישראל בית חומה כך חורב עשוי לאומות בית חומה הרי מלכי הצפון שומעין שנהרגו עמון ומואב וכולן מתכנסין אף הן ונוטלים עצה במדין וישראל מצירין להניח את אחיהם החכמים שבירושלים אי אפשר ׳ ומה אליהו עושה כל אותו המדבר שהוא הולך מירושלים למדבר שכולו מלא נחשים וחיה רעה והמקום עושה לו ניסים והוא בא ועומד לפני המשיח במדין ׳ והמשיח נפטר משם ואליהו עומד באותה שעה מוציא את ספר הישר שכל התורה הזאת אינה אלא שורה אחת מתוכו והארץ נפתחת מתחתיהן ושורפתן ונעשה להם שם זכר גדול והמקום אומ׳ פתחי לי אחותי רעייתי והמשיח בא לו למדין ונוטל לו כל בית ביזתה לקיים מה שנ׳ ישא את חיל דמשק עד שלא * * *[1] לקיים מה שנ׳ שם ירעה עגל וגו׳ שראשי נמלא טל אמר להם המקום חזרו לכם לירושלים הרי אתם דומין לישן הזה ואני מעורר אתכם ׳ הרי מלכי המזרח * * * ומקריבין בירושלים שבעת ימים והמקום משיב להם רוח ואומר לישראל חזרו לתרמוד כנגד מלכי המזרח * * * והמקום יוצא * * * מה שנ׳ ויצא ה׳ ונלחם בגוים הם * * * ולצידון ולתרמוד ולעכו לקיים מה שנ׳ ועפו בכתף פלישתים ימה וגו׳ * * * והן מתכנסות ובאות על פוגה של עכו והן בונין כל סביבות עכו הפרוסות וכל הירדן וכל ישראל מדמין לחבוש הזה שבאפלה ׳ והמקום קורע את הרקיעים ומראה את ישראל כסא הכבוד לקיים מה שנ׳ דודי שלח ידו מן החור וישראל ביון שיראו את כסא הכבוד הן דומין לשיבולת הזו לקיים מה שנאמר ומעי המו עליו ׳ והם מתפללין לו והוא מקבלן לקיים מה שנ׳ פתחתי אני לדודי בפתח שיראה להם והם מתפלין ׳ והמקום מעמיד להם חמה כדרך שהעמיד ליהושע בן נון שנ׳ ולא היה ביום ההוא לפניו ואחריו זה המשיח ודודי חמק עבר נפשו יצאה בדברו שהוא מוציא קרח וכל עדתו בקשתיו ולא מצאתיהו הוי השבינה מסתלקת לשמים וכו׳ ענני. YM.Is. 89 has the whole passage (till ומשמעתם, l. 1131), having among other variations שמעון בן זומא in l. 1116. כדרך שהלגיונות עושין להם בית חכמה in l. 1113. וישראל מצירין להניח את אחיהם החכמים שבמדין איפשר ולהניח את אחיהם החכמים שבירושלים אי איפשר, l. 1116–17. שורה for שירה, l. 1120. See the

[1] Asterisks here, as elsewhere, indicate a *lacuna* in the MS.

פרקי משיח in Jellinek's *Beth Hammidrash*, III, 70; but there is no real parallel to this Messianic apocalypse.

L. 1141–51. ענני . . . ד״א . F. בשעה שהשכינה ד״א קראתיו . . . נסתלקה מישראל בימי ישעיה עשר פעמים · עד שלא נסתלקה השכינה מכרוב האחד לכרוב מכרוב השני למפתן כמו שנ׳ וירם כבוד ה׳ מעל כרוב על מפתן הבית וממפתן הבית. The rest is omitted, commencing again l. 1170. See *Pesikta K.*, 114 b, and ARN. XXXIV and parallels. YM.Ps. 328: מדרש · קראתיו ולא ענני בשעה שנסתלקה השכינה בימי ישעיה עשרה פעמים כיון שהעמיד מנשה את הצלם בהיכל נסתלקה השכינה מן הכרוב הא׳ לכרוב הב׳ . . . כבוד ה׳ מעל הכרוב על מפתן הבית . . . למזבח כמ״ש ראיתי את ה׳ נצב על המזבח ומן המזבח לחומה כמ״ש ראיתי את ה׳ נצב על חומת אנך ומן החומה לגג שנא׳ טוב שבת על פנת גג . . . כמ״ש טוב שבת בארץ מדבר וגו׳ . . . לשמים שנ׳ השמים . . . רוקח to this verse: ד״א בקשתיהו . . . ה״ה כי מי׳ מסעות שנסעה שכינה עד שעלתה למרום ואחר שעלתה קראתיו ולא ענני.

L. 1152–53. מצאוני . . . כבתובת. Perhaps we should read ללסוטות. See *Jerushalmi Shabbath*, 8 b. The MS. Commentary to the *Machzor:* מצאנו לגיונות סבבנו כנהרים עומד כהדסים בהרים · שנינו במדרש מצאונו השומרים כיון שנסתלקה השכינה באו כל המלכיות ושרפו בית המקדש. Cp. פתיחתא דאיכה רבתי, § 23 בשעה ד״א ויקרא ה׳ . . . שבקש הק״בה, &c. &c.

L. 1153–60. יתגבר . . . ד״א . YM.Is. 95, from הגדת שה״ש קול המון בהרים דמות עם רב זה reading עומדין (for עמהן) l. 1155: הק״בה דמות עם רב ה׳ וכלי זעמו לחבל כל הארץ אח״כ יריע אף יצריח. See *Pesikta R.*, 160 b, and ER. XVIII, 15.

L. 1166. Read שלא instead of שלו. The whole passage (from l. 1161 to the end of l. 1168) is very corrupt. See GR. XLIII, 5. The קימחא דאבישונא to the *Machzor:* השבעתי דרוש דוד משרים סור מרוכסי קשרים · מכאן דרשו שישראל משביעים את האומות לעתיד לבא לדרוש את המקום . . . במדרש למה נאמר שכבה השבעתנו מלמד שעתידים האומות לישבע למקום ולמשיח שלא לילך אחרי ע״ז · אמר ר׳ אלעזר הרי את למד מאברהם יום שני שהכה את המלכים אל עמק שוה שנשבעו לו כל האומות שלא לילך אחרי ע״ז · וכשם שנשבעו לו לאברהם כך

עתידים לישבע למקום ולמשיח לכך נאמר שכבה השבעתנו. In the MS. Commentary the passage occurs in a shortened form.

L. 1169–76. דודי . . . כבוד. F. ראשו * * * כשנתן את התורה ואדום כתם פז בשעה שהוא מביא היסורין לעולם לנקותם מעון קווצותיו תלתלים זה המזבח . . . האגדות, whilst l. 1176 is omitted. YS. 180 c the same Derasha. In the above-mentioned Appendix to F, however, we read to these verses: ראשו כתם פז זה ממה"מ שנראה לישראל ברוב דמינות · שנגלה עליהם על הים לעשות מלחמה עם פרעה נגלה כבחור מפני שבחור נאה למלחמה שנ' ה' איש מלחמה ה' שמו ובמתן תורה כזקן שאין ד"ת נאים לצאת אלא מפי זקן שנ' ונגד זקניו כבוד · ואומר לבושיה כתלג חיור · קווצותיו תלתלים אילו קוציות של תורה שבהן העולם עומד · כיצד אם היה כותב אחד אם החליף רי"ש בדלי"ת נעקר מן העולם · ר' היה כותב כי לא תשתחוה לאל אחר החליף ד' בר"ש נעקר מן העולם · הא מצינו שכל העולם אינו אלא על קוצי אותיות · תלתלים שחורות כעורב במי אתה מוצא תלי תלים של תורה במי שמשכים ומשחיר כעורב · עיניו כיונים על אפיקי מים אילו חכמי ישראל שנ' והיה אם מעיני העדה לפי שאין לך בכל בריות נאים כעיני יונה · כאפיקי מים אילו חכמים ותלמידים שיושבים על אפיקי של תורה ודנין את הדין לאמיתו · רוחצות בחלב דברים המסותרים מבני אדם מלבינים אותם כחלב · ד"א אילו ד"ת שהן ערבין כחלב ומתוקין כדבש · יושבות על מלאת אילו בתי מדרשות · לחייו כערוגת הבושם מגדלות מרקחים אילו הלוחות · שפתותיו שושנים אילו הלכות מצות שבזמן שישראל בם גרים (נזהרים?) מביאות אותן לחיי העו"הב · כיצד אשתו נדה או אחותו יושבת עמו בבית רצה משמש רצה אינו משמש · וכי אדם רואהו אותו הא אינו מתירא אלא ממי שגזר על הנדה · פירותיו טבולים רצה מפריש תרומה רצה אינו מפריש · וכי אדם רואהו הא אינו מתירא אלא ממי שצוה על התרומה · וכן לכל מצוה ומצוה · ידיו גלילי זהב ממולאים בתרשיש זו עבודת כה"ג ביו"הכ · מעיו עשת שן זה החשן · מעולפת ספירים זה אפוד · שוקיו עמודי שש עמידתו על הרצפה · מיוסדים על אדני פז בשעת עמידתו בלשכת פרהדרין · מראהו כלבנון מלמד שהוא גדול מאחיו במראה בקומה בעושר בחכמה · חיכו ממתקים בשעת קריאתו בס"ת · וכולו מחמדים בשעת צאתו מבית קדשי הקדשים · זה דודי זה יהושע הכהן הגדול וזה ריעי סיעתו כמו שנ' יהושע הכהן הגדול אתה ורעך. The רוקח to this verse: ד"א צח לכפר עלינו ואדום כנגד האומות. See *Mechilta*, 35 a; CH. V, 11, § 2; 12, § 3; 14, § 1; *Pesikta R.*, 35 a, b, and parallels. See also *Sifre*,

135 b; and GR. XCVIII, 10, with regard to חלב ותורה. See also Rashi to these verses, and Targum to verse 13.

L. 1177–84. אנה . . . ציון. F. אנה הלך דודך כמו שנ׳ ויבן מזבח תחת ההר שהיו ישראל סבורים שהר סיני קדושת עולם ולא היה אלא קדושת שעה · דודי ירד לגנו ביום שירדה האש . . . ירד לגנו ועוד הוא עתיד לירד שנ׳ כן ירד ה׳ צבאות לצבא על הר ציון וכו׳ מכאן אמרו בעלייה שירד הב״ה כשברא את העולם בה ירד על הר סיני ובה הוא עתיד לירד ולקיים מה שנ׳ כן ירד ה׳ צבאות וגו׳. YS. 180 c, אנה . . . לשלמה (l. 1178–80). *Torath Kohanim*, 45 c, offers a partial parallel. Our *Midrash* must have been the source of Rashi in Gen. iv. 4, מלמד שירדה אש (cp. Berliner's edition of *Rashi*, 183 a, note 5), as well as of the ל״ט to that verse. See *Beth Hammidrash*, III, 24.

L. 1185–87. אני . . . מימיהם. F. אני . . . באהבה אני לדודי ודודי לי כבני אדם שלא טעמו טעם עבירה מימיהם. Perhaps our Derasha is meant as a protest against *Midrash Tillim*, c. 45, according to which the verse here speaks of בעלי תשובה. See also CH. VI, 2, § 1, לסלק את הצדיקים.

L. 1188–89. יפה . . . אמרנו. F. . . . יפה . . . כתרצה משל משבח קומתך כתרצה הסבי עיניך · שערך, &c. See above, l. 1018.

L. 1190–94. טוב . . . שיניך. F. שיניך . . . קדושים · עור הרחלים לאוהל נתנם · צמר הרחלים ליריעות ולתכלת · קרנים לשופרות לנבל · שוקיו לחלילים · והרשעים נמשלו לכלבים שאין הנאה מהן שנ׳ כולן כלבים אלמים מה הכלב הזה אינו אוהב אדם וצמרו אינו שוה כלום לכך נמשלו לכלבים שאין בידם לא מצוה ולא מעשה טוב. YM. Is. 216, the whole passage from הגדת שה״ש, reading in l. 1191 ישראל כולם קד׳ עור הרחלים לאהל מועד הצמר לסגנונים והקרנים לשופרות. Rashi to this verse gives the same Derasha. Cp. *Mishnah Kinnim*, III, 6.

L. 1195–97. מספר . . . ששים. See Rashi to this verse, who has the same Derasha, and more complete.

L. 1198–1208. אחת . . . ויהללוה. F. אחת היא יונתי תמתי כששלח משה את המרגלים א״ל משה אל תכנסו בנגבים אלא והתחזקתם ולקחתם מפרי הארץ התחילו הכנענים אומרים לא באו אילו אלא לקוץ את האילנות ולרגל ולשרוף את הערים · יצאו השלוחים אחריהם ונתכנסו האמורים עליהם · והיו אחימן ששי ותלמי רודפין אחריהם עד הגיעו למישור שמלחמת

שביהודה · וכלב היה לו מאחורי הגדר · כשראה שהגיעו המרגלים עמד וצווח צווחה אחת ונפלו לפניו ונופח על פניהם · למה באתם בשביל חמשה רמונים ואשכול אחד · אמרו לו לא באנו אלא שאמרתם הערים אנו שורפין · כשבאו לפני משה הוציאו דבת הארץ רעה ואמרו שם ראינו את הנפילים אמר להם כלב סר צילם ושמעו קולכם ישראל שנים עשר מיל לכך נאמר ראוה וכו׳. The passage is defective and may be partly corrected by the parallel in תד״בא, c. 29 (cp. YS. I, 123 a).

L. 1209–10. משיח . . . מי. F. גלות המשיח. YS. 180 d, § 991, reading גאולת המשיח. See above, l. 1090.

L. 1211–13. לעולם . . . ד״א. F. ד״א יפה כלבנה ברה כחמה מה גלגל חמה ולבנה שהן באין בפרהסיא כך כשתיגלה מלכות משיח היא באה לעולם בפרהסיא. YS. *ibid.*

L. 1213. F. כשהק״בה מביא. YS. *ibid.*

L. 1215–19. הצדיקים . . . ד״א. F. ד״א . . . כחמה מה השחר החמה והלבנה לא דומה מאורו של זה לזה כך אין הצדיקים שוין לע״ל אלא כל אדם מתקבל לפי מעשיו ומה החמה והלבנה . . . כך הקב״ה עתיד לברר את הצדיקים. YS. 180 d, 181 a, partly. The ל״ט to this verse gives the 2nd and 4th ד״א מי זאת הנשקפה; whilst רוקח has כשיראו האומות הצדיקים שבג״ע בתות יש דומה לשחר ויש דומה ללבנה וכו׳. See LR. XXX, 2, and parallels.

L. 1220–22. סלה . . . אל. F. אל . . . זה יעקב ובניו שנכרתו ברית לשבטים כדרך שנכרתה ברית לאבות כמו שנ׳ שבועות מטות. YS. 181 a partly. See *Torath Kohanim*, 112 c, and the Commentary of the ראב״ד to the passage.

L. 1222–27. מצות . . . ד״א. F. ד״א . . . אלו ישראל . . . שנמשלו לאגוז · מה אגוז הזה אם הקשתו כולו מפעפע · כך ישראל משנתקדשו נוחין כולן · א״ר יוסי בר יהודה מי שלא ראה אגוז מימיו ואינו יודע מהו סבור שמא כלום הוא או עצים · פעפעו הרי הוא מוצא אותו אגודות של אוכלין כך * * * כך מבירין אותם אומ׳ בעוונותיהם אנו לוקין בדקו אותן משנתקדשו לפני הר מצאו אותן אגודות אגודות של מצות. YS. *ibid.* סיני נוחים . . . א״ר יוסי בר יהודה . . . מגורות של אוכלים . . . בדקו הם מוצאים אותם מגורות מגורות של מצוה. Cp. CH. VI, § 11 (ר׳ עזריה אמר וכו׳), and the פירוש מהרז״ו. See *Aruch*, s. v. פע 2.

L. 1228–33. לשון . . . לא. F. א״ר בן . . . שמתני זה יעקב . . . לא

MS. בבא . . . שהראה לו המקום . . . זו מלכות בבל . . . העדרים * * *
Commentary to the *Machzor*: וכן הוא במדרש שה״ש לא ידעתי נפשי שמתני זה יעקב שהלך לחרן אמ׳ יהושע מניין שהראה לו הק״בה ד׳ מלכיות . . . שהיא מכתבת טרוניא על כל לשון וגללו האבן על פי הבאר שבטלים מתלמוד תורה. Cp. GR. LXX, 8.

L. 1234. F. בשנאלם המקום reading עמי. Cp. CH. VI, 12; ER. XV, 12.

L. 1236. Read ד״א לא ידעתי וגו׳ urging also the word מרכבות.

L. 1237. F. שנתברכו ישראל למלאכת המשכן, which must of course be corrected into שנתנדבו. Cp. ER. XLVIII, 6.

L. 1238. F. ד״א אף לע״ל שנ׳ אהבם נדבה. The ל״ט to this verse: אברהם נקרא נדיב . . . לכך נקראו כאן עמי נדיב ואמ׳ ארפא משובתם אוהבם נדבה וגו׳. The order of these Derashoth in F. is: ישראל שהיו במצרים . . . ד״א ישראל בימי דבורה . . . ד״א זה יעקב . . . מלאכת המשכן . . . לעתיד לבא.

L. 1239–40. שובי . . . תורה. F. שובי . . . להשלים למקום והמקום נותן. See CH. VII, 1, § 1.

L. 1240–48. ר״א . . . במחנים. F. ר׳ אליעזר אומר שובי שובי השולמית שעתידין המתים להחיות ולעמוד זה אחר זה כדרך שהלכו דורות דורות · ר׳ אלעזר אומ׳ כולן באים כאחד מלך על כסאו נשיא ודורו · ממחולת המחנים זה דורו של אלישע שהיה ממחולה · ודורו של דוד שהיה ממחנים שנ׳ ודוד בא מחנימה · א״ר יהודה יכול שמא מנהיגם בעו״הב ברשעים אמ׳ לאו אלא שהן עתידין לעמוד מחנות מחולות ומשיבן למקומן · דור הולך ודור בא זה דורו של אליהו ושל אלישע שמתו ברעב ודורו של אבשלום שנהרג במחנים. Some partial parallels may be found in ER. XL, 3 (cf. parallels). See also Jellinek's *Beth Hammidrash*, III, 16, 72; VI, 115.

L. 1249–53. מה . . . בשנה. F. מה יפו פעמיך בנעלים אילו הרגלים שנקראו פעמים ואשורים כמו שנ׳ תמוך . . . אימתי היו רגליהם ישראל נאות כשעולין לירושלים בזמני המועדות כמו שנ׳ שלש . . . וכתיב שלוש רגלים וגו׳. Cp. CH. VII, 2, § 1.

L. 1253–56. ד״א מה . . . כשאדם רואה מנעל. F. ד״א . . . עם וגו׳ ברגליו של חבירו ואומ׳ להם לא הכבוד נאה אלא לכם וכו׳.

L. 1256–58. ד״א מה יפו פעמיך בנעלים הק״בה. F. ד״א . . . הדיוט אומר לישראל בת נדיב בת נדול · מעשה ידי אמן · מעשה ידי אומן אינו

דומה למעשה הדיוט. Cp. CH. *ibid.* § 3; *Sukkah*, 49 a. See also above, l. 547.

L. 1259–60. שרך . . . בשושנים. F. שרך . . . נכסים מימיו בטנך ערימת חיטין כדרך שמסלקין את החטים מתוך הדומן כך סילת אתכם · רבן גמליאל היה אומר בטנך ערמת החטים סוגה בשושנים הצדיקים שבכם הם החיטים והחוטאין שבכם נאים כשושנים. See *Sukkah*, *ibid.* See also CH. VII, 3, § 3, and parallels.

L. 1261–64. צוארך כמגדל השן · זו הייתה בדמשק. F. צוארך . . . סנהדרין עיניך בריכות בחשבון אלו הן החכמים שהן מתכנסין לעצה ואין אדם יודע מה שהן יועצין והדבר נודע לרבים אפך כמגדל הלבנון . . . הלבנון שהיה ע׳ אדם בראשו בתוכו ומונה כמה שערים בדמשק. Cp. Rashi to this verse: צוארך . . . ולשכת הגזית . . . כמגדל הלבנון . . . ראיתי במדרש זה בית יער הלבנון שעשה שלמה שהעומד עליו צופה ומונה כמה בתים יש בדמשק. Cp. NR. XIV, 4.

L. 1265. עתידין להיות לבושין. F. See CH. VII, 6, § 1.

L. 1266–71. ד״א . . . כדרך שעלה אליהו אל הר הכרמל וגזר על המקום וקיים כך הק״בה · כך הדלים והעניים שבישראל . . . גוזר והמקום מקיים · מלך אסור . . . יעקב אבינו שנ׳ ויצג . . . זה היה משה שנטל שלו ע״י המים שנ׳ להקדישני במים. Cp. CH. *ibid.*, and parallels; *Tanchuma*, B. תצוה, § 2. See also YS. I, 243 c in the name of the *Yelamdenu*. Some Derasha is missing here about Abraham, which may be supplied by the said parallels.

L. 1272–83. וחיכך כיין הטוב זה היה שאול. F. וחכך . . . בנימין שהיה מחכה ליונתן ואמ׳ לו בן נעות המרדות · דובב שפתי ישנים שהיה ישן והחנות נתונה מראשותיו · ד״א שפתי דובב ישנים אבא תותם איש גזר היה אומר אילו היו קין והבל שהיו תחלת העולם והיה קין בעל דבב להבל · א״ל קין כך העולם נוהג במי שהמקום אוהב לו הוא נותן · ברא אדם אבינו והשליטו על כל בריותיו שהוא היה תחילה ונתן לו ספק · אבל מכאן ואילך אינו נותן אלא למי שהוא · מתוך כך נפלה קטטה ביניהם · נתנו הבל תחתיו · א״ל המקום אל תחמול על הרשע וחס עליו הבל · א״ל המקום חסת׳ עליו הוא יהרוג · לכך נא׳ ויקם קין שהיה למטה ובאותו מקום שנשפך בו דמו של הבל לא עלו בו צמחים מעולם לכך נא׳ דובב שפתי ישנים ראה כמה גדול כח חיבת של קין והבל וגביע של בנימין. See GR. XXII, 8, 9; CH. VIII, 1. In l. 1281 read שנובע for

שנובך. Perhaps we should read מה בין קין והבל לחיבת אחיו של בנימן. Perhaps the Derasha with regard to שאול has some connexion with the ד״א given by Rashi to 1 Sam. xx. 30.

L. 1284–86. תחמודות . . . אני. F. אני . . . תשוקתך כך כשתהיו חוטאין אתם שבים ועלי תשוקתכם שתהיו חוזרין ונחמדין לי ואין תשוקה אלא תחמודות. See CH. VII, 11.

L. 1286–90. הזהב . . . הרי. F. שכך נא׳ ויעל שישך מלך מצרים ויקח את כל מניני הזהב והלא זבוב היה שמו אלא שישק שהיה עומד ואומר מתי ימות שלמה מיד ויקח אוצרות בית ה׳ בית ה׳ וגו׳. Rashi to 1 Kings xix. 25: מצינו במדרש ש״הש הוא פרעה נכה ונקרא שישק על שהיה שוקק ומתאוה כל ימיו לכסא השן שהיה לשלמה חתנו ועכשיו עלה ולקחו.

L. 1291–96. המלחמה . . . לכה. F. לכה . . . בכפרים אימר הרי משיח * * * גאולה באה והן מתכנסין ובאין כיתות כיתות כת ראשונה זקנים שאינם יכולים להלך שנייה נשים וטף עליהם הכתוב אומר נשכימה . . . . אם פרחה הגפן . . . שם אתן את דודי לך אילו בעלי מלחמה ׳

L. 1297–1303. ישנים . . . הדודאים. F. הדודאים נתנו ריח אילו בני אדם של מעשה ושל צדקה שכשם שהדודאין נותנין ריח אילו בני אדם של מעשה ושל צדקה נותנין כבוד בעולם ׳ ועל פתחינו כל מגדים א״ר יוסי הוי אליהו בא ואומר להם לישראל אני הוא אליהו והם אומרים לו אלו אם אתה אליהו החיה לנו את המתים ולא מתים שאין אנו מכירין אלא מתים שאנו מכירין ׳ ועוד א״ר יוסי אם יבא אליהו בימי אני אומר לו פרש לי פרשת נדרים ששנית לי אתה חדשים גם ישנים צפנתי לך. Probably we have to supply after מגדים, l. 1299, the rest of the verse, especially צפנתי לך, which means the buried ones, whilst פתחינו is probably an allusion to פתח נדרים.

L. 1304–1305. משה . . . מי. See Exod. ER. I, 22, ורבנן אמרי כל הפסוק הזה ע״ש רו״הק נאמר. Cp. also the Targum to this verse: ונהי ינקין עמך טעמי אוריתא. Cp. CH. VIII, 2, בית אמי זה סיני, and above, l. 351.

L. 1307. Read ברביעי מראה.

L. 1309. F. בשביעי מראה להם מיתים שהן עתידין להחיות. YS. 182 a, the whole passage. Cp. also the פרקי משיח (Jellinek's *Beth Hammidrash*, III, 72).

L. 1310–19. מי . . . משל לאדם שנושא אשה .F מי . . . יולדה וא״ל שאני על גבך כך כנ״י אמרה לו להק״בה ישאני על אברתו · תחת התפוח עוררתיך ר׳ חנניה אומ׳ באותה שעה צוה משה את הענן לטעון לישראל · והיה הענן מתקרב לצד ישראל והיו טוענין עליו . . . וכלותיהם וכל בהמתם ואף סוסים ופרדים וקרונות והיה מקיף הענן את ארץ מצרים . . . לכך נאמר שמה חבלתך אמך ושמה חבלה ילדתך שהארץ היתה מחבלת כיולדה. YS. 181 d (§ 993), shortened.

L. 1320–23. שימני . . . בשעה שאמר ויקרא אליו .F שימני . . . מום מלאך ה׳ מן השמים · כחותם על זרועיך כדרך שהתפילין הללו נתונות על זרועתיו של אדם ואין בהם מום כך לא היה ביצחק אבינו מום · ד״א שימני כחול שנתת על הים שנ׳ אשר שמתי חק (חול) גבול לים כחותם על זרועך כדרך שגילית׳ זרועך על הים וטימטמא (וחתמת?) את כל מעשה בראשית שנ׳ חשף את זרוע קדשו לעיני כל העמים וגו׳. More correct are the readings in YS. *ibid.* שימני כחותם . . . עזה כמות אהבה שאהב הקב״ה יעקב דכתיב ואוהב את יעקב. See GR. LVI, 7, with regard to יצחק. Cp. also CH. VIII, 6, 2, with regard to תפילין. See also זוהר פ׳מצורע 54 b (ed. Kritoschin).

L. 1323–27. כי עזה . . . עזה היתה אהבה שאהב .F זעמי הק״בה את ישראל . . . עשר מכות הביא הק״בה עליהם . . . ונשאו בדרך מצרים ר׳ נתן אומר במטה הניף יד על אשורים שנ׳ הוי אשור שבט אפי הגדת שה״ש. YM. Is. 80, the whole passage from

L. 1327–32. קשה כשאול . . . לה׳ אלהי .F קשה . . . בקשת הצבאות . . . צרכיך בקש תלך שוב לדרכך מדברה דמשק וכן הוא אומר לחזקיה אך כי שלום ואמת יהיה בימי א״ל הקב״ה חזקיהו צורכך בקשת נחמו נחמו יאמר ה׳ אלהיכם ואין אתם צריכין תפילתו של חזקיהו אליהו. See CH. I, 6, § 1, with regard to אליהו. Cp. also PR. 42 b, 151 a, and YS. II, 43 a.

L. 1333–39. רשפיה . . . כסא הכבוד שנ׳ .F רשפיה . . . שלהבת יה והיה אור ישראל לאש וקדושו ללהבה ר׳ חנניה בן אחי ר׳ יהושע אומ׳ יש נהרות . . . וכשנתנה רשות לגבריאל להחריב את כל את כל הארץ נתנה רשות ללויתן לחבל וכו׳ הנהרות הגדת ש״הש. YS. 181 d, from רשפיה to לאש. Meaning not clear to me. YM. Is. 79, the whole passage from

L. 1341. F. מתגדלת על גבי האשים. Perhaps we ought to read מתגדלת ע״ג המים. See ER. XII, 4, and CH. III, 11, § 1.

L. 1342–43. ד״א . . . התורה. F. עבירה מכבה מצוה ואין עבירה מכבה את התורה. See *Sobah*, 21 a.

L. 1343–45. ד״א . . . יפול. F. ד״א . . . אילו בני אדם שהן בוטחין בעושרן, &c. Cp. *Midrash Mishle*, VII, 31.

L. 1345–48. אם . . . המפורש. F. אם יתן איש . . . אם היה נותן . . . אדם את כל הון ביתו באהבה שאהבתי אתכם אי אפשר כדי אלא יביאו עליהם מלאכי השרת את השטן · ד״א אם יתן איש את כל הון ביתו וגו׳ אי אפשר לבטל החזקה שעשה אברהם שנ׳ בית אל מים והעי מקדם ויבן שם מזבח לה׳ ויקרא בשם ה׳ ושם עתידין כהנים מבני בניו של אברהם להיות עומדין ונושאין כפיהן על ישראל ומברכין אותם בשם המפורש בירושלים. The first Derasha here, which is defective, seems to be a corrupt extract from the Derasha to our verse given in *Midrash Tillim*, XV, § 24. Cp. CH. VIII, 8, § 1, and *Midrash Ruth* at the beginning. Cp. also Targum. In the last ד״א he urges the word ביתו.

L. 1349–55. אחות . . . אחיקם. F. אחות . . . סדום ובנותיה תשובנה וגו׳ ושדים אין לה שאינה נותנת צדקה לעניים ולא פרנסה לאב יונים מה נעשה לאחותינו ביום שידובר בה לפורענות זה דורו של גדליהו בן אחיקם. All the rest is omitted. See CH. VIII, 9, § 2.

L. 1356–59. אם . . . וענוה. F. אם . . . משל לאחד שאמר לו חבירו על מה ימחול לך המקום על ע״ז שיש בידך או על גילוי עריות שבידך · הרי זבולון ואלעזר בן גגי איש בן ברק אומר לה״ד לאחד שהיה אומר עליו איש פלוני חכם אבל ענוה אין בידו איש פלוני עניו אבל חכמה אין בידו אמר הק״בה אני נותן לו חכמה וענוה. Meaning obscure. Cp. GR. XXIX, 2: ואם דלת היא ואם דל הוא במצות ומ״עט.

L. 1360–63. אני . . . שלום. F. אני חומה ושדי כמגדלות . . . אבל אני חכמים יש בי צדיקים. This is the answer to the accusation in the preceding verse. The last three verses (l. 1349–63) seem to form one Derasha. Cp. CH. VIII, 9, § 2, and the פירוש מהר״ז to that passage.

L. 1364–68. כרם . . . בפריו וגו׳. F. כרם היה לשלמה בבעל המון כרם זו כנסת ישראל שנקרא כרם שנ׳ כי כרם ה׳ צבאות בית יש׳ וגו׳ בבעל המון שבאו עליה גוים המונים שנ׳ הוי עמים גוים רבים כהמון מים יהמיון נתן את הכרם לנוטרים אלו עשרת השבטים שהגלה סנחריב ללחלח וחבור ·

כרמי שלי לפני האלף לך שלמה · לא לך נתונים אלא למלך מלכי המלכים הקב״ה שהשלום שלו · ומאתים לנוטרים את פריו זה יהודה ובנימין שהגלה נבוכנאצר מלך בבל והחריב את ירושלים. YM. Is. 105, the whole passage from הגדת שה״ש agreeing on the whole with the printed text, but adding: איש בפריו אלף כסף זה היה ירבעם בן נבט שאמרו לו ישראל מלוך עלינו אמר להם עני אנכי אמרו לו הרי כסף וזהב שנ׳ ברעתם ושמחו אלף כסף זה נבוכנאצר שהביא למלכותו: The ל״ט to this verse. מלך אלף צדיקים . . . ס״א זה אחיה השילוני שהביא בפריו של ירבעם אלף כסף. See Rashi to this verse: במדרש שה״ש מצאתי מקצת סמך על נוטרים הללו שהן המלכיות. See CH. VIII, 9, § 1, and Targum to this verse.

L. 1369–73. היושבת . . . השמיעוני. F. היושבת בגנים זו כנ״י שהיא דומה לגינה קטנה בין גינות אחרות כך ישראל יושבין בין האומות אע״פי שאון הק״בה מוסר גינתו ביד לאבד אחרים · חבירים מקשיבים לקולך השמיעיני אלו החכמים ותלמידיהם שהן מוצאין מקרא בפני עצמן ומשנה בפני עצמן · ומדרש בפני עצמן · הלכות בפני עצמן · אגדות בפני עצמן לפיכך אמר להם הק״בה חבירים מקשיבים לקולך השמיעיני. See CH. VIII, 11, § 1; 12, § 1. MH. IV: היושבת בגנים זו כנ״י שהיא דומה לגנה קטנה בין גנות גדולות לפיכך אמ׳ (אין?) הק״בה מוסר את גנתו ביד אחרים · חברים מקשיבים לקולך השמיעיני אלו חכמים ותלמידיהם שהן מושכין מקרא בפני עצמו מדרש בפני עצמו הלכות ואגדות בפני עצמן · אמר הקבה לישראל בני כל דבר טומאה וטהרה שאתם אומרים לפני קולכם ערב עלי לכך נאמר חברים מקשיבים לקולך השמיעיני.

L. 1374–85. ומאתים לנוטרים את פריו . . . ברח . . . ושעת. F. ד״א איימתי יום שעמדו עליו עמון ומואב ונתן להם מאתים דינרי׳ ואמר להם שמרן לי מקומכם שלא למרות עלי · לפיכך נהגו המלכים שביון שהרג אחד מהם את חבירו ובא וישב על כסאו מיד היה נותן דינעטם · ברח דודי ברה כבוד ישראל · אימתי יום ששכר בלק את בלעם לקלל את ישראל וכן הוא אומר ארם מקדם ופלשתים מאחור זה עמלק · ויאכלו את ישראל בכל פה אלו החמסנים והגזלנים · א״ר הגדול באותה שעה שלח עמלק ולקח את כל אלופי עשו ונתן להם אלף אלפים דינרים לכל אחד ואחד מאותן החיילים שהיו מאלופי עשו · לפ׳ היה יושב ודורש את כל התורה למפרע · ד״א ברח דודי ברח כבוד מישראל אימתי ביום שאמר בלעם לבלק בנה לי בזה

שבעה מזבחות אמ׳ כשם שבנה שלמה בטהרה והעלה בטהרה כך אני אבנה בטהרה ואעלה בטהרה כדי שתהא תפילתי נשמעת. YM. Is. 74: בהגדת שה״ש ברח דודי וגו׳ ברח כבוד מישר׳ ר׳ חנניה היה אומ׳ ברח דודי ברח כבוד מישראל · אימתי יום ששכר בלק את בלעם לקלל את ישראל שנ׳ ארם מקדם ופלשתים מאחור ויאכלו את ישראל בכל פה ארם מקדם זה בלעם · ופלשתים מאחור זה עמלק ויאכלו את ישר׳ בכל פה אלו הגזלנין והחמסנין · אמר רבינו הגדול באותה שעה שלח עמלק ולקח את כל אלופי עשו ונתן להם דינר לכל אחד ואחד מאותן החיילים שהיו מאלופי עשו לפיכך היה יושב ודורש את כל הברכה למפרע. The meaning is obscure. Perhaps we have here a satire upon certain of the Roman emperors who maintained themselves on the throne by bribing the legions.

L. 1385–89. בלימודיי . . . ד״א. F. ד״א ברח דודי אימתי ביום שכרתו ברית ארח ארחמך · והעלו שני טלאים אחד לצפון המזבח לשם ארחמו ואחד לדרום המזבח לשם אנשי ירושלים. The Derasha of בימי אחז (l. 1387–88) is omitted.

L. 1390–96. האילים . . . ד״א. F. ד״א ברח דודי אימתי בימי מנחם והלל שנפלה מחלוקת ביניהם ויצא מנחם הוא ושמנה מאות תלמידים עמו מלובשים בסתרקי זהב · ובא בן מטרון ובעט ביהודה אחיו של מנחם והרגו ועלה אלעזר והתלמידים עמו והכה את אלחנן ומתכו מנות מנות · מיד שלח ארחימו והושיב קסתרא בירושלים והיו מטמאין כל האנשים והנשים שבתוכה ועלה אלעזר והתלמידים עמו והביאו את אנשי קסתרא · מיד נפלה קטטה ומחלוקת בירושלים על אותה שעה הוא אומר ברח דודי וגו׳. With regard to Menachem, see *Jerushalmi Chagigah*, 77 d; *Babli ibid.* 16 b; ARN. 24 a. Perhaps we have here some reminiscence alluding to the events recorded by Josephus, *Bell. Jud.* II, c. 17. If we could assume that Ananias (=חנן or אלחנן) was in some way mixed up with the execution of the zealot Judas we might correct our passage in the following way: ד״א ברח דודי . . . ובא חנן בן מטרון ובעט בו ביהודה אביו של מנחם ועלה מנחם והרגו (לחנן) ועלה אלעזר וחתכו מניות מניות מבשרו (של מנחם) אותה שעה שלחו, &c. &c. ארחמו is perhaps a corruption from אנטניא or אנשי רומי.

ADDENDA.

The following passages from the Scriptures, wrongly quoted in the *Agadath Shir Hashirim*, are here corrected according to the Masoretic text.

L. 95. שנ' עם ה' אלה Ezek. xxxvi. 20.—L. 98–99. לבבתני אחותי כלה Song of Sol. iv. 9.—L. 103. שנ' כי כרם ה' צבאות בית ישראל Is. v. 7.—L. 107. שנ' ואגדתו על ארץ *ibid.* lxi. 6.—L. 110. משרתי אלהינו יסדה Amos ix. 6.—L. 119. שנ' אפרים עגלה מלמדה Hos. x. 11.—L. 144. שנ' עיר ה' ציון קדוש ישראל Is. lx. 14.—L. 144. שנ' הנני בורא את ירושלים גילה ועמה משוש *ibid.* lxv. 18.—L. 175. כה אמר רם ונשא *ibid.* lvii. 16.—L. 181. כי אל קנא ה' אלהיך Deut. vi. 15.—L. 188. ואלו עיר וקדיש Dan. iv. 10.—L. 189. כה אמר ה' מלך ישראל Is. xliv. 6. —L. 189–90. The words from אם to מסתתר have to be cancelled; see Is. xlv. 15.—L. 191. גואלם חזק Jer. l. 34.—L. 257–58. רפאות תהי לשרך ושקוי לעצמותיך Prov. iii. 8.—L. 269. וירח את ריח &c. Gen. xxvii. 57.—L. 281. והנה יוצר גובי &c. Amos iii. 1.—L. 335. ותהלתו מלאה הארץ Hab. iii. 3.—L. 357–58. ויהי כאשר זקן שמואל וישם את בניו שפטים לישראל וגו' ולא הלכו בניו בדרכיו 1 Sam. viii. 1, 3. —L. 404. ובני ישראל אכלו את המן ארבעים שנה Exod. xvi. 35.— L. 415. וימרו על הים בים סוף ויושיעם למען שמו להודיע &c. Ps. cvi. 7, 8.—L. 440. אלכה נא ואשובה אל אחי Exod. iv. 18.—L. 504. Read משפט for ומשפט Jer. ix. 22.—L. 603. ויהי לו הנער לכהן Jud. xvii. 12.—L. 607. גאון שבעת לחם ושלות השקט היה &c. Ezek. xvi. 49. —L. 615. ראמות לאויל חכמות Prov. xxiv. 7.—L. 635. את השמים &c. Deut. xxviii. 12.—L. 721. ואכרתה להם ברית עולם &c. Is. lv. 3.— L. 736. The word את is not in Is. xxxix. 6.—L. 748. יהי אחריתו להכרית Ps. cix. 13.—L. 749. קללה כמדו *ibid.* cix. 18.—L. 763. העירותי מצפון ויאת ועבדת הצדקה &c. Is. xxxii. 17.—L. 873–74. ויזעק שמואל אל ה' בעד ממזרח שמש יקרא בשמי Is. xli. 25.—L. 891. וילבש צדקה כשרין ישראל ויענהו ה' 1 Sam. vii. 9.—L. 897. Is. lix. 17. —L. 972. ויבן את תדמר במדבר 2 Chron. viii. 4.—L. 981. העמודים וכבוד ה' על הבית וחשוקיהם כסף Exod. xxvii. 10.—L. 1011. וישמע את הקול מדבר אליו מעל הכפורת 2 Chron. vii. 3.—L. 1026.

ואת דמי ירושלם &c. Num. vii. 89.—L. 1073. אשר על ארן העדת מבין ידיח מקרבה Is. iv. 4.—L. 1096. העירותי מצפון ויאת Is. xli. 17.—L. 1145–49 have to be corrected according to the readings given from YM. Ps. to these lines.—L. 1158. קול המון בהרים דמות עם רב Is. xiii. 4.—L. 1183. על הר ציון ועל גבעתה Is. xxxi. 4.—L. 1271. עלה שישק Deut. xxxii. 49.—L. 1287. עלה אל הר העברים הזה הר נבו 1 Kings xiv. 25.—L. 1289–90. מלך מצרים ויקח את כל מגיני הזהב ויקח את אוצרות בית ה׳ ואת אוצרות בית המלך ואת הכל לקח ויקח את כל מגיני הזהב *ibid.* xiv. 26.—L. 1327. ומטה הוא בידם זעמי Is. x. 5.—L. 1346. אם יתן איש את כל הון ביתו באהבה Song of Songs viii. 8.

L. 1–5. MS. Cambridge Add. 504. ר׳ יהודה בר שלמה הבבלי כן יזכה לראות בבנין ביה״מק יסד אור ישע מאושרים בנ׳ ג׳ חרזים על שמצא במדרש ש״הש קדושתו של הק׳ משולשת שירותיו משולשון שיר אחד השירים שנים הרי ג׳. MS. Or. 1481 (British Museum), 4 b: פכיף קולהם ז״ל כל הקורא פסוק משה״ש שלא בעתו מביא מבול לעולם ואיזה הוא שעתו זה חג הסוכות שנ׳ באספך מגרנך ומיקבך.

L. 10. Read במכות for במרכבות.

L. 195–201. ...עשר שירות we have to add to the authorities alluding to the שירת ישעיה the ל״ט whose commentary to ש״הש commences with the passage: שה״ש למה נאמר בלשון רבים לפי שהוא מכליל בו שירים הרבה הראשונים והאחרונים שהרי בשירת הים כתיב שבחו של הק״בה בענין מי כמוך באלים ה׳ וכן אתה מוצא בשירת דבורה וברק שנ׳ אנכי לה׳ אשירה ובשירת ישעיה הנביא אתה מוצא שבחו של הק״בה ושבחו של ישראל שנ׳ הנך יפה דודי אף נעים. In the commentary to ש״הש, attributed to R. Saadyah (in the פירושים ג׳), we read: אבל האמת כי דודי הק״בה שנ׳ אשירה נא לידידי שירת דודי לכרמו ופירש אותו ישעיה הנביא ואמר כי כרם ה׳ צבאות בית ישראל. With regard to the authorship of this commentary, I will only notice here that it seemed to me identical with the Arabic commentary contained in MS. Or. 1302 (in the British Museum) which is attributed to R. Saadyah. This is the impression made upon me by the numerous Hebrew quotations to be found in it. But the matter could only be decided by Arabic scholars, who may take my opinion for what it is worth. In the פיוט beg. ש״הש אמריה צפה (Cp. Zunz's *Lg. d. Syn. Poesie*, p. 668),

I find also among the scriptural verses cited in it the verse from Is. v. 1, אשירה נא &c.

L. 351–52. The following extract from the ל״ט to ש״הש will be found interesting: ד״א שמן תורק שמך . . . כך יצא שם הצדיקים במקום, שנשחטו על קדושת השם כגון רשב״ג נשיא ישראל ור׳ ישמעאל בן אלישע כה״ג בן כה״ג שבא הקוסטנום בימי מלכות הרשעה ומצאם יושבין בעזרה נושאין ונותנין בהלכות הפסח נטלם והביאם לפני המלך · בא להרוג את רש״בג . . . וכן חוצפית התורגמן שהיה ר״ע קורא אותו יפיפית מבני אדם הוצק חן בשפתותיך שהיה יודע בע׳ לשונות ותפשוה והרגוהו · וכן יהודה הנחתום שלא הלך לעולם ד׳ אמות בלי תורה · ולמה נקרא שמו יהודה הנחתום שהיה מוצא ד״ת עריבים כלחם חמודות ומצאוהו בורח והרגוהו וכן ר׳ יהודה בן בבא . . . וכן בן עזאי חתנו של ר״ע שמתוך חיבתו בתורה הניח את אשתו מצאוהו בבית המדרש והרגוהו. וכן ר״ע היו עושין קולמסין של קנים ונותנין בין צפרניו לתוך כ׳ שנה הוציאוהו מבית האסורין והרגוהו . . . וכן ר׳ חנינה בן תרדיון . . . וכן ר׳ טרפון שהיה חרד במצות פעם אחת היה רעב בא״י וקידש ג׳ מאות נשים כדי להאכילן בתרומה ומצאוהו בעזרה ועיוורוהו וכן ר׳ ישבב שהיה משארית החסידים ונתפש על מטתו והרגוהו. It seems, however, that these passages formed a part of another Midrash to Song of Songs. Thus we read in the יחוסי תנאים ואמוראים II, 80 a: ובמדרש שה״ש שמתחיל וישב שלמה בתחילתו על דרש עלמות אהבוך מפורש מעשה ר׳ חנינא בן תרדיון כמו בגמרא דידן ומסקנא אותו היום שנשרף אותו הקדש בשמת קיסר אמרו עליו על ר״ח בן תרדיון שהיה יושב על כספו ג׳ חדשים והן רואין לו ושמחין כסבורין שהוא המלך והמלך נידון תחתיו באש ששה חדשים סבורין שהוא ר״ח בן תרדיון וכשבא הדבר אצל החכמים אמרו צדיק מצרה נחלץ ויבא רשע תחתיו. P. 95 b: ומפורש במדרש שה״ש שלישי ר׳ חצפית המתורגמן כשהיה ר״ע רואהו היה קורא עליו יפיפית מבני אדם הוצק חן בשפתותיך שהיה יודע בע׳ לשונות ובקי בהן ותפסוהו עם תלמידיו והרגו כולן עמו. III, 179 b: ובן עזאי שנתבתי למעלה שאף הוא נהרג כמפורש במדרש ש״הש. Cp. *Midrash Tillim* s. v. שמעון בן עזאי and ר״ח בן תרדיון and סדר הדורות IX. See also היכלות (ed. Wertheimer, c. VIII). Whether this מדרש ש״הש is identical with our Chasitha (the copy of our author having begun with the Derasha of R. Isaac in I, 1, § 10) or formed a *third* Midrash, I have not at present the means of deciding. The quoted passages

may have once formed a part of Chasitha I, 2, § 3, where he speaks of the דורו של שמד, but the mystical tone does not quite fit into the context of this Midrash in our editions.

L. 392–97. See ל"ט to Num. xix. 1: . . . בחודש השלישי לצאת בתחילה היו מונין ישראל ליצירה חזרו למנות ליציאת מצרים חזרו למנות לבנין הבית לא זכו למנות לבנינו מונין לחורבנו . . . ולא עוד אלא שאנו מונין למלכות יונים. The fact that R. Tobaya speaks of יצירה shows that he used here our Midrash, and that he read לשטרות (=מלכות יונים).

L. 481–93. See ברייתא דשמואל הקטן, chap. V: בשנת ארבעה אלפים וחמש מאות ושלשים ושש שנה שוו חמה ולבנה ושמיטוח ותקופות.

L. 1220–22. YM. MP. 105 b; the whole passage reading . . . אל . . . ושבטין שנשבעת להם ברית בדרך שכרת לאבות . . . אומר סלה.

POSTSCRIPT.

The first and only modern scholar who ever noticed our *Agadath Shir Hashirim* is Zunz, in his *Gottesdienstliche Vorträge* (p. 277, n. 1, 2nd ed.). But he only knew it, as it seems, through a reference in De Rossi's Catalogue, and therefore attributed to it little importance. In the foregoing Corrections and Notes, however, it will be found that the following authorities have been quoted in connexion with our *Agadath Shir Hashirim*—R. Solomon b. Judah the Paitan, and his commentators R. Joseph Cara and R. Shemaya[1]; R. Tobyah b. Eliezer; R. Meir b. Isaac; R. Solomon b. Isaac (*Rashi*); R. Judah Barzilai of Barcelona; R. Simon Cara, the compiler of *Yalkut Shimoni*; R. Hillel Kayavani; R. Moses Tako; the anonymous author of יחוסי תנאים ואמוראים[2]; R. Eleazar of Worms; R. Moses b. Nachman (*Ramban*); R. Asriel the Cabbalist; R. Abraham ben Maimon; R. Isaac ibn Sahula; R.

[1] The Commentary to the Machzor, MS. Cambridge Add. 394, used so often in the *Corrections and Notes*, has, after the strophe תבנית אוה יוסף, the words עד כאן יסודו של ר' יוסף קרא מכאן ואילך יסוד ר' שמעיה מ"כ. Cp. Zunz's *Ritus*, pp. 198, 201.

[2] Since this was written Herr Epstein has published an essay in the *Monatsschrift*, vol. XXXIX, in which he proved beyond doubt that the author of this work was R. Juda b. Kalonymos b. Meir of Speyer, who flourished about the end of the twelfth century.

Menachem of Recanate; R. Machir b. Abba Mari, the compiler of the *Yalkut Machiri*; R. Bachye Ibn Chalava; R. Jacob b. Asher; R. Simon Duran, the compiler of the *Midrash Haggadol*; and R. Matatyah Delakrat. All these authorities give, more or less, passages which are only to be found in our Midrash, which most of them quote by the title of מדרש ש״הש or אגדת ש״הש or אגדתא דש״הש. It is true that neither R. Tobyah b. Eliezer nor Ibn Sahula quotes our Midrash by name, but considering that their works form commentaries to the Song of Songs, it is reasonable to assume that they took their materials from older homilies based on the same Scriptural book which just occupied their attention, which cannot be anything else but our *Agadath Shir Hashirim*. If any reasonable doubt may be entertained it is only with regard to R. Bachye Ibn Chalava, whose authority in the כד הקמח are the Chapters of R. Eliezer, and about R. Matatyah Delakrat, whose late age (16th century) makes it probable that his knowledge of our *Agada* was only second hand. On the other hand, it is safe to assume that R. Solomon b. Judah did make use of the *Agadath Shir Hashirim*. As a *Paitan* he naturally never mentions his sources, but there are sufficient strophes in his *Piyutim* to make his knowledge of our Midrash fairly certain.

Considering now that R. Solomon b. Judah flourished about the end of the tenth century, considering again that at least a generation or two would be required to give our *Agada* that Midrashic importance and air of antiquity that a Paitan would take it as an acknowledged authority, worthy to become the subject of his versifications, its composition must not therefore, if only on this reason, be placed later than the middle of the tenth century.

Now it is true that there are other indications which would point even to an earlier date. I am referring to certain Messianic as well as mystical passages in our *Agada*, the relation of which to some of the apocalypses edited by Jellinek in the various volumes of his *Beth Hammidrash* is visible at a first glance[1]. This is especially the case with the פ׳ ר׳ יאשיהו, which in a number of passages betrays such a strong resemblance to our *Agada*[2] that

[1] See *Beth Hammidrash*, I, 56 sq., II, 54 sq., III, 66 sq. and 141 sq., IV, 117, V, 45 sq., VI, 112 sq., 117 sq. and 150 sq. Cp. Zunz, *Lg. d. Synagogalen Poesie*, 603 sq.

[2] See ז׳ ר׳ יאשיה, VI, pp. 112, 113, and *Agadath Shir Hashirim*, l. 260–288.

there is but little doubt that the one copied from the other. But as the פ׳ ר׳ יאשיהו is essentially an eschatological Midrash, there was hardly any reason for the compiler to give the various Derashoth on the text לריח שמניך טובים על כן עלמות אהבוך[1], unless he copied it from our *Agada*, where such interpretations are in their proper place. Now there is, as has been already pointed out by Jellinek, a strong interdependence between the פ׳ ר׳ יאשיהו and the other apocalypses (especially the ס׳ אליהו ופרקי משיח and the ג״ע וגיהנם)[2], whilst, on the other hand, there is a strong probability that Kalir made use of such a class of Midrashim[3]. Added to all this, the Paitan's distinct reference to the seventy names of Israel[4], the fact of Kalir's acquaintance with our Midrash becomes very probable. We shall thus have to assign the date of our *Agada* somewhere in the first half of the ninth century[5]. There are, however, grave considerations against such an early date, as will easily be seen after analysis of the sources of our *Agada* itself.

Even a superficial perusal of our *Agada* will convince the reader that its relation to the *Midrash Chasitha* is but small. They may have many minor details in common; but the latter offers but very few parallels to those passages which constitute the most characteristic features of our *Agada*. As such we may consider most of the Agadoth to the first verse of the Song of Songs (l. 1–225), the long Derasha on Zedakah (l. 464–781), and the various Messianic interpretations (l. 338–344, 1094–1142). With regard to the latter, there is hardly a Rabbinic work which would more readily suggest itself as the source of this kind of eschatological Agadoth than the Chapters of R. Eliezer. The quotation in the name of R. Eleazar (l. 1101)[6], as well as the attributing of a whole Messianic apocalypse to such an early authority as Simon b. Shetach (or even

Cp. Corrections and Notes to l. 265–270. See also Corrections and Notes to l. 1085 (the passage given there from F, and *Beth Hammidrash*, VI, 150-151).

[1] See *Beth Hammidrash*, V, 113 . . . לריח שמניך טובים זה דורו של חוקיה ד״א, &c.

[2] See Jellinek's Text, III, 66, V, 45 and 150, and *Introduction* to III, pp. xxviii, xxix.

[3] See Zunz, *Lg. d. Synagogalen Poesie*, p. 31.

[4] See Zunz, *Gottesdienstliche Vorträge*, p. 274 note.

[5] See P. F. Frankl's admirable essay on Kalir in the *Encyklopädie* of Ersch and Gruber, II Section, Theil XXXII, p. 135.

[6] F. has Eliezer.

Simon b. Zoma)[1], point strongly to the Chapters. It is true that the passages to which we have referred are not to be found in our version of the Chapters; but this is well known to be imperfect[2], and thus it is not impossible that the Chapters made use of by the compiler of our *Agada* was more complete, containing also the said passages.

More certain, however, is the relation of our *Agada* to the *Yelamdenu*. Even before the discovery of the former, Epstein, who, to my knowledge, was the first to call attention to the fact that the earlier authorities had two different Midrashim to *Shir Hashirim*, suggested that there must have once existed a *Pesikta* to *Shir Hashirim*, quoted by some writers as *Yelamdenu*[3]. His hypothesis was chiefly based on a quotation by R. Moses Ibn Tabun. Now the quotation is somewhat uncertain[4]. Besides, the well-known formula of "Let our Master teach us," ילמדנו רבינו, which is the main characteristic of the *Yelamdenu*, is entirely absent in our *Agada*. But still, nevertheless, we find the relation between these two Midrashim so strong that, if our *Agada* is not identical with *Yelamdenu*, it must be considered at least as a recast of many *Yelamdenu* passages bearing on the Song of Songs.

As such passages we recognize the very first sentence of our *Agada*, to which only the *Yelamdenu* offers a real parallel[5]. The

[1] F. שמעי בן זומא. Machiri שמעון ב' ו'. The Chapters are also fond of using earlier authorities for the revelation of new truths. See Zunz, *Gottesdienstliche Vorträge*, p. 286, note d, with regard to R. Eleazar b. Arach.

[2] See Zunz, *ibid.*, pp. 284–5. The newer Yemen literature, especially, contains much the origin of which can only be sought in the Chapters; which again strengthens Zunz's theory of the incompleteness of this work.

[3] See Epstein's *Eldad ha-Dani*, p. 79: ואעיר שלעיני הקדמונים היו שני מדרשים שונים על ש"הש האחד הוא מדרש חזית שלנו והשני היה פסיקתא על שיה"ש שממנה מביא הרבה בעל הילקוט מסימן תתק"פ ואילך · ר"מ אבן תבון בפירושו לש"הש דף י' כתב: במדרש שיר השירים בילמדנו תורי זהב נעשה לך אלו ד"ת וכו' מדרש חזית כתורים כשתי תורות ואין ספק שכונתו לשני מדרשים שונים · את הפסיקתא כינה בשם ילמדנו וכו' וכו'

[4] See preceding note. The passage is not to be found in our *Agada*; but from the fact that the לקח טוב quotes it as ד"א we may safely assume that his copy still contained it. Cp. Corrections and Notes to l. 436–41. Some parallel to this Derasha (but *not* based on the text of תורי זהב) may be found in CH. III, 8, 12, *Tanchuma* ויקהל § 8, NR. XIV, 11, and *Yelamdenu* (at YS. II, § 988).

[5] See l. 1–5 ר' נתן אומר מה"ש וכו' and l. 206–10 אמר רא בן עוריה, and *Midrash Agadoth*, p. 170. The relation of this latter to *Tanchuma* תצוה, § 8, points to the lost *Yelamdenu*. CH. has, in the first case, very opposite Derashoth.

passage regarding the things created before the world [1] is probably taken from the *Yelamdenu*, some parallel to which is still retained in the Exod. Rabbah. The same we may also assume of the Derasha relating to the three Songs, for which the *Yelamdenu* offers the best parallel [2]. The interpretation of עפר by *adolescens* (l. 866) suggests *Yelamdenu* to Num. xxiii. 10; and so also the allegories with regard to the Patriarchs (l. 953–56), as well as the Derasha on Ezek. xxxvi (l. 1078), seem to be derived from the same source [3]. More important is the long Zedakah-Derasha, extending over more than three hundred lines, the source of which can only be sought in the *Yelamdenu* [4]. This whole Derasha, occupying now about a fourth part of our *Agada*, is quite out of place in a Midrash to the Song of Songs, and can only be explained by assuming that it was the set purpose of its author to give us a compilation of Yelamdenu Derashoth bearing on the Song of Songs, and he thus felt justified in reproducing from it whole Derashoth, even when their interpretatory value for the Song of Songs is not quite evident. The expression אלהים for הק״בה, fairly frequent in our *Agada*, may also be considered as a proof of the use our compiler made of the *Yelamdenu* [5]. If this be the case, then it is possible that Kalir, as well as the compilers of the various Messianic Midrashim to which I have referred, used the same sources which were at the disposal of the *Agadath Shir Hashirim*. It will thus be safest not to speak with any degree of certainty before the quotations from it become direct and frequent, which is about the end of the tenth century.

S. SCHECHTER.

[1] See Corrections and Notes to l. 58.

[2] See l. 77–100 ג׳ שירים &c., and cp. *Tanchuma* בהעלתך § 8; ילמדנו רבינו &c.

[3] See Corrections and Notes to all these passages in their respective places.

[4] See Corrections and Notes to l. 627–44, the parallel given there from the *Talmud Torah* in the name of the *Yelamdenu*, while, according to Buber's *Mabo to the Tanchuma* (62 a), a similar passage is contained in a Tanchuma MS. in Oxford. The fact that the extracts given above on these lines, as well as on l. 648–702, from the MH. occur in ב׳ עקב, and that the *Or Zaruah* also cites Zedakah-Derashoth from the *Yelamdenu* to this *Parasha*, makes it clear that both had the same source.

[5] See l. 487, 492, 555, 678, 680, 892, and 1069. Cp. Epstein's *Beitrage* (מקדמוניות), p. 63.

CRITICAL NOTICES.

THE REVISED VERSION OF THE APOCRYPHA.

THIS final instalment of the Revision of the Authorized Version of 1611 will be found to stand, in point of merit, as its contents mostly fall in point of time, somewhere between the Old and New Testaments. But while it does not, as a whole, attain the level of sober scholarship displayed by the Old Testament Revision, yet it is in parts a splendid performance, which will reflect credit on English learning and prove a priceless boon to the student. Indeed, the work as a whole is a distinct advance on the A.V., and it would have been a greater stride still but for the regrettable fact that some of the best of the new features are strangely defaced by what looks like a want of continuity in the editing. The most striking change is naturally the one that first catches the reader's eye: the arrangement of the whole version into paragraphs, and the display of the parallelism of line by the method of printing adopted in the more poetical and sententious parts. It is difficult to suggest any other cause than the one already hinted at in explanation of the spasmodic way in which the second of these great changes is neglected. The Prayer of Manasses is printed in one long paragraph, though the parallelism is quite as marked as in the Song of Judith, which the Revisers print in parallel lines. The same remark applies to the Song of the Three Children, where the parallelism is as plainly discernible as in any part of the Old Testament literature. Cf. the 136th Psalm with this Song, and it will be seen that while the O. T. Revisers rightly place the refrain, "For his mercy endureth for ever," in a separate line throughout, the Revisers of the Apocrypha neglect to do the same with the equally catching refrain, "Praise and exalt him above all for ever." (It is here noteworthy that the phrase "above all" is a developed form of the Psalmic "above all gods.") A similar surprise must be felt about the treatment of portions of Baruch iii–v; surely the parallelism in iii. 9 sq. is as easily displayed as say that in Ecclus. l. 1–3, where the

Revisers adopt the newer method? Baruch iii. 9–11 should run thus:—

> Hear, O Israel, the commandments of life:
> Give ear to understand wisdom.
> How happeneth it, O Israel, that thou art in thine enemies' land,
> That thou art waxen old in a strange country,
> That thou art defiled with the dead,
> That thou art counted with them that go down into the grave?

Another general and external point, on which however a difference of opinion is sure to be felt, concerns the retention of the italics. This is to me a very disturbing matter, though here the Revisers of the Apocrypha only maintain the questionable plan of the Old Testament Committee. But in the Apocrypha, as the Revisers' preface points out, a "greater freedom of rendering characterizes the (A. V.) translation when compared with the translation of the Old or of the New Testament," and this greater freedom, we are told, was here preserved. Why then was it necessary to print "a *Greek* place of exercise" in 2 Macc. iv. 12, where the text γυμνάσιον and the context render the word "Greek" a *necessary* part of the translation? The inconsistencies which such a method involve may be seen by comparing the R.V. of Proverbs xvi. 1 with the R.V. of Ecclus. i. 1. In the latter, the Greek Πᾶσα σοφία παρὰ κυρίου is rendered "All wisdom *cometh* from the Lord," but in Prov. xvi. 1, where ומה" מענה לשון involves a similar addition of a verb "to come," the R.V. rightly gives us "The answer of the tongue is from the Lord," without any italicization of *is*. This question I am here raising is not a mere quibble, for at the basis of a true translation must lie a reproduction of Hebrew or Greek idiom by English idiom, and not by an italicized rendering which implies that a word or idea is unexpressed in the original, when it is really implicitly expressed by the syntax of the original. In Wisdom xvi. 9 the italics seem superfluous in rendering ὑπὸ τοιούτων "by such *as these*"; ibid. vii. 4 "*watchful* cares" seems to imply that the Greek φροντίσιν does not exactly mean "watchful, anxious concern." In Baruch vi. 39 "*these gods* of wood," for τὰ ξύλινα introduces an unnecessary interpolation — "wooden things" is a more effective phrase. In Susanna v. 46 why is *woman* italicized? Does not ταύτης mean "this woman"? That the matter is important may be seen from this, that the use of italics leads sometimes to what is almost a mistranslation. A case occurs of what I mean, in the R.V. of the Wisdom of Solomon vi. 14, Ὁ ὀρθρίσας ἐπ' αὐτήν is translated "He that riseth up early to *seek* her;" seek being italicized, the reader is perhaps led to fancy that the Greek verb does not mean "seek." But this is just what ὀρθρίζω does mean

in Hellenistic Greek. Thus in Job viii. 5, where the Hebrew runs אם אתה תשחר אל אל, the LXX has *σὺ δὲ ὄρθριζε πρὸς κύριον*, and the R.V. "If thou wouldst seek diligently unto the Lord." Cf. the use of *ὀρθρίζω* in (LXX) Ps. lxiii. 1, and in some other passages cited by Prof. Freudenthal in this REVIEW, III, 746. The old sense of "rise early," had passed into the derived signification "to seek earnestly." Further, the italics are often ambiguous, for occasionally they imply more than the actual text contains. A striking instance is Ecclus. xii. 3 "a *foolish* daughter is born" to her father's loss. The Greek, however, has only *θυγάτηρ*. In point of fact the author of Ecclesiasticus has a very low opinion of women in general (cf. Cheyne, *Job and Solomon*, p. 187); and while he draws a distinction as regards the father's gain or loss between a bad and a good son, he may mean that a daughter, whether foolish or wise, is her father's loss; at best she is her husband's gain, always she is her father's detriment.

On the other hand, the Revisers have boldly broken from the old spellings of the names in the Apocrypha. They have not attempted a pedantic consistency, but they have been guided by sound common-sense and critical judgment. Some would have preferred them to have been a little bolder here and there, e.g. in 1 Macc. v. 66 where *Marisa* and *Samaria* might have changed places in margin and text. They have retained, too, the spelling *Modin* in 1 Macc. ii. 1–5, though there can be little critical ground for omitting an *e* and reading Modein, a syllable present both in the Greek Μωδεΐν, and in the Hebrew מודיעים. It is not obvious, again, why *Arius* in 1 Macc. xii. 7 is read for Ἀρεύς—but what a scholarly change is made here from the *Darius* of the A.V.! Again, why do the Revisers, who rightly reject the A.V. *Maspha* (1 Macc. iii. 46), replace it by *Mizpeh?* Both the Hebrew of the MT. and all the varying texts of the LXX retain the second *a* sound, as do the Revisers of the Old Testament (see e.g. 1 Sam. vii. 5). But the name improvements are so numerous that it is impossible to do more than indicate a few. *Nebuchadnezzar* (Judith, passim) for *Nabuchodonosor; Chittim* for *Chettiim* (1 Macc. i. 1); *Phineas* and *Joshua* (1 Macc. ii. 54–55) for *Phinees* and *Jesus; plain country* (1 Macc. xi. 38) for *Sephela; Hasideans* (=חסידים 1 Macc. ii. 42) for *Asideans; Chislev* (ibid. i. 54) for *Casleu; Michmash* (ibid. ix. 73) for *Machmas; Hazor* (= חצור ibid. xi. 67) for *Nazor*. The Revisers rightly resisted the temptation to substitute (with Codex Sinaiticus) *Nahum* for *Jonah* in Tobit xiv. 4, for though Tobit seems to imply ignorance of the Bible narrative in declaring that, "I believe all the things which Jonah the prophet spake of Nineveh, that it shall be overthrown," he is really following a Rabbinical tradition which would have it that the repentance of the Ninevites was insincere, and that their

respite from destruction was probably temporary. אמר רבי שמעון בן לקיש תשובה של רמיות עשו אנשי נינוה (Taanith, *T. J.* II. 3. Cf. Rosenmann, *Studien zum Buche Tobit*, p. 11).

To many readers the point of greatest moment will be the treatment meted out to the text by the Revisers. The title-page anticipates the chief novelty of the revision, for we are informed that the present translation is made "out of the Greek and Latin tongues." This prepares us to find included the Latin fragment of 2 Esdras, but it also prepares us for the fact that the Revisers have not used any Hebrew texts to modify certain readings in the Greek. The point is a very debateable one. It must be freely admitted that the Hebrew or Aramaic texts of certain parts of the Apocrypha are neither ancient nor authentic. With the second book of the Maccabees (by the way the Revisers might profitably have given us the third and fourth books in an Appendix), and the Wisdom of Solomon, no Hebrew could be of any relevancy. The extant Hebrew Versions of Tobit and Judith are useless for this purpose[1], even if we do not accept the improbable theory of Nöldeke, Fritsche, and Schürer that Tobit was originally

[1] Hebrew usage seems to suggest an emendation of Judith ix. 12, where the exclamation *Nαὶ ναί* is somewhat pointless. Is it not possible that these words belong to the previous verse and represent the Hebrew אמן ואמן? The LXX is not consistent in its rendering of אמן, sometimes it uses *γένοιτο*, sometimes *ἀμήν*.—In Tobit iv. 17, I feel almost certain that the Greek is best explained by supposing a mistake between בקבר and בקרב. (By the way, the Revisers ought probably to have replaced "grace" (in Ecclus. vii. 33 b) by "kindness," for here *χάριν* = חסר.) Rosenmann, p. 22, defends the reading בקבר by quoting וחוגגים על קברי הצדיקים from the Karaite Sahal ben Mazliach, but the word should be read וחוננים. An important variant, suggested by Talmudical passages, is *three* for *seven* in Tobit vi. 13.—It is almost a pity that the Revisers did not add "and cheese" in Judith x. 5, for which there is strong authority in the versions and in Jewish tradition. On the whole, it must be said that the Revisers have failed altogether to do justice to Judith xvi. That in Judith some carelessness occurred is discernible from a comparison of xvi. 14 with ix. 12. In the former case *πᾶσα ἡ κτίσις σου* is rightly rendered "all thy creation," emending the A. V., which renders "all creatures." But in ix. 12, with strange inconsistency, *βασιλεῦ πάσης κτίσεώς σου* is rendered by the R. V. "King of every creature," the emendation being relegated to the margin!—It was, perhaps, too much to expect in Bel and the Dragon a transformation of the lions' den into the reality—viz. a subterranean pit, or chamber, where the lions were for the occasion confined. The Revisers of the O. T. also left the *den* in evidence, though it is hard to conceive how the lions could have contrived to live there.

composed in Greek and not in Hebrew. The Hebrew of the first book of the Maccabees is lost. But the matter stands somewhat differently with Ecclesiasticus. This work was, of course, written in Hebrew, and though the Hebrew or Aramaic original has long been lost, a large number of quotations from it are to be found in Rabbinical literature. These quotations were given in full in this REVIEW (Vol. III, p. 682) by Mr. Schechter (cf. Vol. IV, p. 162), and it is not unreasonable to maintain that they might be used, with caution and sparingly, for emending the Greek text. It would no doubt be easy to push this argument too far, but I think vii. 10, "Pray not when thou art fainthearted" (Heb. בצר אל יודה reading יודה for יורה), is preferable to "Be not fainthearted in thy prayer." Again, in iii. 22, the R.V. has "Thou hast *no need of* the things that are secret," but a better sense is given in the Hebrew "Thou hast *no business with* the things that are secret." In xxvi. 3, should not the Hebrew בחיק (*in the bosom*) be read instead of בחוק ("*in the portion*") which seems to underlie the Greek ἐν μερίδι? So in xxxviii. 1, when the Revisers were emending the A.V. from "Honour a physician with the honour due to him," into "Honour a physician according to thy need of him," which has little sense, might they not have gone a little farther and have adopted the Hebrew reading "*before* thou hast need of him"? On the other hand, Sᵉadyah's text of Ecclus. v. 5–7, כי רחמים ואף עמו ועל רשעים ינוח עזו (J. Q. R. IV, 163), better agrees with the Greek than do the citations in other Rabbinical forms (J. Q. R. III, 695), though the latter are more consonant with the context. The Revisers in xxi. 23 translate (the italics are not mine), "A foolish man peepeth in from the door of *another man's* house," but surely the Hebrew reading אל בית "*to* another man's house" gives a better sense. The Greek ἀπὸ θύρας ... εἰς οἰκίαν is easily explained, since if, instead of the full form אל בית, the Hebrew had read לבית, the word would be ambiguous. But the passage in which the Hebrew gives the prettiest variant of all is in xiii. 15 seq. By reading גוף for עוף in verse 16, the Greek gives us πᾶσα σάρξ instead of *bird*, while the Revisers (wrongly I think) change *beast* as given by the A. V. in verse 15 into "living creature." By this the parallelism is quite lost. If the reader will cast his eye down the third column and will compare the italicized lines with those in roman type (omitting for the present verse 20), he will see that the Hebrew beautifully preserves throughout the comparison of a fact in brute nature to a corresponding fact in human nature. For verse 20 the Hebrew gives us no help, but I cannot help thinking that perhaps כבוש (*restrained, humbled*) was read for כבש (*lamb*), and זד (*proud*) possibly for זאב (*wolf*) (with allusion to Isaiah xi. 6). It would be no insurmountable objection that verse 20 would, on this

view, resume the thought of verse 17. This is a not unknown device with the author of Ecclus. Comp. xxxiii. 19–23, where the final verse (23) repeats the thought of verse 19. This is how the present passage looks in the A.V., R.V., and in the translation suggested in part by the Hebrew:—

A. V.	R. V.	Reading suggested by the Hebrew.
15 Every beast loveth his like, and every man loveth his neighbour.	Every living creature loveth his like, And every man loveth his neighbour.	*Every beast loveth his like,* And every man loveth his neighbour.
16 All flesh consorteth according to kind, and a man will cleave to his like.	All flesh consorteth according to kind, And a man will cleave to his like.	*Every bird dwelleth with its kind,* And a man will cleave to his like.
17 What fellowship hath the wolf with the lamb? so the sinner with the godly.	What fellowship shall the wolf have with the lamb? So is the sinner unto the godly.	*What fellowship hath the wolf with the lamb?* So is the sinner unto the godly.
18 What agreement is there between the hyena and a dog? and what peace between the rich and the poor?	What peace is there between the hyena and the dog? And what peace between the rich man and the poor?	*What peace is there between the hyena and the dog?* And what peace between the rich man and the poor?
19 As the wild ass is the lion's prey in the wilderness, so the rich eat up the poor.	Wild asses are the prey of lions in the wilderness; So poor men are pasture for the rich.	*Wild asses are the prey of lions in the wilderness;* So poor men are pasture for the rich.
20 As the proud hate humility: so doth the rich abhor the poor.	Lowliness is an abomination to a proud man, So a poor man is an abomination to the rich.	*As the lamb is hated by the wolf,* So a poor man is an abomination to the rich.

The Revisers, indeed, make use of the Hebrew (or rather Syriac) in Ecclus. xxii. 6, but for some curious reason they reject even the three clear and well-established emendations (which Cheyne rightly accepts, op. cit., p. 196) of כיאר for כאר, xxiv. 27, of *poison* for *head*, xxv. 15, and *enemies* for *Tyrians* in xlvi. 18.

It would be hard to congratulate the Revisers too cordially on the courage with which they have omitted the spurious additions to Ecclesiasticus. Perhaps the omitted passages should have been placed in the margin, or in an Appendix, but that was hardly consistent with the nature of their work. Nor would it be easy to cite the many places in which their renderings in this difficult book are decided improvements. I very much fancy the Revisers' phrase in xxii. 11, "Weep more sweetly for the dead"—it is a perfect foil to

the older classical expression "to weep bitterly," and is a distinct gain to Biblical phraseology. In x. 27, Proverbs xii. 9 has been rightly used to get the text. But I wish the Revisers had seen their way in the Introduction of Ecclus. to translate "and are attached to these writings (i. e. this book)," instead of "addicted to these things," which is very ambiguous.

An excellent change in xv. 15, must, however, be specially commended:

A. V.	R. V.
If thou wilt, to keep the commandments, and to perform acceptable faithfulness.	If thou wilt, thou shalt keep the commandments; And to perform faithfulness, is of *thine own* good pleasure.

The Wisdom of Solomon as it appears in the Revised Version is almost a new book. The translators have here produced a masterpiece. So frequent and so admirable are the changes, that I despair to select adequate specimens. Could anything be better than the word *nature* for ὑπόστασις in xvi. 21? The A.V. of xv. 19 runs thus: "Neither are they beautiful, so much as to be desired in respect of beasts: but they went without the praise of God and his blessing"—which is a real puzzle. The R.V. beautifully renders:—

> Neither, as seen beside *other* creatures, are they beautiful, so that one should desire them,
> But they have escaped both the praise of God and his blessing.

Another very difficult passage is xvii. 11 seq., and here the alterations are so felicitous and scholarly that I must find space for a longer quotation:—

A. V.	R. V.
11 For wickedness, condemned by her own witness, is very timorous, and being pressed with conscience, always forecasteth grievous things.	For wickedness, condemned by a witness within, is a coward thing, And being pressed hard by conscience, always forecasteth the worst lot:
12 For fear is nothing else but a betraying of the succours which reason offereth.	For fear is nothing else but a surrender of the succours which reason offereth;
13 And the expectation from within, being less, counteth the ignorance more than the cause which bringeth the torment.	And from within *the heart* the expectation *of them* being less Maketh of greater account the ignorance of the cause that bringeth the torment.
14 But they, sleeping the same sleep that night, which was indeed intolerable, and which came upon them out of the bottoms of the inevitable hell,	But they, all through the night which was powerless indeed, And which came upon them out of the recesses of powerless Hades, *All* sleeping the same sleep,

A. V.	R. V.
15 Were partly vexed with monstrous apparitions, and partly fainted, their heart failing them : for a sudden fear, and not looked for, came upon them.	Now were haunted by monstrous apparitions, And now were paralysed by their soul's surrendering : For fear sudden and unlooked for came upon them.

It is a pity to stop the quotation here, for the whole of this most difficult chapter scintillates with amazingly luminous emendations, which stamp the Revisers as masters of Greek and English. Other smaller changes are always improvements ; in i. 12, "Court not death," exactly catches the force of *ζηλοῦν*, and is a delightful improvement on the A. V. "Seek not death." Death is personified in i. 16, and the Revisers correctly substitute *him* for *it*. In iii. 14 (it will be observed that the passages I am here citing are mostly the same difficult texts which induced Prof. Margoliouth to propound the strange hypothesis that the original language of the Wisdom was something other than Greek), the Revisers rightly replace the A. V. "For unto him shall be given the special gift of faith" by "For there shall be given him for his faithfulness a peculiar favour," for *πίστις* means *fidelity* in many passages of Hellenistic Greek (cf. Freudenthal, J. Q. R. III, 741–2). In iv. 10, the Revisers' emendation is admirable. The A. V. reads : "He pleased God and was beloved of him," the R. V. has "Being found well-pleasing unto God he was beloved of him," which well brings out the idea that *ἠγαπήθη* is the *consequence* of the righteous man being *εὐάρεστος*. The "much people" of the R. V. in vi. 2 represents the Greek *πλήθους* rather better than does the A. V. "people."

I have only left myself space to say a word or two of the new rendering of the Books of the Maccabees. Scholarly care is discernible in every line of the revision. In 2 Macc. iv. 9, the Greek has *τοὺς ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις Ἀντιοχεῖς ἀναγράψαι*, which the A.V. makes nonsense of. The R.V. gives the right meaning : "And to register the inhabitants of Jerusalem as citizens of Antioch." On the other hand, the technical title *στρατηγός*, in 1 Macc. xi. 59, means more than *captain ; commander* would perhaps be a better term (cf. 1 Macc. xiv. 47). At all events 1 Macc. xiv. 27–28 is not satisfactorily dealt with, for whatever the right reading is it cannot be "in Asaramel," nor is the latter obscure word the name of a place. Schürer's suggestion (*Jewish People in the time of Christ*, E. T. I, i. p. 265, note 17), that the original was סגן שר עם אל, has much to recommend it. But the Revisers seem throughout their work on the Apocrypha to have resisted practically every temptation to construct the text by the aid of Hebrew. In no other way can one so readily explain their omission, e.g. in Ecclus. vi. 2,

to read "by a bull" instead of "as a bull" (cf. Ball's Introduction to the Variorum Apocrypha). Might not a better reading have been obtained, too, in 1 Macc. ii. 57, by remembering that חסדיו (especially in the books of the Maccabees), would mean pious acts rather than mercy? It is hard to understand how "David for being merciful inherited the throne." The writer, however, might well have cited David's piety as the cause of his preferment. Mercy was hardly a characteristic of the Biblical David, however much his virtues were idealized.

In the preceding comments, undue prominence has perhaps been given to passages in which I venture to differ from the conclusions arrived at by the compilers of the version under review. But these comments must not be taken to imply that I do not fully appreciate the magnitude of the service the Revisers have rendered. The Revisers might well address captious critics in the words prefaced by the grandson of Jesus the son of Sirach to the Greek translation of his father's wisdom:—"Ye are intreated therefore to read with favour and attention, and to pardon us, if in any parts of what we have laboured to interpret, we may seem to fail in some of the phrases." But the authors of this translation have no need to plead for mercy. The most rigid and candid justice must assign to parts of their work a very high place, and to all of their work an honourable and respectable place, among the great translations of the present century.

I. ABRAHAMS.

THE SIFRE ZUTA.

ספרי זוטא. *Sifré Suta, d. i. eig. Sifré Numeri (in 2. Recension) zum ersten Male nach dem handschriftlichen Midrasch ha-gadol, Jalkut Simeoni u. a., gesammelt und mit Anmerkungen versehen, nebst einer ausführlichen Einleitung herausgegeben von* Dr. B. KÖNIGSBERGER. (1. Lieferung, Frankfurt a. M. Kauffmann, 1894. 24 Blätter, 8vo.)

IN addition to the Sifre on the Book of Numbers, there was another Tannaite Midrash, several fragments of which are preserved in the *Jalkut Shimeoni*. With these and other fragments as a basis to work on, the late Nehemiah Brüll contributed to the Jubilee Volume, published on the occasion of Graetz's seventieth birthday, a descriptive sketch of the lost Midrash termed the "Minor Sifre" (ספרי זוטא). He endeavoured to demonstrate that that Midrash did not belong to a late period, as even Weiss's *History of Tradition* assumes, but that

it contains indisputably genuine antique traditions, and was therefore to be regarded as an important source for ancient Halacha. Soon after the appearance of Brüll's essay, Dr. Hoffman issued, in the form of an appendix to the *Report of the Berlin Rabbinical Seminary* for 1886–7, an excellent introduction to the Halachic Midrashim, in which the Minor Sifre is thoroughly discussed, and Brüll's sketch is completed and occasionally corrected. Hoffman establishes the position that the Sifre Zuta emanated from R. Akiba's school, while the ordinary Sifre on Numbers exhibits the peculiarities of the Midrashim belonging to the school of R. Ishmael. About the same time Dr. Israel Levy called attention, in his important contribution, "A Word on the Mechilta of R. Simeon" (*Jahresbericht of the Breslau Jewish Theological Seminary*, 1889), to the fact that the major portion of the Sifre Zuta is to be found in the Miscellany known as Midrash Haggadol. This Midrash, the promised publication of which, by Mr. Schechter, will, it is hoped, not be too long delayed, excerpted the lost Tannaite Midrashim to the Books of Exodus and Numbers. It thus affords us special means for completing and confirming the fragments of the Sifre Zuta to be collected from the *Jalkut Shimeoni*. The realization of N. Brüll's wish—expressed at the close of his weighty essay—that a critical edition of the fragments of the Sifre Zuta might be prepared, was rendered feasible by the discovery of the Midrash Haggadol. Dr. Königsberger has now resolved to make this wish a reality, and enrich Midrashic literature with a complete and critical edition of the extant Elements of the Sifre. And worthy of a cordial welcome is the first instalment of what promises to be a very important work. In *The Sources of the Halacha*, part I, Berlin, 1890, Dr. Königsberger already proved that he is quite at home in the region of Halachic Midrash, and that his acquaintance with the Midrash Haggadol (MS. in the Berlin Royal Library) is of a close and intimate character. He concludes that essay with a discussion of the Sifre Zuta, and mostly confirms Dr. Hoffman's results. He has now, with the assistance of the Berlin Zunz-Stiftung, fortunately been able to publish the first part of his edition, which we trust will be followed by its successors at short intervals. It is impossible, with the materials before us, adequately to gauge the editor's aims and tendencies, as the elaborate Introduction, which will unfold the principles on which the edition of the text has been formed, will not appear till the close of the entire publication. But even the simple comprehension of the notes beneath the text is made more difficult than it need be, by the author's excessive use of abbreviations in giving his references to the sources and other writings. These abbreviations prove stumbling-blocks even to the scholar, and their elucidation should

have accompanied the first part. It took me some time, I confess, before I could make out the sense of ובמה"ח in the second and other notes. The reference is, of course, to מדרש החפץ, a Miscellany similar in character to the Midrash Haggadol, which, however, is by no means so well known that it should not, at least the first time, have been cited in unabbreviated form. Dr. Königsberger's notes are, besides, full of other abbreviations which must retard the progress of ordinary readers who are not thoroughly familiar with the literature of the subject. The editor of a *new* text ought surely to take this class as well as the specialists into account. On the other hand, the Rabbinical Hebrew in which these notes are written is fairly easy to follow. If these innumerable abbreviations, in the use of which the writer has copied earlier halachic writers, effect a saving of space, economy has not been studied in the number and bulk of the notes. It would be desirable in future parts rigidly to confine the comments to the citation of parallel passages, and the establishment of a correct text and its elucidation. The attention devoted to modern authors and commentaries on the Midrash is not pertinent to the main purpose which the editor should keep in view; viz. to furnish a good text of the Sifre Zuta and facilitate its critical study. Any other observations would find a more suitable place in the Introduction. I am afraid that Dr. Königsberger's want of self-restraint hampers the progress of his edition. Unnecessary notes swell the bulk and materially increase the cost of publication. In the part before us, which consists of 48 pages, a very small portion (1 a-4 b) is on the first four chapters of Numbers, while the larger part (4 b-24 b) contains the Midrash on chapters 5 and 6. If the annotation in the rest of the edition should be on the same scale, the entire text of the "Small Sifre" will attain the dignity of a volume of brobdignagian size.

In regard to the text, we are nowhere explicitly told that the Midrash Haggadol is the source from which it is taken. That fact can only be gathered from the citations of parallel passages in the notes[1]. The Introduction will probably elucidate this important detail. Mr. Schechter's coming edition of the Midrash Haggadol will serve to check, complete, and correct Dr. Königsberger's text, which seems to be exclusively based upon the Berlin Manuscript. As, however, a number of years must elapse before the English savant's edition will reach "Numbers," we owe a debt to Dr. Königsberger for the early opportunity he affords us of reconstructing the "Sifre Zuta" from the Midrash Haggadol. I have, however, considerable doubts whether

[1] Page 3 b, note 41, הביא שאלה זו (במדרש הגדול = במה"ג). The text then in this passage is taken from another source, perhaps the מדרש החפץ?

various parts of the text really belong to the Midrash Zuta. Thus, on page 3 a, two passages are introduced with the word דתניא, which the editor himself admits come from the Baraitha "On the Tabernacle," מלאכת המשכן; these ought not to appear in the text of the Sifre Zuta. The word דתניא, which the Midrash Haggadol uses to indicate that he is quoting a Baraitha, is enclosed in brackets. But the brackets do not change the character of the quotations, which, as derived from another source, have no right to a place in the text.

The narrative (on page 19 b) of the Nazirite vow of Queen Helene of Adiabene is to be found in the Mishna Nazir, III, 6 (Talmud Babli, 19 b), whence the Midrash Haggadol might well have taken it. How can Dr. Königsberger tell that it belongs originally to the Midrash Zuta? One of the two passages beginning with דתניא, to which reference has already been made (see Jellinek, *Beth Hammidrash*, IV, 152), closes with the phrase, מופנה להקיש לדון*ממנו נזרה שוה. This rule belongs, as Dr. Hoffman has already pointed out (*Zur Einleitung*, p. 6, note 2), to R. Ishmael's school; a circumstance which should have warned our editor against including this passage in the Sifre Zuta, a Midrash of Akiba's school. Very briefly too, I would like to point out that in the Midrash on the first Section of Numbers in this edition, occurs the phrase . . . מניד ש, which also belongs to R. Ishmael's school (2 b, line 16; 3 a, line 1); . . . מלמד ש is also found in this chapter (see JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, IV, p. 422), and the two promiscuously in later chapters (12 b, line 7; 15 b, line 6; 16 a, line 2; 18 b, line 15; 20 b, line 6; 22 b, line 8). It would be rash to conclude hence that the Sifre Zuta is of a mixed character, as we are not in a position to gauge the extent to which these phrases are used in the original work from which the Midrash Haggadol excerpted.

As far as can be judged from the first instalment, the text has been very carefully edited, and occasionally also corrected. The sentences are separated by punctuations, and scriptural verses are indicated by a widely-spaced type. The editor's unfortunate omission of Biblical references renders the task of verification somewhat tedious. The insertion in the margin of chapter and verse would be an excellent feature in future parts. Some errata noticed by me are here corrected: page 2 b, line 8, read לבית instead of בית; pages 2 a and 2 b, the heading ב should be omitted, as there is no Midrash on Chapter II; page 2 a, line 8, read ואינה instead of ואינו; the heading on page 4 a should be ד instead of ג; page 13 b, line 12, read והשביעו instead of והשביעה.

Note 28 is inaccurate, the text to which it refers is as follows: והיו לי הלויים מניד שקדושתן קיימת לעולם וזה אחד משלשה עשר דבר שנאמר בהן לי והן קיימין לעולם. On this the editor remarks: "The

thirteen passages where the word לי occurs are collected in Sifre on Numbers xi. 16." The Sifre (§ 42, Friedmann's edition, 25 b) enumerates ten such passages. The correct reference would have been to Leviticus Rabba, ch. 2, § 2, where thirteen passages are indeed gathered; so also Tanchuma בהעלתך, ed. Buber, p. 20; Midrash Samuel, ch. 19, which fathers the saying on the Agadist Levi. I cannot comprehend why Dr. Königsberger in the same note adds מוכח מכאן שלבעל מדרש הגדול היה נודע גם הספרי. Where was the need of proof that the compiler of Midrash Haggadol knew the Sifre, a position which the editor himself has already sufficiently established in his *Quellen der Halacha*, p. 115, where he states that the Midrash Haggadol borrows largely from the Sifre[1]. Besides, he cannot use a passage incorporated in the Sifre *Zuta* as an argument that the compiler of the Midrash Haggadol had knowledge of the *Sifre*. It is hardly necessary to state that Dr. Königsberger's notes contain many invaluable observations and references. And still it is to be hoped that in the next parts these will decrease in volume, and thus the intrinsic value of the edition be enhanced. On account of the extreme importance of the Sifre for the investigation both of the Tannaite Midrash and Halacha, and of the sources of later works which have copiously borrowed from it, e. g. Bamidbar Rabba and Maimonides' Mishne Torah, Dr. Königsberger's edition should be most welcome. The industry, devotion, and intimate knowledge exhibited in this undertaking merit the approval and support of all friends of Jewish learning. May the editor's efforts to reconstruct out of existing fragments the literary memorials of the past be crowned with perfect success.

W. Bacher.

ARAMAIC PROVERBS.

Aramäische Sprichwörter und Volkssprüche von Dr. Moses Lewin. (Frankfurt a. M. Kauffmann, 1895.)

Dr. Lewin has succeeded in writing a very readable and lucid essay, and has compressed an extraordinary amount of information into a small compass. His work is based on a clearly conceived plan. He restricts his attention to those proverbs found in the Talmud Babli which are in the pure Aramaic dialect. The language of these popular sayings is an eastern form of Mandaic, and was spoken in the high-

[1] Hoffman (*Hildesheimer Jubelschrift*, Berlin, 1890, page 85), however, assumes that the compiler did not know the Sifre on Numbers.

lands of the Tigris and Euphrates about the year 500. The collection is provided with an excellent set of notes, which have the merit of brevity and practical directness. Where possible, each proverb is followed by parallels from other languages. A list of authorities used is given on pp. 7–11, but in view of the grammatical introduction on pp. 22–28, it seems strange that no mention is made of *Die Neuhebräische Sprache* by Strack and Siegfried. A few pages are devoted to the consideration of those words which in the cognate dialects appear in a different form, with concise comments on such variations. Dr. Lewin has classified the proverbs, the principle of division and subdivision being particularly neat and workmanlike. It will thus be evident that the arrangement of the book is devised in a manner well suited for the student's convenience. To ensure the correctness of the text, MSS. have been consulted. Abundant references are made to the Variae Lectiones by Rabbinowitz, and by a judicious use of Wünsche's translation of the Agadic portions of the Talmud Babli, the renderings of the proverbs are as literal as is consistent with the preservation of the sense of the original. But in spite of all these merits it must be confessed that the essay, so full of good points, has one great failing, in that it is without vowel-points. The task of punctuation is probably not beyond Dr. Lewin, but it is very unfortunate for him that of the three words he *was* prompted to punctuate, one of them, on p. 48, is wrongly pointed and appears in the list of errata.

The scope of the essay and the method of treatment are so clearly stated at the beginning, that by omitting the vowel-points the author practically condemns his own work. Even if we ignore proverbs like No. 21, on p. 71, הבא לטהר מסעין ליה, and No. 22, on p. 72, הבא לטמא מסעין ליה, which are obviously *Hebrew*-Aramaic and not *pure* Aramaic, and are commonly cited in *Hebrew*, there are numerous others in this collection the inclusion of which as pure Aramaic expressions can only be justified by showing the punctuation. Several may be read quite easily as Hebrew-Aramaic, which possibility the author should have obviated by following the example of Dukes, and punctuating every word. If Dr. Lewin has included some Aramaic sayings which are omitted by Dukes, it must be remembered that, without any explanation, he has omitted some pure Aramaic proverbs included by Dukes. To sum up, Dr. Lewin's essay, however instructive, interesting, and useful, is by no means indispensable. A standard work on pure Aramaic proverbs has, therefore, yet to appear, and the writer of it will have to guard against the faults of both Dukes and Dr. Lewin, to supplement their omissions and to emulate their merits.

S. Levy.

FRANK AND THE FRANKISTS.

Frank i Frankiści Polscy (1726-1816). *Monografia Historyczna przez* ALEXANDRA KRAUSHARA. Cracow, Gebethner & Co. (Frank and the Polish Frankists. An historical monograph, by ALEXANDER KRAUSHAR.)

DR. ALEXANDER KRAUSHAR, of Warsaw, has long been known for his researches into the more obscure parts of Polish history. By exploring the archives of various countries, he has contrived to throw considerable light upon the careers of some of the leading figures of the old Polish days; among others the strange life of the prodigal Alexander Laski, and of Arciszewski, who when banished from his native country, took service with the Dutch, and rose to the position of admiral in their service, in the middle of the seventeenth century. To his other works he has now added an interesting account of the remarkable impostor Joseph Frank, who during the latter half of the last century contrived to get together a large band of followers. Frank pretended to adopt the Christian faith, and he and his disciples were baptized. They seem, however, to have been looked upon with a certain suspicion by those whose religion they had joined. On the other hand, they were of course repudiated by the Jews.

Frank, into whose coffers the tribute of his devotees flowed lavishly, succeeded in renting from a petty German prince the castle of Offenbach on the Rhine. Here he lived in almost regal state, and assumed the fantastic airs of a Messiah. The description of him, sitting on a divan *à la Grand Turc*, and smoking his pipe as he watched his votaries crawling round him, is very graphic. After his death, his daughter Ewa, a woman of considerable intellect, kept the brotherhood for a short time together, but at her decease it collapsed.

There are still old people at Offenbach who remember these vagaries, and the last of the disciples of Frank died a short time ago at an advanced age. He could never be induced to talk about the prophet's doings.

These two very readable volumes are furnished with many *pièces justificatives*, which show how thoroughly Dr. Kraushar has gone into the question. He has had the advantage of consulting some important manuscripts, especially one in the possession of Count Constantine Przedziecki. In this respect he justly boasts of having an advantage over his predecessors. Of those who have treated of this episode of Jewish life, the most important was the late Dr. Graetz,

but Dr. Kraushar does not attach much value to the account of Frank given by this historian. He taxes him with ignorance of the Polish sources. He frequently commits solecisms in the citation of Polish names. Moreover, he lacks the proper objective spirit of the historian, as shown in the abuse which he continually heaps upon Frank. These remarks apply, not only to the mention of Frank in the *Geschichte der Juden*, but also to the work of Graetz, entitled, *Frank und die Frankisten* (1868).

W. R. MORFILL.

MEDIAEVAL JEWISH CHRONICLES.

Mediaeval Jewish Chronicles and Chronological Notes, ed. by A. NEUBAUER. (Oxford: Clarendon Press.) 1887–1895. Parts I–II.

DR. NEUBAUER'S unabated zeal in his useful labours in the field of Hebrew Literature, which he successfully continues in spite of physical suffering, has enabled him to complete the collection of Mediaeval Jewish Chronicles, the first instalment of which appeared in 1887. Students of Jewish History and Hebrew Literature must welcome the work as a valuable treasure that contains a rich supply of desirable information. It is owing to Dr. Neubauer's genius and inexhaustible store of knowledge, in addition to the opportunities, which all have who live in an institution like the Bodleian Library, that the collection is as complete and as perfect as possible. The numerous various readings from different manuscripts and editions, contained in the footnotes, and the many supplementary extracts from different works, give evidence of the immense labour bestowed on this work by the editor. How conscientiously Dr. Neubauer works, and what difficulties the deciphering of the MSS., frequently illegible, involves, can best be seen by the Additions and Corrections of pp. 252 to 255. Each volume contains a brief literary account of the various treatises it includes, and at the end of the second volume a complete Index for the whole work has been added. In these two volumes Dr. Neubauer includes thirteen different treatises, seven of which are edited here for the first time. We will consider them seriatim.

(Part II, p. 3.) *Megillath-taanith*, "Scroll of Fasting," deserves the first place as the oldest of these Chronicles. It contains two different elements, the original scroll in Aramaic, and the Commentary on it in Hebrew of a much later date. The title is apparently chosen after the manner of *lucus a non lucendo;* for the scroll enumerates only the days on which fasting may not take place. Such a name is

a strange phenomenon in Hebrew literature; only on account of euphemy we meet with the title *toharoth* "Purities," instead of "Impurities"; *semaḥoth* "Rejoicings," instead of "Mourning." In the title "Scroll of Fasting," we have just the reverse of euphemy. I therefore beg to differ from Dr. Neubauer, who calls the Appendix, containing a list of fast-days, "a later addition"; it is more probable that this list, including perhaps later interpolations, formed an essential part in the original plan. This theory is confirmed by the following passage: "Who wrote the Scroll of Fasting? The school of Rabbi Eliezer, son of Hananiah, son of Hizkiah, son of Gorion. Why did they write it?" i. e. why did they commemorate the various events, and why do we not do the same? "Because they were not accustomed *to troubles*," i. e. when troubles came it was a memorable event, "but we are accustomed to them," they are an everyday's occurrence. The *troubles* (*tsaroth*) are the principal subject of the *megillah*, and not *the deliverance*, the cause of *not* fasting on certain days. The reading of the Talmud favours still more this theory. "They wrote it because they loved the troubles," *scil.* as opportunities for evincing their cheerful submission to the will of God (comp. Talm. B. Berachoth, 5 b), whereupon R. Jochanan: "We also love them, but they are too many to be written down." To the *variae lectiones*, contained in the notes, I should like to add an important one: p. 12, the word *adrachta* occurs according to the Amst. edition of 1711 and the MSS. consulted by the editor. *Adrachta* signifies "warrant for distress," which is entirely out of question here. The correct reading is found in the edition Jacob Emden, and in the Talmud, viz. *adcharta*, "the name of God."

(Part II, p. 26.) *Seder Olam*, a Chronology from Adam to Ben-Cosiba (i. e. Bar Coch'ba). The book may be divided into two unequal parts: the Biblical and Postbiblical Chronology; the latter begins with the commencement of the Era of the Greeks (minyan Yevanim). The transition from the one part to the other is formed by the following sentence: "Up to here we have the authority of the prophets who were inspired with the holy spirit; as regards that which follows 'incline thine ear and listen to the words of the Sages.'" The Era of the Greeks was, according to the Seder Olam, common among the Jews in the diaspora in all legal documents (*shetaroth*), but in other respects he suggests to count the years from the destruction of the Temple. It is remarkable that whilst the author gives full details of the history of the destruction of the first Temple, and of the events narrated in the books of Ezekiel, Daniel, Esther, Ezra, and Nehemiah, he contents himself with giving a bare outline of the chronology of the second Temple, and does not mention any details of the history of

the Maccabees, or of the Roman period. The dates and facts which are given of the postbiblical time are those which occur in the Talmud[1] in the name of Rabbi Jose, in the very same expressions. It is therefore to this Tanna Rabbi Jose that tradition assigns the authorship of the Seder Olam[2]. There is nothing in the book that contradicts this tradition. Three different dates of a later period are found in the text; 1000 Sel. era (printed ed.); 782 after the destruction of the second Temple (MS. Opp. 317) and 1117 Sel. (MS. Halberstamm). As these dates have no reference whatever to the text, they are later additions by copyists who wanted to illustrate the text by the date of their own times. Succeeding copyists treated these additions as integral parts of the text.

The book contains thirty chapters, divided into three sections; the first two are called *baba kamma*, "first section," *baba metsiatha*, "the middle section"; but the name for the last section, which would accordingly be *baba bathra*, is not found in any of the editions or manuscripts collated by Neubauer. Of these thirty chapters, two are identical, namely, ch. V and ch. XXI; the variations in the text are insignificant, and not one of them essential. It is strange that in the ed. Neubauer the *first* of these chapters is introduced as *baba tinyana*, "second part." The Amsterdam edition has this chapter only once. On the whole, we find that the variations registered in the notes, or added in the text, are not essential; they are mostly clerical errors, and the reader will easily distinguish the reading which is that of the author, from the errors of the copyists. Two instances may suffice: (p. 27) According to one text Rebecca was three, according to another four, and according to a third reading fourteen years old, when married to Isaac. From the clear statement in the text, that Isaac was thirty-seven years old when laid upon the altar; that at the same time Sarah died and Rebecca was born; *it follows*, that Rebecca was three years old when Isaac, forty years old, married her. The number three is the correct number; the numbers fourteen or four may have the authority of a certain tradition[3], but are out of place here. (p. 42) The Israelites commenced to count the years of *shemitah* and jubilee fourteen years after their entry into the land of Canaan; for 850 years they dwelt in the land, that is, seventeen complete jubilees; and so we read in Ezekiel xl. 1, "in the beginning of the year, on the tenth of the month, in the fourteenth year after the fall of the city"; how, then, was it that

[1] Comp. Babyl. T. Shabbath, p. 15 a; Abodah Zarah, 9 a.

[2] Comp. *Tanya* de Seder Olam Rabba, in the Postscript, p. 67.

[3] Comp. Rashi on Gen. xxv. 26.

a Jubilee year was *fourteen* years later? Because they commenced to count fourteen years after the entry. The number fourteen, as in the Amsterdam edition, is the only correct number; the number which the Neubauer edition has, according to MS. Opp. 317, is decidedly wrong. Dr. Neubauer describes the printed edition as Hispanico-Eastern text, and traces the text of MS. Opp. 317 to the Franco-Germanic school. But on examining the variations in the two texts, I am unable to discover any instance that could be considered as characteristic of a particular school. Noteworthy is the author's interpretation of Isaiah xix. 19: when Sennacherib's army was destroyed before Jerusalem, there were left his captives from Egypt and other countries; these fell into the hands of Hezekiah, and, set at liberty by him, they returned home as true worshippers of God and built "the altar to the Lord in the land of Egypt."

This *Seder Olam*, as the larger one (*rabba*), is followed (p. 68) by a smaller one, *Seder Olam Zuta*. It contains the names and dates of the generations from Adam to king Jehoiakim, with the names of the high priests and prophets of each generation from king David to the destruction of the Temple by the Babylonians; thirty-nine generations are then enumerated from the last king of Judah to Mar Zutra, the names given are the heads of the exile, and the Sages that guided them. It was probably compiled in the eighth century, and was intended to establish the Davidic descent of the Heads of the Exiles (*rashe-golah*). No *variae lectiones* accompany the text, but instead, two different texts are added: the text of the Yoḥasin, headed "The family of the Head of the Exile in Babylon," and "A Chronicle from Adam to the Gaon Saadia," according to the first edition of the Yoḥasin. They contain varied and valuable information concerning the Babylonian schools of Sura and Pumboditha. There is one interesting event mentioned briefly in *Seder Olam Zuta* (p. 73); namely, that Mar Zutra, after a successful war against the Persians, established in Babylon a Jewish independent State; which, however, again lost its independence after seven years. It would have been interesting to find in some of the various texts, some more details of the history of the Jewish State during this short period. But if Dr. Neubauer could not discover anything more about it, we may fairly assume that nothing more is extant. Two other treatises named *Seder Olam* are included in the first part of this Collection (pp. 161 and 176). One of these, written by Yeraḥmeel in the eleventh century, contains the history of the Tradition; the names of the high priests of both Temples, the history of the Jews during the second Temple, and an outline of Talmud and Bible. The other, the full title of which is *Seder Olam Zuta veseder Tenaim*

ve-emoraim, is described by Dr. Neubauer (I, xxi, note 4) as epitomized from the *Seder Olam Zuta* and *Rabba*, and *Seder Tenaim ve-emoraim*; it was finished on the 15th of Ellul, 1044, by the same author.

(Part I, p. 3.) *A letter of the Gaon Sherira (Iggereth Rabbenu Sherira Gaon)*. Questions were addressed by R. Jacob b. Nissim of Kairowan concerning the composition of the Mishnah, the Talmud, the Tosefta, the Sifra and the Sifre, and the chronology of the Saburaeans and of the Geonim. The author fully discusses all the questions addressed to him. Enumerating these problems (Part I, p. viii), Dr. Neubauer says, "And chiefly whether the Mishnah was orally transmitted to the doctors of the Talmud or if it was written down by the compiler himself," adding in surprise, "an advanced question for such an early period." Our surprise, however, is gone, as soon as we formulate the question more in accordance with the text: Did Rabbi compile the Mishnah from written documents or from oral communications? The question whether Rabbi wrote down the Mishnah which he compiled, or whether the Mishnah was transmitted orally for some time after Rabbi, is likewise discussed in this letter. But we must leave the further consideration of this problem, and other problems connected with this letter and with the *Sefer hakkabbalah* of R. Abraham b. David, for another occasion. We only add that the valuable notes, extracts, and fragments added by the editor will be of great help to the historian who will attempt to find his way through the labyrinth of names and dates contained in these historical documents. A continuation of the *Sefer hakkabbalah* by R. Abraham b. Shelomoh is included in the Chronicles of Part I (p. 101), edited from a MS. in the Bodleian Library.

(Part II, p. 89.) An Arabic chronicle from the creation to 1159, edited for the first time from two MSS. in the Bodleian Library, has especial interest for the rendering of the geographical names in the Bible. According to the editor, the anonymous author mostly agrees with the Gaon Saadia in his Commentaries, and he considers it possible that the author made use of a chronological treatise of the Gaon, mentioned in Judah b. Bileam's Commentary on the first prophets (Part II, p. xi). The Chronicle is divided into seven chapters. The first five chapters contain the Biblical history of the Israelites according to the Bible, with Midrashic interpretation now and then, whilst the last two chapters are devoted to the chronology of the Postbiblical history up to 1159.

(Part I, p. 85.) Another Chronicle from the creation to 1467, edited from a Bodleian MS., forms the fiftieth chapter of *Zecher Tsaddik*, a ritual work, written by Joseph b. Tsaddik of Arevalo in Spain. "It is probable that Joseph b. Tsaddik and Abraham Zakkuth (in his

Yoḥasin) made use of one and the same chronicle, which both continued up to their time " (Part I, p. xiv). Of great importance for the study of the history of the Jews in the Middle Ages, especially of the Jews in the East, are the extracts from the historical work, *Dibre Joseph*, by R. Joseph b. Yitsḥak Sambary, which was finished in Alexandria. The importance of the work may be inferred from the fact that Dr. A. Berliner had it reprinted in a small edition as the first volume of his *Quellenschriften zur jüdischen Geschichte u. Literatur*. It is perhaps to be regretted that Dr. Neubauer chose to give only extracts, instead of editing the complete work; passages not interesting to *A* may be welcomed by *B* as important information. As a rule, however, the editor of these chronicles has a sound judgment on such matters. The reader will find in these extracts interesting and amusing tales about the Jews in Egypt, about Abraham Ibn Ezra, Maimonides, David Alroy, &c. The book concludes with the complaint and the hope, which are not uncommon in the present age: After them (i. e. the learned men mentioned before) the study of the Torah decreased in the present generation; may the Lord send Messiah, and may be fulfilled the word " and all thy children shall be taught of the Lord."

(Part II, p. 111.) *Sefer Yoḥasin*, " The Book of Genealogy," is a family chronicle written by Aḥimaaz, with a postscript, giving briefly the names and dates of the successive generations, by Menaḥem son of R. Benjamin, in the year 1055. Incidentally it contains also information about the Jews in the South of Italy, about the invasion of the Saracens in the year 872, and the like. An amusing tale is told about R. Silano, the interpreter (Meturgeman) of the Haham of the congregation, who had recently come from Palestine to that place. There was once a riot in the streets, which R. Silano described in a few rhymes. He then got hold of the lecture prepared by the Haham for next Sabbath, erased a line or two, and inserted his rhymes. The poor lecturer was puzzled, and hesitatingly read the rhymes. R. Silano at once interpreted them as referring to the riot which had taken place the previous day. Silano was excommunicated, but through the interference of R. Aḥimaaz the *ḥerem* was cancelled. The book is edited from a unique MS. preserved in the Cathedral Library of Madrid. I doubt whether the MS. is the original copy of the author; there are errors that can only come from a thoughtless copyist, e. g. p. 115, l. 19, ער ברינונים באחד שהיה ר׳ סילנו; the author wrote ערך רינונים ואחד שעשה ר׳ סילנו.

(Part II, p. 133.) The diary of David Reubeni, who describes himself as follows: David, son of king Solomon, and younger brother of king Joseph, who rules in the desert of Ḥabor over three hundred

thousand people of the tribes of Gad and Reuben, and half the tribe of Menasseh. This king Joseph sent his brother David to Rome to transact important business with the Pope. The travels from Habor to Rome are minutely described in this Hebrew diary. The Hebrew is by no means elegant. A few of its peculiarities may here be noticed: אחד סוס "one horse"; זה האיש "this man"; יש לי "I had"; הוא "he was"; and the use of the preposition מן "from," instead of the construct state. The history of the MS. of this diary is unique, as the MS. itself is unique. It was acquired by the Bodleian Library in the year 1848, since 1867 it has been missing. Fortunately, however, a facsimile had been made of the MS., which occupies now the place of the original. From this facsimile the present edition of the diary has been printed.

In conclusion, I call attention to a peculiar benediction (ברכה) which Dr. Neubauer copied (Part II, p. xiv) from MS. Gaster, No. 83, headed "Benediction referring to the words of our Sages" ברכתא לדברי חכמי ז"ל; it is a kind of complement to the ב' התורה and ב' הנביאים. After the usual introduction it continues: אשר בחר בחכמים ובצדיקים ומסר להן רזי חכמה ונתן להן תורה הוא ברחמיו הרבים יוכה אותנו לכל מדה טובה ללמוד וללמד לשמור ולעשות בְּאֹ נותן התורה: "May he who chose the Sages and the Righteous, who delivered unto them the secrets of wisdom, and gave them knowledge of the Torah, grant us in his abundant mercy, that we be able, in every branch of the study of the Law, to learn, to teach, to keep, and to do."

M. FRIEDLÄNDER.

MASSORETIC STUDIES.

I.

The Number of Letters in the Bible.

According to the well-known Talmudical passage, T. B. Kiddushin, 30 a, the name Sofer derives its origin from the fact that the scholars of Scripture *counted* all the letters of the Bible[1]. The same explanation of the term Sofer occurs also in Chagiga, 15 b[2]. It follows, unquestionably, from these passages that the counting of the letters took place at least in Tanaitic times; for the passage in Kiddushin seems to be extracted from a Boraitha. But even if it be assumed that the author of the anonymously mentioned etymology was an Amora, it may, nevertheless, be deduced with absolute certainty, that already at that time the counting of the letters passed for a very ancient tradition, for otherwise no Amora would have hit upon such a derivation.

It may be inferred, from this circumstance alone, that the determination of the number of letters in the Pentateuch and Psalms, which is the subject dealt with in the passage referred to, must be regarded as a pre-Tanaitic, or, at least an early Tanaitic, production. If the letters began to be counted for the first time at the flowering time of tradition, after the destruction of the Temple, it would never have occurred to an Amora living (even in Babylon) 150 years later—the passage in Kiddushin must be ascribed, at latest,

[1] לפיכך נקראו ראשונים סופרים שהיו סופרים כל האותיות שבתורה שהיו אומרים וא"ו דגחון חציין של אותיות של ס"ת דרש דרש חציין של תיבות והתגלח של פסוקים יכרסמנה חזיר מיער עי"ן דיער חציים של תהלים והוא רחום יכפר עון חציו דפסוקים.

[2] איה סופר (Isa. xxxiii. 18) שהיו כופרים כל אותיות שבתורה. (Cf. also B. Sanhedrin, 106 b.) The Jerusalem Talmud gives a different etymology, Shekalim, 5, 1 (ed. Krotoschin, 48 c): אמר ר' אבהו כתיב משׂחות סופרים יושבי יעבץ (1 Chron. ii. 55) מה ת"ל סופרים אלא שעשו את התורה ספורות ספורות חמשה לא יתרומו ה' דברים חייבין בהלה וכו'. The counting is, therefore, not referred to the letters, but to the traditional ordinances.

to about the year 300—to assign this operation to the Sofrim[1]. Such an ante-dating is only intelligible on the assumption that the real period of origin lies so far back in the past that the memory of it is completely obliterated—a condition which supposes an interval of at least two centuries.

There is another consideration which leads us to the same conclusion as to the antiquity of this counting of the letters. In the synagogue scrolls, the middle letter of the Pentateuch (Lev. xi. 42) is indicated by a Vav maiusculum. If the letter-counting, and consequently the indication of the middle of the Pentateuch, was not yet known in the second century of our present era, or only then became a subject of notice, then that fact would not have been made outwardly perceptible in the text of the Bible, not even in the shape of a littera maiuscula, for at that time the holy text was already fixed and *consciously* no further change in it was taken in hand.

To which Biblical books this counting in the earliest period extended, cannot, with the data which have come down to us, be determined. As, in the passage in question, only the Pentateuch and the Psalter are mentioned, and as, further, in these two books alone the middle letter is indicated by large letters, we shall certainly hit the truth if we assume that the process of enumerating the letters was applied, in the first instance, to the Pentateuch as the law-book, and then to the Psalter as the prayer or hymn-book. The Massoretes, at all events in post-Talmudical times, unquestionably counted the letters of the other Biblical books also, as they did also the single letters of the alphabet, the numbers of whose occurrences in the *whole Bible* are given in the well-known poem ascribed to S^{e}adyah. But, strange to say, on this point no specific statement has come down to us; I have nowhere found one.

Another, and indeed more difficult question is, how many letters were counted in the Torah and how many in the other books? The results which have been handed down to us differ considerably from each other. The Pentateuch alone, according to Elias Levita (*Masoreth Ha-masoreth*, III, Preface, ed. Ginsburg, p. 136), has 600,045; according to Joseph del Medigo (*Nobloth Chochma*, at the end), 600,000 in round numbers; according to Ben Asher (*Dikduke Ha-teamim*, p. 55), 400,945; according to Manuel du lecteur (ed. Derenbourg, p. 150), 400,900; according to an old Bible codex of Dr. Curtiss, 305,607

[1] Cf. Sabbath, 49 b, where it is stated: מי לא אמר רנה בר בר הנה משום רבי יוחנן לא זוז משם עד שהביאו ספר תורה ומנאום which Rashi connects with our passage. Kiddushin, 30 a, is in all probability a Boraitha; but we will make our demonstration independent of this hypothesis.

(in *Baer-Strack Dikd. Ha-team*, p. 55, note 1); according to Norzi (*Minchath Shai*, ed. Mantua), in the Massoretic concluding note to the Torah, 304,805; according to Ch. D. Ginsburg's edition of the Massora, 290,136. I have arrived at this last figure by adding together the different estimates showing the number of times each letter of the alphabet occurs in the Torah—which estimates are to be found at the beginning of each letter in the Massoretic Dictionary, *The Massorah*. Ginsburg has, unfortunately, omitted to mention the sources of his Massoretic data, and we therefore do not know whence these important figures have been taken.

If we disregard the smaller differences and only consider round numbers, we get three different estimates: (1) 600,000; (2) 400,000; (3) 300,000. These variations cannot possibly have resulted from actual enumerations; in view of the exactness and extreme accuracy of the Massoretes such gross blunders are entirely out of the question. How, then, is this confusion in the statement of the figures to be explained?

In order to gain a solid standpoint from which these difficulties may be considered, there is no better and simpler means than a re-count. But as in our case the matter to be dealt with is not so much the determination of the exact number of letters, as the accounting for an error of at least 100,000 letters, this re-count can best be effected by working out some comparative estimates of the number of letters contained in various editions of the Pentateuch. For this purpose I select from the editions of the Bible which are accessible to me, three in particular, which contain the text of the Torah without any addition whatsoever; and of these, the stereotype edition of the Bible Society commends itself to the first place.

In my pocket edition (Berlin, 1886) the Pentateuch occupies 150 pages (+ 7 lines); each page has two columns, making altogether 300; each *full* column has 38 lines. A full column which occurs on p. 120 a has 1,072 letters; on the other hand, a column on p. 2 a, which contains 37 lines, and is printed less closely, has only 997 letters. Page 2, containing 74 incomplete lines has 1,997, the more closely printed page 120, with 74½ lines, numbers 2,087 letters; thus, the two together have 148 lines and 4,084 letters. Hence, a column of 37 lines has, on an average, 1,020 letters. In the 300 columns of the Pentateuch there would be, if fully printed, 11,400 lines (300 × 38). But at the beginning and end of each single book, as well as at the chapters, and at the Sedarim and Parashim, a larger or smaller space is always left blank. According to my calculation at least 644 lines are thus missed: viz. 129 in Genesis, 116 in Exodus, 137 in Leviticus, 173 in Numbers, and 89 in Deuteronomy, and the

result is therefore 11,400 − 644 or **10,756** lines. If we add to this 7 lines, which are on p. 151 of this edition of the Bible, and divide the number thus obtained, viz. 10,763, by 37, we get just 291 columns. As one such column numbers, on an average, 1,020 letters, we obtain, as the total number of letters in the Torah, 1,020 × 291 or **296,820.**

Substantially the same result is yielded by a calculation based on ed. Amsterdam, 1734, which bears the title חמשה חומשי תורה, and which presents the Torah to us without any addition. The whole Pentateuch embraces 266½ pages, each full page has 32 lines. About 217 lines = 7½ pages, are incidentally missed; there thus remain 259 pages. Page 20 b, where scarcely a single blank place has been left, contains 1,179 letters; 56 b 1,148; 92 a 1,193. On the average, therefore, there are $\frac{3,520}{3}$ = 1,173 letters to a page, and the total number of letters would therefore be 1,173 × 259 = **303,807.** If we make a deduction on account of letters missed at the closed Parashim, which are indicated by a ס, and at the poetical passages, which we have not taken into consideration, we shall arrive, on this calculation also, at a total sum of about 300,000 letters.

A third test is afforded by the Biblia Hebraica sine punctis, &c., Amstelaedami, 1701. The Pentateuch occupies 148½ pages; each page has two columns, and each *full* column 51 lines. If there were no blank spaces, the Pentateuch would thus contain 15,147 (297 × 51) lines; but, according to my calculation, 610 of these must be deducted; there remain, therefore, 14,537 lines, which, divided by 50, gives 290·7 columns. The two columns on 9 b (= 100 lines) have 2,250 letters, those on 10 a (likewise with 100 lines) have 2,152; a column would, therefore, on an average contain 1,050 letters. Total, 290·7 × 1,050 = **305,235.** If the omissions of letters, as indicated above, are deducted, there remains a round sum of about 300,000.

That the type is uniform, and that, consequently, every page contains very nearly the same number of letters, may be deduced from the fact that the traditional centre of the letters of the Pentateuch occurs almost exactly on the page where it is expected. נחון, Lev. xi. 42, occurs on page 76 (= 150 ÷ 2) in the edition of the Bible Society; in the Amsterdam edition of 1734, which contains 133½ double pages, it appears on page 68 b; and in the Amsterdam edition of 1701, which has 74½ double pages, it is found on page 39 a. That in all three editions the recognized centre of the letters appears one or two pages later than the exact half of the number of pages would presuppose, is explained by the circumstance that comparatively larger blank spaces occur in the first half of the pages than in the latter half.

Reckon how one will, by pages, by columns, by lines, if several pages be reckoned out and the average number of letters per page and line be ascertained, the minimum total never sinks below 290,000 and the maximum total never rises above 310,000. We may even go beyond the wildest dreams of the boldest Bible critics, and, at the expense of the correctness of our text, generously place at their disposal several thousands of letters, which may, at pleasure, be added to or subtracted from the total number, without materially altering thereby the final result. In no case will a sum of 400,000 be arrived at, still less of 600,000.

According to our investigation, then, it admits of no doubt that the approximately correct statement can only be that which is furnished by Norzi and the old Bible codex of Dr. Curtiss, according to which the number of letters amounts to 305,607. But the question arises how the remaining, mutually contradictory, traditions have arisen? I am in the happy position of being able to solve this difficulty satisfactorily.

The statement, just alluded to, reads as follows:

1. וסכום האותיות של תורה שלשים רבוא וחמשת אלפים ושש מאות ושבע (*D. H.* p. 55, n. 1).

In Levita (*Mas. Ham.* ed. Ginsburg, p. 136), the statement takes the following form:

2. ומספר אותיות של כל התורה ששים רבוא וארבעים וחמשה

Similarly, in Joseph del Medigo (*Nobl. Chochmah*, at the end):

2 a. ואמרו יש ס׳ רבוא אותיות לתורה כר״ת יִשְׂרָאֵל שהוא סוף התורה

Norzi, *Minchath Shai*, at the end of Deuteronomy, has:

3. מנין אותיות של ספר תורה שך אלפים ותת מאות וחמשה

The identity of these three statements as regards the main quantity is strikingly evident. In Levita, or rather in the sources from which he drew his estimate, we must read שלשים רבוא instead of ששים רבוא. The words שלשים רבוא arose from the device ש״ר—a mistake arising from its resemblance to the ש״ד, which is found in Norzi. Thus all the estimates can be traced back to Norzi's. From ש״ד (= 304,000), ש״ר arises, which in the old Bible codex becomes שלשים רבוא; and in Levita ששים רבוא.

The next question that arises is how the estimate of Ben Asher and Manuel arose? From the digits 45, it may be concluded with certainty, that here too the same statement lies before us, but in a corrupt form. If the enumerations had been independent, the same number 45 would not have been obtained in both cases, while at the same time, a round difference of 100 (300:400) resulted in the

thousands. We may, with great probability, assume that Ben Asher, or his copyists, resolved דש (= שר = 304,000) into ארבע מאות אלף (= ד) ותשע מאות (= ש = תשע). According to this hypothesis the original statement of the number would have been: ש״ד מ״ה, which = 304,045; this becomes in Levita ששים רבוא וארבעים וחמשה; in Ben Asher ארבע מאות אלף ותשע מאות (= דש = ש״ד) וארבעים וחמשה; in Manuel, likewise ארבע מאות אלף ותשע מאות with the omission of וחמשה ארבעים; in the Curtiss codex שלשים רבוא; while in the words וחמשת אלפים ושש מאות ושבע, which are expressed by the letters ה׳ ו׳ ז׳, lie Norzi's 805. Perhaps from ח (= 800) ה׳ or חמשת אלפים has arisen, and has been referred to the thousands instead of to the hundreds, while after the resolution of ש״ד into שלשים רבוא for the thousands, no units remained.

These conjectures regarding the minor figures may no doubt be accepted or rejected; but every one, it is to be hoped, will assent to the main proposition, viz. the view that the different estimates are corrupt variations of a single statement. If this be the case, there can be no doubt that this statement contained 300,000 or 304,000 in its total. As a matter of fact the Pentateuch numbers about 300,000 letters, as our calculation showed. The only evidence that conflicts with this result is furnished by the estimates for single letters in Ginsburg's *Massorah*, the sum of which amounts to only 290,136.

It can, however, easily be proved that errors have crept into these detailed estimates. For the figures which are there given as specifying the number of times each letter of the alphabet occurs in the Pentateuch, are in many instances so low that they cannot possibly be right. Especially striking are: ב = 1,634; ג = 2,105; ז = 2,200; ם = 1,843. In order to judge of these figures correctly, let us compare them with the figures which are given for the same letters in the case of the *whole Bible*[1]. The relation between the two is represented by the following ratios, in which the numbers for

[1] These latter numbers, as is well known, are furnished in the poem אהל מכון בניני which is ascribed to S^{e}adyah. The poem has often been printed, cf. C. D. Ginsburg, *The Massoreth Ha-massoreth of Elias Levita*, London, 1867, p. 269, n. 1; (also Ginsburg, III, 299); more especially, J. Derenbourg, *Manuel du lecteur*, Paris, 1871, pp. 139 ff. and 234 ff, where, for the first time, an attempt is made to elucidate the unintelligible rhymes. The same numbers are given by Ginsburg in *The Massorah*, at the beginning of each single letter; they therefore emanate from this source.

the whole Scriptures are placed first: ב 38,218 : 1,634 ; ג 29,537 : 2,105 ; ז 22,867 : 2,200 ; ם 13,580 : 1,843. Now the Pentateuch hardly forms more than a fourth part of the Bible; it is, therefore, quite inconceivable that it should contain only the twenty-fourth part of the total number of Beths, and in respect of the letters ג, ז, and ם, the proportion is similarly unfavourable in a greater or less degree. The fact must not be concealed that in the case of ר a contrary proportion is found, viz. Bible 22,147, Torah 18,106. But if even the latter number is pitched too high, it nevertheless does not seem large enough to cover the deficiencies in the case of the other letters, and we may therefore, with great probability, add from 10,000 to 15,000 letters to the total number, whereby here too a result of 300,000 to 305,000 is reached.

This final result is, on the whole, confirmed also by a consideration of the number of *words* in the Pentateuch. This, according to *Dikduké Ha-teamim* (p. 55), and *Manuel du lecteur* (p. 150), as well as Ginsburg, III, 301 a, amounts to 79,856; according to Norzi (end of the Pentateuch), 79,976, or in round numbers, 80,000. Accordingly there would be, on an average, four letters to a word, while on a hypothesis of 400,000 letters, each word would contain at least five letters, and on a hypothesis of 600,000, the number of letters to a word would be $7\frac{1}{2}$. In view of the tri-literal basis of Hebrew, the two latter averages are in the highest degree improbable, for even supposing five letters to a word, it would be necessary to assume that the suffixes, matres lectionis, &c., entirely swamped the radical letters, which is not the case.

It is certainly a question how the words were counted; whether every particle was taken to be a separate word or whether it was regarded as belonging to the following word. E. g., Gen. i. 1 to ii. 3 has 469 words, of which 60 are connected with a Makkef, and among these several words, in reality independent, are found joined to the following word. There can hardly be a doubt that these are counted as separate words[1]. As the section referred to contains 1815 letters, we get a result of four rather than of five letters, as the average number for each word. It is not without purpose that we have selected this section as the basis of our calculation. For we find it here once more exemplified how uncritically Massoretic data are treated even by real savants. In Introduction, no. III to *Massoreth Ha-massoreth*, Levita says (Ginsburg, p. 135) that the weekly section Bereshith has 1,915 letters[2]—which number is de-

[1] Cf. on this point, *infra*, II.

[2] והאותיות בפרשת בראשית אלף ושבע מאות וחמשה עשר סימן א"ץ ט"ו. S. Baer (*Orient.* XII [1851], 202, note) perverts אותיות into תיבות and א"ץ ט"ו into

scribed already by Buxtorf as being too small (*Tiberias*, c. 18, p. 43). Now there can be no doubt that this estimate refers not to the Babylonian, but to the Palestinian weekly section Bereshith, which ends at chapter ii. 3, and contains 1,815 letters[1]. This fact escaped Buxtorf as well as Levita, as may be gathered from the context. There were figures in existence for both kinds of Sedarim. In Buxtorf's edition of the Bible there is a specification at the end of Genesis, according to which the number of letters amounts to 4,395. This number can only refer to the section Vayechi, as Buxtorf (*Tiberias*, 43) already correctly observes.

We see to what misconceptions and confusions the traditional numbers have given rise. Keeping this fact steadily before our eyes, we proceed to an examination of the statement specifying the total number of letters in the Holy Scriptures. In the S^{e}adyah poem already referred to, the amount is given as 792,077[2]. As Derenbourg has already rightly observed (*Man.* p. 150, n. 10) this number is incompatible with the statement which fixes the number of letters in the Torah at 400,000, since the Pentateuch forms not much more than a fourth of the whole Bible. This discrepancy between the two figures is increased if 600,000 letters are allotted to the Torah alone, but neither is it removed, if, according to one demonstration, only an approximate number of 300,000 is adhered to, for after subtracting this sum, there would remain for the Prophets and Hagiographa only 492,077, whereas they are together almost thrice as large as the Pentateuch, and would, therefore, alone contain 792,077 letters.

And this is in fact the case. A glance at the various editions which contain the text without any addition, convinces us of the fact.

א"ץ יהוה. This sum is made to represent the number of words in בראשית; the number of letters, on the other hand, is given as 7,213, with the symbol או"ר אחר. It is a pity that Baer leaves his readers in obscurity as to the source of his information.

[1] Instead of א"ץ ט"ו we must read א"ף ט"ו. How easily ף may be confounded with ץ is seen from the fact that even Baer (loc. cit.) once puts ף for ץ.

[2] *Manuel*, p. 149: כלל מנין האותיות שבמקרא כולם הכפוזות והפשוטות שבע מאות אלף ושנים תשעים אלף ושבעה ושבעים אות סימן ת"ש וצ"ב אלף וע"ז אות. This total sum results mainly from the separate figures for single letters which are also to be found in Ginsburg's *Massorah*. On I, 613, however, י"א אלף נכ is a printer's error for נ"ב; further, in *Manuel*, p. 144, l. 4, in the פירוש the words חמשה וארבעים are wanting. Anschel Worms סייג לתורה Frankfurt a. M., 1766, p. 15, has 815,280, but he counts one of the component numbers twice over. Cf. *Manuel*, p. 148, n. 16.

According to the method already employed with the Pentateuch, the calculation, based on the edition of the Bible Society, appears as follows:

Of the 605 pages, 150 are occupied by the Pentateuch, and 8 are quite blank; there remain, therefore, for the Prophets and Hagiographa 447 pages = 894 columns. At the beginning and end of the books, at the chapters, &c., if my calculation is correct, about 2,180 lines = 58 columns of 38 lines each are missed. The Prophets and Hagiographa, therefore, occupy 894 - 58 = 836 columns. Many pages, however, have but 37 lines, occasionally only 36; further, unprinted places in the middle of the lines have not been taken into account. If we reckon the loss on these accounts at one line per column on an average—which is rather too little than too much—and subtract the 900 lines thus obtained, we get in round numbers 830 columns of 37 lines each as the contents of the Prophets and Hagiographa. Each such column, as has been already remarked above, contains an average of 1020 letters, and the total capacity of the Prophets and Hagiographa is therefore 1,020 × 830 = **846,600.** This calculation is not, by reason of its nature, an exact one; a difference of tens of thousands may be assumed, but not one reaching to hundreds of thousands. But if the *whole Bible* had approximately 800,000 letters, there would remain for the Prophets and Hagiographa only 500,000, which is entirely out of the question.

The calculation in the case of the Biblia Hebraica sine Punctis (Amsterd. 1701) appears much simpler and more exact. The whole of the books occupy a space of 292⅓ double pages = 585 pages, of which, between the three divisions of Scripture and elsewhere, 10 pages are left blank; therefore 585 - 10 = 575 pages = 1,150 columns. Of these 1,150 columns, 298 belong to the Pentateuch, and 852 to Prophets and Hagiographa. Speaking in round numbers, the Pentateuch has been found to contain 300,000 letters; consequently, the Prophets and Hagiographa would number 850,000. But in the case of the Prophets and Hagiographa, comparatively more unprinted spaces must be allowed for, since there are here 34 books, counting Samuel, Kings, Ezra, and Chronicles, as two each, and the Minor Prophets as 12; besides this, in most of the books the chapters are much smaller than in the Pentateuch, for which reason a larger quantity of blank space is taken up in dividing them. These two circumstances demand a deduction of about 40 to 45 columns, whereby a net result of approximately 800,000 is reached. Hence the proportion of the size of the Pentateuch to that of the Prophets and Hagiographa is expressed by the ratio 3 : 8, and not by 3 : 5.

We arrive, therefore, at the astonishing result that in the rhyme

referred to above, the total number of figures mentioned relates only to the Prophets and Hagiographa, exclusive of the Pentateuch. The whole Bible has, not 800,000, but 1,100,000 letters. The source of the error is probably the word מקרא. As is well known, this term was not only used to designate the whole Scriptures, but also to describe the Torah in contradistinction to the Prophets and Hagiographa[1]. The words אותיות של מקרא, then, have been understood to refer to the whole Bible instead of to the Prophets and Hagiographa. With whom the enumeration of the single letters of the alphabet originated, is unknown; it is equally uncertain who is the author of the rhyme[2]. Hence, it cannot be decided whether the versifier regarded the figures handed down to him as referring to the whole Bible or only to the Prophets and Hagiographa. Moreover, as regards the main problem this is a matter of indifference. In Manuel du lecteur the number is held to represent the whole 24 books[3].

If the separate component numbers are placed in juxtaposition, we shall find our assertion, that the final sum, viz. 792,077, only gives the number of letters in the latter two divisions of the Bible, fully established. We append them here according to Ginsburg's *Massorah*, where the two sets of figures, those for the whole Bible and those for the Torah, are recorded, whereas the other sources at our disposal contain only the figures of the poem.

	Bible.	*Torah.*		*Bible.*	*Torah.*
א	42,377	27,055	ה	47,754	28,148
ב	38,218	1,634	ו	76,922	30,419
נ	29,537	2,105	ז	22,867	2,200
ד	32,530	7,034	ח	23,447	7,187

[1] On the expression תורה ומקרא, cf. my *Introduction to the Holy Scriptures*, p. 26; the word was used in the same sense even as late as Ben Asher (cf. *Massoretic Investigations*, p. 50). This nomenclature finds an analogy in the *Massorah*; e. g. on Exod. xii. 39: צו ה כל אורייתא חסר וכל קריי' מלא במ"ב. How this expression is to be understood is shown by the antithesis of וכל שאר קרייא and וכל אורייתא (Frensdorff, *Massoretic Dictionary*, p. 336, col. b). According to this, תורה ושאר מקרא = תורה ומקרא. That the specialized meaning lies in the omitted word שאר, and not in the meaning of מקרא, is proved by Ochla ve-Ochla, No. 60: א"ב חד בהלים וחד בקריא; the antitheses, therefore, are הלים and מקרא, which is only intelligible by the addition of שאר to מקרא.

[2] Cf. *Manuel*, p. 234 ff.

[3] P. 139: וזה הוא מספר כל האותיות שמקרא שהוא ארבעה ועשרים ספרים. The last four words give the impression of being an explanatory gloss of the compiler.

	Bible.	*Torah.*		*Bible.*	*Torah.*
ט	11,052	1,812	ע	20,175	11,244
י	66,420	31,522	פ	20,750	3,975
כ	37,272	8,616	ף	1,975	831
ך	10,981	3,362	צ	16,950	2,929
ל	41,517	21,612	ץ	4,872	1,033
מ	52,805	14,474	ק	22,972	4,701
ם	24,973	10,616	ר	22,147	18,106
נ	32,977	9,873	ש	32,148	15,592
ן	8,719	4,352	ת	36,140[1]	17,960
ס	13,580	1,843			

We have already spoken of ב, ג, ז, ס, and ר. The first four are credited with far too low figures, while ר exhibits far too high an

[1] In Ginsburg, *Massorah*, I, 33 b. ff, the poem is given with the same numbers, and yet 792,145 is given as the total. This figure has arisen from the erroneous סימן in the case of ד. It is rightly stated: מנין כל דלת שבמקרא שנים ושלשים אלף וחמש מאות ושלשים. But then follows סימן להם ל"ב אלף תקצח instead of תקל. The difference of 68 raises the total amount from 77 to 145. Another error in the MS. or in the printing occurs with נ, where instead of נ' we find ע"ו אלף, which, however, has had no effect on the final result. The accuracy of these numbers was already called into question by R. Jair Bacharach (p. 272 a). He says: נאלו רוח ה" דבר בו י" אבל מה נעשה והרוש מכחיש פרטי המספרים. Prof. Kaufmann has drawn attention (JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, VII, p. 291) to this fact, and has also referred to the divergent numbers communicated by Shapira in the *Athenaeum*, No. 2,626 (Feb. 23, 1878). As this note only came into my hands during the correction of the proof of this article, I have been unable to refer to this issue of the *Athenaeum*. Lazarus de Viterbo's words *Litterae omnes ipsius Genesis fuerunt 4,395* are passed over by Prof. Kaufmann without comment, as is also the statement that Genesis contains 1,915 (א"ץ מ"ו) letters, while, on the other hand, he rightly corrects *Versus omnes totius Pentateuci 5,045* into 5,845; Ghimel 29,637 he corrects into 29,537; and the number of verses in Genesis, previously given as 1,634, he corrects into 1,534. It is evident, however, that the admission that the numbers 4,395 and 1,915 are false—a fact which, as we observed above, Buxtorf and Baer perceived—is of the utmost importance for forming a judgment concerning L. de Viterbo, because the admission shows that, in spite of his differing as to the age of the vowels and accents, he followed Levita slavishly. Otherwise, he would not have adopted the figures in question, referring to the book of Genesis and the first section thereof respectively. Other proofs might be adduced to show the slavish dependence of Viterbo on Levita; these, however, do not come within the scope of this article. (On p. 291, for 60,045 read 600,045.)

estimate. If the figures of the first column referred to the whole Bible, then for Resh there would remain only 4,041 letters for the Prophets and Hagiographa, while the Pentateuch would have 18,106, which is manifestly impossible. Similarly, for א there would remain 15,322, while the Pentateuch would have 27,055! Again, on this supposition, the Pentateuch would have more ה, ל, and ע's than the Prophets and Hagiographa. The sums of most of the other letters only correspond to the proportion between the sizes of the two divisions, Pentateuch and the Prophets and Hagiographa; if the single letter estimates for the Pentateuch are not deducted from the corresponding estimates for the מקרא, of which fact any one can convince himself by comparing the corresponding sets of figures. We do not know from what sources C. D. Ginsburg has collected, in his great work on the *Massorah*, the data in question, nor whether the systematic arrangement of them is also to be found in those sources. In the latter case, there is nothing to prevent the conception that the constant forms: שבמקרא . . . מנין כל and . . . מנין כל שבתורה, indicate the numbers for the Pentateuch on the one hand, and the numbers for the Prophets together with those for the Hagiographa on the other: תורה = Pentateuch; מקרא = Prophets and Hagiographa. One feels in this instance also, how important it is in the case of the *Massorah*, to mention one's sources. The Massoretic works of Jacob ben Chayim, S. Frensdorff, and C. D. Ginsburg are invaluable aids, but the *Massorah* can as little be studied by means of them alone, as the Talmud by means of Maimun's *Mishna Torah*, as the Halacha by means of Joseph Karo's *Shulchan Aruch*, or as the literature of the Bible by means of Gesenius', or any one else's, lexicon. All information as to Massoretic sources must be made fully and entirely accessible to research, for a true understanding of it can only be achieved by means of a sifting of all the circumstances, including time, place, and authors.

The process of counting the letters was carried out, not only with the separate books, but also with single sections, at all events, those of the Pentateuch; and that, too, according to the Palestinian division as well as the Babylonian, as has been shown by the examples already cited. Unfortunately, with the exception of those already adduced, no record of these figures is anywhere to be found, so far as I know. And yet these figures, especially those of the Palestinian divisions, would be of importance for the text criticism of the Bible. A few examples are met with in the Talmud and Midrash. A well-known instance is the Baraitha, Sabbath 116 a, according to which the small Parasha, Num. x. 35, 36, contains 85 letters. According to Targum Jonathan and Targum Jerushalmi

on Deut. xxxii. 3, the verses from xxxii. 1 to שם, in verse 3, contain 21 words, comprising 85 letters, whence Norzi infers that כשעירם must be written with only one *yod*. Deut. iv. 34, from לבוא to ובמוראים גדלים, with the omission of the second גוי, numbers 72 letters[1]. The decalogue from אנכי to אשר לרעך has 613+7 letters[2]; the blessing of Isaac, Gen. xxvii. 28, 29, has 100 letters[3]; the priestly blessing, Num. vi. 24–26 has 60 letters[4]. It is certain that the Massoretes counted the letters of every single verse, as many comparisons show[5]. From these data, which make no pretensions to completeness[6], it is evident that the counting of the letters was a practice of very ancient origin. But it was probably not till much later that it was used for agadic interpretations.

I cannot close this chapter without calling attention to the related phenomenon in the Greek and Latin Bibles. The counting of the letters and stichs was in ancient times peculiar to these translations also. What data are still accessible in the MSS. I am, unfortunately, unable to state, since the literature in question is not at present at my disposal. I should merely like to suggest the question, whether the letter-counting of the Hebrew Bible did not give the students and copyists of the Septuagint the first impulse towards a similar proceeding? The Greek translators and the first people to use and disseminate this version were of course Jews, and the possibility that the Greek text of the Bible had its Massoretes as

[1] Judah II in Leviticus Rabbah, c. 23 at the beginning (ed. Wilna, 64 b at the bottom) and parallel places; Deut. Rabbah, c. 1 (196 a), incorrectly מלבוא עד סוף הפסוק.

[2] Numbers Rabbah, c. 13 (p. 108 a); c. 18 (152 b).

[3] Ibid., c. 18 (152 b); this result can only be arrived at artificially.

[4] Ibid. [5] Cf. e. g. Frensdorff, *Massoretic Dictionary*, 377 b.

[6] Gen. xlix. 16, 17 has 70 letters (Numbers Rabbah, c. 14, fol. 121 a); Judges xv. 19, from עין to בלחי, 15 letters. It was here overlooked by the mediaeval authors; that c. 14 of Numbers Rabbah, in which most of the data in question occur, might be very late (cf. also, ibid., c. 14, fol. 126 a). The names of the tribes engraved on the breast-plate of the High Priest contain (according to Jerus. Sota, VII, 4, 21 d 29, and Bab. Sota, 36 a) fifty letters. This statement is of interest in this connexion from the answer given by R. Jochanan to the objection (in the Jerusalem Talmud) that the letters in question only amount to 49. He answers: בנימן דותולדותם מלא. The names of each six tribes contain 25 letters. How this division was effected is a subject of controversy (cf. the commentators, ad loc.). The Aruch (s. v. מאה, Kohut, V, 64 b) cites וי"א שכל הפסוק הזה [Deut. x. 12] עולה למנין מאה אותיות שאל מלא, from which Norzi infers שאל מלא, but in the ordinary editions the word is printed *defective*.

well as the Hebrew, is therefore not *a priori* to be rejected. According to Grause, the Grecian stichometry, and consequently also the counting of the letters which was connected with it, goes back to the habits of the booksellers of classical antiquity, who paid the copyists on a scale of this sort[1]. Contrariwise, the conjecture is also worth considering, whether among the Jews it was not originally the fixing of the transcribers' remuneration that gave rise to the system of recording the number of the letters of the Bible, of its single books and their parts and divisions. It is of course known that the copyists and revisers were paid out of the Temple treasury.

It will be interesting for our purpose to see the estimates of the number of letters contained in the Biblical books as mentioned by Berger (p. 323 f), and we quote a few of them for purposes of illustration and in confirmation of the assertions which we have put forward on this point. The Pentateuch has 523,063 letters, the Octateuch (= Pentateuch, Joshua, Judges, Ruth) 663,027, the whole Bible without the Apocrypha 2,105,515. Hence the Prophets and Hagiographa have 1,582,452. We see then from these specifications of the letters in the Vulgate, that the Pentateuch forms just a fourth of the whole Bible. Hence, in the Hebrew original also, the proportion cannot be other than about 1 : 4. If, therefore, the Pentateuch has approximately 300,000 letters, the Prophets and Hagiographa must have at least 800,000. We see, further, from the figures 523,063 for the Pentateuch, that in the Hebrew, where no vowels are written, 600,000 is an impossible number, for the Hebrew cannot have more letters than the Latin. The total number of letters in the Vulgate amounts to about 2,100,000. If in the Hebrew there were altogether only about 800,000, then we should have to assume that on account of the vowels the number of letters increased in Latin nearly threefold, which is a sheer impossibility. Thus, the results reached by us as regards the total of letters in the Pentateuch on the one hand, and in the Prophets and Hagiographa on the other, are corroborated in this direction also in the most gratifying manner.

II.

The Number of Words in the Bible.

We have, above, already touched upon the question whether the particles were regarded as separate words. This question is all the

[1] Cf. Samuel Berger, *Histoire de la Vulgate pendant les premiers siècles du moyen âge*, Paris, 1893, p. 316 ff.

more justified, because, not only are these little words often, sometimes consistently, marked as belonging to the following word by means of a Makkeph, but also frequently make their appearance deprived of their independence, in the paraphrases of the Hexapla[1]. In order to solve this problem, we have submitted the smallest of the sections, regarding which the number of words contained therein has been transmitted to us, to a re-count. For we find in Ginsburg, *Massorah*, II, p. 714 ff, the following data: (1) מקץ, 2,000 words; (2) קרח, 1,462; (3) חקת, 1,454; (4) בלק, 1,450; (5) ואתחנן, 1,870; (6) עקב, 1,746. Furthermore, Baer observes in the *Orient*, XII (1851), p. 202, note, that בראשית has 1,930 words: סימן א"ן יה"יה. Whether this statement is old or whether it originates with Baer, I do not know. According to our computation the section Balak has 1,454 words[2], consequently the particles are counted independently.

In our traditional literature only the following passages are known to me, in which the number of words is spoken of; and among these only two are of importance for our problem. In Sanhedrin, 10 b, some Amoraim of the second half of the third century point to Num. vi. 24–26 as containing 3+5+7 words. In Numbers Rabbah, Naso, sect. 13 (ed. Wilna, 108 b–109 a), it is stated that Ps. xix. 8–10 has five words to every half verse[3], that in Deut. xxxiii. 18 the blessing of Moses consists of five words[4]; that, on the other hand, the blessing of Jacob in Gen. xlix. 13 consists of ten words[5]. In the last-named verse על־צידן is connected with a Makkeph and is yet taken as two words[6]. Decisive, also, are the passages in Numbers Rabbah,

[1] Dillmann says in his article, "Text of the Old Testament" (*Protestant Real-Encyclopedia*[2], II, 391), speaking of the Greek translations of the Bible, that they "differ indeed very frequently from the present text as regards the division of words, but still this is more the case with words which in sense belong together more closely (Cappell. II, 685–693, 839–842; Eichorn, §§ 73, 76)." Cf. the transliteration in Field, *Hexapla*, LXXIII, *θεσαμηώθ* = תשע מאות.

[2] Possibly I have miscounted to the extent of 4, or the Massoretic statement אלף תנ should be emended so as to read אלף תנר.

[3] כנגד ג' פסוקים (Num. vii. 23) אילים חמשה עתודים חמשה כבשים בני שנה חמשה של תורה שבהם ו' סדרי משנה והן שתים פסקה וכל פסקה ופסקה מן חמשה תיבות ואלו הם תורת ה' תמימה וגו".

[4] נגד ה' תיבות שהם בפסוק שבירך משה שותפותם.

[5] עשרה זהב מלאה קטרת כנגד י' תיבות שיש בברכת זבולן.

[6] In Sanhedrin, 22 a, R. Jehuda says, in the name of Rab: באותה שעה קניחה בת שבע בשלש עשרה מפות, on which Rashi observes that in 1 Kings i. 15, 13 words are to be found. This enumeration is only correct, if

ch. 14 (117 b), where it is stated that Gen. xlviii. 14 וישת—xlviii. 20 has 130 words; ibid. 121 a, that Num. vi. 13-20 also contains 130 words; ibid., that Num. vi. 8-12 contains 70 words; ibid. 118 a, that Gen. xlviii. 14 to והצעיר has ten words; and that in xlviii. 20, from וישם to מנשה, there are five words. According to a citation in the Aruch from the *Yelamdenu* the Shema contains 248 words[1].

It is a question indeed how old the passages here cited are; nevertheless, this much is proved by them, that at the time when the enumeration of the words enjoyed a certain amount of attention, every word which in our texts appears separately, was regarded as independent, which was, indeed, from the outset to be expected. The outward separation of the words, as carried out in written Bible texts is very ancient, and springs from pre-Talmudic times, as can be proved from several considerations[2]. The variations found in the Greek translators are explained by the small size of their copies of the Bible, which offered opportunity for confusion in doubtful cases. Nevertheless, this antiquity of the division of words did not result in the removal of all doubt, for as late as the second century, differences of opinion prevailed as to the proper way of writing certain words[3].

The total number of words in the Pentateuch, as has already been mentioned above, amounts, according to Ben Asher (*Dikd. Hat.*, p. 55 supra) to 79,856; according to Norzi in his concluding observation to the Pentateuch, to 79,876. It is evident that both transmit the same estimate: either נ״ו (= 56) has been corrupted to ע״ו (= 76)

את המלך is counted as one word. It is inconceivable that there is here a miscount, for Rashi quotes the whole verse. Hence את would not be regarded as a separate word. It is, however, possible that Rashi took the name בת־שבע as *one* word. This passage cannot under any circumstances furnish a proof for the period of Rab, because it remains doubtful whether Rab really took the number 13 from the number of words in the quoted verse, since 13 is well known to be a favourite and frequently-used number in our Tradition.

[1] Aruch, ed. Kohut, V, 64 b, Art. מאה: רמ״ח תיבות יש בקריה שמע שמשמרות רמ״ח איברים שנאמרו בילמדנו פרש׳ כי אם שמר השמרון. Kohut remarks hereon that the citation cannot be verified.

[2] Cf. Dillmann, l. c.; Menachoth, 30 a: ובין תיבה לתיבה כמלא אות קטנה.

[3] Cf. Pesachim, 117 a supra; Chullin, 65 a supra. Whether כרולצמר and כסיה form one or two words, could have been decided by the number of words in the Pentateuch; nevertheless, we find no proposition with respect to counting the words (similar to that in Kiddushin, 30 a), because the contending Amoraim probably declared themselves incompetent to decide a question involving a point as to the division of the words.

or the opposite has taken place. It is noticeable that no numerical statement as to the words in the Prophets and Hagiographa has been recorded, whereas such has been the case as regards the letters of the alphabet. There exists, therefore, no mention of the middle word either of the Prophets and Hagiographa or of the whole Bible, as there does of the Torah. In the familiar passage, Kiddushin, 30 a, already quoted, there is no allusion to an enumeration of the words, only to a counting of the letters. For division by words was only an external feature; it was therefore not necessary that, like the quantity of letters, it should be fixed by a number. They rested satisfied with having done this with the most important book—the Torah. The counting of the letters is unquestionably older than the counting of the words. From the preceding, too, the fact is explained why in Tradition the letters are so often spoken of and the words so seldom.

LUDWIG BLAU.

BUDAPEST.

(To be continued.)

MISCELLANEA.

A Document illustrative of early Anglo-Jewish History.

THE following extract from the Close Rolls of Edward I (10 Ed. I, m. 8. d.), which my friend Mr. Charles Johnson, of the Public Record Office, has been kind enough to send me, illustrates three enactments affecting the members of the Jewish communities which existed in England before the Expulsion, viz.:—one ordering Jewesses, as well as Jews, to wear a badge to distinguish them from Christians, a second forbidding Jews to sell meat to Christians, and a third forbidding them to employ Christian servants, male or female. The first of the three enactments is mentioned in a writ which is entered on Close Roll of Edward I, and is printed by Tovey (*Anglia Judaica*, p. 208), so that the extract from the later Roll, here printed, is of interest only as showing that it was meant to be strictly enforced; the second is meant to prevent the Jews from selling to Christians *trifa* meat, which they themselves refused to eat, a practice of which a Pope had not disdained to complain (Bouquet, *Recueil des Historiens des Gaules et de la France*, XIX, 497), and which was forbidden by Statute in England (*Statutes of the Realm*, 1810, I, 202, 203; *Leet Jurisdiction in Norwich*, Selden Society, p. 28; *Thirteenth Report of the Historical Manuscripts Commission*, Appendix IV, p. 294); the third is a measure which was repeatedly demanded by Councils and Synods of the Church, but of the promulgation of which by the temporal authorities in England there is, as far as I am aware, no other evidence.

Quod Judee portent tabulas sicut et Judei.

Rex Justiciariis suis ad custodiam Judeorum assignatis salutem. Cum nuper preceperimus et publice proclamari fecerimus, quod omnes Judei regni nostri tabulas deferant in indumentis suis exterioribus, ut sic a cultoribus Catholice fidei evidencius discernantur, volentes hoc idem de Judeabus ejusdem regni generaliter et firmiter observari; vobis mandamus, quod tam in civitate nostra Londonia, quam in aliis civitatibus, burgis, villis, et alibi infra regnum predictum ubi Judei conversantur, publice proclamari faciatis, sub gravi forisfactura nostra,

ut omnes et singule Judee ejusdem tabulas hujusmodi publice deferant in forma que provisa est de Judeis predictis; faciatis insuper inhiberi et publice proclamari per totum regnum predictum, ne aliquis Judeus quascumque carnes quoquo modo presumat vendere Christianis set (seu ?) Christianum aut Christianam secum in hospicio suo seu alibi in servicio suo audeat decetero retinere. Teste Rege apud Westmonasterium primo die Decembris.

B. LIONEL ABRAHAMS.

Jews' Houses in Lincoln in 1484.

ANOTHER piece of information concerning the pre-expulsion Jews is given in the *Fourteenth Report of the Historical Manuscripts Commission* (Appendix, Part VIII, p. 11), from which it appears that the houses which had belonged to certain Jews expelled from England in 1290 were, in 1484, still known by the names of their former Jewish owners. There is preserved among the Lincoln records an "Inspeximus" by Richard III, dated November 30, 1484, of a charter of Edward IV issued on February 15, 1466, making certain grants to the mayor and citizens of Lincoln. Among the grants was "a large number of quit-rents paid to the Crown from various houses in the city," many of which had belonged to Jews, and which are all specified in detail. In the list the following names of Jews are found: "Ursell Levy, of Wickford, in the parish of St. Mark, whose name occurs thrice; Diabella, a Jewess, condemned for felony, whose name occurs four times; Bealesset or Belasset, of Wallingford, a Jewess also condemned for felony, five times; Hagin, son of Benedict, of Lincoln; Agnu or Agni, daughter of Benedict, one of whose houses is said to have come to the king's hands by the exile of Benedict; Jacob Levi, in the parish of St. Benedict; Floria, of London, a Jewess of Lincoln, in the parishes of St. Martin and St. Cuthbert; Juda in the bailly; Benedict le Count, in the parish of St. John called 'la poure'; Jacob Brauncegate, in the parish of St. George; Jocey Gabias, in the parish of St. Michael-on-the-Hill; Salomon of London, in the parish of St. Martin and in Brauncegate; Manser de Bradeworth, in the parish of St. George; Jocey of Colchester; Benedict of London, in Brauncegate; Hagin Calf; Elias Gaboys. Besides this there is a rent of 2*s.* partly from the burial-ground of the Jews, and 19*d.* paid by the bailiffs from various Jews' houses not specified." With one exception the names given above are to be found in one or other of the three earlier lists of the houses of the expelled Jews of Lincoln, viz. those contained in the Record Office Manuscripts known

as "Queen's Remembrancer's Miscellanea—Jews, 557, Nos. 9 and 11," in the Lansdown Collection at the British Museum (Vol. 826, Part 5, Transcript 4), and in the *Rotulorum Originalium Abbreviatio* (printed by the Record Commission), pp. 73 a-76 b. The one exception just referred to is the name of "Agnu or Agni daughter of Benedict." I have no doubt that this is a copyist's mistake for Agin or Hagin son (*fil'*) of Benedict.

It is worth noticing that there was evidently no Jews' quarter in Lincoln. The Jews' houses are situated in parishes in every part of the city.

B. Lionel Abrahams.

Additions to the Jews in China.

(*J. Q. R.*, vol. VIII, p. 123 sqq.)

Mr. Marcus Adler has drawn my attention to correspondences in *Jewish Chronicle*: (*a*) July 11, 1879, by Mr. J. L. Liebermann; (*b*) July 27, 1888, by an anonymous correspondent. Both have nothing more than the missionaries reported.

Remarks by my friend S. J. Halberstam: p. 130, l. 12, לשכנך for לשכבך; l. 16, כיריעה for כזריעה; l. 22, יברכו for וברכו. P. 132, ll. 5, 6 from below, read

6 וירגיע רוב שלום במבשר אליה

5 זאב ירעה

By these readings we find the following acrostic:

שמואל ברבי ברוך חזק ואמץ

P. 138. Mr. M. Adler writes that amongst the facsimiles of Shanghai in his possession, the sections קדשים (Lev. xix. 1 to xxi. 27), at end קדוש ליהוה : סד and ראה אנכי (Deut. xi. 26 to xvi. 17), at end קכז.

Ad. Neubauer.

THE

JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW

APRIL, 1896

SOME ASPECTS OF RABBINIC THEOLOGY.

VI.

THE TORAH IN ITS ASPECT OF LAW.

R. SIMLAI, a well-known Agadic teacher and controversialist of the third century, preached as follows: "Six hundred and thirteen commandments were delivered unto Moses on Mount Sinai; three hundred and sixty-five of which are prohibitive laws, corresponding with the number of days of the solar year, whilst the remaining two hundred and forty-eight are affirmative injunctions, being as numerous as the limbs constituting the human body[1]." This is the earliest source for the six hundred and thirteen laws, which are brought forward in many of our theological works, with the purpose of proving under what burden the scrupulous Jew must have laboured, who considered himself under the duty of performing all these enactments. The number is, by its very strangeness, bewildering; and the Pharisee, unable to rise to the heights above the Law, lay under the curse of its mere quantity. In this essay, the object of which is to treat of Torah in its aspect of Law, a few words as to the real value of those theological

[1] Makkoth, 23 b, and parallels in the יפה עינים (where פר"א פמ"ח ought to be corrected into מ"א). Cp. Bacher's *Agada der Palästinensischen Amoräer*, I, 558, and notes. See also Bloch.

statistics are therefore necessary, before we pass to other questions connected with our subject.

The words with which I introduced the saying of R. Simlai, "He preached[1]," must already have suggested some doubt as to the accuracy of his statement. Preachers have always enjoyed, as we know, a certain license, even in regard to quotations, and from them least of all have we to expect exactness in numbers. The lesson these numbers were intended to convey was, first, that each day brings its new temptation only to be resisted by a firm Do-Not; and on the other hand, that the whole man stands in the service of God, each limb or member of his body being entrusted with the execution of its respective functions[2]. This was probably the sentiment which the preacher wished to impress upon his congregation, without troubling himself much about the accuracy of his numbers. How little, indeed, we are justified in urging these numbers too seriously is clear from the sequel of R. Simlai's sermon. It runs thus: "David came (after Moses) and reduced[3] them (the six hundred and thirteen commandments) to eleven, as it is said: Lord, who shall abide in thy tabernacle? who shall dwell in thy holy hill? he that walketh uprightly, &c.[4] Then Isaiah came and reduced them to six, as it is said: He that walketh righteously, &c.[5] Then Micah came and reduced them to three: He hath shewed thee, O man, what is good; and what doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, &c.[6]

[1] דרש ר' שמלאי in most of the parallels.

[2] Cp. Pesikta d' R. Kahana, 101 a, and Rashi to Makkoth, ibid. Cp. also Tanchuma תצא, § 2. There are, however, grave doubts whether the subdivision in 365 and 248 (the words in the Talmud from שס"ה to אדם) is not a later addition. Cp. Bacher, *ibid.*

[3] The word in the Talmud and in Tanchuma שופמים end is והעמידן, which may mean compressed or reduced. See Bacher, *ibid.* I take here the version of the Talmud, omitting the additional controversies. Cp. also Midrash Tillim, XVIII, end.

[4] Ps. xv. 2–5, which verses contain eleven moral injunctions. Cp. Kimchi's Commentary to this chapter.

[5] Isa. xxxiii. 15, which verse contains six moral injunctions.

[6] Micah vi. 8, where three moral injunctions are contained.

Then Isaiah came again, and reduced them to two, as it is said: Thus saith the Lord, Keep my judgments and do justice[1]. Then Amos came and reduced them to one, as it is said: Seek the Lord and live[2]. Whilst Habakkuk (also) reduced them to one, as it is said: But the just shall live by his faith[3]." The drift of this whole passage shows that the sermon was less intended to urge the necessity of carrying out all the commandments with their multifarious details, than to emphasize the importance of the moral laws, which themselves, nevertheless, may be compressed into the principle of seeking God. or of faith in God.

Granted, however, as others think, that R. Simlai took it seriously with his number of six hundred and thirteen: granted, again, that his enumeration rested on some old authority which may be regarded as a guarantee for its exactness[4], this would prove nothing for the Burden-theory. The only possible explanations of our Rabbi's saying are the lists of R. Simon Caro and of Maimonides[5]. But, as I have elsewhere pointed out, "even a superficial analysis will discover that in the times of the Rabbis many of these commandments were already obsolete, as for instance, those relating to the arrangements of the tabernacle, and to the conquest of Palestine; whilst others concerned only certain classes, as, for instance, the priests, the judges, the soldiers and their commanders, the Nazirites, the representatives of the community, or even one or two individuals in the whole population, as, for example, the king and the high priest. Others, again, provided for contingencies which could occur only to a few, as, for instance, the laws concerning divorce or levirate-marriages. The laws, again, relating to idolatry, incest, and the sacrifices of children to Moloch, could hardly

[1] Isa. lvi. 1.

[2] Amos v. 6. This was undoubtedly the original version of R. Simlai's words, notwithstanding the objection of R. Nachman b. Isaac.

[3] Hab. ii. 4. [4] This seems to be the opinion of Maimonides.

[5] The former in the הלכות גדולות, the latter in the ספר המצות and the Introduction to the משנה תורה.

be considered as a practical prohibition even by the pre-Christian Jew; just as little as we can speak of Englishmen being under the burden of the law when prohibited from burning their widows or marrying their grandmothers, though these acts would certainly be considered as crimes. A careful examination of the six hundred and thirteen laws will prove that barely a hundred laws are to be found which concerned the everyday life of the bulk of the people[1]." Thus the law in its totality, which by the number of its precepts is so unpleasing to the theologian, is in its greater part nothing else than a collection of statutes relating to different sections of the community and to its multifarious institutions, ecclesiastical as well as civil, which constituted, as I have already said, the kingdom of God.

And here lay the strength of Judaism. The modern man is an eclectic being. He takes his devotion from the Bible, his laws from the Romans, his culture from the classics, and his politics from his party. He is certainly broader in his sympathies than the old Jew; but as a composite being, he must necessarily be lacking in harmony and unity. His sympathies are divided between the different sources of his inspiration,—sources which do not, as we know, always go well together. In order to avoid collision, he has at last to draw the line between the ecclesiastical and the civil, leaving the former, which in fact was forced upon him by a foreign religious conqueror, to a separate body of men whose business it is to look after the welfare of his invisible soul, whilst reserving the charge of the body and the world to himself.

The Rabbinic notion seems to have been that "if religion is anything, it is everything." The Rabbi gloried in the thought of being, as the Agadic expression runs, "a member of a city (or community) which included the priest as well as the prophet, the king as well as the scribe and the

[1] "The Law and Recent Criticism," JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, vol. III, p. 763.

teacher," all appointed and established by God[1]. To consider the administration of justice with all its details as something lying without the sphere of Torah would have been a terrible thought to the ancient Jew. And the Rabbis are most anxious to show that the appointment of judges was suggested by Moses, even before Jethro gave him the well-known advice[2]. The Torah, they point out, is a combination of mercy and justice[3]. That the ways of the Torah "are ways of sweetness, and all her paths are peace," was a generally accepted axiom[4], and went without saying: what had to be particularly urged was that even such laws and institutions as appear to be a consequence of uncompromising right and of rigid truth, rather than of sweetness and peace, were also part and parcel of the Torah, with her God-like universality of attributes. Hence the assertion of the Rabbis that God threatens Israel with taking back his treasure from them should they be slow in carrying out the principle of justice (*dinin*)[5]. "To the nations of the earth he gave some few laws; but his love to Israel was particularly manifested by the fullness and completeness of the Torah, which is wholly theirs[6]." And in it they find everything. "If thou wantest advice," the Rabbis say, "even in matters secular, or in questions regarding behaviour and good manners, take it from the Torah, even as David said, From thy precepts I get understanding[7]."

As a fact, the old Rabbis, as I have already indicated[8], hardly recognized such a chasm between the material and the spiritual as to justify the domain of religion being confined to the latter. The old Rabbinic literature is even devoid of the words "spiritual" and "material." The

[1] Sifre, 134 a. Cp. Chulin, 56 b. The passage in the text follows more the reading in the MH. ר"מ אומ' כרכא דכולא ביה . כהניו מתוכן לוויו מתוכו מלכיו מתוכו נביאיו מתוכו חכמיו מתוכו סופריו מתוכו ומשניו מתוכו &c.

[2] See Mechilta. [3] Debar. R., V, 7.

[4] See, for instance, Succah, 32 a; Yebamoth, 87 b, and elsewhere.

[5] Exod. R., XXX, 23. [6] Exod. R., ibid. 9, and parallels.

[7] See Pesikta K., 105 a. [8] See JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, VII, 212.

corresponding terms, רוחני and גשמי, were coined by later translators from the Greek and Arabic philosophers, with whom the division between body and soul is so prominent. It is true that the Rabbis occasionally used such expressions as "things of the heaven" and "things of the world," or matters concerning "the eternal life" and matters concerning "the temporal life[1]." But apart from the fact that they were little meant to indicate a theological division between two antagonistic principles, the "things of the heaven" covered a much wider area of human life than is commonly imagined. Thus we hear of a Rabbi who remonstrated with his son for not attending the lecture of his friend R. Chisda. The son apologized, and answered that he had once gone to the school of R. Chisda, but what he heard were "things of the world," the lecture having consisted in the exposition of a set of sanitary rules to be observed on certain occasions. Whereupon the father rejoined indignantly: "He (R. Chisda) is occupied with the life of God's creatures, and dost thou venture to call such matters 'things of the world'[2]?" Elsewhere we find the Rabbis deciding that to teach a child a trade or a handicraft is to be considered as one of the "delights of heaven," for which arrangements may be made even on the Sabbath[3].

As a rule, the Rabbis spoke of sin and righteousness, a good action or a bad action, מצוה or עבירה, for each of which body and soul are alike held responsible. But no act is in itself the worse or the better for being a function of the body or a manifestation of the soul. When Hillel the Great, who, as it would seem, was the author, or at least the inspirer, of the saying, "Let all thy deeds be for the sake of Heaven[4]," was about to take a bath, he said, "I am going to perform a religious act in beautifying my person, which was created in the image of God[5]." "The

[1] מילי דשמיא — מילי דעלמא. See e. g. Berachoth, 7 b, v. Shabbath, 33 b.
[2] Shabbath, 82 a.
[3] חפצי שמים. Shabbath, 150 a.
[4] See Pesikta R., 115 b.
[5] Lev. Rabbah, XXXIV, 3.

fourth degree of love," says St. Bernard somewhere, "is to love self only for God's sake."

R. Judah Hallevi, with the instinct of a poet, hit the right strain when he said, in his famous Dialogue *Kusari*, "Know that our Torah is constituted of the three psychological states: Fear, love, and joy" (that is to say, all the main functions of man are enlisted in the service of God). "By each of these thou mayest be brought into communion with thy God. Thy contriteness in the days of fasting does not bring thee nearer to God than thy joy on the Sabbath days, and on festivals, provided thy joy emanates from a devotional and perfect heart. And just as prayer requires devotion and thought, so does joy, namely, that thou wilt rejoice in his commandments for their own sake, (the only reasons for this rejoicing being) the love of him who commanded it, and the desire of recognizing God's goodness towards thee. Consider these feasts as if thou wert the guest of God invited to his table and his bounty, and thank him for it inwardly and outwardly. And if thy joy in God excites thee even to the degree of singing and dancing, it is a service to God, keeping thee attached to him. But the Torah did not leave these things to our arbitrary will, but put them all under control. For man lacks the power to make use of the functions of body and soul in their proper proportions[1]."

The law thus conceived as submitting all the faculties and passions of man to the control of the divine, whilst suppressing none, was a source of joy and blessing to the Rabbis. Whatever meaning the words of Paul may have, when he speaks of the curse of the Law, it is certain that those who lived and died for it considered it as a blessing. In the Babylonian Talmud, as I have elsewhere pointed out[2], one of the most frequent appellatives of God is the "merciful one" (*Rachmana*), and it is worth noticing that this term is mostly used in Halachic or casuistic discussions

[1] כוזרי מאמר ב׳ (ed. Sluzki, p. 45).

[2] JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, VI, 422.

about ritual cases, which proves how little in the mind of the Rabbis the Law was connected with hardness and chastisement. To them it was an effluence of God's mercy and goodness. In the daily prayer of the Jews the same sentiment is expressed in most glowing words: "With everlasting love thou hast loved the house of Israel, thy people; Torah, commandments, statutes, and judgments hast thou taught us. . . . Yea, we will rejoice in the words of thy Torah and thy commandments for ever. . . . And mayest thou never take away thy love from us. Blessed art thou, O Lord, who lovest thy people Israel."

The שמחה של מצוה, the joy experienced by the Rabbinic Jew in being commanded to fulfil the Law, and the enthusiasm which he felt at accomplishing that which he considered to be the will of God, is a point hardly touched upon by most theological writers, and if touched upon at all, is hardly ever understood. Renan maintains somewhere, that the best way to judge of a religion is, to have at one time been in it and afterwards out of it. None of the writers on the subject had the privilege or the misfortune to comply with these conditions. But still this "joy of the Law" is so essential an element in the understanding of the Law, that it "forms that originality of sentiment more or less delicate" which can never be conceived by those who have experienced it neither from life nor from literature.

How anxious a Jew was to carry out a law, and what joy he felt in fulfilling it, may be seen from the following story, which perhaps dates from the very time when the Law was denounced as slavery and as the strength of sin. According to Deut. xxiv. 19, a sheaf forgotten in the harvest field belonged to the poor; the proprietor being forbidden to go again and to fetch it. This prohibitive law was called מצות שכחה, "the commandment with regard to forgetfulness." It was impossible to fulfil it as long as one thought of it. In connexion with this we read in the Tosephta: "It happened to a Chassid that he forgot a sheaf in his field, and was thus enabled to fulfil the commandment with

regard to forgetfulness. Whereupon he bade his son go to the temple, and offer for him a burnt-offering and a peace-offering, whilst he also gave a great banquet to his friends in honour of the event. Thereupon his son said to him: Father, why dost thou rejoice in this commandment more than in any other law prescribed in the Torah? He answered, that it was the occurrence of the rare opportunity of accomplishing the will of God, even as the result of some oversight, which caused him so much delight[1]."

This joy of the *Mizwah* constituted the essence of the action. "Let man fulfil the commandments of the Torah with joy," exclaims the Tanna of the school of Elijah, "and then they will be counted to him as righteousness[2]." The words, "Moses did as the Lord commanded him" (Num. xxvii. 22), are explained to mean that he fulfilled the Law with joy[3]. In a similar manner the words, "I have done according to all that thou hast commanded me" (Deut. xxvi. 14), are interpreted to signify, I have rejoiced, and caused others to rejoice[4]. Naturally, it is the religionist of high standard, or as the Rabbis express it, "the man who deserves it," who realizes this joy in the discharge of all religious functions, whilst to him "who deserves it not" it may become a trial of purification[5]. But the ideal is to obtain this quality of joy, or "to deserve it." The truly righteous rejoice almost unconsciously, joy being a gift from heaven to them, as it is said, "Thou (God) hast put gladness in my heart[6]."

This principle of joy in connexion with the *Mizwah* is maintained both in the Talmud and in the devotional literature of the Middle Ages. The general rule is: Tremble with joy when thou art about to fulfil a commandment[7]. God, his Salvation, and his Law, are the three things in

[1] Tosephta Peah. Cp. Midrash Ruth (ed. Buber, 51 b). Of course, we must read there שלא בכונה for בעונה.

[2] חרבא"ר, XXIX. [3] Sifre, 52 b. [4] Ibid. 129 a.

[5] Yoma, 72 b, זכה משמחתו לא זכה צורפתו. [6] חרבא"ר, XVIII.

[7] Derech Eretz Zuta.

which Israel rejoices[1]. But R. Ibn Chalawa, to mention one of the later sages, declares that the joy accompanying the carrying out of a religious performance is even more acceptable to God than the *Mizwah* itself. The righteous, he proceeds to say, feel this ineffable delight in performing God's will in the same way as the spheres and planets (whose various revolutions are a perpetual song to God) rejoice in their going forth and are glad in their returning[2]; whilst R. Joseph Askari of Safed (16th century) makes joy one of the necessary conditions without which a law cannot be perfectly carried out. And I may perhaps remark that this joy of the *Mizwah* was a living reality even in modern times. I myself had once the good fortune to observe one of those old-type Jews, who, as the first morning of the Feast of Tabernacles drew near, used to wake and rise soon after the middle of the night. There he sat, with trembling joy, awaiting impatiently the break of dawn, when he would be able to fulfil the law of the palm-branches and the willows!

To give one or two further instances how many more things there are in the Synagogue and in the Law than are dreamt of by Christian divines, I will again allude to the Sabbath and to Prayer.

The institution of the Sabbath is one of those laws the strict observance of which was already the object of attack on the part of the compilers of the Synoptic Gospels. Nevertheless, the doctrine proclaimed in one of the Gospels that the Son of man is the Lord of the Sabbath, was also current among the Rabbis. They too teach that the Sabbath is delivered into the hand of man (to break it when necessary), and not man into the power of the Sabbath[3]. And the Rabbis even laid down the axiom that a scholar living in a town, where there could be among the Jewish population the least doubt as to the question whether the Sabbath might be broken for the benefit of a person dangerously

[1] Pesikta d' R. K., 147 a and 194 a.
[2] Kad Hakkemach.
[3] Mechilta, 104 a.

sick, was to be despised as a man neglecting his duty; every delay in such a case being fraught with grave consequences to the patient; for, as Maimonides points out, the laws of the Torah are not meant as an infliction upon mankind, "but as mercy, lovingkindness, and peace[1]."

The attacks upon the Sabbath have not abated. As I have elsewhere said, "the day is still described by almost every modern writer in the most gloomy colours, and long lists are given of the minute observances connected with it, easily to be transgressed, which would necessarily make the Sabbath, instead of a day of rest, a day of sorrow and anxiety, almost worse than the Scotch Sunday, as depicted by continental writers[2]." Even Hausrath—who is something more than a theologian, for he also writes charming novels—is unable to see in the Rabbinic Sabbath more than a day which is to be distinguished by a mere non-performance of the thirty-nine various sorts of work forbidden by the Rabbis on Sabbaths, such as sowing, ploughing, reaping, winnowing, kneading, spinning, weaving, skinning, tanning, writing, &c. &c.—a whole bundle of participles, in the expounding of which the Pharisee took an especial delight[3]. Contrast this view with the prayer of R. Zadock, a younger contemporary of the Apostles, which runs thus:—"Through the love with which thou, O Lord our God, lovest thy people Israel, and the mercy which thou hast shown to the children of thy covenant, thou hast given unto us in love this great and holy seventh day[4]." This Rabbi clearly regarded the Sabbath as a gift from heaven, an expression of the infinite love and mercy of God, which he manifested toward his beloved children. And, as I have already said, "the Sabbath is celebrated by the very people who did observe it, in hundreds of hymns,

[1] Jerushalmi Yoma, 45 b. Cp. Maimonides, הלכות שבת פ"ב ה"ג.

[2] "The Law and Recent Criticism," JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, vol. III, p. 763.

[3] *History of the New Testament Times*, I, 101.

[4] Tosephta Berachoth, III, 7 (ed. Zuckermandel).

which would fill volumes, as a day of rest and joy, of pleasure and delight, a day in which man enjoys some presentiment of the pure bliss and happiness which are stored up for the righteous in the world to come, and to which such tender names were applied as the 'Queen Sabbath,' the 'Bride Sabbath,' and the 'holy dearly-beloved Sabbath [1].'" Every founder of a religion declares the yoke which he is about to put on his followers to be easy, and the burden to be light; but, after all, the evidence of those who *did* bear the Sabbath yoke for thousands of years ought to pass for something. The assertion of some scholars that the Rabbis, the framers of these laws, as students leading a retired life, suffered in no way under them, and therefore were unable to realize their oppressive effect upon the great majority of the people, is hardly worth refuting. The Rabbis belonged to the majority, being mostly recruited, as I have already pointed out in another place, from the artisan, trading, and labouring classes [2]. This very R. Zadock, whom I have just mentioned, says: —"Make not the Torah a crown wherewith to aggrandize thyself, nor a spade wherewith to dig;" whilst Hillel considers it as a mortal sin to derive any material profit from the words of the Torah [3].

The prayers of the synagogue are another case in point. That Jews could pray, that they had, besides the Temple, a synagogue-service, independent of sacrifices and priests, does not, as every student must have felt, fit in well with the view generally entertained of the deadly and deadening effects of the Law. The inconvenient Psalms of the later periods were easily neutralized by divesting them of all individualistic tendency, whilst the synagogue was placed under the superintendence of the Rabbis, whose mechanical tendencies were well known. In their hands prayers turn into rubrics, and it is with an especial delight that theo-

[1] "The Law and Recent Criticism," JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, vol. III, p. 763.

[2] JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, vol. VII, p. 212. [3] Aboth, IV, 7.

logians dwell on the Rabbinical laws relating to prayer, as, for instance, how many times a day a man ought to pray, the fixed hours for prayer, in what parts of the prayer an interruption is allowed, which parts of the prayer require more devotion than others, and similar petty little questions of religious casuistry in which the Rabbi, as a professional, if I may call him so, greatly delighted [1]. But these writers seem to overlook the fact that the very framers of these petty laws were the main composers of the liturgy. And who can say what the Rabbi's feelings were when he wrote, for instance, "Forgive us, our Father, for we have sinned"? The word Father alone suggests a world of such ideas as love, veneration, devotion, and child-like dependence upon God. It is easy enough to copy rubrics. They float on the surface of the so-called "Sea of the Talmud," and it requires only a certain indelicacy of mind, or what Renan would have called "the vulgarity of criticism," to skim them off, and pass them on to the world as samples of Jewish synagogue-life. If Life and Times-writers would only dip a little deeper into this sea, they would notice how easily the Rabbis could disregard all these rubrics. Thus we read, with reference to Jeremiah xiv. 8: God is the *Mikwah* of Israel, which word the Rabbis take to mean "the source of purity" (Israel's purification being established by attachment to God). "God says to Israel, I bade thee read thy prayers unto me in thy synagogues; but if thou canst not, pray in thy house; and if thou art unable to do this, pray when thou art in thy field; and if this be inconvenient to thee, pray on thy bed; and if thou canst not do even this, think of me in thy heart [2]." Prayer is, indeed, as the Rabbis call it, "the service of the heart [3]," but "matters given over to the heart," as the Rabbis phrase it, can, as the Rabbis express themselves in another place, only be comprehended by God. Prayer, and the recitation of the Shema, are among the things which keep the heart of

[1] See Weber, 40–42, and Schürer, II, 408 seq.

[2] Pesikta d' R. K., 158 a. [3] Taanith, 2 a. Cp. Sifre, 80 a.

Israel in exile awake[1], and God requires of Israel that, at least in the time of prayer, they should give him all their hearts[2]; that is to say, that the whole of man should be absorbed in his prayer. "Prayer without devotion is like a body without a soul," is a common Jewish proverb. God himself teaches Israel how to pray before him[3]; for nothing is more beautiful than prayer; it is more beautiful even than good works, and of more value than sacrifices[4]. It is the expression of Israel's love to God; God longs for it[5]. Prayer is Israel's chiefest joy[6]. Hence the benediction in which Israel thank God that they are permitted to pray to him[7].

And here I must again be allowed an allusion to personal reminiscences. The following passages in the Song of the Unity are recited in some congregations on the Eve of the Day of Atonement:—

Now we, thy people and thy flock, delight to do thy will.
But how can we serve thee when there is neither sacrifice nor oblation, seeing that we are not come unto the place of our rest,
Neither is there any water to cleanse us of impurity, for we are in an unclean land?
Verily I rejoice at thy word, and at thy bidding am I come;
For it is written, Not for thy sacrifices nor for thy burnt-offerings will I reprove thee;
I have not commanded thy fathers concerning them.
What have I required and sought of thee but to fear me,
To serve me with gladness and a cheerful heart?
Behold, to obey is better than sacrifice,
And a contrite heart than pure oblation:

[1] See Shir Hashirim Rabba, V. [2] Tanchuma, כי תבא, § 1, end.
[3] See Rosh Hashanah, 17 b.
[4] See Tanchuma, ויבא, § 1, and Sifre, 71 b.
[5] See Midrash Tillim, CXVI.
[6] See Yalkut to Ps. c. Cp. Midrash Tillim to this chapter.
[7] See Jerushalmi Berachoth, 3 d (the first lines on the top). Cp. Baer's remarks to the מורים דרבנן.

The sacrifices of God are a broken spirit.
Sacrifice and oblation thou didst not desire, nor didst thou demand sin-offering and burnt-offering.
I will build an altar of the wreckage of my heart, and will crush the spirit within me.
My proud spirit and haughty looks I will humble; yea, I will rend my heart for my Lord's sake.
These broken fragments of my spirit, these are thy sacrifices. Oh, may they rise, an acceptable gift, upon thine altar!

But only one who has seen the deep despair reflected on the faces of the worshippers, as they repeat the first stanzas bewailing the loss of sacrifices as a means of an atonement, and the sudden transition to the highest degree of joy and cheerfulness at the thought expressed in the last stanzas, that it is neither burnt-offering nor meat-offering which God requires, but that the heart is the real altar and the service of the heart the real sacrifice—only one who has witnessed such a prayer-meeting will be able to conceive how little the capacity of the Rabbi to pray, and to rejoice in prayer, was affected by the rubrics, and how superficial is the common conception of Christian theologians on this subject.

I shall now pass to another question in reference to the Law. I will quote Schürer, who is, of course, in this respect, the expounder of older views, being followed again by the whole tribe of minor theologians. His words are: "But what were the motives which gave rise to this enthusiasm for the Law? And what were the means by which the Law gained this terrible power over men's souls" (*Gemüther*)? The answer of the professor amounts to this:— It was the belief in the divine retribution (including both punishment and reward), and this in the strictest juristic sense of the term. If Israel refrain from sin, it is because they are afraid of the chastisement of God, with which he has a right to visit them by the terms of his contract with them. If they act in accordance with his will, it is because they expect him to reward them either in this

or in the next world, it being God's duty as a master to pay well those who carry out his wishes [1].

I have treated of the belief of the doctrine of retribution in Rabbinic literature in another place. Here let it be simply stated that the Rabbis, though never tired of urging this belief, and striving to make of it a living conviction, displayed a constant tendency to disregard it as a motive for action. The saying of Antigonos of Socho, "Be not like servants that serve their master with the view to receive reward," is well known [2]. All the commentators on the sayings of the Fathers explain this sentence as meaning that love pure and simple is the only worthy motive of the worshipper. But we must not look upon this saying of Antigonos as on one of those theological paradoxes in which divines of all creeds occasionally indulge. It is a sentiment running through the Rabbinic literature of almost every age. Thus the words in Deuteronomy xi. 13, "To love the Lord your God," are explained in the Sifre to mean: "Say not, I will study the Torah with the purpose of being called sage or Rabbi, or to acquire fortune, or to be rewarded for it in the world to come; but do it for the sake of thy love to God, though the glory will come in the end [3]." The words in Psalm cxii. 1, "Blessed is the man who delighteth greatly in his commandments," are interpreted in the Talmud to mean, that he is blessed who delighteth in God's commandments, but not in the reward promised for his commandments [4]. This proves, by the way, that the Rabbis could depart from the letter of the Scripture for the sake of the spirit, the preceding verses in this very Psalm being nothing else than a description of the reward awaiting the pious man, who fulfils God's commandments. In the Midrash, those who, in view of Proverbs iii. 16, look out for the good things which are on the left side of wisdom, namely, riches and honours, are

[1] See *Geschichte*, II, pp. 388, 389.
[2] Aboth, I.
[3] Page 84 a.
[4] Abodah Zorah, 19 a.

branded as wicked and base[1]. And when David said, "I hate them that are of a double mind, but thy law do I love," he indicated by it, according to the Rabbis, his contempt for mixed motives in the service of God, as the Law should not be fulfilled either under compulsion or through fear, but only from the motive of love[2]. In the devotional literature of the Middle Ages, there is hardly a single work in which man is not warned against serving God with any intention of receiving reward, though, of course, the religionist is strongly urged to believe that God does reward goodness and does punish wickedness.

The real motive of this enthusiasm for the Law must be sought in other sources than the hope of reward. Those who keep the commandments of God are his lovers. And when the lover is asked, Why art thou carried away to be burned, stoned, or crucified, he answers, as we read in the Mechilta, Because I have studied the Torah, or Because I have circumcised my son, or Because I have kept the Sabbath; but he considers the suffering as wounds inflicted upon him for the sake of his beloved one, and his love is returned by the love of God[3]. The Law is thus a means of strengthening the mutual relations of love between God and his people[4]. The fulfilment of the Law was, in the eyes of the Rabbis, a witnessing on the part of the Jews to God's relationship to the world. "Why does this man," they say, "refrain from work on the Sabbath? why does he close his business on the seventh day? He does so in order to bear witness to the fact of God's creation of the world, and to his providence over it[5]." The Law, according to the Rabbis, was a source of holiness. Each new commandment with which God blesses Israel, adds holiness to his people; but it is holiness which makes Israel to be God's own[6]. They

[1] See Bemidbar Rabba, XXII. [2] Midrash Tillim, CXIX, § 46.
[3] 68 b. [4] See Mechilta, 98 a. [5] Ibid., 104 a.
[6] Ibid., 98 a. Cp. also the passage commencing חביבין המצות in the סדר המוכר in the פרק המצות about the end.

deduce this doctrine from Exodus xxii. 30, which verse they explain to mean that it is the fact of Israel being holy men אנשי קדש which gives them the privilege of belonging to God. Hence the formula in many benedictions: "Blessed is the Lord who sanctified us (or made us holy) through his laws, and found delight in us." These reasons, namely, the motive of love, the privilege of bearing witness to God's relationship to the world, the attainment of holiness in which the Law educated Israel, as well as the other spiritual motives which I have already pointed out, such as the joy felt by the Rabbis in the performance of the Law and the harmony which the Rabbis perceived in the life lived according to the Torah, were the true sources of Israel's enthusiasm for the Law. At least they were powerful enough with the more refined and nobler minds in Israel to enable them to dispense utterly with the motives of reward and punishment; though, as in every other religion, these lower motives may have served as concurrent incentives to a majority of believers.

S. SCHECHTER.

PASSOVER HYMN.

(ISAAC B. JEHUDAH IBN GIAT.)

The glory of the Lord our God behold,
  Who set us free from bondage sore,
And praise in song the mercies manifold
    He grants us evermore.
When close and closer dangers thee appal
  And fill with terror day and night,
Oh! bid thy heart remember 'midst them all
    That darkness turns to light.
See how the sun, now rising golden-clear,
  Sank yester eve in gloomy grey;
Then wherefore let to-morrow's doubt and fear
    Afflict thy soul to-day?

Look up unto our help in ages past,
  In troubled days and perilous,
What time the hostile camps besieged us fast,
    And nigh consumèd us.
O silent dove, the glorious power await
  Of him who doth thy life redeem,
Who makes the men of might, their pomp and state,
    As passing shadows seem.
Then like a vision of the night is stilled
  The haughty tumult of the foe,
And all the pride, with which his heart is filled,
    Is suddenly brought low.

Declare then evermore unweariedly
To generations yet unknown,
The wonders that our rock in majesty
Has to his people shown.
Seek'st thou a sign to know the dead once more
Shall rise to life, their troubles past,
And that the pilgrims, all their wand'rings o'er,
Shall dwell in peace at last?
Look upon this—how God from out the grave
Did lead us forth to life and breath,
And how he wrought great miracles to save
Us from the dust of death.

Therefore, with closèd lips and silent tongue,
Accept thine hour of sore distress,
And banish from thy heart, by anguish wrung,
All wrath and bitterness.
Hope still for happier days. To every woe
Shall come an end, though long delayed.
Why is thy hand grown slack, thy faith sunk low?
Be strong and undismayed.
Remember how one evening saw of old
A nation plunged in darkest night,
And when the morning came again—behold,
The Lord had brought us light!

ALICE LUCAS.

LIGHT AND DARKNESS.

(JEHUDA HALEVI.)

O silent heart, pour forth thy prayer!
From Meshech's tents of strife and care,
Look up to God, thy rock divine,
Banner and host and refuge thine.
'Tis he who makes thy sun to shine,
Who formeth light and darkness.

His mandate made the earth appear,
And curved the heaven's celestial sphere.
That all might then his glory see,
Nor aught in vain created be,
He called the sun in majesty
To rise and banish darkness.

"Let there be light!" the heavens heard,
And all their host, his mighty word.
Then knew they that a rock of might
Upheld the heaven's highest height,
And praised their Maker for the light,
Which overcame the darkness.

Thus will he turn my night to day,
And when I fall, my footsteps stay.
He will my people's light restore,
And make them glad as heretofore.
He is my light for evermore,
Although I sit in darkness.

ALICE LUCAS.

THE COTTON GROTTO,

AN ANCIENT QUARRY IN JERUSALEM,

WITH A NOTE ON THE STONES USED FOR THE ALTAR.

WHILE in Jerusalem, in April, 1891, I became interested in the great subterranean structure known to travellers as the Quarries of Solomon, and to the Arabs as the Cotton Grotto. The entrance to this structure is about 100 paces east of the Damascus Gate, and some 19 feet below the wall [1].

I visited this place several times, making such examination as was possible by the light from the torches of the servants of the American Consul, and of some members of the so-called "American Colony," who kindly placed their time at my disposal[2].

Note was made at the time to the effect that the quarry proceeded 1000 feet, and was about 150 feet in depth. The depth was obtained by the reading of a carefully compensated aneroid barometer, but the length was estimated.

Various measurements have been given at different times. Dr. Barclay states that the cavern "varies in width from 20 to 100 or 200 yards, and extends about 220 yards in the direction of the Serai (barracks), terminating in a deep pit." In another place he asserts that the quarry from the entrance to the termination in a nearly direct line measures

[1] These are the figures given in Baedeker's *Palestine and Syria*, 1894, p. 136.

[2] The "American Colony" is a party of religious enthusiasts who have given up worldly goods and cares, and await the second advent. They visit the Mount of Olives every morning at daybreak.

250 yards. Still another estimate fixes "the length of the quarry to be rather more than a quarter of a mile, and its greatest breadth less than half the distance." The latest edition of Baedeker describes the quarry as "stretching 213 yards in a straight line below the level of the City, and sloping down considerably on the south" (p. 106). From this diversity it may be inferred that a series of accurate measurements would not be wholly superfluous. Possibly an idea of the size of the quarry may be obtained from the statement that it is "sufficiently large to have supplied much more stone than is apparent in all the ancient buildings of Jerusalem, gigantic though these are[1]."

The roof is supported by huge pillars. These are, according to Sir William Dawson, in such good condition that the quarry might be re-opened at any time with very little expense. Bits of pottery were found cemented to the rock by the action of water. Two large chambers unlike the rest of the quarry, which was comparatively free from débris, were filled with small stone chippings. The conclusion seemed inevitable that in these places the stone had been dressed[2], giving the clue to the meaning of the Biblical passage which is referred to later on.

It was assumed that if the workmen actually dressed the stone here, they must have dropped some tools or other objects; and after picking about among the chippings with such rude implements as were at hand, some objects were actually found. Dr. Herbert Friedenwald, who was of the party, picked up a lamp plainly of Jewish pattern, being one of a few recorded, and the only one found in this place, as far as is known.

One foot below the surface of the chippings I found

[1] "By-Paths of Bible Knowledge," VI, *Egypt and Syria. Their physical features in relation to Bible History*, by Sir J. William Dawson. Third edition, London, 1892, p. 95.

[2] All observers seem to agree on this point. See Geikie, *The Holy Land and the Bible*, vol. II, pp. 16-19, New York, 1888.

many fragments of pottery. One lot of these fragments has been restored at the United States National Museum, but with the rest nothing could be done. Some were unglazed and undecorated, on others the glazing and decoration was still intact. The greater portion of the fragments discovered were left with Mr. Baurath Shick, of Jerusalem, in the hope that they might be useful to some future investigator. There is no record of pottery having been found there before, nor had Mr. Shick, the chief local archaeologist, knowledge of any such finds. One foot below the surface of the chambers, charcoal was found, indicating that the workmen had lighted a fire.

The stone from this underground quarry was chosen in preference to that of Zion Hill or of the Mount of Olives, because it offers "a thick bed of the pure white 'Malake' (stone), compact in quality, and durable, yet easily worked. This is a finely granular stone, and under the microscope is seen to be composed of grains of fine calcareous sand and organic fragments cemented together. It is not, like some of the limestones of the region, an actual chalk, composed of foraminiferal shells, but is really a fine-grained white marble[1]." There is a trickling spring on the right side, but the water is unpleasant to the taste.

The history of this quarry is uncertain, and though there is no good ground for doubting the tradition that it was used by Solomon, still no evidence on this point has thus far been discovered. It was no doubt in existence in the time of Herod, and is perhaps referred to by Josephus under the name of the Royal Caverns situated on the north side of the City[2]. Its first mention in modern times is contained in the work of Mujr ed Dîn, who wrote his *Uns al Jalîl* in 1496[3].

[1] Dawson, p. 92.

[2] *Wars*, IV, 2, cited in the *Survey of Western Palestine: Jerusalem*. London, 1884, p. 6.

[3] See von Hammer, *Fundgruben des Orients*, cited by Edward Robinson, *Later Biblical Researches*, Boston, 1856, p. 191. *Palestine under the Moslems*, by

Robinson states that the quarry was open for a short time in the days of Ibrahim Pasha, about 1844, and rumour affirmed, he says, "that his soldiers entered and found water within. A year or two since it was again opened, and Mr. Weber, a Prussian Consul at Beirut, with the Mussulman whom we visited on Zion, and another, went in and followed the passage a long way; but as they had neither lights nor compass they could not be sure of the direction nor of the distance. A few days afterwards, when they attempted to repeat the visit with lights, they found the entrance walled up. The Mutsellim had learned that Franks had entered the grotto. This account was afterwards confirmed to me at Beirut by Mr. Weber himself." The discovery of the quarry in modern times is due to Dr. J. T. Barclay, who accidentally found the entrance in 1854[1]. The origin of the name, "Cotton Grotto" (*magharet el Kettan*) or rather linen grotto, is uncertain.

All the signs of quarrying remain, including the niches for the lamps necessary for lighting the subterranean work-place and the soot from the lamps themselves[2]. The method of quarrying was as follows: the rock was blocked out with a metal tool[3] all around; it was then detached by the insertion of small wooden wedges which when swelled with water split the rock apart. The traces of all these processes are perfectly plain. It may be useful to quote the words of an engineer in describing this process[4]: "The methods adopted for the horizontal quarrying

Guy le Strange, p. 12. Compare also *Itinéraires de la Terre Sainte. . . .* par E. Carmoly, Bruxelles, 1847, p. 419; H. Sauvaire, *Histoire de Jérusalem et d'Hébron*, Paris, 1876.

[1] *The City of the Great King, or Jerusalem as it was. as it is, and as it is to be,* by J. T. Barclay, M.D., Philadelphia, 1858, pp. 456-468.

[2] See Sir William Dawson, p. 95

[3] See "Chisel Marks in the Cotton Grotto at Jerusalem," by Baurath Shick, and "Note" on the same subject, by W. M. Flinders Petrie, *Quarterly Statement of the Palestine Exploration Fund*, January, 1892, pp. 24-27.

[4] *Quarrying Methods of the Ancients*, by W. F. Durfee, M.AM.Soc.M.E. *The Engineer's Magazine*, July, 1894, vol. VII, No. 4, pp. 474-491.

of the granite blocks of ordinary size was to cut a narrow groove two or three inches deep, parallel with a vertical face of rock, at such distance as the width of the desired stone required; in the bottom of this groove rectangular holes were made, about two inches long, one inch wide, and two inches deep; these were usually placed about four inches apart; dry wooden plugs were then driven tightly into these holes, and the spaces between them in the groove first mentioned, filled with water; and the expansion of the plugs as they absorbed the water split the stone in the lines of the holes. No more uniform and simple application of sufficient force for the purpose could possibly have been desired." Ample evidence exists of the use of this method of quarrying in ancient times, and its survival even to modern times is attested. That this method was, and is still, practised in Egypt is affirmed by Professor Erman, the best authority on ancient Egypt, who states that "the procedure by which the old Egyptian stonemasons extricated the blocks can be distinctly recognized. At distances, generally of about six inches, they chiselled holes in the rock, in the case of the larger blocks, at any rate, to the depth of six inches. Wooden wedges were forcibly driven into these holes; these wedges were made to swell by being moistened, and the rock was thus made to split. The same process is still much employed at the present day [1]."

The use of the expansive power of wedges when soaked with water, is not, however, confined in modern times to Egypt. It is still employed at Mardin in Asiatic Turkey, although gunpowder has been in use there for four centuries. The quarries at Mardin, like those in Jerusalem, are underground, and the dressing of the stone is largely carried on within the quarry. Professor George P. Merrill, of the United States Natural Museum, has pointed out that this process either survived, or was rediscovered, in the last

[1] *Life in Ancient Egypt*, described by Adolf Erman, translated by H. M. Ferard. Macmillan, 1894, p. 471.

century in New England [1]. Dr. Daniel G. Brinton informs me that the quarries of Westchester County, Pennsylvania, which have been in existence for about 140 years, are worked by the same method. Quarrying by fire is employed in India and Peru, and the use of the expansive force of the wooden wedge was common in Mexico and Peru.

Professor Graetz sums up what is known from Biblical sources of the quarrying work done for the Temple in these words: "Eighty thousand of these unhappy beings worked in the stone quarries day and night by the light of lamps. They were under the direction of a man from Biblos (Giblem), who understood the art of hewing heavy blocks from rocks, and of giving the edges the necessary shape for dove-tailing. Twenty thousand slaves removed the heavy blocks from the mouth of the quarry, and carried them to the building site [2]."

The Biblical statement is as follows: "And the king commanded, and they hewed out (brought away) great stones, costly stones, to lay the foundation of the house with wrought stone; and Solomon's builders and Hiram's builders and the Gebalites did fashion them, and prepared the timber and the stones to build the house [3]."

The only place in which the word quarry actually occurs in the Old Testament is 1 Kings vi. 7: "And the house, when it was in building, was built of stone made ready at the quarry: and there was neither hammer nor axe nor any tool of iron heard in the house, while it was in building [4]."

It is true that the Authorized Version renders פְּסִילִים in Judges iii. 19 and 26 by quarries, but this is altered in the Revised Version, and the former rendering is no doubt

[1] *Stones for Buildings and Decoration*, p. 325.

[2] *History of the Jews*, by Professor H. Graetz, vol. I (Philadelphia, The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1891).

[3] 1 Kings v. 17 and 18; cf. also 1 Chron. xxii. 2 and 15.

[4] The Hebrew word translated quarry is מַחְצֵב.

incorrect; the term apparently means either stone images (its usual use) or localities where there was an especial cult of such images[1].

The passage in Kings, just cited, is fully explained by the situation of the quarry and the undoubted fact that the stones were quarried underground. The sound of the tool could certainly not be heard on the Temple Hill from the underground chambers at the Damascus Gate, and probably not in any part of the City.

It might seem at first sight that the underground quarrying by wedges or fire would offer an explanation of the statement concerning the stones to be used for the altar. In Exod. xx. 25 (R. V.), we read, "And if thou make me an altar of stone, thou shalt not build it of hewn stones: for if thou lift up thy tool upon it, thou hast polluted it."

Further considerations, however, show that this is not possible, and indicate that the stones referred to must have been boulders. This view is amply confirmed by an historical account in the Talmud, kindly pointed out by Mr. S. Schechter, of Cambridge.

In tract Midoth 36 a, it is stated that the stones for the altar were from the valley of Beth-Kerem, that they dug down to the virgin soil (or unbroken ground), and that they were perfect stones not touched by iron.

The Beth-Kerem (house of the vineyard) mentioned here does not seem to have been identified by the geographers. One naturally thinks of the passage in Jer. vi. 1, "Raise up a signal on Beth-hakerem" (cf. also Neh. iii. 14). This place is usually identified with the so-called Frank mountain near Jerusalem, but it is more likely that it is the same as the modern Ain Karem (spring of the vineyard). On the ridge above Ain Karem are cairns which may have been used as beacons of old. One is 40 feet high and

[1] The authority of the Targum is, however, in favour of quarries; still as it refers to a place in the neighbourhood of Gilgal, it is not especially significant in the present connexion. The verb פסל in a number of Targumic passages means to quarry.

130 feet in diameter, with a flat top measuring 40 feet across [1].

The late Professor Robertson Smith fully demonstrated the significance of cairns in connexion with the altar among Syrian tribes[2], while in America some of the North Coast Indians set up cairns in place of the ordinary totem-posts.

CYRUS ADLER.

[1] *Quarterly Statement Palestine Exploration Fund*, 1881, p. 271 ; *Palestine*, by Rev. Archibald Henderson, Edinburgh, 1893, p. 190.

[2] *Fundamental Institutes of Semitic Religions*, pp. 183 and 185 ff.

DR. WIENER ON THE DIETARY LAWS.

DR. WIENER'S Treatise on the Jewish Dietary Laws is one of the most important books on the Jewish religion which has appeared during the last quarter of a century [1]. Is it characteristic of the times that, in England at least, it has made so little stir? The orthodox party has perhaps tried to ignore it, and true reformers are far and few. Small, indeed, is the percentage of educated Jews in this country who observe the dietary laws, but smaller still is the percentage of the transgressors who trouble their heads for a moment about the justification of their own disobedience. Nevertheless, a great book like Dr. Wiener's must ultimately win its way and do its work. It is *there*, and it cannot be killed.

Nor can it be refuted. It may have its mistakes, but it is a powerful indictment; the more impressive, perhaps, when we call to mind the man who drew it up. Dr. Wiener has passed beyond the range of praise or blame. But when he wrote and published his work he was already an octogenarian, and could care but little for its effect upon himself. He had been for many years Rabbi of the Jewish Community in the small Prussian town of Oppeln, and he was bound, when asked, to give ritual decisions on all the casuistic minutiae of the dietary laws in true accordance with the Code. It is wonderful, in reading his book, to think what wastes of ritualistic barrenness are still connected

[1] *Die jüdischen Speisegesetze nach ihren verschiedenen Gesichtspunkten zum ersten Male wissenschaftlich-methodisch geordnet und kritisch beleuchtet*, von Dr. A. Wiener (Breslau, 1895).

with religion[1]. Charges of inconsistency could freely be brought against him. He had nothing to gain by his attack upon the dietary laws: he had, if anything, a good deal to lose. Some would say he was putting a weapon in the hand of the Anti-Semites, others that dirty linen must not be washed in public (which means that it must never be washed at all), while all the eager devotees of the Talmud and the Shulchan Aruch, all the neo-orthodox school, at present so rampant in Germany, partly through the dubious influence of the Seminary at Breslau, would empty their full-stored armoury of vituperation and abuse. The old man was moved to speak by higher considerations: love of Judaism, still so hampered by obsolete ritualism and oriental superstitions, would not suffer him to keep silence unto the end.

Dr. Wiener's book deals with one of the two great evils in our modern Judaism: one of the two great barriers to internal progress and development, and to external influence upon the world beyond.

The Jewish dietary laws are a mere survival. They are a bit of Asia in Europe, which can never prosper in their new environment; or rather they belong to a stage of religious custom which for all civilized persons has utterly passed away. The essential doctrines of the Jewish religion are precisely those which are most independent of place and of time. They are not more Asiatic than European: not more past than present. They are human and divine. It is these doctrines which lifted Judaism up and out of the Asiatic religions around it in the earlier stages of its career, and which marked it off from its neighbours. *Its least characteristic element is its dietary code.* Take up any commentary upon Leviticus and you will find parallels to the dietary laws of the Bible and of the Talmud in dozens of races and religions. The lower down you go in the

[1] *Speisegesetze*, p. 121, n. 2; 247, n. 1: the latter note is of a very curious and distressing character, but well worthy of the fullest consideration.

scale of religions, the more rules and restrictions do you generally find.

I spoke of two great evils: I referred to the Jewish laws about food, and to the Jewish laws about women. Both these unfortunate classes of laws partly rest upon certain primordial superstitions; superstitions which would be scouted at the present day by all such educated persons as still observe these laws. But that they rest upon and grew out of these superstitions does not now admit of doubt. The science of comparative religion cannot be ignored. Certain things we know, and all the protests in the world will not make us again ignorant. We know, e. g., that the custom of avoiding blood, or of drinking it on certain solemn occasions, rests on a superstition. We know that the basis of the prohibition in the Pentateuchal law ("for the blood is the life") is in itself a partial expression or embodiment of that superstition, and we further know that a peculiar aspect of that superstition has had the most far-reaching effects in the relation of the sexes to each other, and still lives a shadowy life in certain enactments of the Jewish ceremonial law. These things we know, and no one can get out of them and of their implications, because he does not find them convenient, or even because they interfere with certain cherished observances. It interfered with some people's views of religion exceedingly when science asserted that the earth went round the sun, but the interference did not prevent the fact, and gradually people had to shape their religion more or less in accordance with the fact.

The superstitions on which the fabric of the dietary laws has been reared I will not now indicate in detail. A determining superstition was this: that certain kinds of physical cleanness or uncleanness are of vast importance from the point of view of religion and personal safety. One point I may add further: the dietary laws, in their origin, and probably in their development, have had nothing whatever to do (except unconsciously) either

with self-control or with sanitation. I emphasize the last three words: *or with sanitation.* I will do the founders and developers of the dietary laws the justice to say that they, at all events, did honestly, if mistakenly, institute and observe them from a religious intent. They did not confound religion with hygiene.

The dietary laws, and other customs of similar kind, resting on similar superstitions, were no essential element of that *un*popular religion, which was preached by Amos, Hosea and Isaiah, and which constitutes the true basis of Judaism. The dietary laws were part and parcel of the popular religion, to which the prophets were opposed. They only became incorporated and adopted as part and parcel of the Jewish law because of the alliance between the priest and the prophet. The priest adopted some of the prophetic principles, but he retained some of his own priestly observances and conceptions. The people could only be won over to the doctrines of the prophets, or rather to some of them, by casting the aegis of orthodoxy over a mass of popular customs and superstitions. Hence the ceremonial law, as we have it in the Pentateuch. The original contributions which Judaism made to religion are precisely the highest and most spiritual elements in Pentateuch, Prophets and Psalter. About the dietary laws, or the laws about women (the swelling belly and the rotting thigh, e. g.), there is nothing characteristic or original whatever. Here, again, dispute is unavailing. It is not I, a nobody, who says so: it is science.

It is a crying necessity of the time that at least the Rabbinic developments of the dietary laws should be *authoritatively* removed. People say, "they are dying a natural death as it is, there is no necessity to hurry the dissolution." But, as Dr. Wiener points out, such people forget that, in scores of cases, these laws are disobeyed not from conviction, but from indifference or carelessness or convenience. They forget that they are still regarded as an essential part of orthodox Judaism, and that every

Rabbi is bound to say that they ought to be observed, even as he is himself bound to observe them. They forget that this divorce of theory and practice is of the gravest harm all round, harmful both to the influence of Judaism upon those within its pale and to its position and influence in the world beyond[1]. Is Judaism always to be regarded as an antiquarian, obsolete, oriental religion, made up of and constituted by strange and funny customs which even its own adherents, as soon as they are Europeanized, begin gradually to throw aside and disregard?

It may, indeed, be said that the superstitions on which the dietary laws were built up are now forgotten. It needs the investigations of scholars even to recall them. How, then, are we to regard them if we ignore their true and scientific origin? We may suppose them to be arbitrary decrees of God, and this is a favourite point of view in the Talmud itself. By some odd coincidence the very same rules which in other nations grew up as customs, God decreed to the Israelites as immutable laws. The all wise and all good God revealed to Moses the exact details of *Shechitah*: the Talmud asserts this and even essays to prove it from the Bible. God himself told Moses how sheep and oxen and chickens were to be killed, and we must not inquire into the reasons of God's commands, we must simply obey them. But this point of view is hopeless for modern times. Who will believe in a God who reveals rules about slaughtering cattle, and solemnly ordains that milk must not be eaten with meat? The whole thing seems to us now, at the best child-like and strange, at the worst unworthy and degrading.

We can also regard the dietary laws as mere sanitary enactments. Well, even if they are this, let us observe them *as such*, and not injure religion by giving them a false religious wrapping or homage. Some of them, moreover, are not sanitary, but as Dr. Wiener shows, distinctly the reverse. Or, you can say, whatever the origin

[1] Pp. 112, 426.

of these laws, I choose to obey them now, because they are ascetic exercises, disciplinary rules in self-control and self-restraint. This point of view, unknown, I believe, to the Talmud [1], is the best defence that can be made of them, but is of necessity temporary and transient. The son of a man who would only eat a chicken killed in one particular way, and who would never eat milk and meat together, because he believed that he was fulfilling a law of God, may continue to observe these enactments from the point of view of ascetic exercises and moral training, even although he believes that these customs were not divinely ordered at all, and that they are the outgrowth of purely human superstitions. But the son of the man who observes them from the point of view of self-control will hardly continue their observance. He will look at them as they are in themselves, at their origin and purpose, at their social effects, at their relation to his religious opinions, and to the society in which he moves and lives, at their influence upon Judaism in the present and as a whole—and so looking and so judging, he will, I think, feel bound or feel tempted—take whichever verb you will—to observe them no more.

Dr. Wiener's book is on the dietary laws in general. But his real attack is on the dietary laws, not of the Pentateuch, but of the Rabbis. Nor is this differentiation either irrational or surprising. For one of the great objections which attaches to the Rabbinic laws, namely, their burdensome and restrictive character, scarcely applies to the Pentateuchal laws at all. The Pentateuchal laws are fourfold: (*a*) the law not to eat blood; (*b*) the law not to eat an animal which has died of itself, or has been "torn" by a wild beast; (*c*) the law not to eat fat; (*d*) the law not to eat certain specific animals and birds and fishes. The first two laws in their real meaning no one would think of disobeying. The third would, I admit, if obeyed, prove burdensome and

[1] P. 352. It is most interesting to see how Isaak Arama attacked the hygienic point of view.

circumscribing. The fourth is neither one nor the other. I was myself brought up to obey it, and out of respect for my mother I still do so. To my knowledge I have never partaken deliberately of pig, hare, lobster, and the rest of them; but I have never found these abstentions either burdensome in themselves, or preventive of my free social intercourse with Christians.

Hence omitting the law about fat (which was obviously a mere appanage of the obsolete system of sacrifices) the Pentateuchal dietary laws might at any rate continue for a time. Geiger notoriously thought otherwise. "Sint ut sunt aut non sint" was his maxim. Leave them as they are or abolish them altogether. In Germany, it may be observed, there is no *via media* in practice. Either people follow the entire Rabbinical code, or they eat hare as freely as they cook their chop in butter. But Dr. Wiener, while admitting the obsoleteness in religious principle both of the Biblical and of the Rabbinical dietary laws, thinks that a distinction can still be made. Let reformers at all events exert all their efforts to abolish the Rabbinical laws: the Biblical ordinances can be left for a space alone. For one thing they are neither burdensome nor restrictive, and for another the Bible is after all a greater and a more authoritative book than the Talmud or the Shulchan Aruch[1].

Dr. Wiener's work suffers a little from the garrulousness of age. But on the whole it is well and logically arranged. He begins with a short introduction, to which, however, is immediately added an epilogue, that might perhaps have been better allocated to the end. Then follows the treatment of the dietary laws themselves, in eight divisions. A summing up and two valuable appendices complete the whole. The eight divisions treat of (1) The sinew that shrank, (2) Milk and meat, (3) Fat, (4) Blood, (5 and 6) *Nevelah* and *Terefah*, (7) Unclean beasts, birds and fishes, (8) Mixtures.

It is not my purpose to enter here into a full review and

[1] Cp. pp. 8 n. 2, 10 k, 418, 483.

criticism of Dr. Wiener's admirable book. I still hope that some adequate scholar, who sees things much as Dr. Wiener saw them, may review his work in the pages of this Quarterly. I will only here notice a few of the points which the wise old Rabbi brings forward.

First a word as to the sanitary wisdom of the dietary laws. It is commonly supposed that these laws, if nothing else, are at all events, whether by good luck or good management, admirable from the point of view of hygiene. Whereas the truth is that even here they are somewhat a failure. The law which the ingenuity of the Rabbis evolved out of the story of Jacob's wrestling with the angel rests to begin with, as Dr. Wiener shows, upon an anatomical impossibility. Let that, however, pass. The "porging" necessitated by this Rabbinic law removes from orthodox Jews "the best and most nutritive parts of the meat[1]." Still less hygienic are the Rabbinic laws about salting and washing meat in order to drain it of every possible driblet of blood. Remember that these laws are still in force in every orthodox household, and that they are still part and parcel of orthodox Judaism. Now let us hear their hygienic effect.

Dr. Wiener quotes medical authority to the following effect:

> Diseases of the intestines are exceedingly common among Jews of both sexes. The dietary laws are partly the cause of this. They make a meat diet less accessible to the poorer classes, and even of those animals which they may eat, the meat is divested by means of salting and washings of its nutritive elements, *so dass kaum mehr als das faserige Gewebe dem Magen zugeführt werden kann*[2].

Another authority, Dr. Niemann by name, gives similar evidence:

> Mit dem Wasser des Fleisches werden Eiweiss und Fleischstoff, die Milchsäure und Salze vom Kochsalze ausgezogen. Die ausfliessende Salzlake wird entfernt und mit ihr ein Theil der löslichsten und wesentlichsten Stoffe des Fleisches[3].

[1] P. 33. [2] P. 215. [3] P. 216.

And a third medical man, Dr. Pappenheim, says:

> Das Salzen setzt den Nahrungsstoff des Fleisches erheblich herab, indem das Salz das Wasser aus demselben entzieht, mit diesem aber die grosse Menge der Phosphorsäure und des Kalis, beinahe alle Extractivstoffe, das lösliche Eiweiss und einen grossen Theil des Fleisches extrahirt[1].

Even the laws about slaughtering are by no means so hygienic and scientific as is commonly affirmed. The examination of the carcasses is often inadequate. Dr. Phillipson admitted that the distinguishing marks of "healthy" and "forbidden" laid down by the Rabbis can no longer hold water. In some directions they go too far, in others not far enough[2]. In any case, should a minister of religion decide when meat is or is not fit for human food, or a veterinary surgeon? The relegation of such questions to a minister as a part of his religious duties would be farcical were it not so intensely sad. *Ars longa; vita brevis.* And it is with endless details about slaughtering and "mixtures," and with pages on pages of casuistic distinctions and difficulties, that the budding Rabbi has to fill his mind and occupy his time. The great thoughts and books of the world he has less leisure to learn and to read.

Another point which Dr. Wiener presses home is indeed so glaring that little knowledge is needed for its making. In order that a Biblical authority may be found for the Talmud's amazing mass of dietary enactments, the plain words of Scripture have to be twisted and perverted beyond recognition. One wonders that any man who has learnt grammar and exegesis can still obey laws which have been devised on such a basis.

Thus the odd *custom* to refrain from eating the "sinew of the hip," the mention of which a redactor most unfortunately appends to the legend of Jacob's wrestling with the angel (its real origin must be sought in very different

[1] P. 216.

[2] P. 242, and especially pp. 501-504.

connexions), is perverted by the Talmud into a *law*. This is done by mistranslating the words "Therefore the Israelites eat not of the sinew of the hip unto this day" into "Therefore the Israelites must not eat of the sinew of the hip for ever." Grammatically this is impossible; historically it is absurd. If the law-makers of the Pentateuch had desired to turn the custom into a law they would have included it in their codes. The probable truth is that this was one of the popular superstitions which they refused to sanction or to incorporate.

Again, the Pentateuch is urgent against the drinking of blood, and I have already indicated that it here adopts a widespread and hoary superstition. But it also partly reacts against superstition: for blood being very holy and *taboo*, it was drunk on various solemn occasions for magical and idolatrous purposes. In any case, however, what the codes forbid is the absolute drinking of blood; or again, the partaking of raw meat with the blood still in it. There is no thought of elaborately draining the meat of every particle of blood within it after the liquid blood has been removed. Nor is there any hint that the animal ought to be killed in one way rather than in another, in order that there may be a better chance that more blood may issue out of the meat, and less blood be left within it. Salting and *Shechitah* are pure figments and inventions of the Rabbis, without any Scriptural basis. What men in those ancient days either feared or desired to partake of was real liquid blood; and it is only this which the Bible forbids the use of, partly because it stands on the level of its time, and does regard the blood as holy, and partly because it stands above the level of its time, and seeks to prevent the idolatrous superstitions and ceremonies in which the drinking of blood played a central and prominent part.

More amazing still is the absolute inversion and *bouleversement* which the Rabbis have made of the Biblical laws about *Nevelah* and *Terefah*. The Pentateuch says, as clearly as words can say it, first that the Israelites are not to eat an

animal which is found dead. That is *Nevelah*. Secondly, they are not to eat an animal which has been "torn" by a wild beast. That is *Terefah*. If you find a dead bird, e.g. quite whole and uninjured, you must not eat it; it has "died of itself": it is "unclean." That is *Nevelah*. If you find a dead bird with its feathers scattered around and the mark of a talon upon its breast, you must not eat it any the more. It has been torn by a bird of prey. That is *Terefah*. All this is perfectly clear, and none of us would desire to transgress so moderate and wholesome a law.

The Talmud, however, absolutely inverts the whole thing, and turns two simple commands which need no explanation into a mountain of oppressive and trifling enactments. According to orthodox Judaism, an animal is *Nevelah* which has not been killed according to all the minute and multitudinous laws of the *Shechitah*; an animal is *Terefah* which, on examination, proves to be afflicted with any trace of a disease recognized as such, not by modern science but by mediaeval Rabbis! So wholly has the natural sense of the Scriptural words disappeared from the minds of the Talmudic authorities, that they positively allow an animal which is found dangerously ill, but is killed before its actual death, to be freely eaten. Only the very pious and the very scrupulous, they say, refrain from such food[1]!

The Talmud asserts that God revealed to Moses all the rules of slaughtering animals. Now can anybody, I ask, in the year 1896, believe this? Does not the belief, or even the statement, verge close on the borders of irreverence and absurdity? And how does the Talmud prove its point? In the Book of Deuteronomy the following passage occurs:

> When the Lord thy God shall enlarge thy border, as he hath promised thee, and thou shalt say, I will eat flesh, because thy soul longeth to eat flesh; thou mayest eat flesh, whatsoever thy soul lusteth after. If the place which the Lord thy God hath chosen

[1] Pp. 241–243.

to put his name there be too far from thee, then thou shalt kill of thy herd and of thy flock, which the Lord hath given thee, *as I have commanded thee*, and thou shalt eat in thy gates whatsoever thy soul lusteth after. Even as the roebuck and the hart is eaten, so thou shalt eat them: the unclean and the clean shall eat of them alike. Only be sure that thou eat not the blood: for the blood is the life; and thou mayest not eat the life with the flesh. Thou shalt not eat it; thou shalt pour it upon the earth as water. Thou shalt not eat it; that it may go well with thee, and with thy children after thee, when thou shalt do that which is right in the sight of the Lord.

What do the italicized words "as I have commanded thee" mean? The answer is simple. The Deuteronomic code, which for the first time enjoined that sacrifices were only to be offered in one central place, namely, at Jerusalem, allowed, as a necessary sequence, that meat might be freely partaken of without a sacrifice. That was a great innovation. Men had been accustomed to eat venison without a sacrifice, but not mutton, kid or beef. Hence the words "as I have commanded thee" refer back to the previous permission or injunction to eat meat, just as if it were venison ("as of the roebuck and the hart"), without a sacrifice. They refer back to this:

Notwithstanding thou mayest kill and eat flesh in all thy gates, whatsoever thy soul lusteth after, according to the blessing of the Lord thy God which he hath given thee: the unclean and the clean may eat thereof, as of the roebuck, and as of the hart. Only ye shall not eat the blood; ye shall pour it upon the earth as water.

The Rabbis, however, evolve from these simple words, "as I have commanded thee," the singular interpretation that God had commanded Moses how animals were to be slaughtered. "Thou shalt kill of thy herd as I have commanded thee," i.e. kill them according to the rules of *Shechitah* which I have already explained to thee! And this interpretation is, I believe, still solemnly maintained and supported by accredited representatives of orthodox Judaism. Once more: it would be ludicrous, if it were not so infinitely sad. Just as strained and as irrational

is the Talmudic elicitation of the worst and most restrictive of all their dietary laws—the prohibition of eating or cooking milk and meat together—out of the simple and direct command of the Pentateuch, "Thou shalt not seethe a kid in its mother's milk." Let the reader peruse Dr. Wiener's book and judge for himself[1].

The immense range and volume of the dietary discussions and laws in the Talmudic and Rabbinic literature are in themselves a mournful monument and evidence of human folly. How appositely does the learned Steinschneider speak of the endless printed matter devoted to this unedifying and unelevating subject, as of "a spiritual desert, in which occasional oases of acuteness displayed in technical distinctions and sub-distinctions alone reveal the indestructible power of thought." What is the reason of it, he asks? I give the answer in his own pregnant German. It is as gentle and considerate as may be.

> Die Antwort liegt freilich ebenso nahe, dass jede einseitige Ausspinnung des Gesetzes ohne sichtbaren Zusammenhang mit den innersten Triebfedern des Geistes und ohne den belebenden Hauch allgemeiner Cultur zu solchen Erscheinungen führe, wie sie die jüdische Halacha nicht allein, wenn auch im ziemlichem Umfange, aufzuweisen hat, entsprechend der durch äussere Schicksale verkümmerten Bildung und dem inneren Drang nach geistiger Thätigkeit[2].

Here is a philosophic excuse for these aridities in the past: but it is no longer valid for maintaining and studying them now. "The five simple words of Scripture, לא תבשל גדי בחלב אמו, have grown in the Talmud into twenty-eight folio pages. The Shulchan Aruch has expanded the command into eleven sections and sixty-two sub-sections, not to mention the legion of other writers and of *responsa* upon this same subject[3]." "The three words of Scripture, טרפה לא תאכלו, have become fifty-nine folio pages in the Talmud. Maimonides draws up a list of seventy kinds of *Terefah* alone, without including the kinds of *Nevelah*.

[1] Pp. 41–120. [2] P. 284, n. 2. [3] P. 120.

The writers on this subject are legion; a *fruitful*, or better a *fearful* productivity has been displayed upon the dietary laws in general, and upon *Terefah* and *Nevelah* in particular[1]."

Young men, in the few precious years that they can give to study, are still, in Jewish colleges and seminaries, made to devote many hours of the week to Halachic lore. Compare the curriculum of an orthodox Jewish seminary for ministers with the curriculum, for example, which young divinity students undergo in the Unitarian Training College at Oxford. Which gives the more time to the reading of great books that still help forward and onward the thought and action of man? Which has the more time to spare for philosophy, for sociology, for the history of human thought and human civilization? Or will *Tractate Chullin* do a man more good than Lecky's *Morals*? will Maimonides' *Hilchoth Shechita* be better for him than Spinoza's *Ethics* or Mill's *Political Economy*? Is it not hard that the students' time in the seminary should be largely occupied with a philosophy that is obsolete and sterile, and with laws that are childish and unedifying? It is all very well to boast that the methods of modern science are now applied to Jewish lore. But if the lore be often ethically and spiritually valueless, no degree of scientific application or of trained pedagogic imparting will make it educationally profitable. The will and the soul, and in the higher sense, the mind are alike starved. Instead of bread, the young and healthy appetite is offered a stone.

Dr. Wiener does not scruple to point out that to the minute observation of the dietary laws there are, at any rate in Western Europe, grave ethical and religious dangers attached.

The German proverb is only too true, he says, in regard to religion as to other things: *Im engen Kreis verengert sich der Sinn.* "If average persons lay great weight on trivialities, the capacity to appreciate great truths or to

[1] P. 258.

realize the great purposes of life fades away. Superficiality, mechanical observance, and an hypocrisy, which is real though often unconscious, gradually overmaster them[1]."

Moreover, the danger against which the prophets protested so loudly must always exist so long as human nature is what it is. A scrupulous observance of dietary laws, and of other laws of similar kind, will always tend to be regarded by the average man as equivalent to religion. What does the word *fromm* mean in orthodox circles? It means a *kosher* household, a double or triple set of dishes, and so on. Is not this an instance of the degradation of words which might have been included by Archbishop Trench in his famous little study?

Zu welcher Carrikatur, exclaims the dear old Rabbi, *wird doch unser herrliches Judenthum durch die spätere Form und seliggesprochene ausgedehnteste Küchen-Frömmigkeit und Heiligkeit!*[2]

Dr. Wiener is especially emphatic upon the evil effects of the dietary laws on the character of Jewish women of the middle and lower classes. I quote his words, which are spoken from experience, in the original German:

Wahrlich, nicht blos die unnöthigen, zwecklosen Entbehrungen und kleinen Quälereien bedauern und beklagen wir, es erfüllt uns noch mehr mit Unmuth, mit Schmerz, der Umstand, dass diese minutiösen Uebungen einen kleinlichen Geist erzeugen, bei dem weiblichen, ohnehin zum Kleinlichen geneigten Geschlecht einen höheren Gesichtskreis verschliessen; dieses fortwährende Rechnen mit so kleinlichen Faktoren, die für Grundpfeiler der Religion ausgegeben werden, verödet das Gemüth und lässt höhere Gedanken nicht aufkommen. Mittelmässige Naturen leiden Einbusse an idealem und ethischem Gehalt durch diese unerquickliche, minutiöse Küchenreligiosität; sie glaubten und glauben noch heute, der gewissenhaften Ausübung mancher weit wichtigeren Riten, ja, vielleicht gar der sittlichen Pflichten weit weniger obliegen zu müssen, weil sie betreffs vieler ceremonieller Observanzen, speciell der Speisegesetze, eine peinliche Scrupulosität an den Tag legen. Den schädlichen Einfluss dieser unnützen, belästigenden, übertriebenen, minutiösen

[1] P. 425, &c.

[2] P. 269. The note on the same page is too painful for me to transcribe.

Observanzen muss auch das blödeste Auge erkennen in der Praxis unserer Frauen bezüglich des Pessachrituals: wie geht da in ihnen die ganze, grosse herrliche Idee der Befreiung von ägyptischer Knechtschaft so ganz unter! Da besuchen viele Frauen während der ganzen Pessachzeit kein Gotteshaus, da wird Gebet, Andacht, Belehrung ganz hintenangesetzt, weil ja zu Haus strenge Wacht gehalten werden müsse, dass nur ja kein Atom des fingirten Chamez in die Küche komme. So machen sie denn das Nebensächliche zur Hauptsache, diese aber—kaum zur Nebensache[1].

To a practical religious evil, which is directly due to the dietary laws, Dr. Wiener also calls attention. His words are, I believe, applicable not only to Germany but also to Great Britain.

"The maintenance of a special butcher (who is, moreover, often wholly uncultivated, and causes the mockery and contempt of Christians) prevents the appointment, in poor communities, of an educated religious teacher." And this butcher is, in such cases, the religious minister of the community. Can it be wondered at if Christians find it difficult to understand that persons whose religion compels them to maintain such officials, either are or want to be real Europeans? Dr. Wiener adds:

In Folge der rabbinischen Casuistik, die weder auf biblischem Grunde beruht, noch irgend einem guten Zwecke dient, ist der Schächter, oft ein naturalisirter polnischer Ignorant, der wichtigste Gemeindebeamte geworden, dem, wenn Interessen collidiren oder nur über geringe Mittel verfügt werden kann, Alles und jeder Andere zu weichen hat. Daher denn der ungenügende und verwilderte Religionsunterricht der Jugend und der geist- und gemüthlose Schlendrian des Gottesdienstes in allen unbemittelten Gemeinden — abgesehen von der Missachtung und dem Hohn, den ein Schächter, der nur zu schächten versteht, auf sich selbst und auf Juden und auf Judenthum ladet[2].

And here we pass to another very important point: the influence of the dietary laws upon the relation of Judaism to the outer world.

At present if any attempt is made within the Jewish

[1] P. 95, n. 1. Cp. pp. 216, n. 1, 217, 218, 424, n. 2, 425, n. 2.

[2] P. 424.

community to bring to light a religious evil, if any attempt is made to urge reform and progress, we are at once met by the rejoinder: "Hush! In the face of anti-Semitism, not a word must be said which could imply that all the Jews are not perfectly united, not a word which could imply that official Judaism has any shadow of fault; every existing custom and rite must be defended and justified, and no grain of evil must be admitted to inhere in it." Any amount of laxity and indifference is of less consequence: every decade the number of those increases who, partly for lack of a religion which is in full accordance with the other aspects and sides of their mental, moral, and spiritual lives, drop off from active participation in communal work, and cease to have any true religion whatever. It is all of minor consequence to the one supreme end of "crying Peace, peace, where there is no peace," of ignoring and denying "the hurt of the daughter of their people."

But though this organized arrangement of silence serves the turn of the hyper-orthodox and neo-orthodox party, while, as Dr. Wiener complains, we, who yearn for a liberal and progressive Judaism, inwardly and outwardly in accordance with our deepest convictions and ideas, bear the loss and the discredit, there would be far less ground of complaint if the end held out to us were really gained. And yet the policy of silence and stagnation, on the plea of putting no additional weapon in the reckless hands of anti-Semitism, though it has won over many who would otherwise be opposed to it, does actual harm to our position in the big outer world beyond our pale. No anti-Semite was ever converted from his anti-Semitism by the inspiring spectacle of Jewish orthodoxy, neglected in deed but maintained in word. On the contrary. Nothing suits his turn better than that the Jews should consist of two classes only; first, the very orthodox, whose religion is Asiatic and not European, secondly, the indifferentists who have no religion at all. Reform Judaism is a thorn in

his flesh. For without it he can argue: the Jews are a people who *either* refuse to eat with us and pray for their restoration to Palestine, *or* who are arch-materialists without belief in the soul or in God. Dr. Wiener rightly maintains that with the exception of the Jewish method of slaughtering, the anti-Semite desires nothing better than that the Jews should differ in all their rites and usages as much as possible from their Christian fellow-citizens. The greater the difference, the more complete the marking off of Jew from Gentile, the better and more evident his case [1].

But not every Gentile critic of Judaism is an anti-Semite. Jews are far too ready to assume that this is the case. It is pleasant to avoid the unpleasant task of trying to find out whether there is any truth in any Gentile criticism, and it is so easy. *Rishuss*, anti-Semitism, we say, and the thing is done. But though the method be easy, it is perilous.

Dr. Wiener, for example, points out that, more than perhaps any other of the dietary laws, the prohibition of cooking or eating milk and meat together provokes the satire and sarcasm of outsiders. He adds: "Ein Volk wird zum Theil nach dem innern Gehalte seiner religiösen Verordnungen und Riten beurtheilt und geschätzt [2]." John Spencer was, as he says, no anti-Semite, when he wrote on the milk and meat regulation: *quin et eo stultitiae deventum est hodie, quod vasa duplicia, altera ad carnes, altera ad cibos lactarios, coquendos comparent: cultros duos, unum ad carnem, alterum ad caseum, scindendum deferant. Duo etiam in mensa salina habere solent, ne carnes et lacticinia uno eodemque sale condiantur: duo etiam pro utrisque mantilia, notis aut literis distinctis inscripta, ne ab incautis permisceantur* [3].

[1] P. 10 h. [2] P. 116.

[3] *De Legibus Hebraeorum ritualibus*, Book II, chapter IX, section 2 (vol. I, p. 340, ed. 1727); Wiener, *Speisegesetze*, p. 118. Is the double set of salt-cellars and table-napkins true or libellous?

In his remarkable work on Ethics, Prof. Paulsen, who seems somehow to touch upon everything in the world (and usually to illumine it), also touches upon the Jews. I do not think that he is an anti-Semite. On the other hand, I do not think that whatever he has said is true. But I do say that the conditions which he appends to his claim of complete civil and political rights for the Jews deserve the deepest and fullest consideration. They may sting, but at all events they open the eyes. They let us see ourselves as others see us, and the others are not necessarily our foes. Still more are they worthy of our consideration if a lingering remnant of the old prophetic desire still exists among us, that Judaism should exercise any influence whatever upon humanity at large.

Zu fordern wird allerdings sein, dass wer als Gleichberechtigter angesehen werden will, sich auch ganz auf den Boden des Gemeinschaftlebens stellt; wer von Religionswegen gehindert ist, mit Andern zu Tische zu sitzen oder in der Schule am Sonnabend die Feder anzurühren, der schliesst sich selber aus, und es ist thöricht, unter dem Titel der Toleranz solche anmassliche Abschliessung gelten zu lassen, und dass eine Religion, zu deren Wesen eine bestimmte Verstümmelung des Körpers oder eine besondere Form der Tötung des Schlachttiers gehört, Gleichstellung mit der Religion zivilisierter Völker beansprucht und durchsetzt, ist auch eine seltsame Thatsache. Wer durch solche Dinge sich selber ausserhalb stellt, der darf sich nicht beklagen, wenn er draussen bleibt; wer aber entschlossen ist, sich der ganzen Lebensgemeinschaft des Volks anzuschliessen, dem soll seine Herkunft und seine religiöse Überzeugung kein Hinderniss sein[1].

[1] Paulsen, *System der Ethik*, vol. II, p. 493. The attitude towards the Jewish observance of Saturday seems to me unnecessarily severe. There is nothing "oriental" in the observance of the sabbath. But here again it is Jewish orthodoxy which is partly at fault. For from the orthodox point of view the objection is not so much to attendance at school in general, as to the act of writing when there. When I was at Oxford, some of my orthodox Jewish contemporaries would attend lectures and *read* their Demosthenes and Cicero on Saturday, only they would take and make no notes. It was this letter worship which their Christian fellow-students failed to understand.

Dr. Wiener, on the Jewish side, says somewhat to the same effect.

"Separation and isolation were the watchwords of the Middle Ages. The motto for the present time must be union and attachment. And, therefore, so far as they are not based upon the pure and clear doctrine of Judaism, all those partition walls and boundary lines must be removed which prevent a close and sympathetic union with our fellow-citizens of other creeds [1]."

Isolation and separation in matters of food and drink are especially calculated, says Dr. Wiener, to make the Jews disliked and misunderstood.

> Exclusiveness on one side leads to exclusiveness on the other. It is right and proper to endure mockery, misery, and even death, for the sake of God, the truth, and our country. But to ascribe a great importance to immaterial rites, and by their eccentric observance to isolate oneself, and thereby to provoke dislike and intolerance, is neither religious nor rational [2].

What a wise, and clear-eyed octogenarian he was! And if we think of the past as well as of the present, we shall, I think, also see his wisdom in the following:

> Mixed marriages and conversions will take place whether the dietary laws are observed or not. Das Herz, der Ehrgeiz, die Eitelkeit, die Gewinnsucht, der Schwachmuth, die Feigheit lassen sich nicht vom rituellen Küchenzettel beherrschen [3].

Is there any hope that in the Jewish communities of western Europe the dietary laws of the Talmud may be formally and authoritatively abolished? Dr. Wiener urges that to expect the Rabbis themselves to move is out of the question. They are either too conservative or too nervous. Can then nothing be done? Are we simply to see, decade after decade, a larger and larger proportion of educated Jews openly violating laws which are still supposed to be an inherent part of their religion, and which all their religious teachers unanimously obey? Is it to

[1] P. 480. [2] P. 456. [3] P. 452.

become more and more impossible because of the yoke of the dietary laws for any educated person to become a Jewish minister? Nothing is so likely to make people drop away from Judaism altogether as the assumption that it is largely made up of a number of obsolete customs, which no "man of the world" can possibly obey. As to any influence of Judaism upon the outer world, any active witnessing to God, that is impossible, so long as its pure doctrine is overshadowed and overcrusted by a mass of oriental, restrictive, and in their origin superstitious observances.

Dr. Wiener believed that the only possible remedy would be a synod called together by a number of intelligent laymen, to which the Rabbis would then also be invited[1]. Is the idea purely visionary? It is not religion or religiousness which would prevent its accomplishment. No; it is a mixture of indifference, apathy, laziness and timidity. And so Judaism languishes, and the hour of its purification is dangerously delayed.

But, perhaps, it will be argued that there is a restraining motive at work to which I have been wilfully blind. Many persons who openly disobey the dietary laws of the Talmud, and perhaps even some persons who disobey the dietary laws of the Pentateuch (especially as to fat), will nevertheless disapprove of this article. They will use what Daniel Deronda so aptly called the logic of the roasting-jack, that must go on to the last turn, when it has been once wound up. They will say, if you once formally allow any rite to be repealed or abolished, you will set the fatal jack in motion, and every distinguishing characteristic of Judaism will gradually be destroyed. It is the thin edge of the wedge. This argument seems to me to show a lack of faith in Judaism and in God. It assumes in the first place that what is characteristic of Judaism is just that part of it which is separative, oriental, ritualistic. It makes Judaism a fetish, as if there were

[1] P. 481.

any good in the preservation of it apart from its religious and ethical truths, or over and above them. It seems to assume that there is some reason and value in the existence of Judaism outside and beyond the *diffusion through the world* of its essential doctrines. As if Judaism were a sort of family or archaeological curiosity that must be preserved in the world's museum of religious oddities! But there is still worse behind.

The argument holds that Judaism is so feeble and flaccid a religion that it can only be kept together by a large integument of ritualistic and unspiritual customs in direct and pointed opposition to the social instincts and ethical feelings of its educated adherents and of the outer world. It assumes that Judaism needs the crutch of oriental customs, wholly out of touch and out of keeping with our Western civilization. It assumes, therefore, that Judaism can never take its place as a European or universal religion. The argument is, therefore, a *reductio ad absurdum*.

And, finally, the argument, though meant to be religious, betrays a want of faith in God. If God be the God of truth, can he be served by the propagation and maintenance of error? If God has entrusted Judaism with a certain work to do, need we fear that he will be unable to accomplish his purpose? It is for us to make Judaism as true and pure and serviceable as we can; it is for God to preserve it. If it has no more work to do, the object of its life is ended. But if it have, it is our duty to make it as fitted for that work as possible. Beyond that it is not ours to go. The future we commit to God.

C. G. MONTEFIORE.

YEDAYA BEDARESI,

A Fourteenth Century Hebrew Poet and Philosopher.

The year 1306 enjoys a terrible notoriety in the annals of the Jews of France. At the beginning of that year, Philip IV, surnamed Le Bel, issued an edict of expulsion against all the Jews living in any of his dominions. The edict practically confiscated all the property of the French Jews, and its terms were so rigorous that any Israelite found on French soil after a certain short space of time became liable to the penalty of death. Philip's mandate was promptly executed by the royal officers, and some 100,000 Jews were mercilessly driven out from their native land—a land in which their fathers had already resided long before Christianity had become the dominant religion there. In consequence of this expulsion, several far-famed Jewish seats of learning that had long been established in various French towns, such as those of Beziers, Lünel, and Montpellier, ceased to exist, since masters and pupils became, like the rest of their unhappy co-religionists, weary wanderers and fugitives. One of these was Yedaya En-Bonet ben Abraham Bedaresi, the object of the present essay.

Yedaya, known also under the poetical pseudonym of Penini, has left no documentary evidence concerning the incidents of his life. The best biography, however, of a man like Yedaya is undoubtedly that which is found in his own works. Biographical material from such a source is, however, liable to vary with the judgment of the critic. Thus there is some diversity of opinion among bibliographers as to the exact date of Yedaya's birth, for while

Bartolocci, Wolf, and de Rossi assert that he was born in 1298, Steinschneider and Neubauer put the year of his birth between 1255 and 1260, without, however, attempting to fix the year of his death. Graetz, again, maintains that Yedaya was born in 1280, and died about 1340, and that his birth-place was Beziers, and not Barcelona, as some bibliographers assert[1]. The only indisputable fact in connexion with Yedaya's early education is this, that he entered the school of Rabbi Meshullam of Beziers when he was fifteen years old.

From Yedaya's numerous and multifarious writings it is obvious that he was a philosopher and a moralist, a talmudical scholar and an expert in medicine, and above all, a clever writer of Hebrew prose and poetry. It is chiefly to his latter capacity that Yedaya owes his prominent position among the Jewish savants of the Middle Ages, and for that reason special attention will have to be paid in the course of this essay to his *chef d'œuvre*, entitled בחינת עולם, or *The Examination of the World*. It is true that Graetz finds fault with this poetical composition, of which he thinks that it has the appearance "of empty grandiloquence and artificiality." But, on the other hand, Munk, in his *Melanges*, p. 495, and Buxtorf, in his *Bibliotheca Rabbinica*, speak very highly of Yedaya's poetical talent, and the latter calls *The Examination of the World* an excellent literary production. And indeed, the same opinion will be shared by all those readers of the בחינת עולם who, like Munk and Buxtorf, are not prejudiced against it on the ground that its style is not so pure, elegant, and clear as that met with in some of the writings of the most prominent representatives of the so-called Spanish and Italian schools of Hebrew poetry. In fact, the little book in question has always enjoyed an extraordinary popularity among the Jews; and it is astonishing to notice the comparatively large number of manuscripts of the original,

[1] Comp. Graetz's *Gesch. d. J.*, VII, p. 277.

and of the commentaries on it, which are to be found in various libraries. In addition to this, it may also be mentioned that the same book has passed through more than forty-four editions, issued with or without commentaries at various times and in various countries. and has been frequently translated into German, as well as into Jargon, once into Latin, English, French, Italian, and Polish. It is interesting to note that the eleventh and twelfth chapters of one of the German editions, issued at Prague in 1795, by Moses Kunitz, were rendered into German by Moses Mendelssohn; and that the French translation, published at Paris in 1629, by Ph. d'Aquin, was dedicated to Cardinal Richelieu. The English version, which appeared in London in 1806, was inscribed by its author, Rabbi Tobias Goodman, to "The Most Reverend Solomon Hirschell, Presiding Rabbi of the German Jews"; and the Latin one, which has for its title, *Examen mundi, R. J. Bedreshitae, latina interpretatione*, was done by A. Uchtman, and issued at Leyden in 1650.

It is curious to notice that the editor of the first of the forty-four known editions of the בחינת עולם, printed, as some bibliographers think, at Mantua between 1476 and 1480, was a lady called Estellina, the wife of a certain Abraham Conath. She was assisted in her task by Jacob Levy, of Tarascon. The last known edition of the book under notice, or rather the greater part of it, was published only a few years ago by Dr. Harkavy, of St. Petersburg, from a MS. in his possession. Dr. Harkavy is also the owner of a hitherto unpublished commentary on the same book, composed in 1508 by Isaac Monçon, of Reggio. In some prefatory lines, the author states that he was induced to write his commentary because he had noticed that many Jewish young men in his country were in the habit of learning the original by heart, without knowing anything about its contents[1]. This curious remark still holds good

[1] למה שראיתי הבחורים המתעננים בהלצה זו עד שיורעים אוהה על פה בפיהם ובשפתותיהם כברוה ולבם רחק מהם.

in its application to the mode in vogue in Russia and Poland, where parts of the Hebrew Bible are often learnt by heart by the Jewish youth in a mechanical manner, whilst their contents remain unknown to the learners. Yet there is something to praise in the method. The young may easily commit to memory passages which they will subsequently understand, and thus their minds may be stored with fine thoughts. In truth, all systems of education proceed on these lines. But the method is undoubtedly a dangerous one.

As regards the style and composition of the בחי׳ עולם, which seems to have been composed by Yedaya after the expulsion of the Jews from France in 1306, it must be admitted at the outset that the general reader will not find them quite in harmony with his modern taste. Already de Sacy, in his *Magasin encyclopédique*, III, p. 321, censures the author of that book for his employing therein certain Biblical phrases in a different sense from that which they bear in the Bible. But he readily admits that the Church fathers during the Middle Ages, and certain Arabic writers, have, at all times, taken the same liberties respectively with the Scriptures and the Koran. The finest of the Spanish-Jewish poets, not excluding Ibn Gebirol himself, allowed themselves the same license; while Charizi often derives his whole point from the witty misuse of a familiar Biblical phrase. Despite this defect, it cannot be denied that the *Bechinath Olam* possesses a peculiar charm of its own. This will easily be detected by those readers who, being well versed both in the Hebrew Bible and in the Midrash and the Talmud, cannot fail to appreciate the art with which Biblical phrases, used with an occasional striking play on words, are composed into a mosaic.

Take, for instance, the following few sentences which occur in Chapter IX[1]: "By no means let thy pride in

[1] אפס כי לא תהיה תפארת המכונות נמשכת—עוד מעט ויצאה רוח אלהים לבזר רכושיך—ויהיו כלא היו חמשים אלפי זהב אשר בקנינם מכרת נפשך; תתהפך הומן כמעט רגע לקחה חן וכביד מעל ראשך—תרד אש האלהים מן השמים ותאכל אותך ואת המשיך.

possessing wealth be of long duration, for at any moment may a blast come from God, which will scatter and disperse all thy treasures. Then will vanish as nought the fifty thousand ducats for which thou hast bartered thy soul, and thy former honour and glory will likewise depart at the sudden reverse of thy fortune. Or a fire may come down from heaven, and devour thee along with thy five myriads of ducats." Here it will at once be seen how cleverly the author uses for his own purpose certain phrases found in the second chapter of 2 Kings, in connexion with the prophet Elijah, and how striking the play on the word חמשיך is.

As this peculiar mode of composition is a marked feature in the whole בחי׳ עולם, a few more examples, having, however, a somewhat different form, may be given here for the sake of illustration. In Chapter IV we read as follows[1]:

"Thy longings in sooth are but passion and lust,
Thy strength sinks asunder like crumbling light dust;
Thy treasures, like thorns, are surrounded with stings,
And thy most lovely possessions but worthless things.
Thy pride is enkindled like flames in the night,
Thy riches, like insects, soon hasten their flight."

And again, in Chapter XI, the author gives the following description of the four seasons of the year[2]:

"The lovely Spring gives me no peace,
For constant cares disturb my ease.
The Summer, too, is full of pain,
Its glow and heat are but my bane.
The Autumn has no charms for me,
From cold and ills I ne'er am free.
When Winter brings its snow and frost,
Oh, then I am undone and lost."

1 החשקים מחשכים וכלי הנשקים שקים
הצנינים צנינים והשושנים קמשונים
הרהבים להבים והזהבים זבובים.

2 האביב לא יאבה השקיטני כאובות במכאובות חרשים יבקעני
חקיץ יקוץ בחיי במצוקות יציקני יקיצני משנת מנוחה מקשב מרירי
החירף יחרפני למות יחרף לבבי מהיות שלו בפגעי הסתיו יסית צנה וסנדיר לבלעני חנם.

Another conspicuous feature of the בחי׳ עולם is its frequent use of poetical metaphors, which the author employs with great aptitude and force. The eighth chapter of the book in question, beginning with the words התבל ים זועף, may fitly serve as an illustration of this, and the following free English translation of it will afford the reader at the same time an insight into the general contents of the whole poem. It runs as follows:

"The world is as a boisterous sea of immense depth and width, and Time forms a fragile bridge built over it. The upper end thereof is fastened to the ground by means of weak ropes, and its lower end leads to a place which is shone upon by the rays of the divine light, emanating from God's majesty. The breadth of the bridge is but one short span, and has no lattice work to afford protection from falling over it. Over this narrow path thou, O son of man, art compelled constantly to go, and notwithstanding all thy might and glory, thou canst not turn either to the right or to the left. Now, threatened as thou art on both sides with death and destruction, how canst thou sustain thy ordinary courage, and how can thy hands remain firm? In vain dost thou pride thyself on the possession of vast treasures obtained by thee by vileness and wickedness; for of what avail are they to thee when the sea rises, and rages, and foams, thus threatening to wreck the little hut wherein thou livest [meaning the body]? Canst thou boast to be able to calm and subdue its powerful waves, or willest thou try to fight against them? Intoxicated with the wine of thy vanity, thou art pushed hither and thither, until thou sinkest into the mighty abyss; and tossed about from deep to deep, thou wilt at last submerge into the foaming surge, and no one will bring thee up to life again."

The ninth and eleventh chapters of the בחי׳ עולם contain some passages which refer to the author's own sufferings, caused to him by the aforementioned expulsion of the Jews from France, and to the cowardice displayed on that occasion by some wealthy French Jews, who, in order to

be permitted to remain in the country, and to retain their earthly possessions, had embraced Christianity. How shamefully these renegades behaved in the face of the great calamity which had befallen their French co-religionists may be seen from the following passages, which occur in Chapter XI. They run thus[1]:

"What care they for those gloomy envoys of fate?
They dance all the night, and they rise very late.
Feasting they love, and high play and flirtation,
And laughter, and pleasure, and wild dissipation.
They look upon evil, of whatever sort,
As a mirth-causing jest, and an innocent sport."

These few extracts from the בחי׳ עולם, together with the above-given English translation of its eighth chapter, may suffice to convey an idea of the style and contents of the whole book. The latter has certainly several faults, which chiefly consist in the frequent use the author makes therein of Chaldaic and Aramaic words and phrases, a proper translation of which is almost impossible. Yet, on the whole, this little poetical composition of Yedaya deserves, for the sake of its many peculiarities, that honourable position which has been accorded to it by general consent in the wide domain of Hebrew literature.

Another small treatise, composed by the same author when he was eighteen years old, is one that bears the title of צלצול כנפים, and has for its subject "The Defence of Women." Till about ten years ago it only existed as a unique MS. in the Bodleian Library; but Dr. Neubauer published it for the first time in the *Jubelschrift* (Berlin, 1888), issued by some friends of Zunz on the occasion of his celebrating his ninetieth birthday, under the title of אוהב נשים (*The Women's Friend*). This title is more appropriate than the one it originally bore, for the simple reason

[1] לא האמינו לשמועתו אורבי מחולות אוהבי כלילות
חושקי יעלות נושקי אילות שוחרי עדניו
סוחרי רנניו השבוהו כמהתל ויהי כמצחק בעיני חהניו

that the treatise in question was evidently written by Yedaya in opposition to another composed, in 1208, by the physician, Judah ben Sabbatai, under the title of שונא נשים (*The Woman-hater*), in which the author's strong aversion to the fair sex is clearly put forth. The אוהב נשים, which Yedaya dedicated to two friends of his, viz. to Meïr and Judah, the sons of Don Solomon Del Infanz, is written in rhymed prose, intermixed with a few short verses. Its style is rather heavy, and all that can be gathered from its subject-matter is this, that a certain king, called Cushan Rishataim, a great woman-hater, did once wage war against an army composed of the friends of the fair sex, and led on by a general named Seria. The latter ultimately defeated the king and his hostile troops, and, out of gratitude for his great victory, he himself was proclaimed king by his followers. Under his reign, a new and happy era opens for women in general, who are then wooed, and married, and loved more dearly than ever before, and wedded life is everywhere declared to be the most desirable state in existence. The אוהב נשים closes with the description of the appearance of Judah ben Sabbatai's ghost on earth, and of how it agrees with all Yedaya's statements made there, with the exception of one. Every man, the ghost declares, ought certainly to marry once; but it would be the height of folly on his part if he were to enter again upon the matrimonial state, after his first marriage had turned out a failure.

In passing, it may be mentioned that the same controversy about the merits and demerits of the married state was still carried on in the sixteenth century among some learned Jewish writers in Italy. Among these are most conspicuous: Jacob of Fano, who in his poem שלטי הגבורים (*The Shields of the Mighty*), makes a strong attack on women, and Judah Sommo, of Portaleone, who in his treatise, מגן נשים (*The Women's Protector*), which exists as a MS. in the Bodleian Library, presents himself as a champion of women. To these writers may be added

Messer Leon (flourished at Mantua at the end of the fifteenth century), who, in a commentary of his on the thirty-first chapter of Proverbs, seizes the opportunity of eulogizing the female sex in general, and a few specially named women in particular. Among these he also mentions Laura, the lady-love of the poet Petrarch; and it is interesting to notice the trouble which the author takes in that commentary to prove that Laura was by no means a myth, as some writers on Petrarch consider her, but that she really existed in person, and was greatly distinguished by her exquisite beauty and grace.

Resuming now our review of Yedaya's literary compositions, especially of those he wrote when he was still very young, we have to refer to a Hebrew hymn of his, well known under the title of בקשת הממין, the formal characteristic of which is this, that each word of it begins with the letter *mem* (מ). Bartolocci, in his *Bibliotheca Rabbinica*, III, p. 7, gives the same hymn the title of תהלה לשם (*Praise of God*). This seems to have been Yedaya's first literary attempt, as it is generally assumed that it was composed by him at the age of fourteen. His father, Abraham, himself a writer of Hebrew verses of inferior quality, was so delighted with his son's hymn, that he sang its praises in a short Hebrew quatrain. Although from a literary point of view, the *Supplication of the Memmin* has little to recommend it, it has passed through fifteen editions, and has frequently been translated into German, and once also into Latin by Hil. Prache, who published his translation at Leipsic in 1662.

Another short composition belonging to an early period in Yedaya's life is his ספר הפרדס (*The Book of Paradise*), which was composed by him at the age of seventeen, and appeared for the first time in print at Constantinople in 1517. It is divided into four chapters, each of which has a different heading, while the fourth chapter is again subdivided into four sections. The principal subjects discussed in these chapters are (*a*) The worship of God; (*b*) Friendship

and Enmity; (*c*) The Lack of Stability in the World; and (*d*) The Desirability of studying Science after the usual Devotions. From this it will be seen that Yedaya had already in early life displayed a taste for writing on moral, ethical, and philosophical themes; but this early taste was greatly developed in him at a later period of his life. After having reached his manhood, he wrote several other treatises of a similar description, each of which will be briefly noticed here.

1. לשון הזהב (*The Golden Tongue*). This forms part of a commentary (existing as a MS.) on the *Agada* and the *Midrashim*, and was first printed at Venice in 1599.

2. A MS. bearing the inscription: פרוש מסכת אבות ופרוש אגדות בתלמוד (*Commentary on the Ethics of the Fathers, and on the Agadoth in the Talmud*).

3. אגרת ההתנצלות (*An Apologetical Letter*). This well-known and often-quoted letter was addressed by Yedaya to Rabbi Solomon ben Adereth (רשב"א), on the occasion of his publicly censuring the Jewish communities of the Provence for their occupying themselves with scientific studies. There a passage occurs, which throws some light on the author's own enlightened ideas in reference to the same subject. It runs as follows: "We cannot give up science; it is as the breath of our nostrils. Even if Joshua would appear and forbid it, we would not obey him; for we have a warranty who outweighs them all, viz. Maimuni, who recommended it, and impressed it upon us. We are ready to set our goods, our children, and our lives at stake for it[1]."

4. A Liturgical Poem. It is composed of a number of words, each of which begins with the letter *aleph* (א), and refers, according to Graetz[2], to the sufferings endured by the French Jews banished from France in 1306.

5. A Treatise on Medicine, based on a similar work composed by the Jewish philosopher, Ibn-Sina.

[1] Comp. Miss Löwy's translation of Graetz's *Gesch. d. J.*, IV, p. 47.

[2] *Gesch. d. J.*, VII, p. 269.

6. כתב הדעת (*A Treatise on Intellect*). This is also based on another book treating of a kindred subject, and bearing the inscription ספר השכל והמושכלות, the author of which is Al-Fabri. A Latin translation of the latter treatise exists under the title of *De Intellectu et Intellecto*, Venice, 1595.

7. הדעות בשכל החמרי (*Opinions on Material Intellect*).

8. המאמר בהפכי המהלך is a philosophical treatise on the movements of bodies, and has been quoted by Ibn-Habib under the title of כתב הפכי האנה.

9. כתב ההתעצמות (*Treatise on Consolidation*).

10. Is a MS. without any title; but judging from its contents, it seems to correspond with the ספר הצורות המיניות, once quoted by the same Ibn-Habib.

11. מדבר קדמות (*The Desert of Kedemoth*). This is a commentary on the twenty-five propositions placed by Maimonides at the beginning of the tenth chapter of his מורה נבוכים.

12. Is a Hebrew poem, having for its subject the thirteen articles as arranged by Maimonides.

The authorship of the following four compositions is also attributed to Yedaya:

1. A Divan, compiled by a member of the family of Bedaresi, and that member is, according to Luzzatto, no other but Yedaya.

2. מעדני מלך (*The Pleasures of a King*) is a short treatise on the game of chess, and has several times appeared in print.

3. Wolf, in his *Bibliotheca Rabbinica*, I, p. 403, attributes to Yedaya the authorship of a commentary on another commentary written by Abraham Ibn Ezra on the Book of Genesis, the former of which exists as a MS. in a Paris library.

4. אגרת התשובה (*A Letter of Response*). This letter, which was published by Dr. Berliner in 1888, and copies of which are found in various MSS., is attributed to Yedaya by Bartolocci and de Rossi.

From all hitherto said about Yedaya and his multifarious

writings, it will be seen that he fully deserves the recognition accorded to him by several biographers. Indeed, his name will always be honourably mentioned among the host of other Jewish savants living during the Middle Ages, who, often as exiles and fugitives, and amidst all kinds of sufferings and deprivations, did not neglect their habitual researches into almost every domain of mental culture. Nay, in spite of the many obstacles Yedaya must have met with in his daily occupation, he found leisure to enrich Hebrew literature with a number of works which are even now read with some pleasure and advantage.

J. CHOTZNER.

THE BURNING OF THE LAW.

(*By Rabbi Meir of Ruttenberg, Teacher of Rabbenu Asher*, 5046 = 1285.)

Ask, is it well, O thou consumed of fire,
With those that mourn for thee,
That yearn to tread thy courts, that sore desire
Thy sanctuary;

That panting for thy land's sweet dust[1], are grieved,
And sorrow in their souls;
And by the flames of wasting fire bereaved,
Mourn for thy scrolls;

That grope in shadow of unbroken night,
Waiting the day to see,
Which o'er them yet shall cast a radiance bright,
And over thee?

Ask of the welfare of the man of woe,
With breaking heart, in vain
Lamenting ever for thine overthrow,
And for thy pain;

Of him that crieth as the jackals cry,
As owls their moaning make,
Proclaiming bitter wailing far and nigh;
Yea, for thy sake.

And thou revealed amid a heav'nly fire,
By earthly fire consumed!
Say how the foe unscorched escaped the pyre
Thy flames illumed!

[1] Amos ii. 7.

How long shalt thou that art at ease abide
In peace unknown to woe,
While o'er my flowers, humbled from their pride,
Thy nettles grow[1]?

Thou sittest high exalted, lofty foe!
To judge the sons of God;
With judgments stern thou bringest them down low
Beneath thy rod.

Yea more, to burn the Law thou dared'st decree,
God's word to banish hence:
Then blessed he who shall award to thee,
Thy recompense[2]!

Was it for this, thou Law, my Rock of old
Gave thee with flames begirt,
That in thine after days should fire seize hold
Upon thy skirt?

O Sinai! was it then for this God chose
Thy mount of modest height,
Rejecting statelier, while on thee arose
His glorious light?

Wast thou an omen that from noble state
The Law should lowly be?
And lo! a parable will I relate
Befitting thee.

'Tis of a king I muse, who sat before
The banquet of his son,
And wept: for 'mid the mirth he death foresaw;
Thus thou hast done.

Cast off thy robe; in sackcloth folds of night,
O Sinai! cover thee;
Don widow's garb, discard thy raiment bright
Of royalty.

[1] Prov. xxiv. 31. [2] Ps. cxxxvii. 8.

Lo, I will weep for thee until my tears
Swell as a stream and flow
Unto the graves where thy two princely seers
Sleep calm below.

Moses, and Aaron on the Mount of Hor;
I will of them inquire:
Is there another to replace this Law
Devoured of fire?

O thou third month most sacred! woe is me
For treason of the fourth,
Which dimmed the sacred light that shone from thee
And kindled wrath;

And brake the tablets, yea, and still did rage:
And lo, the Law is burnt!
Ye sinful! is not this the twofold wage
Which ye have earnt[1]?

Dismay hath seized upon my soul; how then
Can food be sweet to me,
When, O thou Law! I have beheld base men
Destroying thee?

They cast thee out as one despised, and burn
The wealth of God Most High;
They that from thine assembly thou would'st spurn
From drawing nigh.

I cannot pass along the highway more,
Nor seek thy ways forlorn;
How do thy paths their loneliness deplore,
Lo! how they mourn!

With wine, as honey to my mouth, 'tis sweet
To mix my tears like rain;
Yea, and 'tis pleasant to my shackled feet
To bear thy chain.

[1] Isa. xl. 2.

Ah! sweet 'twould be unto mine eyes, alway,
Waters of tears to pour,
To sob and drench thy sacred robes, till they
Could hold no more.

But lo! my tears are dried, when, fast outpoured,
They down my cheeks are shed;
Scorched by the fire within: because thy Lord
Hath turned and sped.

Taking his holy treasure[1], he hath made
His journey far away[2];
And with him hath not thy protecting shade
Vanished for aye?

Yea, I am desolate and sore bereft,
Lo! a forsaken one:
Like a sole beacon on a mountain left[3],
A tower alone

I hear the voice of singers now no more,
Silence their song hath bound,
For broken are the strings on harps of yore,
Viols of sweet sound.

In sackcloth I will clothe, and sable band,
For well-beloved by me
Were they whose lives were many as the sand,
The slain of thee.

I am astonied that the day's fair light
Yet shineth brilliantly
On all things; but is ever dark as night
To me and thee.

Call with a bitter cry to God above
Of anguish and of pain:
Ah! that he would remember yet his love,
His troth of eigne[4]!

[1] Prov. vii. 20. [2] Prov. vii. 19. [3] Isa. xxx. 17. [4] Jer. ii. 2.

Gird on the sackcloth of thy misery
For that devouring fire,
Which went forth ravenous, degrading thee
To ruins dire.

Even as when thy Rock afflicted thee
He will assuage thy woe,
And turn again the tribes' captivity
And raise the low.

Yet shalt thou wear thy scarlet raiment choice
And sound the timbrels high,
And glad amid the dancers shalt rejoice,
With joyful cry.

My heart shall be uplifted on the day
Thy Rock shall be thy light,
When he shall make thy gloom to pass away,
Thy darkness bright.

NINA DAVIS.

INEDITED CHAPTERS OF JEHUDAH HADASSI'S "ESHKOL HAKKOFER."

THE editors of the *Eshkol Hakkofer* (Goslow, 1835) entirely omitted the chapters (Alph. 98 partly, 99, and 100 partly) directed against Christianity. The detailed table of contents by Kaleb Afendopolo, heading the book, also fails to mention the chapters in question, and says instead, with significant brevity (p. 30), אלפא ביתא צ"ט וק' נתבטל לגמרי. The Vienna manuscript of the *Eshkol Hakkofer* offers a possibility of supplementing the deficiency in this important work; and the passages fully deserve to be published. They are an interesting specimen of controversial literature, and fittingly complement analogous passages in Qirqisânî's *Sketch of the Jewish Sects*, recently edited by Dr. Harkavy[1]. I content myself with reproducing here the text according to the Vienna manuscript, adding only a few explanations and indications of sources.

The editors of the *Eshkol Hakkofer* commenced their omissions already at the second half of the 98th alphabet, which contains the commencement of the controversy against Christianity. (See my note, *Monatsschrift*, 40. Jhrg., p. 123, where ח must be corrected into כ). That which in the edited copy now forms the conclusion of the 98th alphabet, is in reality the conclusion of the 100th. The second half of the 98th alphabet runs as follows (Vienna MS. 64 a):

[1] See JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, VII, 704.

וכן עושים עד היום הזה[1] זמנך ׳

כפרנות דת זדים הנוצרים אשר חברו כסא הוות[2] עם אלהים יתעלו תושבחותיו ותהלותיו שהוא ה׳ אחד ׳ ואמרו כי הוא אב ובן ורוח הקדש והאב הוא כולל עיקר האלהות ודברו הוא הבן ולבש בשר כדרך בני האדם ורוח הקדש היא חכמתו ונבואת נביאיו והושוו שלשתם והם כא־ד ׳ ובזה תעו הזדים כי דברו וגזרתו לבש בשר ונהיה רמה ותולעה אפוס ונכחד ׳ וחברו בייחוד אלהינו דברים אפוסים יחד ׳ זלעפה אחזתני מרשעים עוזבי תורתך.

לעצו תועה וכפרנות וכסלות כי אלוה מרחם יצא וכיונק נהיה ׳ וכאדם בעולם הלך ונהרג ועוד קם וחיה ׳ ואולם כדבריהם לישוע בן פנדירא[3] כן נהיה ׳ אבל לכבוד הבורא יתקדש שמו ההויה ויהיה והיה ׳ אין עליו כאלה ככתוב חלילה לאל מרשע ושדי מעול[4] וכתוב אין כאל ישורון רוכב שמים וגו׳[5] וכתוב אין קדוש כה׳ כי אין בלתך[6].

מטענו ובדו מלבם השלוחים חכמיך ׳ והטעו לעממיך ׳ והפכו דברי אלהים חיים מתורתך ׳ ומסרו להם נאם ה׳ לאדני לאדנָי[7] כי גם אוי להם בשורי מהם בְּשָׂרִי מהם[8] לחזק כי האלהים לבש בשר ׳ אוי למחפאים על ה׳ שמץ שלא כתורתך ׳ ושנו מלת וישתחו ישראל על ראש המִּטָּה על ראש המַּטֶּה[9] להעמיד חוק הצלוב הוי ההופכים משפט ללענה[10] שלא כמשפטיך ׳ ורבים הפכו כאלה ומסרום להם רועיך[11] ׳ כאשר חפכו מלות התורה ואמרו אל תקרי אותם אלא אתם[12] אל תקרי הדר אלא הדר באילנו[13] אל תקרי אמון אלא

[1] So far the edition, p. 42 a, line 20.

[2] Ps. xciv. 20. [3] See JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, V, 143.

[4] Job xxxiv. 10. [5] Deut. xxxiii. 20. [6] 1 Sam. ii. 2.

[7] Ps. cx. 1. Comp. Ev. Matt. xxvi. 63; Acta Apostolorum, ii. 34.

[8] Hosea ix. 12. The Christian interpretation of the verse mentioned here read בְּשָׂרִי "my flesh," and saw in it an allusion to the incarnation of the deity.

[9] Gen. xlvii. 31. The Septuagint reads הַמַּטֶּה instead of הַמִּטָּה, and the Christian apologists had early based the worship of the cross on this reading, according to which Jacob inclines himself before the cross-shaped staff. Compare Siegfried, *Festrede zur akademischen Preisvertheilung*, am 15 Juni, 1895, Jena, p. 13 sq.

[10] Amos v. 7.

[11] Hadassi explains here, that the exegetical method of the Christian commentators, as shown by the passages he cites, is on a par with the exegetical methods of the teachers of tradition ("thy Shepherds"), who, by means of the formula אל תקרי, interpret words of the text according to a reading different from the Masoretic.

[12] Bab. Talm., Rosch Haschana, 24 a. [13] Sukka, 35 b.

אומן[1] ורבים כאלה בתורה שבעל פה אשר חקקו עליך כדי להעמיד דת על נקהליך · חציים תקנו את דתך וחציים כת גלותך · הוי החוקקים חקקי און ומכתבים עמל כתבו[2] ונתנו לך ולעממיך · חקים לא טובים[3] הדריכום מאז ועד הנה לעיניך · וטח מראות עיניהם מהשכיל לבותם[4] לאמר הלא שקר בימיננו[5] אשר לא צוה ה' אלהיך.

ס חברו ונצמדו גם בני אלצפתיה[6] עם הנוצרים בדבריהם · באמרם כי אין לה' ספורים[7] מענהו[8] הארבע אשורים באמריהם · ידיעתו ויכלתו ומציאותו וחיותו[9] אינם מצואים לו לנפשו כי אם בחדוש כמוך.

ס זאת הכת כלל דבריהם מושחתים מדעות · כי כל המתחדש ומתחלף ומשתנה יש לו מקראות וחילופים ואם שנים או שלשה יהיה בהם חלוף עצות וחפץ הדעת פעם כן פעם כן לנטות ולהשעות · ותוכן ומדה ותקון אחר לא יֵעשה בקניינים וברכושים בלי לתעות ולהתעות · והלא כתוב וכמצביא עביד בחיל שמיא ודארי ארעא ולא איתי די ימחא בידיה ויאמר ליה מה עבדת[10] בעולמך.

ס רבן אלמתוסיים[11] כמותם אמרו על חלוף השְנון · משום כי יש בהם מי שיאמר

[1] Genesis Rabba, ch. i. [2] Isa. x. 1. [3] Ezek. xx. 25.
[4] Isa. xliv. 18. [5] Isa. xliv. 20.

[6] Alsifâtija. The followers of the doctrine of the divine attributes. Hadassi follows here the Karaite philosopher of religion, Joseph Al-Basir, who connects this doctrine of the attributes with the Christian doctrine of the persons in the deity. See P. F. Frankl, *Ein mutazilitischer Kalâm aus dem* 10 *Jahrhundert* (Vienna, 1872). Comp. Kaufmann, *Geschichte der Attributenlehre*, p. 37.

[7] ספורים (=Arab. צפאת, אוצאף), attributes. See Frankl, l. c., p. 54, line 3: צפה והוא ספור.

[8] מענהו. An Arabism for ענינו (contents), frequently used by Hadassi.

[9] About the four essential attributes, see especially, *Maimuni*, More Nebuchim, I, c. 53, 56.

[10] Dan. iv. 32.

[11] This passage is particularly difficult; so are the following sections that belong to it, and the abbreviations at the end of section ה. At all events אלמגוסיים must be read instead of אלמתוסיים, as Dr. Schreiner of Berlin rightly conjectured, the Magii, the followers of the Zend religion; and השְנון is only a false punctuation of the word which is corrupted from השטן. השטן is the devil, the Angramainyus (Ahriman) of the Magii. Hadassi himself speaks at the end of the 95th alphabet (p. 40 b, l. 10 from below) of בני דת אלמגוסיים and their שטן. In Albasîr's Muhtawi there is a chapter which deals with Christians and Sifâtites, as also of Manichees and the followers of the Gnostic Bardesâni; it contains also a chapter about the Magii, commencing with the words

כי הוא קדמון ואין הוא קדמון אלא בחדוש השנון · והשנון הם מעשים אשר לא יוכל עליהם זולת אלהיך.

ה היא דעת שנון הקדמון לא החדש אשר הסכימו דבר רע באלהי הצבאות · וכן מי שקיים בהם עבשות על אלהינו ית״ש עושה נוראות · מליצתו עפ״ת לפ״תול מע״ה ת״ע על אלהיך.

ד דרך הלוך שמש ירח וכוכבים אמנם היוצר יצרם · ומי שיאמר אחר שבראם הבורא השיב עליהם העצה והיכולת לעשות בעולם כרצונם בכל יצורם · בכל מקראות ותולדות ארצך.

ג גם כך עושים ומחזיקים ומורים ומעמידים זו הדת עד היום הזה · חוח עלה ביד שכור[1] ותעה והתעה מדברי כל נביא וחוזה · כי אין ראיה כזו נזכרת בתורה או טעם ודעת וחכמה ויושר כזה · כי אלו נתקיים כי הם היועצים ויכולים עם בוראך.

ב בירורו כי אם הם הבוראים כאלהיך · לא היה מחייב להם העבודה אלא כי הם ברואים ואין להם יכולת כיכולת הבורא כי הם מאפס נמצאים לפניך · ודבריהם הבל בחכמת לבבך · וכן מי שאמר כי ברא ברואי מלאך עושך.

א אלי מלאך ברואי צורה אחת בעולם השיב אליו העצה והממשלה · אף אשר אומרים הנוצרים והוא ישוע בן פנדירא שהוא מבני אדם ויחברוהו לעבדהו תעותם גדולה · שעושים שלושת רשויות עם אלהיך.

The 99th alphabet runs as follows:

א אכן בשתם עוד שמקיימים ומגלים צורות ופסילים אלהים אחרים ומחברים עם יוצר הכל · ואין ראוי כי כל חדש אינו מחדש צורות עם הרוח חי מיצורי כל · בעולמך.

ב בזו עוד גם כל חדש יש לו מקראות[2] מכל · ויש לו ראשית ואחרית קץ ותכלה כתולדות ויצירות הכל · וכבר כתוב הנה לא ינום ולא יישן שומר ישראל[3] וכתוב אתה הוא ה׳ לבדך[4].

ג גם[5] דת ישמעאלים מייחדים לאל רם · ואומרים כי שליח האל נביאם ·

פאמא אלמגום פמן קולהם אן אלש׳מאן לאלק אלצבאע ואלחיאת. The observation about the Muhtawi I also owe to Dr. Schreiner. He may perhaps succeed in elucidating the other difficulties of the whole passage.

[1] Prov. xxvi. 9.

[2] מקרא = מִקְרֶה, accident. Comp. previous alphabet, end of section ד.

[3] Ps. cxxi. 4. [4] Neh. ix. 6.

[5] The controversy against Islam commences here, turned chiefly

ומחברים אותו שליח שני עם משה בן עמרם · ושליח שלישי ישוע מודים בזה הישמעאלים אך אומרים אינו אלוה אלא נביאם יושב בימינו של אלוה וישוע בשמאלו ולפניו משה רועה נביא אלהיך.

ד מותות וצורות וכל צלמים אסר להם להשתחוות וכל זנות ועבירה ואכילת ארנבת וגמל ושרצים התיר · ומועדים בראית לבנה הכתיר[1] · וחקים לא טובים החביר · לדעת עממיך.

ה הוא נועץ בושת וכלמה לביתו · באמרו אני נביא ותורה עמי וחלף תורת ה' ושלוחו נאמן ביתו[2] · כתוב יראת ה' טהורה עומדת לעד[3] וכתוב ודבר אלהינו יקום[4] לעולמך.

ו הם[5] לא להוון דבקין דנא עם דנא · ומתערבין בזרע אנשא[6] בני ישמעאל ואדום בדינא · לא ידעו ולא יבינו בחשכה יתהלכו[7] לפניך.

ז ומממים ויזומים ושמחים יחד ועל שלחן אחד כזב ידברו[8] · יתאמרו כי יש לנו שלוחים ותורות חדשות יבררו · הם הם המתקדשים והמטהרים אל הגנות אחר אחד בתוך אוכלי בשר החזיר והשקץ והעכבר יחדו יסופו נאם ה'[9] אלהיך.

against the assumption, that God had changed through Muhammed the law formerly given to Israel (Abrogation).

[1] This passage is meant by Steinschneider, *Polemische und apologetische Litteratur*, p. 308.

[2] Moses (Num. xii. 7). [3] Ps. xix. 10. [4] Isa. xl. 8.

[5] In this passage and the following the controversy is directed at the same time against Islam and Christianity.

[6] Dan. ii. 42. [7] Ps. lxxxii. 5. [8] Dan. xi. 27.

[9] Isaiah lxvi. 17. Hadassi sees in this verse an allusion to Christians and Muhammedans, as does also the anonymous author from whose work a rather lengthy fragment is given by Pinsker (*Likkute Kadmonijoth*, II, 95–97), including the following explanation: המתקדשים הם שיאמר(ו) קדוש פלוני ממי הטומאה והמטהרים הם עם מחומט אשר דתם לטהר ה' פעמים ידיהם ורגליהם. Thus the word המתקדשים is taken to allude to the sanctity of baptism, and המטהרים to the five daily purifications of the Muhammedans. Respecting this, see Steinschneider, *Polemische und apologetische Litteratur*, p. 330, note 45. Steinschneider incorrectly takes the words שיאמרו קדוש פלוני ממי הטומאה to refer to "Christian saints." The words mean rather that the Christians say: *N.N.* (whosoever is baptized) becomes holy by the water of baptism. Steinschneider refers also to this section of Hadassi's *Eshkol Hakkofer*, but quotes incorrectly 101 instead of 99 (also p. 308, l. 22). He also says incorrectly that Hadassi takes the two expressions (המתקדשים והמטהרים) to refer to the Ishmaelites. But the context shows that he also means Christians and Muhammedans.

ח חברינו אחינו שכנגדנו[1] מודים לישוע הנוצרי בעשותו האותות ואומרים אמת בקוסמנות שם המפורש היה עושה האותות · וכפי תורתם היה ממרה מהם וע״כ הרגוהו בבית שני מקדשך.

ט טוענים בעדו הכתוב אומר ובני פריצי עמך ינשאו להעמיד חזון ונכשלו[2] · ולכן הרגוהו כי כן מנהגם למי אשר ימחה בידם ויחליף מאמר אשר דברו ומללו · בעבור דתם הן למות הן לשרושי הן לענוש נכסין ולאסורין[3] עד יום זה זמנך.

י ודעי תורה בני המקרא אומרים[4] · כי ישוע איש מתוקן וחכם וצדיק בדבריו מתחלה היה לפני ישרים · ומדרך צדוקים וביתוסים היה בלבו לגמרים · ואסר גם הגירוש מאשה כמו שאסרו צדוקיך[5].

כ תרוהו בני בי רב על כי היה מחליף דבריהם והרגוהו והלך לו · כאשר הרגו כמה צדיקים מוכיחים על דבריהם בשמתא ובנדוי ונהרגו בתוכחת פילולו · ובקשו להרוג גם לענן נשיא ישראל ראש הגולה נ״ע בגורלו · יען שחלף וחלק בדבריהם ברוב יראתו ושכלו · ולא נתנו אלהים בידי רשעי ישראל רועיך[6].

כ כלל אחרית כל אלה בימי אֱלֵיני המלכה ובנה קושטנדינו המלך המצורע · עמד אבא שאול הוא פַּוְלוֹש הצייד ורבי שמעון הוא פֶּיטרוֹש הנודע · הם שופטים לעממיך[7].

[1] These are the Rabbanites, who admit that Jesus had done miracles by means of the name of God. See Qirqisânî (ed. Harkavy), p. 305, line 5.

[2] Dan. xi. 14.

[3] Ezra vii. 26. Qirqisânî (ibid., line 5) mentions the opinion of Benjamin Nehawendi, according to which Dan. xi. 14 (ובני פריצי עמך) refers to five pseudo-prophets, including Jesus. See also the commentary of Saadya (the younger) to Daniel, l. c., and Maimûni, *Iggereth Têman*, p. 19 (ed. Holub); קובץ, II, 5 a.

[4] See Qirqisânî, ib., line 9: ואמא קום מן אלקראין פאנהם יזעמון אן ישוע כאן רגלא צאלחא ואנמא כאן סבילה סביל צדוק וענן וגירהמא.

[5] Qirqisânî, in the short chapter on the Sadducees (p. 304), mentions that Christians prohibited divorce altogether.

[6] This is the exposition of that which is to be read in Qirqisânî as the continuation of the passage quoted: פקצדה אלרבאנין חתי קהלוה כמא קר טלבו איצא קהל ענן פלם יתהיא דלך להם.

[7] See Qirqisânî, 306, 24 sqq. and 307 sqq. from David Ammuqammaṣ. Hadassi has combined both passages in such a manner as to produce the curious anachronism, as if the apostles Peter and Paul had lived at the time of Helena, Constantine's mother. The designation "the leper" is also from Qirqisânî (קסטנטין אלאברץ).

לארבעה גליונות הנקראים בלשונם הפחותה אוונעלייא[1] · גליון מתיאוש היה איפרכוש בעממיך · מרקוש היה צייד הדגים דייג בברכה של טבריא · ולוקאש היה רופא תלמיד פוולוש ויוחנן הרביעי עמהם בתרמייה · הם הם חכמיך[2].

כוודים אלה וכל חבריהם ותלמידיהם ומעידים על ישו שהוא אלוה · שלושה איקונין[3] הם אב ובן ורוח טומאה הם עוד אחד אלוה · ואומרים הוא המשיח שאמרו נביאיך.

כואמים שישו בן אלוה וכתבו ארבעת אוונעלייא ושמו חקים וקבעו דת באמרם לעממיך · מי יקיים את ישו לבן אלוה וינצל מנקמת עולמך · נאמו עוד סודות ומשפטים נתן לנו ישו המשיח · והם הם הכתובים בעונות[4] גליונותיהם[5] ובספרים אחרים האמת להשכיח · ולבבות להדיח · וחרדי אל וחכמי תורתו להכפיף ולהכחיש ולהשיח · וקבעו ונתנו חקים לא טובים אשר לא בתורת אלהיך.

[1] This is the transcription of *Εὐαγγέλια*.

[2] These data are certainly also taken from Qirqisânî, but the MS. from which Harkavy edited is defective. According to it Matthew was an *ἵππαρχος* (or *ὕπαρχος*), Mark a fisher from the lake of Tiberias, Luke a physician (see Epistle to the Colossians iv. 14), and pupil of Paul; nothing is said about John.

[3] איקונין, as designation of the three persons assumed by Christianity in the doctrine of the Trinity, occurs also later in section ר. Hadassi understands by it the expression איקונין = *εἰκών*, *εἰκόνιον*, image, a word frequently occurring in the Midrashic literature. (See Levy, *Wörterbuch*, I, 70.) According to Frankl, l. c., p. 28, Joseph Albasîr, Hadassi's authority, designates the three persons of the Trinity as *εἰκόνες*. In Albasîr's Hebrew text, communicated by Frankl, p. 52, we read דברי הערלים פי אלאקנים. It is this word which Frankl transcribes as *εἰκόνες*. But we may assume almost with certainty that the original Arabic text had אלאקאנים, i. e. the well-known and customary Arabic designation of the Trinity (taken from the Syriac); in the singular אלאקנום. The translator of Joseph Albasîr's Arabic work, who knew Greek, read אלאקנים, and took it perhaps as *εἰκόνες*. This was also done by Hadassi, whose איקונין is verbally still more like אקאנים, יו having been mistaken for א, and ם interchanged with ן. My conjecture, that Albasîr had written אלאקאנים, is confirmed by Qirqisânî, who (p. 305, l. 21) says in so many words: וזלך אנהם יזעמון אן אלבארי גוהר ואחד תלתה; and then further (line 22 f.): פאלגוהר קנום ואלצפתאן קנומאן פלזלך צאר אקאנים תלתה. Comp. ib., 306, 8.

[4] In margin, נ"ל צ"ל באונות מלשון אן ותרפים שכך נק' און גליון.

[5] Plural of עץ גליון, the transcription of Evangelium. The glossator interprets the writing און גליון from אן, 1 Sam. xv. 23.

סררו ואמרו בזו כי בצום ותפלה אין אנחנו חייבים אבל הם שפלות רוח וקדרות[1] · והתירו כל דבר אסור מן היתוש ועד פיל[2] מענהו מרמש ועד עוף ובהמה וחיה גדולה וזוללות אסורה וסבאות שכרות · וכל זנות וניאוף בארצך.

עתים ומועדים קבעו להם שלא כתורת ה׳ · אף בניין עתיד שראה יחזקאל ע״ה שמוהו עבר שהוא הבית השני שנבנה בבנייני[3] · וכל אותותיו העתידות שמו להם חכמות ומענים בפירושיהם ומליצותיהם לא בביאור חפץ ה׳ · זו דתם ומנהגם לעיניך.

פסילים וכל צורות התירו להעבד · באמרם כי זה ויעבד (?) · וימות המקודשים חלפו מזמנם בלי להתכבד · ומצות ברית המילה ומצות שבת השביתו וחדשו יום ראשון שאינו מקודש ומכובד ממכבד · ותמור מצות המילה קבעו מים ושמן ושחק עפר פגרי קְדֵשיך[4] · פחות ופנות עם שרי ארץ כשדים ושאר שרי ואלופי רומניאה[5] · אלופים שלש מאות ושמונה עשר הם הם הקרואים אִיפַּטְרִיש נתקבצו במדינת ניציאה[6] · עיר גדולה בבניניך.

צוו וקבעו חוק וחקרו ודרשו ושמו משפטים מן אוונעלייא אשר לא צוו ראשונים כמותם לכבד ולנשאה בזמן קושטנדינוש המלך המצורע[7] בן אליני המלכה בגלותך · צלוב[8] נראה בזמנו אל פּוּנְדַקְיֵיה כאשר הם נואמים · ואין בדבריהם כי אם אחד רשע מלשין כפרן בה׳ נמצא אז בישראל וכדי להרע אז לזרע יעקב התמימים תקן עין מרובע כרובע האדם וטמנו בארץ ואמר לגוים תחפרו בזו המקום ותמצאו דבר שבו נצלב ישו בן אלוה והוא דמותו וקדוש הוא לכל מאמיני ישו ולכל הקמים · וזו קושטנדינוש קבל דברי המלשין הכפרן ההוא והחזיק והתחיל להאמין בצלוב ולאמת לדעת אחרים · ובנה בזה במות לבעלים ולצלמים · אלה הם אשר העמידו וחזקו וקבעו דת לעממיך בעדות והוראת חכמיך.

[1] See Qirqisânî, 305, 17: וזעם אן אלרין אנמא הו אלתואצע פקט · והם יזעמון אן הדא אלצום ואלצלוה אלדי יסתעמלונה ליס הו פרצא ואגבא ואנמא הו התוע.

[2] Qirqisânî, ib., line 18: ולם יחרם שיא מן אלמאכול בתה בל אסתלק גמיע אלחיואן מן אלבקה אלי אלפיל.

[3] Ibid., 306, 1–3.

[4] Instead of קְדֵשיך, just as רוח המטמאה (above, section מ) for רוח הקדש.

[5] The Bishops of Syria and Greece.

[6] The 318 fathers of the Council of Nicaea, אִיפַּטְרִיש = *οἱ πάτρες*. See Qirqisânî, 306, 29, 33.

[7] See above, section נ.

[8] An interesting version of the discovery of the cross at the time of Constantine, according to which it was a machination of a Jewish apostate.

קשור דתם מדת מצרים · כי ישו מהם נתלמד וגרים מספריהם ומכשפנותם ולהטיהם של מצרים · והם ממצות דת אלצאב"יין שאומרים יש מושלים רבים בעולמך[1].

רוחשים גם אלה כך כי הק"בה שלושה איקיונין הוא · והם חתיכה אחת וזה סור הוא · והודיעו ישו לבני האדם וידעוהו · כי קודם לו לא היה יכיל בדעת אנשיך.

שישו בנו של אב נולד ממנו והוא אור חתיכה אחת מן אור אלהים ובעבור הצלתנו ירד מן השמים ונכנס כאור בבטן מרים ויולד בבשר ונתגדל בעולמך.

תמור תחתנו ובעבורנו נצלב ומת ונקבר · וביום השלישי קם כשנעקד ונקבר · ועלה לשמים וישב בימין אביו אלהיך[2].

The 100th alphabet runs as follows:

קוף

תכלית אין למלאכת זו אומרים · כי הוא יבוא לשפוט העולם ולהחיות מתי העולם כך מבררים · ואם כן כדבריהם האור בראוי הוא מה' לעולמים · והבראוי אינו בורא ושופט נסתרות בעולמך.

שכל חדש אינו בורא ולא מחדש צורות בחיות · אף יש לו קץ ותכלה חֲלישות וגבורה ומיתה וחיות · ועל זה נצלב ומת ונקבר בהודעת פיך.

ראיה עוד יותר מדברי אלופיו ושלוחיו · פוולוש ופיטרוש ולוקאש ומרקוש

[1] Hadassi commits here a sad blunder. The contents of this section refer to Qirqisânî, who reports (after David Almukammas): פאמא אלמחדתין מן פלאספה אלנצארי פאנהם יזעמון אן פראיץ אלתוריה אנמא דפעת אלי בני אסראיל עלי סכט ואנהם הם אלדי אכתארוהא לאנהא משאבהה לפראיץ אלצאביין ואנמא כאן דלך לאנהם קד אלפו מדאהב אלמצריין למא כאנו מקימין מעהם והי גנס מדאהב אלצאבין. The translation of this is: "The newer Christian philosophers assert that the laws of the Thorah had been given to the children of Israel in wrath. They were pleased with the laws, because they were similar to those of the Sabians. This had its origin in the fact that the Israelites had adopted the tenets of the Egyptians, because they lived among them. But the doctrines of the Egyptians are a variety of those of the Sabians." Hadassi misunderstood in this way, as if Jesus had taken his doctrines from the Egyptians, which were based upon those of the Sabians. And this he amalgamates with the notion of the magical knowledge of Jesus, already before mentioned by him and referred to a Talmudic source.

[2] These last two sections contain an exposition of the Christian dogmas of the redeemer.

ומתיאוש ויואניש הוא יוחנא שהעידו עליו ועל ייחום אבותיו ואמותיו ואחיו ואחיותיו וכל משפחתו שהוא מעמך.

קריאת ארבע הגליונות מודיעות ייחוסו מתיאוש ספר מאדם עד אברהם ויהודה ודוד עד אמו ייחוסו אבל לוקאש דבר ייחוסו מן יוסף אביו עד אדם הראשון אביך[1].

צדיית מרקוש ויוחנא הוא יואניש לא הזכירו אבות ולא יחס אבל אומרים כי רוח הקדש עברה בדבר המלאך אשר רחש ואמר לה שישי ושמחי מרים כי ה׳ עמך בהריונך[2] · צדקת דבריהם אינו ראוי כי מדבר המלאך נתעברה · אבל שמא בדבריהם בשרה מביאת יוסף אישה להתעברה · או אז מביאת אותו הנואף הרשע הבא עליה בלא רצונה במקום נצרית[3] המדינה וממנו נתעברה · ונולד בנה ישו בזמן הורודוס המלך באבוס בר במקום מסתתרה[4] · וירדו במצרים מרוב פחדם ונתגדל שם בחכמת מצרים ובתלמוד תורה[5] · אבל בלא איש לא יתכן כי נתעברה · כי לא מצאנו בכל העקרות כזו מאלהיך.

פצו פה בערמה כלל הקדשים האלה להעמיד דת וראשיתו מחכמיך · אשר העידו עליו לחזק זו הדת וממעש מכוער ומחדש נקבע ואיך היה נודע הוא לכל חרדי עושך · פשר זו הדת וכלל הכתות שהזכרנו הבל ורעות רוח הם כי מחברים עם הבורא שני ושלישי ורבים כהם · אף איך כבודו נכנס ברחם המטונף כדבריהם ולבש בשר וגוש עפר[6] וקבל הייסורין והמיתה כאמריהם · ואומרים כל אלה קבל למען לכבוש את השטן שלא יעשה רעות בעולמו שמדיח לבותיהם · וכבר לא כבש כלום כי עד עתה הרעות והחמסים והעושק והגזלות והגנבות וכל דרכי השטן מזנות וניאוף ורציחה וכל שקר וכזב וטומאת לב וחניפות הווים בעולם ביניהם · ולא עוד הלא כתוב השמים ושמי השמים לא יכלכלוהו[7] ואיך היה יכול ברחם אוי להם · והם מורים כי

[1] See Qirqisânî, 307, 6 ff. Comp. Matt. i. 1–16; Luke iii. 23–38.

[2] Neither in Mark nor in John occurs such a manifestation of the angel to Mary; these gospels do not contain the history of Jesus' nativity.

[3] Nazareth. Kalir (איכה ישבה in the Ritual of the 9th of Ab) has also נצרת. In the New Testament the reading vacillates between Ναζαρέτ and Ναζαράτ.

[4] Luke ii. 7.

[5] Hadassi combines here the narrative of the New Testament about the flight to Egypt (Matt. ii. 13) with the afore-mentioned assumption that Jesus had been a disciple of Egyptian wisdom.

[6] See Job vii. 5.

[7] 1 Kings viii. 27.

הכבוד אינו יכול במקום באמרם לבורא אָכוֹרֵיטוֹשׁ[1] הוא וכתוב אתה הוא ה' לבדך[2].

עוצם דבריהם כאלה וכאלה במלות וחכמתם נבארת · לפני תורת ה' התמימה העומדת לעד[3] וננצרת · ואם כבוד מכבוד ה' היה ישו איך נחוהו הצולבים ותלוהו על עץ להשמד ולהכרת · וכבר כדבריהם הכבוד אָפֵּרִידְרַכְתּוֹשׁ אַקְטוֹנַאיתוֹשׁ[4] מעניהם לא ינוצח ולא יודע בלבות האדם דמותו וטבע קדושתו ולא עם בשר ודם מתדבק ומתחבר לשרת · וכבר כאלה וכאלה נעשו על ישו לכן הוא בשר ודם כשאר בני אדם וצאצאיהם · אף אין בדבריהם כי אין דין ומשפט ונקמה לעתיד לנפשות אשר מתו מאותם שהאמינו לישו כי הוא יעמוד ויצילם משחיתותיהם · ואיך יוכל בשר ודם לפדות מיד האלהים את המורדים במצותיו והלא כתוב חי אני נאם ה' אלהים אם בן אם בת יצילו וגו'[5] וכתוב ואין מידי מציל[6] יאמר אלהיך.

סדור פירוש אחינו שכנגדנו רועיך[7] בזו היא אשר הם מחפאים כי שתי רשויות הם בעולם[8] · ואברהם אבינו ע"ה יעמוד ויציל לזרעו מיד האלהים מדין גיהנום ויכפר בגללם[9] · כי כל חייבי תפתה שהם מזרע אברהם בברכת דוד הע"ה כשיברך בשלחן עתיד אשר יעשה האל לצדיקיו ויטעימם תאוותם כשישמעו ברכתן יענו אמן[10] ויעלו משחת בשמחת צדיקיו בעולם · הלא למוד אחד ודרך אחד להנה וכל אלה דברי הבל ורעות רוח לפני חכמת דעתך.

נאומים אלה הלא נתנו פתח כל פושע ומורד בה' לעשות פרצה בתאוותו בעולם ואיה הכתוב הנה כתובה לפני לא אחשה כי אם שלמתי ושלמתי על חיקם[11] · וכתוב על צדיקיו אז נדברו יראי ה' איש אל רעהו ויקשב ה' וישמע

[1] That is *ἀχώρητος*. [2] Neh. ix. 6. [3] Ps. xix. 8, 10.

[4] That is *ἀπερίδρακτος*, *ἀκατανόητος*. See Frankl, *Monatsschrift*, 1884, p. 517.

[5] Ezek. xiv. 20. [6] Deut. xxxii. 39.

[7] See above, p. 436, note 1.

[8] Hadassi alludes to the Rabbinical doctrine of the מדת הדין and מדת הרחמים. In Rabbinical literature שתי רשויות means the gnostic or manichaean doctrine of Dualism, and is, of course, combated by the Rabbis themselves.

[9] See Erubin, 19 a.

[10] See Pesachim, 119 b. At the meal given by God to the pious in the world to come, the blessing is pronounced by David (after Ps. cxvi. 13). Jalkut to Isaiah xxvi. 2 (from a Midrash, cf. Elijahu zûta, c. 20): the power of Amen to rescue from hell.

[11] Isa. lxv. 6.

ויכתב ספר זכרון לפניו ליראי ה׳ ולחושבי שמו[1] · וכתוב לתת לאיש כדרכיו וכפרי מעלליו[2] · וכתוב אלה לחיי עולם ואלה לחרפות ולדראון עולם[3] · וכתוב ועסותם רשעים כי יהיו אפר תחת כפות רגליכם וגו׳[4] · וכתוב והמשכילים יזהירו כזוהר הרקיע ומצדיקי הרבים ככוכבים[5] לעולמך · נואם מאמרם אם בדבריהם מה בצע כי נשמור משמרת אל · או כי נלך קדורנית[6] לעבוד ולשרת שם כאל · אם באמן ננצל מכל מרד תאות הנפש מיד המשלם וגואל · שבת המצוה ממצותו והוא הנותן תורה ותורתו בהואל · אף טובו ונקמתו ואיה הכתוב אמרו צדיק כי טוב כי פרי מעלליהם יאכלו[7] וכתוב אוי לרשע רע כי גמול ידיו יעשה לו[8] וגו׳ וכתוב ויצאו וראו בפגרי האנשים הפושעים בי כי תולעתם לא תמות ואשם לא תכבה והיו דראון לכל בשר[9] בעולמך.

כ מצות תורתו ובריתו של אלהים אם כן הבל הבלים · בזו פירוש המפרשים וממללים · אם ישמור איש ואם לא ישמור באמן ינצל מנקמה וחבלים · מה לנו לשמור לעשות את כל המצוה הזאת לפני ה׳ אלהינו כאשר צונו וצדקה תהיה לנו מאל אלים · וכזאת נהיה גם בעמי הארצות וכמשפחות האדמה בכל טומאות וגלולים · וכתוב והעולה על רוחכם היה לא תהיה וגו׳[10] וכתוב זכרו תורת משה עבדי אשר צויתי אותו בחורב על כל ישראל[11] עמך. מעונה אלהי קדם[12] ואכן יש אלהים בישראל · ועל כל אלה תורה שם בישראל · כי לא אלמן ישראל ויהודה מאלהיו[13] לחבוש לנשברי לב לקרוא לשבויים דרור ולאסורים פקח קוח[14] הגואל · והוא מהשנא עדניא וזמניא מהעדי מלכין ומהקים מלכין[15] ועושה רצון כל שואל · לכל אשר יקראוהו באמת להגאל הוא ימלוך לעולם ועד על מורדיו ועל בניין אריאל · ככתוב אם לא ביד חזקה ובזרוע נטויה ובחימה שפוכה אמלוך עליכם[16] וכתוב אסוף אאסוף כלך קבץ אקבץ שארית ישראל[17] · וכתוב לתת לאיש כדרכיו וכפרי מעלליך[18].

ל כן אין חכמה ואין עצה ואין תבונה נגד ה׳[19] · חכם לבב ואמיץ כח מי הקשה אליו וישלם[20] ממנאצי אלהי · וכתוב מי הקדימני ואשלם תחת כל השמים לי

[1] Mal. iii. 16. [2] Jer. xxxii. 19. [3] Dan. xii. 2.
[4] Mal. iii. 21. [5] Dan. xii. 3. [6] See Mal. iii. 14.
[7] Isa. iii. 10. [8] Isa. iii. 11. [9] Isa. lxvi. 24.
[10] Ezek. xx. 32. [11] Mal. iii. 22. [12] Deut. xxxiii. 27.
[13] Jer. li. 5. [14] Isa. lxi. 1. [15] Dan. ii. 21. [16] Ezek. xx. 33.
[17] Micah ii. 12. [18] Jer. xxxii. 19. [19] Prov. xxi. 30.
[20] Job ix. 4.

הוא[1] וכתוב אנכי אנכי ה' ואין מבלעדי מושיע אנכי הגדתי והושעתי והשמעתי ואין בכם זר ואתם עדי[2] ' ונאמר ואנכי היודע ועד[3] אמר אלהיך.

As already mentioned, the other letters of this alphabet, till the end, appear in the edited copy, appended as a conclusion of the 98th alphabet. In the Vienna manuscript the next section, letter כ, commences with the words כן בזאת יחרד כל איש ויתר לבו ממקומו. In the printed copy, where the omission commences at the middle of the letter כ of the 98th alphabet, this section is given as the conclusion of the section ב, with the alteration of כן בזאת into לזאת, in order to make the phrase more consonant with the Biblical source, Job xxxvii. 1.

* * * * * *

That which gives the controversy of Jehudah Hadassi, published here for the first time[4], a character of its own, consists in the combination of his attacks upon Christianity with those upon Rabbinical Judaism. In an original way, he considers the arbitrary interpretation of the scriptures applied by the Christian commentators in the interest of their dogmas as a counterpart of the freedom of the Agadic interpretation of the Bible against the Masoretic reading of the text (alphabet 98, section ט). From an Agadic legend about the future world he draws the inference, that the Rabbanites attribute more power to a single Amen, than to the fulfilment of the religious law, and that they therefore are in this case in touch with Christian notions (alphabet 100, sections ס, נ). He goes even so far as to attribute to the Rabbanites a turbid notion of the unity of God, applying to the doctrine of the attribute of divine mercy and of divine justice the very expression used by the Rabbis in combating the gnostic doctrine of Dualism (see above, p. 441, note 8). Those sections

[1] Job xli. 3. [2] Isa. xliii. 11, 12. [3] Jer. xxix. 23.

[4] The late P. F. Frankl had the intention to edit these sections of the *Eshkol Hakkofer*. See *Monatsschrift*, 1884, p. 517. Steinschneider, *Polemische und Apologetische Litteratur*, p. 352.

also, in which Christianity and Islam are together the subject of his controversy (alphabet 99, sections ו, ז), claim special attention. But, apart from this, the polemical passage contains a number of interesting items, a portion of which only I have pointed out in my notes. Some of the former are not quite clear; but on the whole, Hadassi's expositions, once they are dissolved from their peculiar rhymed form and its consequent distortions, can be followed without trouble. This piece of polemical literature deserves to occupy a place in the history of Jewish controversy against Christianity, both on account of the extracts it produces from older sources (Joseph Albasîr and Qirqisânî) and its general contents. It is remarkable that this class of literature owes its last great product to another Karaite, Isaac Troki (Chizzuk Emuna, 1594). The controversy, in the form as given by Hadassi, belongs to history. One of the editors of the JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW has only recently given an example (*J. Q. R.*, VIII, p. 193), full of candour and learning, how it is possible for modern Judaism to deal with Christianity without the unenjoyable harshness of the old controversialists.

W. BACHER.

BUDAPEST, *January*, 1896.

JOHANN REUCHLIN,

THE FATHER OF THE STUDY OF HEBREW AMONG CHRISTIANS.

On writing of Johann Reuchlin as the father of the study of Hebrew among Christians, I experience a difficulty of a peculiar nature. It would be my duty to confine myself to the dry, sober, and prosaic details of my subject; but at every step I am in danger of being drawn away from my immediate purpose by the many points of interest afforded by the personality and career of Johann Reuchlin.

Every detail in the life of Reuchlin is of absorbing interest. Whether we look upon the greatness achieved by him in his luxuriant mental endowments, or upon the greatness thrust upon him by the unholy zeal of his enemies, we are equally struck by the commanding power of his intellect, the noble dignity of his conduct, and the harmony in which the various traits of his character were blended, so as to form an imposing and, at the same time, sympathetic figure. It is almost impossible to speak of him merely as a man who was at pains to discover the abstruse rules of an unknown language; to consider Reuchlin only in the light of a laborious grammarian who devoted his life to the study of ancient languages, and thus drew Hebrew within the circle of his investigations. If he had been only this, I could at once commence discussing his books on the Hebrew language, dwelling upon the theories he evolved, the authorities upon whom they were based, the diligence bestowed by him on finding

a suitable soil for the seeds strewn, and his struggle to procure admission at the various seats of learning for his newly-discovered discipline. But he was more than a merely great scholar, whose thirst for knowledge would cause him to explore distant fields of learning. The motives that induced Reuchlin to plunge himself into the depths of Hebrew and Rabbinical lore were the outflow of his peculiarly constructed mind, and of convictions that forced his keen sense of duty into a certain direction. These we must try to comprehend first, before we are able to judge of Reuchlin as the father of the study of Hebrew in Christian Europe.

I shall, therefore, indulge in one deviation from my subject, and this only for the purpose of elucidating the workings of Reuchlin's mind when he determined to make the propagation of the study of Hebrew one of the objects of his life. I shall allow myself the pleasure of considering his convictions, both religious and philosophical, and the circumstances that caused him to embrace them, in order to understand the stimulus that impelled him to take the road on which we find him. I shall force myself, however reluctantly, to shut my eyes to the many other attractive phases of his career ; I shall omit his struggle with vile but powerful opponents when he resolutely set his face against the desire of the latter to commit all Jewish books to the fire. I shall be silent upon his many grand achievements in other branches of learning, on his career as statesman, lawyer, ambassador, courtier, writer of comedies, and of learned works on Greek and Latin languages and literature. Those who wish to gather information on these various points can refer to Ludwig Geiger's biography of Reuchlin, which appeared in Leipzic in 1871. In English there is a life of Reuchlin, by F. Barham (London, 1843), which is only an imitation of older German books on the subject. The quarrel with the book-burners is described in the *Life of Ulrich von Hutten* by Strauss, translated into English by Mrs. Sturge, and in

an essay written by me, entitled *John Pfefferkorn and the Battle of the Books,* which appeared in the JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW of January, 1892. An interesting essay on the *Epistolae obscurorum virorum*, from the pen of Sir William Hamilton, appeared in the *Edinburgh Review* of March, 1831.

Johann Reuchlin was born in 1455, twelve years after Rudolph Agricola, and about ten years before Erasmus of Rotterdam. At that time Scholasticism was still predominant at most Universities. It had, however, already commenced to totter in its struggle against Humanism, to whose attacks it finally succumbed. During several centuries the object of Scholasticism had been to harmonize the religious doctrines of the Church with the philosophy of the Ancients. It was one of the many attempts to amalgamate two opposite aspirations of human nature. Man, by his consciousness of intellectual power, claims to have the right and also the capability of forming a judgment upon anything and everything. On the other hand, the pious acquiescence in the will of a supernatural Being is not less an essential element in the constitution of human nature. Philosophy claimed to be self-sufficient, to be able to attain to Truth by the sole agency of the intellect, without positing anything, without being directed and guided by any other authority. But the Europe of the Middle Ages believed in the doctrines of the Church as in something which it was not only sinful but also absolutely absurd to deny. The question whether their religion was in harmony or in conflict with reason was not asked. They reasoned rather in this way: The teachings of the Christian Church being true, and, on the other hand, reason being the sole arbiter of that which was true or untrue, therefore there could not possibly be a conflict between religion and reason. It was in this way that the doctrines of the Church were subjected to the test of reason; a major was posited which included everything, but not more than it was desired to prove. It was in

this way that the first noteworthy Scholastic philosopher, Johannes Scotus Erigena, understood philosophy. To him philosophy and religion, which latter meant true religion, which again meant his religion, the religion of his Church, were identical. When he seems to give the preference to reason over religion the preference is more apparent than real. He only ventures to do so because he is convinced that the doctrines of his religion as taught by the fathers of his Church are in perfect agreement with reason. He prefers reason because his trust in the truth of his religion is unbounded.

The authorities of the Church saw a danger in this. They took cognizance of the violence occasionally done by Scotus Erigena to ecclesiastical tenets for the sake of bringing them in harmony with his philosophy, or rather the philosophy of those who preceded him. They condemned his writings ; they realized that several of their dogmas would stand in danger of being explained away and losing their meaning. Later Scholastic philosophers were obliged to exempt certain doctrines from the ordeal of intellectual investigation. Albertus Magnus, Thomas Aquinas, Duns Scotus excluded certain dogmas of their Church from their philosophical speculations. This process was extended ; the Church narrowed more and more the circle within which it allowed the human intellect to disport itself. All theological questions of importance were at length excluded ; only mere trivialities, the most inane questions, were allowed to occupy the by no means small intellects that were the pride of mediaeval Scholasticism. The latter became to be neither a philosophy nor a theology ; it neither satisfied the cravings of the pious nor the demands of the intelligent. Piety and intelligence both rose against Scholasticism, sometimes separately, sometimes with united efforts, till the structure of centuries tottered and fell never to rise again. On the one hand, Humanism and the science of Nature were in opposition to the dialectical methods and metaphysical principles of

Scholasticism, whilst piety endeavoured to gratify its spiritual longings after God and things divine by means of theosophical mysticism.

The way had been indicated long ago by Scotus Erigena, but the seeds he had sown, and which he himself had received from those who preceded him, did not bear fruit till at last mediaeval mysticism prevailed above all in Germany. It was not less opposed by the Catholic Church than certain aspects of Scholasticism had been. The first and, perhaps, the greatest of the German mystics, Master Eckhardt, who died in 1329, was persecuted for his doctrines. Eckhardt could not conceive the Deity without Universe and Man. His speculations were founded on the writings of the alleged Areopagite Dionysius and Scotus Erigena. Eckhardt's theosophy was particularly congenial to the German mind. According to Eckhardt nothing can be attributed to God which could not with greater reason be denied him. He is everything and nothing of everything. He has no existence because he is above existence. In this stage God is only the Godhead, non-personal, unknown to himself. He can only become known to himself by becoming united with Nature and Form. From this self-conception is derived, firstly, the difference of persons in God as taught by the Christian Church in the doctrine of the Trinity; and, secondly, the revelation of God in a world. But he can only communicate himself; he is the essence of all things, he is void of all things. Things are only distinguished from God by nothingness.

I have said enough to show how to Eckhardt's mind all things coincide, how the *principium coincidentiae oppositorum* is the leading string in his theosophical speculations. Such mysticism, rooted in the Christian dogmas, in Neo-Platonism, and other ancient speculations, suited the German mind. It was continued by others, especially by Nicholas Cusanus. The old idea of the harmony of contradictories (*coincidentia contradictorum*) was again put forward by him. He held that in God coincide all

contrasts, even those of to be and not to be, of the finite and the infinite; that in him no contradiction is contradictory, no difference exists between the infinitely great and the infinitely small, between absolute motion and absolute rest, &c., &c.

Cusanus connected with his theosophical speculations the investigation of Nature and the study of mathematics. This new branch of cogitation and knowledge, physical philosophy, was zealously pursued by Theophrastus Paracelsus, whose contemporary, Cornelius Agrippa von Nettesheim of Cologne, propagated theories which exercised an influence even two hundred years after his death. Agrippa was born in 1487; he was thus a younger contemporary of Reuchlin, whose part he took in the latter's famous controversy with the book-burners of Cologne. Agrippa, although an ardent opponent of Scholasticism and writing against the occult arts, practised magic himself. His theories were based on previous theosophical systems and on the Cabbala. He distinguishes between the divine, the heavenly, and the elemental worlds; he speaks of the world soul, the influence of the stars, of sympathy and antipathy, and of many other points of a similar nature.

We cannot therefore be surprised that Reuchlin, himself a Humanist and an opponent of Scholasticism, was a great admirer of the Cabbala and of Pythagoraean doctrines. The theosophical and theological theories of his time once having taken a firm hold on his convictions, he was not the man to rest satisfied with merely adopting them without inquiring into their origin. For Reuchlin, in whatever he undertook, never contented himself with a useful mediocrity. Although not a theologian by profession, and remaining to his last days a staunch adherent of the Catholic faith, and an opponent of that movement which ended in totally altering the convictions of a great portion of the Christian world, his personality was nevertheless of a decisive, though indirect, influence upon the origin and course of that revolt against Rome. As a lawyer he was

one of the most learned of his craft; as a statesman he showed himself a skilled and, what is more, a successful negotiator. Honours were showered upon him; he was created a Count Palatine, although he never assumed the title; he also held the legal profession in low esteem, as having only worldly interests for its object. His aspirations were of a loftier nature; he pined after truth, the mainspring and fountain-head of which he wished to reach. He refused to acquiesce in the evidence of others who declared a truth to emanate from a certain source. He would follow up for himself every stream and brooklet, every fall and course, to discover its origin. He pressed into the service of his explorations his vast achievements in the field of classical literature. For the same purpose he made himself acquainted with the philosophy of his time, with which, in pursuit of an impulse given by others, he connected the Jewish Cabbala. It was in this chase after truth, pure and unadulterated, that he discovered for Christian Europe a Hebrew and Rabbinical literature, which was henceforth to be an important branch of study at every higher seat of learning.

But in searching for truth he firmly believed it possible to find it. Like all great minds he doubted; as with all thinkers his doubts revolved within certain limits. On asking then what was the truth he wished to ascertain we shall find that truth was to him neither more nor less than what it was to his contemporaries. Although he infinitely surpassed the latter in the means employed to reach the goal, yet his ultimate hopes went no farther than theirs. He considered as truth the religion in which he was brought up, and the tenets of which he would have held it sinful to doubt. Nor was his philosophy any other than that which was taught by his contemporaries. His peculiar notions about the occult properties of things, the magical forces, the harmony of contradictories and of that which reason declares to be impossible, sufficiently show that as theologian and philosopher he was neither in

advance of nor behind his time. If as humanist he must be grouped with Johann Wessel, Rudolph Agricola, Erasmus of Rotterdam, and Philip Melanchthon, he stands as philosopher and Christian between Nicholas Cusanus, who died when Reuchlin was nine years of age, and Agrippa von Nettesheim, who was born when Reuchlin had already attained the age of manhood.

Reuchlin was of opinion that as a sincere and consistent Christian he could not but at the same time believe in his mystical tenets. His thoughts concerning the latter did not induce him to ask whether they were true according to the dictates of reason; he did not try to ascertain whether they were deduced from some primary and simple principle. With him the question was only whether they were or were not historically attested; whether they could stand the ordeal of scrutiny by the light of what he called history; whether they were in accordance with that which he considered to be the Christian religion. But the Christian religion was based upon the traditions of the Jews. Reuchlin was persuaded that God had revealed himself primarily to the Jews; that every truth, religious, moral, scientific, had been, in the first instance, revealed to that people by direct divine inspiration. Whatever other nations could boast of in the way of knowledge and wisdom must have emanated from Hebrew sources; if the Greeks, if Pythagoras, have shown signs that they were possessed of treasures of wisdom, there must have been channels by which the stream of knowledge had been drawn from the Hebrew mainspring. The latter had therefore to be explored; the study of the Hebrew sources of knowledge was imperatively demanded. A knowledge of Hebrew and of the Rabbinical dialects was necessary, and no obstacles could deter Reuchlin from steadily pursuing his object.

The Cabbala showed him doctrines which resembled those of the supposed Areopagite, of Master Eckhardt, of Nicholas Cusanus, in short, of that theosophy which was

in his day prevalent in Germany. The Cabbala had nothing in common with that Scholasticism which it became more and more the fashion to oppose; an opposition in which Reuchlin took an active part. But the Cabbala was a Jewish theosophy; it was a wisdom that had been treasured up by the Jews, by the people who by divine interference were the bearers of everything that was wise. Thus the tenets of the Cabbala were in Reuchlin's eyes raised at once high above the wisdom which the Neo-Platonists and those who followed them were able to teach, for the wisdom of the latter could only be an imitation of the superior, of the really divine wisdom as preserved by the Jews. In the Cabbala Reuchlin thought to have found the fountain-head from which all secular philosophy had emanated, the pure spring from which the turbid streams of Greek and Egyptian knowledge had issued.

But besides his theosophical views, another incentive to study Hebrew and the Rabbinical dialects was drawn from his religious convictions. Firm in his belief that the religion instilled in him from his infancy, the religion of the Christian Catholic Church, was the true religion, he endeavoured to find out and form for himself an opinion about the nature of, and the foundations on which that structure was based. Here again his doubts were historical and not metaphysical; and even these historical doubts moved within a narrow circle only. They stopped far short of an investigation of the acceptability of the doctrines taught by his Church; he would have considered the slightest doubt in that direction as rank heresy. To him it was the work of a bold and independent thinker to doubt the adopted interpretation of the Old and New Testament; to doubt whether the way in which the teachings of his Church were brought in harmony with the text of the Bible was the right way. This he considered an independent, unprejudiced investigation of the truth, and thus the study of Greek and Hebrew became to him a necessary of life.

Now if his theosophical views led him to believe that all things had some occult and mysterious properties beyond those perceptible to the senses, no wonder that he was greatly struck by that doctrine of the Cabbala that every word, every letter, of the Hebrew Bible had an occult significance beyond the simple meaning of the text. If everything in nature had an occult meaning, how much more must this be the case with the words spoken by God himself for the purpose of revealing to man all things superhuman and divine? He threw himself ardently into that kind of speculation; and by making use of an unrestrained freedom of transposing and combining letters and their numerical values, he managed to find in the Hebrew Bible everything he wished to establish. This was a new incentive to him to study Hebrew.

The necessity of learning Hebrew had already been felt by him when he was twenty years of age. At that time he composed a Latin dictionary, which was printed without his name under the title of *Vocabularius breviloquus*. Then already he expressed himself that we must appeal to the Hebrew book whenever a mistake in the Old Testament was found. In this dictionary, which was based on older works, Reuchlin was under the necessity of quoting many a Hebrew word which he did not understand. Such parrot-like copying was repulsive to Reuchlin's nature. It is true the translations of such words were given to him, but how was he to know that they were correct? He disliked using translations; even if correct, he compared them to wine that had been poured from cask to cask. His resolution to master the Hebrew language was probably taken at an early time, but he had to wait for twelve years longer before he was able to gratify his wish to some extent. For the study of Hebrew was at that time unknown in Christian Europe.

Reuchlin's education had not been neglected; he had acquired the rudiments of knowledge in his native town of Pforzheim, where he attended the Latin school. When

he was fifteen years of age he went to the University of Freiburg, where the attention of the court was drawn to him by his beautiful voice. He became one of the choristers, and his personal acquaintance with the Margrave Frederick began in a most curious way. Papal nuncios had been sent to the court of the Margrave, and when they came to take leave and to receive their dispatches, they were addressed by the High Chancellor. This was otherwise a good and clever man, but he had been born in Hechingen, and had transferred to his Latin the abominable German pronunciation of his district. He began his oration: "Ceilsissimus et eilustrissumus naoster prainceps eintellexit," &c. The Italians were astonished; they did not understand a word. They protested not to be able to accept this as a dispatch. In this embarrassment some one remembered that Reuchlin, the amanuensis of the Chancellor, could speak pure Latin. He was called, and carried on the discourse in a style cultivated by practice and travelling, and was much admired. He became attached to the service of the Margrave, whom he accompanied on a journey to Rome in 1473. In 1474 he went to Basle. Here he met Lapidanus, with whom he had previously been acquainted, and who was now professor at Basle. Reuchlin proceeded to study Greek under his guidance, perfected himself in grammar, and read Aristotle. He eagerly grasped the opportunity offered him here of learning Greek from Andronicus Contablacas, a native of Greece. From this circumstance originated that which was called in the schools the Reuchlinian mode of pronouncing Greek. He thought that his teacher, being a Greek himself, ought to be an authority on pronunciation. It was at Basle that Reuchlin composed his Latin Dictionary, which was indeed compiled from older works, chiefly from that of Papias, and in which he showed already then that he was not to be a mere manufacturer of books, but that he promised to become an independent worker in the field of learning. After a few years he visited Paris for the second time and continued

his Greek studies under the Greek George Hermonymos. But Reuchlin, not being rich, had to work for his support. He selected the legal profession for his career, went to Orleans, where, whilst studying Roman law, he supported himself by teaching Greek. For this purpose he composed in Greek a grammar of the Greek language. Having received at Poitiers his diploma as Licentiate of Civil Law, he left France and went to Tübingen in 1481.

Several reasons are given for his selection of Tübingen as his residence. The University at that town was renowned far and wide, it was near Reuchlin's native town of Pforzheim, and the court of the Count of Wurtemberg was accessible to men of learning. But besides these allurements I cannot help thinking that there was another magnet that attracted him thither. This magnet was the study of the Hebrew language.

There can be no doubt that already at that time he was bent upon studying Hebrew. But such a wish, easily as it was conceived, was difficult of execution. Reuchlin's great contemporaries, Johann Wessel, who himself knew a little Hebrew, and Rudolph Agricola, rather discouraged him; but this did not deter a man of Reuchlin's persistency. The fact is, there were no teachers, hardly any books, and nothing in the shape of a grammar or dictionary accessible to Reuchlin. He could not employ Jews, because in a number of German states no Jews were permitted to dwell; and some Jews thought it wrong to teach Hebrew to a non-Jew. Although as a good Christian he sincerely wished that all Jews might be induced to become Christians, he somehow or other felt strong dislike to the baptized Jews he came across. It is true the Council of Vienna had decreed in 1312 that chairs for Hebrew be erected in Paris, Oxford, Salamanca, and Boulogne, but the decree remained almost a dead letter. Now it happened that at the time when Reuchlin terminated his studies in France, there were in Tübingen two theologians who had the reputation of knowing Hebrew, namely, Conrad Summenhardt and

Paul Scriptoris. When we consider the doggedness with which Reuchlin persisted in his determination to master the Hebrew language we are led to believe that the presence of these two men in Tübingen was one of the inducements that caused Reuchlin to settle there.

Whether these two scholars were of much use to Reuchlin is another question. We may safely assume that Reuchlin had, by his own perseverance, gained some knowledge of Hebrew, which, infinitesimally small as it may have been, must have equalled, if not surpassed, that of those two professors. There is a circumstance which, I think, enables us to gauge the extent of their Hebrew knowledge.

There lived at that time a man called Conrad Pellican, a clergyman, a man of learning, who became at a later period a friend and follower of Zwingli. From his knowledge of Latin, Greek, and Hebrew he was called by Thomas Murner, in his *Kirchendieb- und Ketzer Kalender* (Calendar of Church Robbers and Heretics), an observant, recalcitrant heretic, and an apostate in three languages[1]. When he first conceived the wish of learning Hebrew he had the good luck of coming across a commentary of Nicholas de Lira to some books of the Hebrew Bible. He tries to read the Hebrew words by means of the Latin transcription, puts to memory the letters of such words, by these means learns the alphabet, and practises reading by the recurrence of the same letters in other words. After a year he obtains a Hebrew Bible, and composes a small grammar, "*De modo legendi et intelligendi Hebraea*," which according to some was printed in 1503. In his autobiography he tells us that he was vexed at not being able to find, except in rare instances, the first person of the present indicative, which he supposed to be the stem of the verb, like in Latin, *amo, lego, audio*: "Sed dolebat mihi valde non inveniri in verbis, nisi raro, primam personam praesentis indicativi ut est apud latinos thema: amo, lego, audio." After some time

[1] Conradus Pellicanus, *Chronicon*. ed. Riggenbach (Basle, 1877).

he happened to meet Reuchlin, to whom he communicated the difficulty, and who of course at once told him where to look for the roots of verbs. "Tunc subridens humanissimus Doctor Reuchlin dicebat, apud Hebraeos thema verborum non esse primam personam nec indicativi, nec imperativi, sed tertiam singularem praeteriti perfecti." Pellican adds: "hac regula accepta exultavi in animo, sciens huiusmodi verbo impleta Biblia."

Now it is known that Pellican had been assisted in his work by Conrad Summenhardt and Paul Scriptoris, and we can conclude how unsatisfactory the knowledge of these two professors must have been.

If Reuchlin had some hopes of getting information from them he must soon have been undeceived. He proceeded to pursue his studies on his own account, but with little success. It is true he was already in 1483 praised for his knowledge of Hebrew, but who can tell with how much justice? He had no Hebrew Bible. The first copy was printed in Italy in 1488; Reuchlin asked a friend to procure him a copy, but it is not known whether the latter was successful.

But his craving for receiving instruction in Hebrew was at length to be gratified. His master Eberhard with the Beard sent Reuchlin to the Emperor to obtain the latter's sanction to an enlargement of his territory. It was on this occasion that Reuchlin and his brother were ennobled by the Emperor and received the dignity of Counts Palatine. It was on this occasion that Reuchlin became acquainted with the Emperor's Jewish body physician, Jacob Jehiel Loans, who occupied an honoured position at the court and became Reuchlin's teacher of Hebrew. Reuchlin never assumed the title conferred upon him by the Emperor, but always remained plain Johann Reuchlin; but the acquaintance with Loans was always considered by him as one of the happiest events of his life. A blind man who had been groping in the dark for years, when by a happy accident the light of heaven dawned upon him, would not

rejoice more than Reuchlin did when the portals of the divine truth were widely opened before him. In the same year that Columbus added a new world to the one within whose limits mankind had been hitherto confined, Reuchlin disclosed to Christian Europe a new language and literature. Reuchlin never forgot, nor was he ever ashamed to own, how much he was indebted to Loans; he quotes him in subsequent books as "praeceptor meus mea sententia valde doctus homo J. J. Loans Hebraeus," or "praeceptor meus ille J. J. Loans doctor excellens." Eight years later, when he had made considerable progress in Hebrew, he writes to Loans a Hebrew letter, in which he informs him that after they had parted he had succeeded in successfully continuing his Hebrew studies, a fact at which his master no doubt would greatly rejoice. He writes:

שלום שלום לרחוק ולקרוב אדוני ר׳ יעקוב אלופי ומיודעי: ממני המשתוקק והנכסף לחזות פניך הנעימים להתענג מזיו פניך המאירות לשמוע למודך הטהור: ועתה באתי במגלת ספר להודיעך כי שבח לאל אחרי נסעי ממך הצלחתי בלמודי והגעתי בהשגה גדולה: ידעתי תשמח ותגיל · אני יוחנן רוחילין מפורצן הכותב ראש חודש כסלו שבת הרסא: ליד הנכבד ר׳ יעקוב בכמר יחיאל לואנש. (1 Nov. 1500)

Now that the gates of this branch of learning were opened to him, he passed with gigantic strides over the whole field. Having successfully concluded his mission, he left the court loaded with honours which he little esteemed, and took up his residence at Heidelberg, where he became Agricola's successor as keeper of the library of Johann Dalburg, Bishop of Worms. He also became councillor of Philip, Elector of the Palatinate, and chief censor (*Zuchtmeister*) of his sons. He had perfected himself in Hebrew, continued his Cabbalistic studies, and published in 1494 his work *De Verbo mirifico*, which contains many quotations, but yet does not display any particular knowledge of Hebrew, as almost all quotations could be accounted for as having been derived from secondary sources. His

wonderful word consists of the letters י, ה, ש, ו, ה, in which he blended together the Hebrew name of the Deity with three letters of the name ישוע. He ascribed many mystical properties to that word, which is frequently to be found on the title-pages of his books. At Heidelberg he wished to give lessons in Hebrew, but the monks prevented him. This need not surprise us, for they also disliked the study of Greek. When Reuchlin's brother Dionysius, who had been educated at his expense, became magister in Tübingen in 1494, he was to occupy the first chair in Greek at that University. But the monks put difficulties in his way. The Elector repeatedly writes to them to allow Dionysius to lecture, but it was of no use; they refused to give him a college room. At that time Philip's son was to marry a lady who stood to him in such a degree of consanguinity that a papal dispensation was required. Moreover Philip himself was at that time excommunicated for withholding some revenues of the monks. Reuchlin was sent to Rome to set matters right. This was his third journey to Rome. His negotiations were again successful; but being retained for a whole year, he employed his time in further adding to his knowledge of Hebrew by taking instruction from Rabbi Obadiah Sforno, who was a classical scholar, a physician, a philosopher, and a Cabbalist. Reuchlin, at the same time, tried to obtain Hebrew books. He never ceased learning, and even as late as 1516 he wished to take lessons in Chaldaean from Johann Potkin, the same who had instructed Petrus Galatinus, one of the most shameless plagiarists that ever lived[1].

Reuchlin's work, *De Rudimentis Hebraicis*, appeared in March, 1506. He was very proud of this work, and on the last page he puts the verse of Horace, "exegi monumentum aere perennius." The work is divided into three books. The two first contain the dictionary, and the third

[1] For the following short survey of Reuchlin's books on Hebrew grammar, compare Ludwig Geiger, *Life of Reuchlin*, and *Das Studium der Hebräischen Sprache.*

the grammar. The dictionary is a close imitation of Rabbi David Kimchi's ספר השרשים, the first edition of which was printed in 1480. Kimchi's work was written in Rabbinical Hebrew, in a concise style. Reuchlin's arrangement differs from that of Kimchi only in a few points. The words are arranged according to the roots, only that Kimchi places the quadralitera at the end of every letter, and Reuchlin embodies them between the trilitera.

Reuchlin gives the proper nouns, which were omitted by Kimchi. Kimchi places the Chaldaean words of the Bible at the end, and Reuchlin puts them with the Hebrew words. Sometimes it would appear as if Reuchlin's dictionary contained more articles than that of Kimchi; the fact is that he sometimes dissolves the latter's articles into four, and even into six parts. The quotations are those of Kimchi, which Reuchlin corrects only occasionally. On the whole it may be said that Reuchlin closely followed Kimchi, although other Jewish authors are also utilized by him. He quotes the Massorah, which must have been no easy task to him, for he had to glean those enigmatical annotations from manuscripts. He quotes the מורה נבוכים of Maimonides, whom he calls R. Moyses Aegyptius, the כוזרי of R. Jehudah Halevy, and occasionally Nachmanides, Gersonides, and Cabbalistic writers. He quotes copiously from Rashi, who is to him *ordinarius scripturae interpres*. His quotations from Rashi he had at first hand, and not from Nicholas de Lira's commentaries, for he says that if he were to strike out from De Lira's works all that the latter had taken from Rashi, only a few pages would remain. He had a much higher opinion of Paulus Burgensis. Of the fathers of the Church he quotes Jerome most frequently; we must not forget that he had always taken the latter as a sort of a model, whose life he was desirous of imitating. In the greater number of cases Reuchlin adopts his opinions, but he is sometimes surprised at his interpretations. Of Augustin he says once, "Augustinus, nescio quo somno motus." Not less cavalierly he treats

the Vulgate, of which he says once, "Nescio quid blacterat," and again, "Nescio quid nostra translatio somniavit"; and he complains of the many defects of that translation. He kept all along steadfast to a principle laid down by him elsewhere: "Quamquam enim Hieronymum sanctum veneror ut angelum et Lyram colo ut magistrum, tamen adoro veritatem ut deum." Besides the authorities mentioned, he made use of the Septuagint, Symmachus, Theodotion, Aquila, and the Chaldaean versions. His Arabic quotations are from Kimchi; he knew no Syriac, and it is doubtful whether he studied Arabic at a later period. He illustrates some statements by examples from Greek and Latin, and even from German idioms. He shows hardly anything of Bible criticism in the modern sense of the word.

The third part of his Rudimenta is devoted to Grammar. It is the first work of its kind. Reuchlin's object is to help the reader to an independent and grammatically intelligent reading of the Bible, and not to teach how to write Hebrew. He is very much afraid his readers might endeavour to read the Hebrew the wrong way. He therefore gives the

CANON.

Non est liber legendus hic ceu ceteri
Faciem sinistra dextera dorsum tene
Et de sinistra paginas ad dexteram
Quascumque verte. Quae Latina vides
Legito latine, hebraea si sit insita
A dextera legenda sunt sinistrorsum.

And in the dedicatory epistle to his brother Dionysius he gives the same directions.

The work is very elementary. As a reading exercise he gives the "genealogia Mariae virginis" in Hebrew. Strange to say, this genealogy astonished John Fisher so much that he asked Erasmus to inquire from Reuchlin whence he had taken it. He discusses the consonants and their properties, the vowels, diphthongs, the שוא. His rules are ample and diffuse, he recapitulates them and inter-

sperses them with words of encouragement to the student. He analyzes every word, every syllable quoted. He treats on the noun and its genders and declension; on the pronouns, the numerals, the preposition מ when used as ablative. He admonishes his reader to find the root of every word, be it ever so compound, and illustrates this by showing how it would have to be done in Latin in the words *hae inhonorificabilitudines*. For the verb he uses as paradigms פעל and פקד. Instead of Kal, Piel, &c., he speaks of the first, the second conjugation, &c., with their passive voices, and thus, assuming an active and a passive Hithpael, he has four conjugations with their passives. Their regular verb follows, then the quadralitera, the verb with suffixes, a short syntax, the prepositions, and, at last, the rule of the vav conversive as given him by Loans. His chief source is again Kimchi in his ספר מכלול. But he also quotes Moses Kimchi, Ibn Ezra, Ibn Ganach, and a ספר שכל טוב by Moyses Zejag. The book was really written by Moses Kimchi, but the MS. contained at the end a notice that the book had been sold to Moses Ziug, and Reuchlin mistook him for its author. He calls Gabirol, the Avicebron of the Scholastic philosophers, Moses instead of Solomon. On the whole it can be said that none of these quotations are at first hand.

The work was not a success from a business point of view. In 1510 there were still 750 copies on hand. The bookseller Amorbach of Basle complained to Reuchlin that the book did not sell. Reuchlin told him to wait, in time he would make great profit by it, "for," Reuchlin added, "if I live, the Hebrew language must come out; should I die, the opening is made."

Reuchlin had particularly turned his attention to the literature of the Rabbis. He wanted to obtain a copy of the Talmud, but without success. In 1510 he wrote that he would like to pay the price for a copy of the Talmud twice over, but he had not yet been able to obtain one. In 1512 he bought the treatise of סנהדרין. The manuscript,

which is now in the library at Carlsruhe, has some notes from his hand. He quotes once from this treatise; his other quotations from the Talmud are not original. In the division of the Talmud he follows the mistake of some of his predecessors that the Talmud had four parts, the first treating of feasts and ceremonies, the second of herbs and seeds, the third of matrimonial laws, and the fourth of civil and criminal law. If he had ever possessed a copy of the whole Talmud he would certainly have corrected that error.

In 1512 he published the seven so-called penitential psalms (vi, xxxii, xxxviii, li, cii, cxxx, cxliii), with a translation and commentary. It was the first Hebrew text printed in Germany. His explanations are most elementary, and the book was written in such a clear and easy style that Sebastian Munster said at a later period that a child of seven might learn Hebrew from it. His authorities are again the Jewish authors Rashi, Ibn Ezra, the Kimchis, Nachmanides, and the Targumim. In Psalm li. 6 he would fain prefer the plain meaning of the words למען תצדק בדברך to the translation given in the letter to the Romans iii. 4. He excuses this boldness by a quotation from Hieronymus, "quod frequenter annotavimus apostolos et evangelistas non iisdem verbis usos esse in testamenti veteris exemplis quibus in propriis voluminibus continentur." In the dedicatory epistle to Jacob Lemp he says that his Rudimenta would not display their full usefulness as long as there were not more Hebrew Bibles to hand. He had hoped that a great number of Bibles or other Hebrew books would come to Germany, but the Emperor Maximilian's wars in Italy had made it impossible. The Pfefferkorn braggarts had promised to print Hebrew books, but they did not keep their promise. Less elementary and diffuse was his translation and commentary of Ps. cx–cxiv, but the book was never printed.

He also published in the same year a translation of the poem קערת כסף of Joseph אזובי (Hyssopaeus), whom he calls

poetam dulcissimum, and in the preface he says that he had formerly thought that Hebrew was unsuitable for poetical composition, but that this poem had taught him that he had been mistaken. Ezobi's poem has found much favour among Christian scholars. It was also translated by Mercerus, and both the original and the two translations were reproduced by Wolf in his *Bibliotheca*[1].

In 1518 Reuchlin issued his work *De accentibus et Orthographia linguae Hebraicae.* When he wrote his commentary on the penitential psalms he was already thinking of writing this work. In the preface he says that he dedicated the book to the Cardinal Adrianus, "to give the youth, bent upon studying languages, a leader under whose banner they would be able to fight, if need be, with those ferocious and rabid dogs who hated all good arts; against the disease and pestilence of everything old, against the burners of books who thirsted for the destruction and extermination of the most ancient monuments. As an old man he might cease to teach elements of grammar, fit only for children and young people, but his zeal for the spread of the study of Hebrew makes him forget all objections." It is very rare for Reuchlin thus to allude in his learned books to his cruel and relentless persecutors.

The work is divided into three books. The first book he calls טעם, it treats on pronunciation. Taking the root פעל for his paradigm he gives all possible forms of words with indication of the מלעיל and מלרע; but for words with suffixes he takes פקד instead of פעל. Every word is accompanied by a quotation from the Bible where it occurs. He gives the noun with all suffixes, the prepositions, some pronouns, the verbs with and without suffixes.

The second book he calls מתג, for the proper use of which he gives twenty-seven rules. He speaks of the דגש and of the difference between ש׳ ימין and ש׳ שמאל. He calls these signs rhetorical accents, governing a rhetorical metre.

[1] An English translation of the "Silver Bowl" appears in the present number of the JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW.

The third book he calls נגינה. He says that it was an ancient custom of the Hebrews to devote songs to God, and refers to the example of Moses. This custom had survived even to his days, and was a daily custom in the synagogue. He enumerates the accents, and translates their names into Latin. He then explains them, and discusses their value. He confesses that in all this he followed the Rabbis. At the end he gives the tunes of each accent as they were and are still chanted in the synagogues. There is something curious in this musical transcription. Firstly, the notes, while written in the musical notation of his time, run, however, like Hebrew, from right to left. But in his zeal he displays an excess of lucidity which caused much obscurity. In the synagogue the chanting is done by the reader only, and there is never a chorus. Reuchlin thought of a performance by choristers, and arranged the tunes for four voices; namely, the discant (treble), the alto, the tenor, and the bass. Contrary to modern custom, the tenor contains the melody, which thus appears in the middle of the harmony. Moreover, the accents being given in the order of the "*Zarka* table," the harmony does not always place a musical close on just those accents which demand it. Now I am told by the Rev. Francis Cohen that what happened was this. Some writers on mediaeval music thought, firstly, that the melody was contained in the discant (soprano), and not in the tenor; secondly, that they had to read the notes from left to right; and thirdly, that the latter presented one consecutive melody. You will not be surprised therefore that, after much trouble, they could make nothing of it.

The book on the Hebrew accents was the last of Reuchlin's large works. But he was not satisfied with learning himself, and writing books, and, having written them, leaving them to their fate. With him the propagation of the study of Hebrew was the great object of his life. Though this study was not the cause of the bitter persecutions he had to undergo at the hands of the

firebrands of Cologne, it was used by them as a weapon with which to strike at him. But neither this nor anything else caused him to waver. He persuaded many students to take up the study of Hebrew. The influence he exercised in this direction was enormous. There were many who wished to learn, but the question was, how was it to be accomplished? The Universities were useless. In 1510 Reuchlin petitioned the Emperor, "for the sake of God and the Christian faith, to effect that at every German University two professors of Hebrew be appointed for ten years, and that the Jews be compelled to lend Hebrew books against good securities for this purpose, till such a time as the Christians would provide for themselves printed and written books." But ten years elapsed before a beginning of that kind was made. Numbers of young people came to Reuchlin to learn, others consulted him in writing on difficult points which he always was ready to answer. Such letters of inquiry he even received from monks and soldiers. Among his followers was a young Englishman, Richard Crokus, the author of some books, who wrote to him that he was always at Reuchlin's service, and asked him to dedicate his next Cabbalistic work to John Fisher, Bishop of Rochester. John Fisher removed to Michael House in Cambridge, now embodied in Trinity College, in 1484; he was elected Master of his college 400 years ago, in 1495. He was chaplain of Margaret, Countess of Richmond, the mother of Henry VII. In 1501 he became Doctor of Divinity, in the following year he was appointed Professor of Divinity, and in 1504 he became Bishop of Rochester. When Reuchlin was so bitterly persecuted by his slandering tormentors of Cologne, he asked Erasmus to put his case before the English scholars, who only knew the reports spread by his Cologne enemies. But Reuchlin was mistaken. The English scholars admired him greatly, especially Thomas More and John Fisher. The latter was one of Reuchlin's great admirers; he took his part in the controversy, sent him

tokens of esteem, admonished him to persevere, and expressed a wish of making a journey for the sole purpose of seeing Reuchlin and conversing with him. The authors of the *Epistolae obscurorum virorum*, pretending to inveigh against the influx of foreign students, which, they thought, was flooding the University of Leipsic, thus allude to the aforesaid Crokus in their satirical imitation of the monkish dog-Latin of the day: "Et est alius hic, qui etiam legit in Graeco, vocatus Richardus Crocus, et venit ex Anglia. Ego dixi nuper: Diabolus, venit iste ex Anglia? Ego credo, quod, si esset unus poeta ibi, ubi piper crescit, ipse etiam veniret Leiptzick.' Crokus was a good scholar, and certainly did not deserve such quizzing. But we know that all blame contained in those *epistolae* was meant for praise.

Obsolete as Reuchlin's works are at the present day, his boast that "he had erected for himself a monument more imperishable than bronze" is true to the letter. He was as good as his word, "that the study of Hebrew must come out," and he was, after all, as he said himself, the first. The study of Hebrew in Christian Europe commenced with him, was taken up by his immediate successors, and has never since been relinquished. I cannot dwell on the vigour of his mind and his powers of application, as shown by the fact that he could unswervingly pursue the study of Hebrew, and zealously work for its propagation at a time when he was engaged with delicate political negotiations, with legal affairs, with theological and philosophical, or rather theosophical subjects, with the study of Greek and Roman authors; at a time when he had to sustain a struggle of life and death against unscrupulous and influential persecutors. This struggle only would have been enough to weigh down the energies of any man less richly endowed by nature, less earnest in the fulfilment of his duties, than Reuchlin. As I said before, it was my duty to dwell on the least interesting phase of Reuchlin's life. Reuchlin has many claims on the gratitude of later

generations, but this one portion of his activity, his discovery of Hebrew learning, would have been sufficient to secure for him the regard of posterity. It was through Reuchlin that Germany can boast that one of her children has disclosed a Hebrew and Rabbinical literature to Christian Europe.

It might not have been so. If circumstances had at one time been more favourable, that privilege might have fallen to the lot of England. It will always be a cause of regret to every friend of learning and science, and particularly to a loyal and patriotic Englishman, that the vast erudition and patient researches of Roger Bacon were destined to remain without influence upon the history of civilization. Although naturally of quite different disposition and intellectual formation, yet was there much in common between Roger Bacon and Johann Reuchlin. Both of them were induced by the very same instincts to occupy themselves with the study of Hebrew. It is noteworthy that in this respect some observations made by Bacon and by Reuchlin are almost identical to the letter. Both believed in a mysterious and spiritual meaning of every word of the Bible beyond the one which appeared on the surface. Both held that all knowledge, all philosophy, had been revealed by God to the Jews, and was transferred by the latter to the other nations. Bacon held that Joseph had instructed the Egyptian princes and elders, that Moses had known the Egyptian wisdom, that Solomon had been the greatest philosopher, that medicine was invented by the sons of Adam and Noah. Like Reuchlin, he made use of Jewish instructors, he complained of the difficulty of getting even the most indispensable books, he complained of the ignorance which caused words that were in reality Hebrew to be derived from Latin or Greek roots. He had the same aversion as Reuchlin to translations, even to correct ones, and, almost in the same words as Reuchlin, he declared "that it was sweeter to drink water from the very source than from turbid pools, and that the wine from the

first vat was purer and more wholesome and of better quality than after it had been poured from vessel to vessel." He, equally with Reuchlin, distrusted translations, even those translations of the Bible which enjoyed the sanction of his Church. He even goes so far as to charge Jerome with want of moral courage, which occasionally prompted the latter wittingly to put down an erroneous version so as not to irritate the crowd, who considered him a falsifier of the text on account of his novel translation of certain passages. He complains of the prevalent ignorance of Hebrew, and that the knowledge of that language, possessed by a few, was only mechanical, without any insight into Hebrew grammar. Bacon himself professed to be a good Hebrew scholar, and he asserts that he was able to teach Hebrew to any diligent and zealous pupil, so as to enable the latter to read and understand Holy Writ and the ancient sages, and everything appertaining to the interpretation of such writings, and all this within three days. In this respect Bacon differed considerably from Reuchlin, who said that the student commenced to master Hebrew only when he had reached the stage of despair and was on the point of throwing up the study of Hebrew as an impossible task. It is a pity that the Hebrew Grammar which Roger Bacon is supposed to have written does not now exist—if it ever existed. It was the fate of this wonderful man that all the discoveries he made in so many branches of knowledge should die with him, and remain without effect upon the development of learning. This was also the case with his study of Hebrew, and that which in another age and under different circumstances might have been brought about by Roger Bacon was left to be accomplished by Johann Reuchlin.

S. A. Hirsch.

A COLLATION OF ARMENIAN TEXTS OF THE TESTAMENTS OF (1) JUDAH; (2) DAN; (3) JOSEPH; (4) BENJAMIN.

{ B = MS. Bible of British and Foreign Bible Society.
{ Z = MS. Bible of Lord Zouche.

V = Armenian detached MS. of XII Patriarchs in Mechitarist Library at Venice.

THE TESTAMENT OF JUDAH.

BZ have foll. title: Test. Iudae de fortitudine et auaritia et fornicatione; but V has: Test. Iudae tertium de auaritia et fornicatione, sed et iustitia.

The figures give the page and line to Sinker's edition.

Page 149, line 3. Et Leia mater mea. 4. *ἀνθομολογήσομαι.* om. *καί.* 8. *μοι*] *περί* (*or ἐπί*) *μου.* om. *καί.* 10. *ὡς εἶδον*] *οἶδα* with O. *πιάσας*] *ἐποίησα* (dedi) and om. *ἐποίησα* in l. 11. 11. After *τῷ πατ. μ.* add *ἐπεὶ χειρὶ ἐπίασα, καί.* 12. *δρόμου μου. φοράδα*] The versions render "females" as if *θηλείας ἀγρίας.* 13. om. *καὶ πιάσας* and read *καταλαβών.* After *ἡμέρωσα* add *τὰ ἄγρια ζῷα ἐθήρευσα χειρί μου, καί.* After *λέοντα* add *πολλάκις.* 14. *ἄρκον*] "ursumque." 15. *ἐκ τῶν κρημνῶν. διήσπουν*] "I slew." 17. om. *ἐν τῷ τρέχειν με. κατεσπάραξα αὐτόν*] "having smitten it, I scattered its bones." After *πάρδαλις* add *που.* 19. *ἐρράγη*] *εὑρέθη* (+*ἡ πάρδαλις* BZ only) *ῥαγεῖσα. χώρᾳ νεμ.*] *νεμ. ἐν ὄρει.* 20. *κρατήσας* w. O. 22. *ἦλθεν ὁ βασιλεύς . . . τεθωρακισμένος.* 23. *μόνος ἦν καὶ δραμών.*

P. 150. 1. Σούρ] ζούρ *or* τζούρ. 2. Ταφονέ] τῶν Ταφίων. 3. λαὸν αὐτῶν w. O. 4. Ἀχώρ] Ὀχοσωρα BZ: χώρα V. γίγαντα w. O. 4, 5. βάλλοντα . . . ἵππου] ἔχοντα περὶ τὴν ὀσφὺν ὄπισθεν καὶ ἔμπροσθε τὸ τόξον καθημένον ἐφ' ἵππου. 5. After ἀνελόμενος om. comma. ξ'] 20. ἔδωκα τῷ ἵππῳ] ἔκρουσα τὸν ἵππον. 6. τὸν βασιλέα Ἀχὼρ ὡς ἐπί. 6, 7. ἀπέκτεινα . . . μερίδας] om., cp. R. 7. ποιήσας] κλάσας. om. αὐτοῦ. 8. αὐτοῦ] add καὶ οὕτως ἀπέκτεινα (+ αὐτόν BZ). Ἐν δὲ τῷ ἐνδύεσθαί με τὸν θ. αὐτοῦ. 8, 9. ἰδού, ἄνδρες ἐφάνησαν ἕτ. αὐ. ἐννέα (but ἑπτά V) καὶ ἤρξαντο. 9, 10, 11. ἐνειλίσας . . . ἀνεῖλον] "And having wrapped my hand in my garment slinging I slew of them four. 12. ἡμῶν] ἐμοῦ. Βελιασάθ. 14. ἀφ'] καθ'. 15. ὅτε] ὅτι. ἐν] σὺν w. O. εἶδον γάρ. 16. om. περὶ ἐμοῦ. After ἄγγελος add κυρίου V only. After ἡττᾶσθαι add ὑπό τινος. 18. After ἐδίωξα add ἐξ αὐτῶν. 20. om. ἐπ' αὐτούς and add αὐτῶν after τείχους. ἄλλους ἔτι βασ. τέτταρας ἀνεῖλον. 24. ἀπειλοῦσαν . . .] "et illi minitabantur nobis mortem." 25, 26. om. καὶ νότου w. O. 27. καὶ οὕτως . . . ἀδελφοί] καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι πάντες ἀδ.

P. 151. 4. θαφφοῦ] Thêôkiorum. 5. παραδόντες and om. σύν w. O. 7. ἐσκυλεύσαμεν w. O. 9. καὶ συνάψαντες ἐτρέψαμεν αὐτούς w. O. 9, 10. καὶ τοὺς . . . ἀπεκτείναμεν] om. 10. om. αὐτοῖς. 11. οἱ ἀπό w. O. 12. After λαβεῖν add ἀφ' ἡμῶν. 13. δυναστῶν w. O. 14. αὐτούς] "many hosts." 18, 19. αἱ . . . ἡμᾶς] Γᾶς πόλις βασιλεῖ δυνατῷ ἔρχεται πρὸς ἡμᾶς. 20. om. αὐτῶν. 21. "et in profunda nocte exorti aperuimus fratribus nostris portas." 22. om. πάντα. 24. τότε] καί. 25. ὑβριζόμενοι ἀπ' αὐτῶν ἐθυμώθημεν καὶ ὡρμήσαμεν.

P. 152. 1. ἔχοντές με ἂν ἀνεῖλον. 2. καὶ ἐφυγαδεύσαμεν αὐτούς for κ. π. ἐφ. 3. πατρὸς ἡμῶν καὶ ἐποιήσαμεν. 5. om. πᾶσαν. καὶ μετὰ τοῦτο ὠκοδόμ. 8. "Hiram." 9. Ὀδολαμήτων for Ὀδολάμ. 11. "Bersonê." 14. ἐποίησεν w. O. om. καὶ ἡμεῖς w. O. 16. ἀπὸ Λ. ἐκ Μ. Συρίας. 18. πατρὸς ἡμῶν. 19. κ. πορευομένων ἐτάφη ἐν Ἀνανιράμ. 20. πόλεις. 21. τείχη σιδηρᾶ κ. π.

αὐτῶν χ. om. ἐν αὐτῇ. 22. αὐτόν. 23. ὁρώντων αὐτῶν] om. προσάγομεν κλ. πρὸς τεῖχος αὐτῶν καὶ τιθεὶς τὴν ἀσπίδα ἐπὶ τῶν κεφαλῶν ἡμῶν *sic*. 24. ἕως] ὡς. 25. om. ἀνελθών. ἄνδρας τέσσαρας. om. τῇ w. O. 26. ἔξ w. O.

P. 153. 1. ἔτι τι πρός. 2. After ἡμῖν add ἀεί. 3. βέθ 500 V; βέθ 105 ?BZ. οἶνου μ. χ. πεντ.] om. 7. om. γῆς. τρίτῃ] δευτέρᾳ. 8, 9. ἡμέρᾳ . . . αὐτῆς. Ἐν] om. ?Through similar ending. 10. θαλάμου αὐτοῦ· κἀγὼ ἤθελον (but BZ om. κἀγώ and = ἤθελεν) ἐπιγαμβρεῦσαι VBZ. 11. ἕνα ἐνιαυτόν. 14. "Silamon" and V adds "tertium filium meum." "Bersone." 14, 15. ἐπονηρ. . . . Θάμαρ] om. 17. om. οἰνοχοοῦσαν. 18. συνέπ. π. αὐ.] "procubui in consilium (*or* mysteria) eius." 19. om. γῆς. 24. ἀπεν. τ. π.] "in media ciuitate." 24–26. νόμος . . . πύλην] om. 26. Χουζάβ. 27. ἐπάτησε.

P. 154. 4. ἐποίησα. 4, 5. τὸν ἀρραβῶνα. 6. λόγους παρ' αὐτῆς. οὓς ἐλάλησα] om. 7. κυρίου ἦν ἐκεῖνο. Ἐνεθυμήθην δὲ καὶ ἔλεγον. 9. After ἔτι add "sed deuitaui (*or* consternatus sum)." ἕως ἡμέρας. 10. om. τοῦτο. μὴ εἶναι ἐν τῇ π. τελ.] "that there were not achieved in their gate (πύλῃ) things such as these." 12. καὶ ἐνόμιζον οὕτως. 13. om. πρὸς Ἰωσήφ. 15. ἐκεῖ] ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ. 16, 17, 18. καὶ φυλ. τοὺς λόγους Ἰούδα τοῦ πατρὸς ὑμῶν, τοῦ ἔχειν πάντι τι δικ. ἐνώπιον κυρίου. 18. ἐντολὰς θεοῦ and om. κυρίου. 19. ἐπιθ. καρδίας ὑμῶν μηδὲ διαβουλίοις ὑμῶν ἐν ὑπερηφανίᾳ ἐνθυμήσεων ὑμῶν ἐμπίπτετε καὶ μὴ κ. ἐν ἰσχύι ἔργων νεοτ. ὑμῶν, ὅτι τοῦτο πᾶν πονηρὸν κ.τ.λ. 22. ἐκαυχησάμην. 23. καὶ ὠνείδιζον. 24. After μου add "et deinceps." τὸ πν. τῆς πορν. κ. τ. ζ. 25. ἐν ἐμοί] "adversus me." 26. τῷ υἱῷ.

P. 155. 2. ἐν καλ. γυν.] "sed erat pulchra nimium" BZ, but V omits. 3. ἡδονή] εἰς ὀδυνήν (but ?corruption). 10. πλάνην ὀφθαλμῶν. 11. τὸν νοῦν. 13. om. εἰς πορνείαν. 17. πλῆθος τὸ ἐν τῇ πύλῃ. 18. καὶ ἀνεκ. κ. ἀκ. ν. μ.] "et manifestaui filiis meis facinus impuritatis meae." 20. Διό] om. 20, 21, 22. συνέσεως κ.τ.λ.] prudentiâ opus est, filii mei, quicunque bibat uinum propter gaudium, sapientia est. Nam dum bibit aliquis uinum,

modeste bibet, &c. 23. καὶ ποιεῖ om. 24. καὶ μηδένα αἰσχ. 25. Νομίζοντα καλόν τι ποιεῖν. 26. Ὁ πορν. καὶ ζημιούμενος οὐκ αἰσθάνεται καὶ ἀδοξῶν κ.τ.λ. as in O. om. οὐκ w. O. 27. ἐγυμνώθην.

P. 156. 1. τὸ διάδ. τῆς κεφαλῆς μου. 3. ἐδίδαξε. 4. ὅτι εἰ βασιλέων καὶ πτωχῶν. 5. τῶν βασιλέων. τοῦ δέ] τῶν. 6. ἀνδρείων . . . τῶν πτωχῶν τὴν πτωχείαν. 10. ἐν εὐφροσύνῃ] "et uultis gaudiis." θεοῦ] κυρίου. 11. ζήσεσθε] πίνετε. ἐὰν γὰρ εὐφροσύνης ἀποστῇ and om. πίνητε μ. αἰδ. κ. 12. εἰ δὲ κ.τ.λ.] "sed melius est omnino non bibere uinum, ne oberretis," &c. 14. ἀπόλησθε and om. οὐκ. 15. om. ὑμῶν. καὶ γάρ. 17. ᾗ εἶπεν (*or* ἐκέλευσεν) ὁ κύριος. 19. om. οὖν w. O. 22. ταῦτα ἔσται τὸ γένος τοῦτο ἐν πορνείᾳ. 24. λόγοις. 25. τὸν πατέρα μου. Ἀβραάμ] Ἰσαάκ. 27. καί] διότι w. O.

P. 157. 2. ἐπ' ἐσχ. ἡμ.] ἐν συντελείᾳ χρόνου. 5. ἀφίει] "permittit." 7. καὶ ἀφ. ὕ. αὐ.] om. 8. θεοῦ] κυρίου. καὶ εὐλ. οὐ μεμν.] om. 9–12. Δύο . . . πορεύεται] om. 14. δι'] om. w. R. ὄντας θεούς, θεοὺς ὀνομ. καὶ ποιεῖ . . . ἐμπεσεῖν] "quia qui habent illam in ecstasin iniicit eos." 19. ἐτύφλωσε] "scandalizauit." 20. φθαρείς] "steeped" as if χυθείς. 20, 21. καὶ ἐπέγνων . . . εἶναι] om. 24. οὗ ἐὰν θ. κλ.] om. 24, 25. καὶ γὰρ τὰ τῆς ἀδικίας καὶ τὰ τῆς ἀληθείας γέγρ. 25. ἕνα for ἕν. 26. αὐτῶν] ἀνθρώπων. 27. om. ὀστέων and αὐτοῦ for αὐτός. 27—**158.** 1. ἐνώπιον κυρίου. καί] om.

P. 158. 1. ἀληθείας καὶ μαρτ. 2. ὥσει (*or* ὡς περ) ἐμπεπ. ἐκ τ. ἰ. κ.] om. 3. πρὸς τ. κρ.] om. 4. τέκνα μου. 5. ἐπαίρ. ἐπ' αὐτόν, ἵνα μή] om. 5–9. ἐμοὶ γὰρ . . . βασιλείας] om. 9. ὑπὲρ ὑμᾶς. ἐγγίσατε. 10. ἐσθίετε. om. ἀπαρχάς. After Ἰσραήλ add σὺ δὲ ἔσῃ βασιλεὺς ἐν Ἰακώβ. 11. om. αὐτοῖς. 12. χειμάζονται] βαπτίζονται. οἱ μὲν . . . πλουτοῦντες] om. 13. ἀνθρώπων] Ἰσραήλ and om. οἱ μέν. κινδ. αἰχμ.] "periclitabitur et transibit." 13, 14. οἱ δὲ πλ. ἁρπ.] om. 14. οἱ βασιλεύσοντες ἐν σοί. 15. ἀνθρώπους] Ἰσραήλ. tr. υἱ. κ. θυγ. and om. ἐλευθέρους. 16. καὶ οἴκους. 17, 18. καὶ προκόψ. . . . ὑψούμενοι] om. 18. om.

ὡς and ψευδο before προφ. 19. πάντες οἱ δίκαιοι. 20. κατ' ἀλλ. om. 20, 21. πολέμους ἐν Ἰσρ. and om. συνεχεῖς ἔσονται. 21. καὶ συντελ. βασιλ. αὐτῶν. 22, 23, 24. ἕως παρουσίας . . . ἔθνη] "Et tunc habitabit Iacob in pace," and omit the rest, BZ. But V = "et tunc habitabit nouus Israel nouus in pacem," *sic*. 25. μου, καί] om. 26. πάσ. τ. ἡμ.] om.

P. 159. 1. εἰς τὸ βασ.] om. καὶ ἐγγαστ. 4. λοιμόν] σάλον V; φόνον BZ. 5. ἐκδικοῦσαν] om. καὶ πολιορκίαν ἀπ' ἐχθρῶν omitting καὶ κύνας εἰς διασπ. 6. om. ὀφθ. 7. om. ἀναίρεσιν . . . ἁρπ.] ? ἔνδειαν. 7, 8. ναοῦ . . . γῆς] om. 8. εἰς δουλ. 9. εὐνούχους εἰς δουλείαν ταῖς γ. 10. καὶ ἐν τελείᾳ καρδίᾳ w. O. 11. τοῦ θ.] αὐτοῦ and om. καί. om. κύριος. 12. ἐν ἀγ.] ἀναγάγῃ. om. τῶν ἐχθ. ὑμ. 13. om. ὑμῖν. τὸ ἄστρον ἐν εἰρ. and om. ἐξ Ἰακώβ. 14. καὶ ἀναστ. ἄ. ἐκ τ. σπ. μ.] om. ὡς ὁ ἥ. τ. δ.] τοῦ ἡλίου τῆς δικαιοσύνης V; but BZ om. 15. συμ. τ. υ. τ. ἀ. ἐ. πρ. κ. δικ.] καὶ συμπορεύσεται ἀνθρώποις (+ εἰρήνῃ B) πραότητι (+ καὶ δικ. BZ). 16. καὶ πᾶσα ἁμ. οὐχ εὑ. ἐν ἀ.] om. 17. ἐπ' αὐτόν] αὐτῷ. om. πνεύματος. After ἁγίου add "quod est Christus" V only. 18. ἐφ' ἡμᾶς τὸ πν. χαρ. εἰς υἱοὺς ἐν ἀλ.] εἰς υἱοθεσίαν ἀληθείας. 19. ἐν προστάγμασιν αὐτοῦ πρ. κ. δευτέροις. 20, 21. τότε ἐξελεύσεται βλαστὸς ἐξ ἐμοῦ καὶ ἀναλάμψει σκῆπτρον βασιλείας κ. ἀπὸ τ. ρ. 22. After ῥάβδος V alone adds the gloss ὁ ἀπόστολος. 24–25. καὶ μ. τ. ἔσται Ἰακὼβ ζῶν καὶ Ἰσραὴλ ἀναστήσεται καὶ ἐγὼ κ.τ.λ. 25. σκήπτρων and om. ἐν Ἰσραήλ. 27. om. καθεξῆς.

P. 160. 1. εὐλογήσει. αἱ δ. τ. δ.] καὶ ἄγγελος τ. δ. 3. αἱ σκηναί. 4. ὁ ἥλιος] αἱ δυνάμεις καὶ στηριγμοί. ἐλαίαι. 5. ἔσται] ἔσεσθε εἰς BZ: ἔσονται εἰς V. om. ἔτι. πν. ἐν ὑμῖν. 6. om. τοῦ B. ὅτι ἐμβληθήσονται μιαρὰ πνεύματα (+ τοῦ πονηροῦ V) εἰς κρίσιν αἰώνων. 7. om. ἐν χαρᾷ. 7–9. καὶ οἱ ἐν πτ. . . . ἰσχύσουσι] om. 9, 10. om. ἐν ζωῇ. 10. om. ἐν ἀγαλλιάσει. 10, 11. οἱ ἀετοὶ . . . χαρᾷ] "et uitulae Israel saltabunt." 11, 12. οἱ δὲ ἀσ. . . . κλαύσονται] om. 14. τὴν ὁδὸν αὐτοῦ] κατ' αὐτόν. καὶ εἶπε π. αὐτ.] om. Cp. O. 15. καὶ ἐγὼ ἐτῶν ἑκ. δεκ. ἀποθν. 16. πολυτ. ἐσθ.] om.

17. ὅτι τ. μ. π. οἱ β.] om. καί] ἀλλά. 18. ταῦτα εἰπὼν ἐκ. Ἰουδ.] om. om. οἱ υἱοί. 19. καὶ ἔθαψαν κ.τ.λ.] καὶ ἐκοιμήθη Ἰούδας μετὰ τῶν πατέρων αὐτοῦ.

THE TESTAMENT OF DAN.

P. 169. 20 in title for π. θ. κ. ψ.] "de superbia et inuidia." 22. αὐτοῦ] τούτων. 23. τὴν πατριάν] τὰ τέκνα. εἶπεν αὐτοῖς. 24. τοῦ π. ὑ.] ἐμοῦ. 25. Θεῷ] ἐνώπιον Θεοῦ.

P. 170. 1. pr. ὅτι] om. alt. ὅτι] καί. 2. ἀνθρώπων w. O. ὁμολογῶ οὖν. 3. ἀνδρὸς δικαίου κ. ἀλ. 4. Ἰωσήφ] αὐτοῦ w. O. 5. αὐτόν w. O. ἀλαζ.] "of hatred." 7. om. ἐν αὐτῷ. 9. om. ἐστι τό. τὸ πεῖθον] ἔπεισε. 11. ἵνα] καὶ οὐχ ηὗρον. 12. ἵνα μή w. O. 14. ἰδοὺ ἐγώ w. O. 15. πνεύματος πλάνης καὶ τ. ψ. 16. κ. τ. θύμου] om. 18. θυμώδης] om. w. O. om. ὅτι. 19. ὡς πολ. πρ. α. ἐὰν ᾖ] om. τὸν ἀδελφὸν οὐκ οἶδεν, καὶ προφήτην κυρίου οὐκ ἀκούει· καὶ τὸν δίκαιον οὐ βλέπει. περιβάλλει γὰρ τὸ πν. τῆς πλάνης ἐν δικτύοις ἀσελγείας, καὶ τυφλοῖ. 22. καὶ διὰ τ. ψ. 23. om. αὐτοῦ. ἐν τίνι κ.τ.λ.] "Itaque occludit oculis suis et obsidet odio cordis; datque illi cor inimicum aduersarium fratri suo et inuidiosum."

P. 171. 1. om. δύναμιν and ἵνα . . . πᾶσαν, and so read σώματι τὰς ἰδίας ἀνομίας. 2. πράξῃ τι ἡ ψυχή. 4. om. τῆς δυνάμεως καί. 5. τῶν ὑπ.] τῇ συνεργούσῃ. 8. παρά] et si quidem ex natura sit illi auxilium, tunc in iniustitia irae. 9, 10. ἐκ δεξιῶν . . . ψεύδει] om. propter homoioteleuton. 14. πικραῖς] μικραῖς w. O. 16. ὑμεῖς] μή and read κινείσθω ἡ καρδία ὑμῶν εἰς θύμον. 17. pr. μήτε om. εἰς εἰδέαν] "in tumultum." πρῶτον κ.τ.λ.] πρ. γὰρ ἡ τέρψις τέρπει τὴν ἀκ. 18. νοῆσαι τὸ ἐρ.] συνετίζει τὸ διαβούλιον τοῦ ἐρεθίσθεντος. 19. τότε] ὁ. 20. μου, μὴ θρ.] om. om. αὐτό. πνεῦμα πλάνης. 21, 22. ἐπεθύμησεν ποιεῖν καὶ εἰς τὸ τελειοῦν τὴν ἀπώλειαν ἵνα λυπηθῇ διὰ τοῦ διαβουλίου τῆς ἀπωλείας. Ἐὰν ζημ. ἐκ. ἢ ἀκουσίως καὶ λυπῆσθε κ.τ.λ. 22. μετὰ ψεύδους] om. 23. συνερῶνται] "auxiliantur." 27. om. μου.

P. 172. 1. *τηρήσατε*] *μὴ ἐκκλίνετε.* 4. *ἡδονήν*] *μνησικακίαν.* *ἔσεσθε πάντοτε.* 4, 5. *τῆς εἰρήνης*] *τὸν εἰρηνοποιόν.* 6. *ἀληθινῇ*] "pure." ? *καθαρᾷ.* om. *γάρ.* 9. *ὁδηγήσει.* 10. *καὶ ἀπόσταντες ἀπὸ κ. πορεύσεσθε ἐν π. κ. ποιοῦντες.* 11. *ἐκπορνεύοντες.* 12. *ἐνεργ. . . . πλάνης*] ? *ἀφρονοῦντες τῷ πνεύματι τ. πλ.*, but Arm. text is corrupt here. 13. *ἐστίν*] *ἔσται* and om. *καί.* 15. Before *ὑπακ.* add *μή.* 16. *τῷ Λ.*] *τοῖς υἱοῖς Λ.* 17. *καὶ συνεξ.* *ἔσονται.* *οἱ υἱοί.* 18. *ἀπαχθ.*] "Ye shall come (*or* go)." 20. *ἐπιστρέψετε.* 21. *καὶ ἐλεήσει ὑμᾶς.* *βοῶν*] *ποιῶν.* 23. After *κυρίου* add *καὶ ποιήσει εἰρήνην εἰς αἰῶνας.* om. *αὐτός.* 24. *πέρασιν ἡμῶν*] *τοῖς πάτρασιν αὐτοῦ* w. R. 25. *ἀπὸ τ. Β. καὶ ψ. ἁγ. καλέσει πρὸς ἑαυτὸν καὶ ἐπιστ.* 29. ? *ἐν Ἱερ. ἐρήμωσις*, and read *ὑπομενεῖ* w. R. *αἰχμαλωτισθήσεται* w. R. 30. *αὐτῶν.* *ὁ ἅγιος* w. R. 31. *τοῦ Ἰσραήλ.* *βασιλεύσει ἐν αὐτῇ.* 32. *ἕως τῶν οὐρανῶν.*

P. 173. 2. *ἑαυτοῖς καὶ φυλάξασθε ἀπὸ τ. Σ. καὶ κακοῦ πνεύματος αὐ.* 4. *καὶ ἐπί* w. R. *καὶ κατέναντι τοῦ ἔχθους τῶν βασιλέων στήσεται καὶ διά.* 6. *τὸν κ.*] *τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ κ.* 7. *αὐτὸς γάρ.* 8. *κακόν.* 9. *τῆς ἀνομ.* w. R. 10, 11. *καὶ μετ. ἐπὶ ἔθνη καὶ τὸ θέλημα αὐτοῦ τελειώσει, ὅτι οὐδεὶς τῶν ἀγγ. ἴσος αὐτῷ.* ? Cp. R. 11. *ἐν π. τ. Ἰ.*] *ἐν πάσῃ γῇ καὶ ἐν Ἰ.* 11, 12. *καὶ ἐν τ. ε. Σ.*] om. 13, 14. *καὶ ἁγ. . . . μακροθ.*] om. 15. *καὶ ὑμεῖς*] om. 16. *ὁ πατήρ*] *ὁ σωτήρ.* 18. om. *τοῦ νόμου*; read *θεοῦ* for *κυρίου* and add *καὶ ἔσται τὸ γένος ὑμῶν εἰς σωτήριον εἰσαιεί.* 18, 19. *καὶ νῦν, τέκνα μου, θαψ.* 22. om. *τὰ ὀστᾶ αὐτοῦ.* *πλὴν οὖν ἐπροφητεύθη περὶ αὐτῶν, ὅτι κ.τ.λ.* 24. *καὶ γένους Ἰ.*] om. 25. *οὕτως κ. γέγ.*] om.

THE TESTAMENT OF JOSEPH.

P. 186. 21 (in Title) om. *ια'* and *περὶ φθόνου.*

P. 187. 1. *ἀπὸ τῆς ἀληθείας.* 3. *μου*] *ἡμῶν.* 7. *ὕψιστος*] *θεός.* 8. *σωτήρ*] *θεός.* 10. *σὺν δόλοις*] *συνδούλων.* 12. *Φωτιμάρ*] *Φωτιφάρ* BZ: "Petaphrês" V. *ὁ ἀρχ. Φ.*] om.

14. *θεὸς τοῦ πατρὸς ἐμοῦ* 'Ισρ. *ἐρρύσατο* w. O. 15. *ἐμυκτ.*] om. w. O. 17. *οὐδὲ ἐνσκοτεῖ* (*or ἐνσκοτίζει*) "darkens" and om. *ἥ*. 19. *ἀπωθεῖται* w. O. 20. *ἐπὶ κ.τ.λ.*] *ἔστι γὰρ ἐν π. τοπ.* and om. *παρίσταται*. 22. *ἐμακρ.*] *ἐδοκιμάσθην*. 23. *μεγάλα φάρμακα εἰσὶν αἱ μακροθυμίαι*.

P. 188. 1. *ἡμῶν*] *μου*. *οὖν*] *δέ* w. O. 3. *κυρίῳ*] *θεῷ*. *ἐνήστευον τὰς ἑπτὰ ἡμέρας ἐκείνας*. 5. *ἐπεδίδῃ*] venirem aliquando, "if I ever came" V: "if they ever come" BZ. 7. After *ἀσθενοῦσι*] V alone adds "but all night long I would pray." 8. *σφόδρα καί*. 9. After *μοι* V alone adds "to commit fornication." *τὰ μὲν πρῶτα*] om. 12. *ἔσχατον*] "and after this." 16. *πονηρᾶς*] V alone adds "and she manifestly spake unto the eyes of man." 17. *ἅγιον*, and om. *ἀνδρί*. 18. After *ἐπαινοῦσα* add *με καί*. 22. *ἐγὼ καὶ ἐν σάκκῳ ἐδ. τοῦ κυρίου* and om. *ὁ κύριος*. 24. *ἴσχυσε λόγῳ* and om. *πάλιν ἐπι. ἤρχετο*] "entered" *εἰσήρχετο*. After *πρός με* add *θέλουσα*. 26. Add *συγκοιμήθητι καί* before *συνπείσθητι*. After *Αἰγύπτιον* add *τὸν ἄνδρα μου*. *καὶ ἐν*. 27. *πορεύεσθαι*. 28. *θέλει* w. O.

P. 189. 1. After *εὐδοκεῖ* add *ὁ κύριος*. 8 *τὴν ἐπίν. τ. ἀσ.*] "malum facinus." 9. *ἠξίου με*. 10. *ἀναχωρήσασα ἔθαλπε*. *ἔπεμπέ μοι*. 12. pr. *καί* om. and *ἀπέστειλε* w. O. 13. *αὐτό*] *τὸ βρῶμαν* : *τὴν δίαιταν* BZ. 15. *αὐτῆς*] *αὐτή*. om. *ψυχῆς*. *ἐξελθόντος αὐτοῦ*] om. 20. om. *μόνῳ*. 20, 21. *τῶν πατρῶν μου*. 21. *ἄγγελον αὐτοῦ*. 22. om. *αὐτό*. *ἵνα δὲ μ.*] *τοῦτο δὲ γνώσῃ*. 24. *καὶ λαβών*. 25. *ἄγγελος φυλάξει με*. *Ἡ δέ*. 27. *τοῦ*] *μοι* w. O.

P. 190. 1. *ὅτι δέ*] *ὅμως δέ*. 2. *προσέπ.*] "was sorrowing," "lugebat." ? *συνέπιπτεν*. 2, 3. *πρὸς αὐτήν*] om. 3. om. *πόνον*. 5. After *ἀσθενοῦσαν* V alone adds *καὶ ἐν τῷ παρελθεῖν με*, but ? sense. 7. *συμπείσθης*] "sleep with." ? *συγγένῃ*. 9. After *ἁμαρτίαις* add *μεγάλαις*, or similar. 10. *ἡ Σ.*] *Ἀσηθώ*. 12. om. *οὖν*. 13. *μόνον*] *τοῦτο*. *ἀντιποιῇ*] "care about." *καὶ τ. τ. μ.*] om. *ἔχω οὖν*. 14. *ἔγνω*] *ἐνόει*. 16. *πονηρᾶς*] *καὶ πονηρίας*. *κἂν ἀγ. τι ἀκ.*] "although she hears ten thousand things." ? *μύριον τι* V: but BZ = "quamvis omne quid audierit." ? *ἀγαγόν τι*.

17. τὸ π. ο. ἡτ.] τοῦ πάθους ἡτ. 18. λέγω οὖν w. O. τέκνα μου w. O. 20. δακρύων + πρὸς κύριον. 22. συνουσίαν] "et ego reliqui in eam vestimentum et effugi ab ipsa." 24. om. καί. εἰς φυλ.] om. 25. τὴν εἱρκτὴν τοῦ Φ. 28. om. μου w. O. ὅτι μόνον ἀπὸ προφ.

P. 191. 1, 2. πλ. τ. ἐπιθ.] om. 2. λυτρόω. 2–7. καὶ ἀπαλ. . . . ποσάκις] om. 7. πρός με] om. After ἀωρίᾳ add "vespertina in caligine." 9. om. γάρ. 10. συμπέσω] ὑποσκελίσῃ με. 10, 11. εἰς αὐτήν . . . ὡραῖα] om. 11. πρὸς ἀπατ. μ.] om. 12. καὶ ὁ κ.] ὁ κ. οὖν. 14–20. οὖν . . . συνέχεται] ἐὰν γένησθε τοιοῦτοι ἀπὸ λύπων καὶ θλίψεων καὶ πονηροῦ σωθήσεσθε διὰ κυρίου· ἐάνπερ ἐν λόγῳ ἢ ἐν διανοίᾳ παραβήσῃ τις. 21. ἐν τῇ δ. μ.] ἐν ἐμαυτῷ. 22. εἶχον . . . μου] om. 23. καὶ αὐτοὺς ἐτίμων. 23, 24. τοὺς ἀδ. μ.] om. 27. ἔχετε . . . φόβον, καί] om. 28. τιμᾶτε] ἀγαπᾶτε.

P. 192. 1, 2. μετὰ τ. Ἰσμ.] μετ' αὐτῶν, ἠρώτων με Ἰσμαηλιταὶ καὶ εἶπον, δοῦλος εἶ ἢ ἐλεύθερος; κἀγὼ εἶπον κ.τ.λ. 4, 5. ἕως θαν.] om. 5. om. αὐτῶν. 6. τίς π. χ. λ. με] "et unusquisque dabat portionem mercedis suae," and V adds "in return for what they should take me for their gain." 7. εἶναι] ἀφιέναι "dimittere." 8. ἐμπορίαν] + "Itaque fecerunt." 10. om. αὐτόν, and read τὸ χρύσιον καὶ τὸ ἀργύριον. 12. τὸν καιρόν] οὖν. 13. μ. δοξ. π.] om. καὶ ἐπέβ. . . . αὐτῆς] "and having looked saw me." 13, 14. ὅτι . . . ἐμοῦ] om. 14. καὶ ἐπιστρέψασα λέγει. 15. ἐπλούτησεν w. O. 18. om. ἐκ. 19. Πετεφρίς] om. πεισθείς] "gauisus." 20. ταῦτα ἅ. 21. Ἑβρ.] Χαναάν. μετεμπ.] καὶ εἰς παιδίσκας. 22. ἐδ. λέγ.] λέγει αὐτῷ. 23. οὖν] om. 26. Add τούτοις τοῖς λόγοις w. O. ἄχθητε τὸν νεανίσκον: after which V alone adds "et dicit nobis omnia." 27. τῷ ἄρχευν.] αὐτῷ. τρίτος] δεύτερος. 28. ἄρχων . . . παλλακάς] om.

P. 193. 1. ἀπ' αὐτῶν. 2. αὐτῷ] om. 3. om. πάλιν. 4. ὅτι ἐκ τ.] ἐκ τῆς γῆς. om. ἠπίστησε and read λέγει. 6–8. τυπτομένου . . . ἀδικήσαντα] om.: but see on line 11. 9. om. τυπτόμενος. 10. om. φησιν. τοῦ παιδός] μου. om. αὐτοῦ. 11, 12. After αὐτόν add words omitted above

ἄδικός ἐστιν ἡ κρίσις σου, ὅτι καὶ τὸν κλάπεντα τιμωρεῖς (or συνέχεις) ὡς ἀδικήσαντα, ὃν ἔδει εἶναι μᾶλλον ἄνετον καὶ ὑπηρετεῖν σοι, omitting words in line 11 διὰ τί . . . παῖδα. 13. om. ἁμαρτίας. 14. ἔστι νόμος παρ'. 15. ταὐτὰ εἶπεν καὶ ὁ μετάβολος καὶ ὁ παῖς, ὅτι ὄφειλει ἐγκ. εἶναι, and add "Itaque conticuit Memphia." 18. ἀκούσαντες] + ἐκ γῆς Χαναάν. ὁ πατήρ μου] om. περὶ ἐμοῦ] π. τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ. After εἶπον V alone adds ἐλθόντες. 20. ἐν τῇ γῇ w. O. After σου add περί σου. om. πάλιν. 21. ἤθελον + σφόδρα. 22. καὶ . . . εἰμι] om. 24. ἤκουον w. O. and add περὶ αὐτοῦ. 26. Πετεφρὶ δευτέρου. ἤτουν w. O. 27. κἀκεῖνος] καὶ ὁ μετάβολος.

P. 194. 1. ἐδήλωσε] ἀπέστειλε. 2. καὶ ἕτερον εὐνοῦχον. 3. καὶ ἠτεῖτό με ἀπ' αὐτῶν εἰς πρᾶσιν. 3, 4. καὶ μὴ . . . ἀνεχώρησεν] καὶ καλέσας ὁ ἀρχιμ. τοὺς ἐμπόρους ἤτει με ἀπ' αὐτῶν εἰς πρᾶσιν. Cp. O. 4. ὁ δὲ . . . ὅτι] καὶ ἐσήμηνεν ὁ εὐνοῦχος τῇ γυναικὶ ὅτι. 5. om. τοῦ παιδός. ἡ δὲ κ.τ.λ.] ἡ δὲ λέγει. Ἐὰν καὶ δύο μνᾶς. 6. om. πρόσεχε and read φείσασθε. 7. χρυσίου . . . ἀγάγετε] om. δίδει] "dedit." 8. ὀγδ.] "sixty." ἑκ. εἰ. τῇ Αἰ. δ.] καὶ εἰπὼν ὅτι ὀγδοήκοντα χρυσίνους ἔδωκε. 9. ἐμοῦ] ἐκείνου. 9, 10. ὁ εὐν.] om. 11. ὁρᾶτε οὖν τέκνα μου. 12. om. οὖν. 13. καὶ ἐν . . . ἐλαττώματα om. θεός] κύριος. 13, 14. ἐπὶ ὁ μ. ἀδ. κ.] om. 14. ἀγάπην] ἀγαθά BZ; but V ἀλλήλους as if a reminiscence of the words which in lines 13, 14 have dropped out through similar ending. 14. Alt. καί] om. 15. ὡς καὶ ἔγν. 16, 17. αὐτούς om. and add "Ecce audiunt et dicent (+fratres mei V), quod etiam falsum aliquid dico (+reuertuntur in faciem meam V). ἀλλὰ μετὰ θάνατον VBZ. 17. om. περισσοτέρως. 18. ἐκέλευσαν and om. ἐκ περισσοῦ. καὶ οὐκ ἀφῆκα omitting ἐθαύμ. and γάρ. 19. After πραγμ. add "et dedi eis omnia quae petierunt." 20–24. υἱοί μου, υἱοὶ αὐτῶν ἦσαν· καὶ δοῦλοί μου, δοῦλοι αὐτῶν, καὶ ἡ ψυχή μου, ψ. αὐτῶν, καὶ ἡ γῆ μου, γῆ αὐτῶν ἦν καὶ πᾶν ἄλγημα αὐτῶν, ἄλγ. μου ἦν· μία ἦν ἡμῶν πάντων ἡ βουλὴ καὶ οὐχ ὕψωσα ἐμ. ἐν αὐτοῖς διὰ δόξαν μου. 24. ἀλλ. . . . ἐλαχ.] om. 25. καὶ ὑμεῖς οὖν τὴν αὐτὴν ὁδὸν πορευθῆτε τέκνα

μου μετ' ἐμοῦ. καὶ ὁ θεὸς δοξάσει ὑμᾶς καὶ ὑψώσει ὑμᾶς εἰς αἰῶνας.

P. 195. 1, 2. καὶ ἐὰν . . . κυρίου] om. 3. om. γάρ. om. διὰ τ. μακρ., καί. 4. δέδοται] dederunt. 5. καίγε ὡρ. ἔδ. μ. ὡς ἄνθος] "et erat Aseneth mulier mea pulchra quasi" V: "et erat ille (*or* illa) pulchra quasi flos" BZ. 6. ὑπὲρ ὡ. Ἰσρ.] add "et (+ego V) pulchrior (+eram V) quam (+omnes V) selectos Israel" BZV. 6, 7. καὶ διεφ. . . . ἐν κάλλει] "et (+prudens et humilior V) quam Levi et Iuda et (+quam) Nepthalim (+plus eram pulcher quam eos V) (+conseruauit me pulchritudine BZ)." So BZV. 7. Ἰακώβ] V add τῷ πατρὶ ἡμῶν. 8. Cap. ιθ'. Itaque (+uenite omnes V) audite uisionem quam uidi (+in eo tempore V) duodecim ceruos uidebam pascentes (+qui sumus nos duodecim fratres V) et (+uidebam V) ex iis nouem, dispersi sunt; tres autem saluabantur (pascebant inter se *for* saluab V). Atque mane etiam illi dispersi sunt. Et uidebam, quod tres cerui tres agni fiebant (ἐγίνοντο), et clamauerunt ad dominum et eduxit illos e tenebris in lucem, et eduxit illos in locum herba uiridem et aquis scatentem. Et illic clamauerunt ad dominum, donec congregati sunt ad illos nouem ceruos, et facti sunt illi ueluti duodecim oues, et post paruum spatium ducebantur et facti sunt grex magna. Post hoc uidebam et ecce duodecim iuuenci sugebant unam uaccam, quae ex pollente lacte mare faciebat et bibebant ab illa duodecim greges et innumerabilia pecora; et quarti iuuenci exaltata sunt cornua usque ad coelos, et fiebant tanquam murus gregium, et in medio (+amborum V) cornuum effulsit (*or* ortum est) aliud cornu. Et uidebam uitulum (μοσχάριον) (+ubi erat V); duodecimam uicem ("ten times") circumdabat illos; et factus est iuuencis universim in auxilium. Et uidebam in medio cornuum uirginem, quae habebat tunicam uersicolorem (ποικίλον Ezek. xvi. 13); et ex eadem eueniebat agnus, et ex dextra parte eius irruebant omnes ferae, et omnia reptilia; et uicit eos agnus et destruxit eos. Et gauisi sunt propter eum uituli, et uacca, et (but V has

et foetus trium ceruorum for et uacca et cerui) cerui gauisi sunt una cum illo. Et hoc necesse est euenire in tempore suo sed uos filii mei *τιμᾶτε τὸν Λευὶ καὶ τὸν Ἰούδαν ὅτι ἐξ αὐτῶν ἀνατελεῖ σωτηρία τοῦ Ἰσραήλ· ἡ γὰρ βασιλεία ἐμοῦ ἡ ἐν μέσῳ ὑμῶν ἐπιτελεσθήσεται, ὡσπὲρ σκηνὴ ὁπωροφυλακίου ὃ οὐ φανήσεται μετὰ τὸ θέρος* (*ἐν σώματι* for *μετὰ τ. θ.* V). 21. *οἶδα ὅτι οἱ Αἰγ. μετ' ἐμὲ θλίψουσιν.* 22. *ὑμῶν*] *αὐτῶν.* 24, 25. *ὅτι ἀναγ. . . . Αἰγυπτίων*] om. 26. *ἐγγὺς* B. *π. τ. Ἰπ.*] om. 27. *Ῥαχὴλ* + *τῆς μητρός μου. ταῦτα εἰπ.*] *μετὰ ταῦτα. ἐκτείνας* + *Ἰωσήφ* V only.

P. 196. 1. *ἐκοιμ. ὅ. αἰ.*] *ἀπέθανεν.* 2, 3, 4. *καὶ γὰρ . . . παριστάμενος*] om.

THE TESTAMENT OF BENJAMIN.

P. 196. 5. In title om. *π. διαν. καθ.* 6. After *αὐτοῦ* add "in quarto anno morbi sui." 7. *ρκε′* w. O. 9. om. *οὖν.* 9–11. *μέ, κἀγὼ τὸ γάλα παιδίσκης αὐτῆς τῆς Βάλλας ἐθήλασα. ἦν δὲ αὐτῇ ἔτη δώδεκα ἃ ἐστείρευσε καὶ προσηύξατο κυρίῳ, καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτῇ γάλα ἰσχυρόν. Σφόδρα γὰρ ἠγάπα τὴν Ῥαχήλ. Διὰ τοῦτο κἀγὼ ἐκλήθην κ.τ.λ.* 16. *τί εἶπον οἱ ἀδελφοί μου περί μου* (+*Ἰακώβ* V) *τῷ πατρί μου ὅτε ἀπωλόμην.* 17. om. *αὐτῷ. πέμψαντες*] + *τῷ πατρί* BZ: *αὐτῷ* V. 18. *εἰ ὁ . . . οὗτος*] *τὸν χιτῶνα ὅτου ἐστιν οὗτος* and V alone adds "ut dixi hoc, lugebat Ioseph." 19. *καὶ γὰρ ὅτε*] om. *ἔλαβον*] *ἔκλεψαν. οἱ Καναανῖται ἔμποροι βίᾳ.* 19, 20. *εἷς ἐξ . . . τρέχειν*] om. 21. *αὐτόν*] so BZ: *αὐτούς* V. Read *ἔκρυψαν* or *καὶ κρύψαι. εἰ ὑπήντησεν ἐμοὶ θηρίον καὶ ἀνεῖλεν* (omitting *αὐτόν*). 22, 23. *καὶ οὕτως . . . αὐτῶν*] "Volebat (+enim V) celare a me (+facinus fratrum meorum V). Et quum uocasset ad sese fratres suos (but meos V) dicit, (+clam me ipsum V) ne dicite patri meo quod fecistis erga me. Sed hoc modo dicite, quomodo narraui ego Beniamin. Consiliumque (+ne V) sit (+inter uos BZ) tale (+in itinere, ne cognouerit Beniamin et narret Iacob V). Neque euadant uerba haec in cor patris mei (but V nostri)." 24. *καὶ ὑμεῖς . . .* P. 197. 19. *αὐτῷ*] "And so do ye, my sons,

be imitators of a man good and true. Because even until his death, he would not tell about himself. But Jacob having learned from the Lord, saith to him. Yet nevertheless he denied. (+And then V) hardly therefore under oath did he communicate it to Jacob. Nevertheless did he (+Joseph V) beseech his father, not to reckon to them at all this misdeed, (+that the brethren be not heart-broken V). And then Jacob having heard, began to cry aloud and say: O my sons (+Joseph, my son V) most sweet, boy (+thou hast overcome the evildoing of thy brethren V). Thou hast conquered the pity (*lit.* bowels) of thy father Jacob. And having taken him in his arms, he kissed him for about three hours, and said. There shall be fulfilled in thee the heavenly prophecy which says, that the spotless shall be defiled for the sinful, and the sinless one die for the sake of the impious" 20, 21, 22. εἴδετε οὖν, τ. μου, τοῦ ἁγ. ἀν. τὸ ἔλεος (+τὸ τοῦ Ἰωσήφ V)· μιμούμενοί ἐστε αὐτόν, ἵνα στέφανον δόξης φορέσητε (*lit.* accipiatis). 22. om. ἄνθρωπος and read οὔποτε ἔχει. 23, 24. κἂν βουλ. . . . τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ] om. (but in place of them V reads "uidet quidem," which may be a trace of σκεπτόμενος read instead of σκεπαζόμενος). 25. ἐὰν δέ. 26. After φθονεῖ add ἐπὶ τῇ δόξῃ αὐτοῦ V only. ἐὰν τ. ἀν.] τὸν ἀνδρεῖον. 27. om. πιστεύων. τὸν πένητα . . . **P. 198.** 1. στρέφει] om.

P. 198. 1. πν. ἁγ.] τοῦ κυρίου. κατά] "equally with." 3. ἐὰν ἦτε ἀγαθοί, πον. ἀνθ. 4. αἰδεσθ.] αἰδέσονται. ἐπιστρέψουσιν. 9. αὐτοῦ] om. ἐὰν δέ. 10. ὅσιον] ἀληθινόν or ἀληθῆ. om. ὁ ὅσιος. 11. προδοίη] ὑβρίζῃ. 11, 12, 13. καὶ ὁ δικ. . . . ἀδελφός μου] "plangit, quia uidit eam humilem factam, et poenituit, quomodo factus est Ioseph frater meus. 14. πλάνου w. O. 16. om. ἐμπαθῶς. συνάγει] "cognoscit" and om. εἰς φιληδον. 17. οὔδε τερπ. 17, 18. οὐ λυπεῖ . . . ὀφθαλμῶν] om. 19. ἐπιδέχ. δ.] "cognoscit gloriam" and om. καὶ ἀτιμίας. 20. καὶ ψεῦδος καὶ μάχην. 21. om. κατοικεῖ. 22. γλώσσας] "consilia." 23. χαρᾶς] κολακῆς. 24. πεν. κ. πλ.] om. 25. εἰλικρινῆ] "firmam (*or* stabilitam)" and

om. διάθεσιν. 26. πᾶν γὰρ . . . **P. 199.** 2. ἁπλότητα] "omnis enim qui facit ἔργα Dei et τοῦ Beliar, duplex est, neque simplicitas."

P. 199. 3. om. διὰ τοῦτο. τοῦ B.] καὶ τὴν πορνείαν. 5. πρῶτον συλ. ἡ διάν.] quae habet BZ: quas recipit V. 8. θεοῦ] κυρίου. 9. om. ὁ κ. ὅτι διακ. ἐτῶν τῆς ζωῆς αὐτοῦ ἤρξατο πάσχειν ἐκεῖνο. 10. After κατακλυσμοῦ add "et passus est illud." 11. ἐν τ. ἑπτ. ἔτ. ὁ Κ.] ἐν τοῖς ἑπτὰ κακοῖς. 12. ἐκρ. ὁ δὲ Λ. ἐ. τ. ἑ. ἑ.] ἔκρινεν αὐτόν. ἐν δὲ τοῖς ἑβδομηκοντάκις τὸν Λ. 12–14. ὅτι . . . κριθήσονται] quia (+uindicias dei Lamech fecit ex Caino, quia V) usque ad finem seculorum, qui similes Caino sint, tormentabuntur. 15. om. καὶ ὑμεῖς and read τέκνα οὖν. 15, 16. φθόνον τε κ. τ. μισ.] om. 16. καὶ τ. ἀγ.] om. 17, 18. ὁ γὰρ ἔχων αὐτὴν οὐχ ὁρᾷ γ. εἰς π., οὐδὲ γινώσκει μιασμόν, ὅτι ἀναπ. ἐν αὐ. τ. πν. ἅγιον and omit τοῦ θεοῦ. 19. om. ὥσπερ and read ὁ γάρ. 20. ἀλλὰ . . . δυσωδίαν] om. 21, 22. οὐ συνέχεται and om. μᾶλλον . . . μιαίνεται. 23. οὐ καλάς] "malitiae." ὅτι ἀπὸ λ. 24. Ἔνωχ τ. δ. κ.τ.λ.] τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν ἠκούσαμεν ὅτι πορνεύσετε π. Σ. 25. ?γυναικῶν εἰς στρ. 26. εὐθ. αὐ. λ.] εὐθυφρόνες λήψονται, but ?a corruption in the text. 27. ὁ ναὸς . . . ὑμῖν] ἡ κληρονομία αὐτοῦ.

P. 200. 1–8. ὅτι . . . ἐν οὐρανῷ] "Et propter domum Domini eleuauit me Iacob, eo ut gloriam habeam (ἐνδοξάζωμαι) in eo. Et duodecim tribus illuc congregabuntur, et omnes gentiles. Sed Dominus insultabitur et sine honore fiet. Et transmeabit e terra in coelos. (+Quia cognoui quomodo est e terra uel quomodo in coelos V), uel quae sit mensura eius, et locus (+et V) uia." 9. ὅτι δὲ . . . **P. 201,** 17. φυλῆς σου] "Itaque dum erat Ioseph in Egypto, et desiderabam videre faciem eius; et precibus patris mei (BZ nostri) Iacobi vidi faciem eius uiuentem.

Iamque, filii mei, ego morior; et mando uobis ut faciatis iustitiam et ueritatem (+domini V) et iudicia in fidem domini. Hocce do uobis pro (=ἀντί) omni hereditate. Uosque date hoc filiis nostris in hereditatem aeternam. Hocce

fecerunt Abraham, Isaac et Iacob; et magis quam omne hoc (+uobis V) in hereditatem darunt, dixeruntque, Hoc modo facite, donec manifestauerit dominus Salutem (+suam BZ) in omni terra. In eo tempore videbitis Enochum, Noe, Abraham, Isaac et Iacob. In eo tempore et nos surgemus, unusquisque in sceptro suo, et uenerabimur caelestem regem. In eo tempore omnes (but BZ et nos for *omnes*) renouabimur; alii in gloriam (honorem V), aliique in ignominiam. Propterea quod iudicat dominus prius Israel, propter iniquitatem quam fecerunt (+electus BZ); et deinceps omnes gentiles. Quomodo refutauit Esauum in Madianis, qui (+si V) amauerunt fratres suos.

Sed, filii, fiatis portio timentium dominum. Si enim uadatis cum sanctitate, iterum domicilium habetis in me; et congregabitur ad me omnis Israel. Neque amplius uocabitur post haec latronum dux et lupus, propter rapinam uestram; sed amatus (+domini V) et artifex (ἐργάτης) voluntatis oris eius." Cp. R.

P. 201. 18. καὶ ἐγένετο ὡς. εἶπεν αὐτοῖς. 19. τέκνα μου] om. 21. After ἐτῶν add ζωῆς αὐτοῦ. 22. ἐνεν. πρ.] ἐν ἐννάτῳ ἐν πρώτῳ BZ: ἐν δεκάτῳ πρώτῳ V. τῆς ἐξόδου . . . ἐξ Αἰγύπτου] om. 24. After κρυφῇ add ὅτε ἦσαν ἐν πολέμῳ οἱ Χαναναῖοι and om. ἐν τόπῳ λεγ. X. αὐτούς] αὐτόν. 24, 25. παρὰ τ. πόδ.] ἐγγύς. 26. om. γῆς.

F. C. CONYBEARE.

CRITICAL NOTICES.

THE JEWS OF SPAIN.

An Inquiry into the Sources of the History of the Jews in Spain. By Joseph Jacobs. (London: David Nutt. 1894. pp. xlvii. 263.)

In the year 1888, Mr. Joseph Jacobs, who is known to a wide circle by his *Jews of Angevin England* and other works, undertook a voyage of investigation to Spain in order to collect from the archives there materials for the history of the Jews in Spain, or, to speak more precisely, to obtain some insight into the treasures which, in the shape of MSS., are preserved there; for merely to catalogue a small portion of the records extant in the Spanish archives, which concern the history of the Jews—to say nothing of copying them—would require years of labour on the part of several workers well versed in Palaeography and thoroughly acquainted with Spanish, and relatively with the Catalonian dialect. Mr. Jacobs had no particular epoch of Jewish history in view; and in his zeal and extraordinary industry, he did not shrink from the task of collecting, in Spain of all countries, a considerable mass of material; and indeed in no country are the State archives, lodged as they are in palaces, so well arranged, the catalogues so admirably compiled, as in Spain. We need only mention Barcelona, Alcalá de Henares, Simancas, Pamplona, the well-known archives of which were inspected and made use of by Mr. Jacobs. The results of his investigations, consisting of about 1800 single entries and twenty-nine records and documents, the toilsome labour of only twenty-eight days, now lie before us in a well-arranged volume, which is furnished with several indices, and published under the above-named title.

Accompanying Mr. Jacobs on his journey, we sojourn with him first of all at Pamplona, the capital of Navarre. The "Archivo de Comptos" of that place yielded him rich profit and, as we may remark at the outset, the most valuable material in the whole book; the 300 items which were copied by him in not more than four days from the excellently arranged catalogues, afford a grateful addition to the history of the Jews in Navarre, for which the three-volumed *Diccionario de Antiguëdades de Navarra*, by D. José Yanguas y Miranda

of Navarre, is one of the chief sources. Mr. Jacobs might have spared himself much trouble if he had consulted this important work during his labours at Pamplona; many of the entries copied by him are already found in Yanguas; e.g. Nos. 1381, 1383, 1394 (of the year 1256), 1396, 1401, 1443 (where for the unintelligible "Fasureria," "Tafureria," gaming-house, must be read), and 1452 (where for "Fiendas" read "Tiendas," shops), 1500, 1588, and many others. In Nos. 1388, which is printed fully in my *History of the Jews in Navarra*, p. 200, "en la Caldeza" is a mistake for "en la Caldera" (cauldron). On the other hand, side by side with much that is immaterial, we obtain also much fresh, hitherto unknown matter concerning several persons who played a part in Navarre, especially concerning the members of the families Ablitas, Orabuena, &c., who occupied a position at the court of Navarre similar to that occupied by many Jews in Germany in connexion with the small princes of the Empire, viz. that of "Court Jews"; they advanced money to the kings, who constantly found themselves in embarrassed circumstances, they furnished clothes and jewellery for the queen and others belonging to the prince's household, they provided the court with corn, bread, and wine—even the purchase of horses and mules was frequently negotiated through them. We obtain from Mr. Jacobs' *Sources* further particulars concerning a personage who was not entirely unknown before, viz. D. Ezmel de Ablitas—Mr. Jacobs also writes the name "Abitas," "Oblitas"—who lent considerable sums not only to the King and Queen of Navarre, but also to the King of Aragon (1416 f.), and whose sons Ezmel (which should be read in 1422 for "Ezchel"), Salomon, and Judas (erroneously given as "Junes" in 1409), continued or rather developed their father's business.

The most influential personality among the Jews of Navarre was D. Juze (Joseph) Orabuena of Tudela, who also lived for a time at Estella, and who was private physician to the king, farmer of the taxes, and Chief Rabbi. This Juze or Juce ben Samuel Orabuena, who must be distinguished from another Juce Orabuena ben Belin, was, as we conjecture, the brother of that Juda ben Samuel Orabuena, who in the year 1348 was Rabbi in Tudela in conjunction with Yomtob ben Jonah ibn Abas, and who consulted R. Jehuda ben Asher, the son of Asheri, in an interesting marriage affair (*Responsa Sichron Jehuda*, No. 81). D. Juze Orabuena is mentioned for the first time in the year 1385, being called "Medico Judio" (1495). In conjunction with Nathan Gabay (who appears in Mr. Jacobs variously as "Nazar," "Azan," and "Anazas del Gabay") and with Juda Levi, he farmed the taxes of the whole country in the year

1391 for 72,000 libras. One wonders whether Juda Levi of Estella, who collected the succession duties from Jews and Moors, and who also stood in particular favour with the king, to whose presence, as appears from 1477, he was often summoned, was driven from his post by his colleagues. With the year 1392, which was possibly the year of his death, all further intelligence of him ceases. A law-suit, which presumably was brought forward after his death by his relatives residing in Estella (in the list of Jews who lived at Estella in 1366, which was copied by Mr. Jacobs from the *Libro de Fuegos*, document XVIII, mention is made, besides Judas Levi, of Judas Levi el Joven, the younger, Saul Levi, Salomon Levi), produced a painful sensation, so that Orabuena, who was perhaps involved in the affair, appealed to Chasdai Crescas requesting him to quiet the disturbed minds by pronouncing his decision in the matter. Thus much was indeed already known. But we learn for the first time from Mr. Jacobs' references (1570) that Crescas of Zaragoza, where he was Rabbi in 1401, did indeed come to Tudela at the king's desire, in order to settle on the spot, in conjunction with Maestre Astrug, the Rabbi of the congregation at Tudela, the matter in dispute. Likewise "Maestre Azday Rab de los Judios de Zaragoza" proceeded at the direct command of the king to Sanguesa, Exea, and other places "por ciertos negocios"; of what nature these transactions were may perhaps be ascertained from the documents themselves. That, moreover, Chasdai Crescas, "Magister Azday evesques (Cresques) judeus Aljame civitatis Cesarangastane (Cesaragaste)," was held in honour by the royal pair who ruled over Aragon, and also by Queen Violante (Zolanda), the consort of King Juan I, is shown by the reference (IX)—rendered unintelligible by clerical errors and mistakes of print—which is dated December 5, 1390, and in which D. Chasdai is named as the executor of the will of his uncle, who died at Gerona "Vitalis Azday judei civitatis Gerunde avunculi sui."

After the stay at Navarre of D. Chasdai, whose travelling expenses were paid through Orabuena and Abraham Enxoep out of the State exchequer (1570, 1574), Orabuena received as a present from the king a house situated in the Juderia at Monreal, in grateful recognition of the many good services which he had rendered him on various occasions (1571). In May, 1408, he undertook a journey to France; he passed through Barcelona, where he advanced fifty florins to the king, and went as far as Paris, where, by order of his sovereign, he delivered to the Chancellor (Chancellor r. Chancellar) of the Duke de Bretagne a female mule of the value of a hundred florins (1599). Joseph Orabuena, who remained court physician and Chief Rabbi till his death in 1413, had several sons; his son Juda, whom he appointed

to be his successor (1592), followed him in the Chief Rabbinate and in the king's favour. His daughter Sorbeillida—more correctly Solbelita, compounded from Sol (שול) and Belita (בליטה)—was the wife of Abraham Enxoep, Ensoep (1610) or Schoeb, as his real name was, of Estella, private physician to Queen Leonora. We make the acquaintance of several other physicians from Mr. Jacobs' *Sources*; e.g. Maestre Azaq Bonbet fisico (1594), who is no other than Isaac Bonfos b. Schealtiel of Falces, the learned son-in-law and correspondent of R. Isaac ben Sheshet, who came to an agreement with another physician of his native town to share their common profits for five years[1]; Maestre Abraham Cominto, Comineto, private physician to the queen, who passed twenty-four days at the bedside of her eldest daughter, the Infanta D. Juana, who had fallen ill at Bearn (1617); Maestre Vidal of Olite, a surgeon, and Samuel Alfaqui of Pamplona, who cured an English knight and received for this the special thanks of the queen (1519); Maestre Aron, whose successful cures became especially famous, &c. We should be inclined to doubt that Sallaman Gateymos, the physician of the Infanta D. Juana (1596), was a Jew.

Besides trade, the Jews of Navarre, like those of Aragon and Castile, engaged in the most varied occupations; they were even employed as lion-keepers. In 1338 D. Pedro of Aragon sent his lion to Valencia under the care of a Jew[2]; another lion-keeper was Acaz Jacob, who in 1385 brought a lion to the Queen of Navarre[3]; we recognize a third in Abram Azen, Azac (?), who was certainly not a Chasan as Mr. Jacobs thinks (p. 254), nor was his name Aron; and a fourth, who hailed, like all the others, from Zaragoza, and received payment of three quarters of a florin a day, is called sometimes Juze Zayel, sometimes Zayet, sometimes Zazel. Similarly uncertain is the name of the animal he conducted, and which is variously styled Marzol, Marzot, Marzet (1502, 1504, 1512); nor indeed is it of much importance if we do not learn the exact name of the lion or of the lion-conductor.

That there were also jugglers among the Jews of Navarre, has hitherto been nowhere referred to. As such Judios Zuglares, or rather Juglares, as it should really be called, we find the names of

[1] See my *History of the Jews in Navarre*, pp. 86 and 87, note 1.

[2] *Revue des Études Juives*, XXV, 255.

[3] Vide my *History*, p. 97. Mr. Jacobs refers on p. xxxvii to Amador de los Rios, II; the latter, however, mentions no one but Acaz Aben Jacob, adding indeed the reference, "*Arch. de Comptos*, caj. 45, num. 28; caj. 48, num. 23," instead of simply referring to Yanguas, *Diccionario*, III, 131. Parade notes of this character are no rarities in De los Rios.

Bonafos and Gento (1467, 1519), the sons of the above-mentioned physician Samuel. In 1381 Bonafos el Toben—el Joven—the younger had given his services in S. Maria de Pamplona, together with Mosen (Mossen) Pierres Garsel "por la alma del Vizconde de Castelbon!" The king gave command to refund to "Sancho de Mayer," as Mr. Jacobs often writes, i. e. Sancho "el Mayor," or Sancho the elder, the expenses incurred in this affair.

The number of Jews in Navarre was never very large; only Tudela and Pamplona had considerable congregations of 270 and 220 families. The roll of the eighty-five families who in 1366 lived in Estella, and of the twenty-five families who lived in Sangueza, furnished by Mr. Jacobs, p. 150, from the *Libro de Fuegos*, is of importance for our knowledge of Spanish family names; it is a pity that precisely in regard to the correct writing of the names so little trouble has been taken. Thus he gives us (p. xxxiv) the names of the signatories to fourteen deeds of sale belonging to the years 1245 to 1293, which were prepared in Toledo in the Arabic tongue but with Hebrew characters, and which are to be found in manuscript in the library of the Academy of History at Madrid; and the name of one and the same man appearing in four of the deeds which belong to one and the same year, is varied four times: Moses ben Chainiz, Moses ben Chinaz, Moses Chaya, and Moses ben Chaya. The last is probably correct; so also we have Samuel ben Chaya. But this is probably less the fault of Mr. Jacobs than of Professor D. Fernando Fernandez y Gonzales, who copied the deeds of sale for printing. The name Acach, Azach, which frequently occurs among the Jews of Spain, is Açac=Isaac; Gentto (Jento) Correo de Lanaga should probably be de Larraga (of Larraga), and Abraham Lera=Leria. In the list of Non-Podientes, i. e. poor people and persons exempt from taxes, in Estella (p. 151), Salomon Habn=Habet; la Vidua de Rabiona, Rabiona—also in the index—is Rabbi Jona; Donna Vaseba is Bat Seba; Lave Azen is meant for Levi; the abbreviated name of R. Nissim, Ran, Mr. Jacobs gives as Ren according to the English pronunciation; Cota, not Jota or Gotta, is a well-known Spanish family to which the poet Rodrico Cota belonged; Embolat is Bolat with the Provençal En; and Mose Basu is Basula. Many names are completely corrupted; thus Abou and Alor, Nucion, &c., to which we will return later.

We now turn to Barcelona, the capital of Aragon. In the "Palacio de los Reyes," situated near the Cathedral and the old Juderia—that palace in whose capacious court the Inquisition held its celebrations—there is now lodged the "Archivo general de la Corona de Aragon," one of the largest and richest archives in the world, which, thanks

to the indefatigable labours of the man who was its custodian for many years and who died three years ago, viz. D. Manuel Bofarull y Sartorio, possesses extremely excellent registers. D. Manuel Bofarull collected, during his long life, a great number of records, and worked with the idea of publishing them. It was intended by his son Francisco, that this collection of records, already prepared as it was for the press, should appear, but this has not yet taken place. Probably some considerable time will elapse before the publication of the Bofarull collection, which has reached the dimensions of many volumes.

Mr. Jacobs has copied from the "registers" of the years 1257 to 1338 about 1120 entries, specifying carefully register and page in each case. Some of these indeed have no sort of connexion with the Jews and their history, as, for example, all those which refer to "Jayme de Monjuich" (489–93). The Monjuich, that mountain situated in the neighbourhood of Barcelona and the sea, served the Jews, like the Monjuich near Gerona, as a burial-place; see No. 1079; hence also called Mons judaicus. Only a few years ago, the industrious Girbal found on the Monjuich at Gerona the tombstone of Estellina, wife of Abu Astruc Joseph, as also that of R. Joshua ben Sheshet. Jayme de Monjuich was no more a Jew than Jayme de Call (564, 565, 626, 629, 664) or Muce de Peralta. The Peraltas are an old Spanish family, and Muce or Mossen is, in the Aragonian dialect, a title equivalent to "Mr." Moreover, at least thirty entries (748, 749, 751, 753, 763, 765, 769, 788, 791, 829, 834, 837, 854, 873, 895, 913, 915, 920, 923, 936, 951, 957, 1011, 1015, 1038, 1057, and many others) have been already made use of, and quoted with register and number, by J. Amador de los Rios, l. c. II, 150–159. The documents 246, 323 were printed in full by Girbal, *Los Judios en Gerona*, pp. 66, 69. On the other hand, Mr. Jacobs has overlooked some items—a fact less remarkable than his skill in including so many in so short a stay. By way of supplementing his compilation, we add the following items taken from our notes made in Barcelona:—

1300. Legacion al Rey de Granada a *Samuel Alfaquin* (Reg. 252, 80, 110).

1301. Observancia de una gracia de fisico Rabi *Salomon Abenjacob.*
Pasaporte al Judio de Mallorca *Astrugo de Abennuno.*
Concesion de cierta gracia al Judio de Zaragoza *Azmael Avenbruch.*

1305. Concesion a *Vidal* de la Escribania de los Judios de Barbastro (Reg. 203, 222).

1306. Orden para permitir a un Judio de Zaragoza a egercer el oficio de Cirujano.

1308. Franquicia de pechos a *Isach y Jusef Avenesra.*
Indulto al Judio *Salomon Abenvives.*
Remision al Judio *Vidal Abulhaca.*
Despacho sobre las escusas del Judio *Asach Avinacaza.*
Moratoria por paga de pecho a *Isach y Jusef Avenesra.*
Orden por que la Aljama de Huesca observase la gracia concedida a los hermanos *Abuarrabi.*

1311. Confirmacion de la franquicia concedida a Rabi *Azer Abenbontriou.*

1313. Permisio por nombrar substituto al Excl^mo de la Juderia de Zaragoza Rabi *Azarias.*

1318. Declaracion desaprejudical a la Aljama de Zaragoza el nombr^to de Rabi en favor de R. *Azarias.*

1320. Franquicia temporal de pechos a los Judios de Monclus resid. a Barbastro.
Indulto al monadero falso *Salomon Abenmimir.*
Remision de usuras y fraudes a *Vitas y hijos de Salomon Abenmimir.*

1322. Salvoconducto al *Judio Alatzar.*

1324. Guiage a los Judios *Isach Bonastruch* y otros (Reg. 226, 295).
Remision de escesos a *Samuel Abendanon.*
Esencion de tributos al Judio *Azach Arreti.*
Esencion de peytas en Calatayud al Judio *Gento Almuli.*

1325. Remision de escesos al Judio *Isacho Altaleg.*

1327. Orden para expulsar de Valencia a la *Judia Ester.*
Confirmacion de franquicias y concesiones al fisico *Rabi Azaria Abenjacob* (Reg. 477, 147).

1336. Protecion para si, su familia y bienes al fisico de S. M. el Judio *Alatzar* (Reg. 860, 20, 87, 147).
Franquicia al fisico de Zaragoza *Rabino Azarias* (Reg. 860, 60).

1337. Indulto al fisico de Zaragoza *Samuel Alatzar* (Reg. 861, 213).
Confirmacion de un privilegio de franquicias a los hijos de *Bonafos Aventilea*, Judio de Calatayud.
Remision a los Judios de Villafranca par haber concurrido al mercado del Arcos.
Licencia p^a tomar prestamos de los Judios de Fraga para cubrir los cargos de la villa de Almudevar.

That bigamy was legal among the Jews in Spain, and that cases occurred as late as the fourteenth century, is well known. In each individual instance it was necessary to obtain, on penalty of death, the permission of the king [1], and this rested its authority on the Mosaic law

[1] הנושא אשה על אשתו מחייב ראשו למלך אלא אם כן נמל רשותו, *Responsa*, Isaac b. Sheshet, 510.

"por falta de sucesion" (649), or, as it runs in one document, "Judeos legem habere, secundum quam eis permissum est duas habere simul uxores." Bigamous marriages were indeed not at all rare. Thus it is evident from one of the items quoted by Mr. Jacobs (148), that in the year 1258 Jucef de Grassa obtained permission to enter into a marriage "por sentencia del Rey," with Regina, the daughter of Samuel Brafayre, in addition to his wife Luna. He furnishes two other cases from the years 1337 and 1338 (1226, 1227). There are, however, several other bigamous marriages recorded in the Registers of the Archives of Barcelona; thus: "Permision por tener dos mugeres con arreglo a la Ley judayca a Abraham Abuasaya" (Reg. 222, f. 169). In the same year, 1322, Strug (Astrug) Mercadell "judaeus Turricelli" took another wife "juxta legem judaicam," in addition to his wife Regina[1]. "Concesion al Judio Ferrer Bonafos para usar del privilegio de tener mas de una consorte," from the year 1333 (Reg. 576, f. 80). Also a Jewish bride required the royal consent before contracting a marriage with a relative (1101).

The materials collected by Mr. Jacobs in Barcelona afford additional information of great importance concerning the taxes, both ordinary and extraordinary, for purposes of war, which the Jews had to pay. To the various tax-lists of the Jews in the kingdom of Aragon, which were already well known, Mr. Jacobs adds a few more from the year 1270 (Appendix V to VIII). These imposts, however, were very often altered, usually increased. Thus, for example, the "Aljama dels Jueus de Perpinya" had to pay some years later "X m. solidos, primerament ne haguerir un any II m. solidos; apres altron any IIII m. solidos e axi poch a poch muntaren la dita demanda a XIIII m. solidos." The tributes which had to be furnished to the king by the whole of the Jews of Aragon amounted annually to 43,300 solidos Jacc.[2] The task of collecting these taxes was made over to certain farmers or collectors called Bayles, who were appointed, with the approval of the king, by the Bayle General, or Director General of the royal exchequer. Jacobs' *Sources* place us in a position to learn more accurately the widely extended activity and considerable influence of several of these Jewish farmers of taxes in the reign of King Jayme I. Vidal Salomon, whose son and heir, Bonafos, is mentioned (158), was farmer of the taxes or Bayle for Barcelona. The same post was occupied from 1257 to 1267, and longer for Barcelona, Gerona, Lerida, and other places,

[1] *Documentos ineditos del Archivo general de la Corona de Aragon*, VI, 240; vide the record in Frankel's *Monatsschrift*, XIV, 390.

[2] *Documentos ineditos del Archivo general de la Corona de Aragon*, XII, 348.

by Benveniste de Porta, whom Mr. Jacobs, relying on the hypothesis advanced by Graetz, that Moses b. Nachman and Bonastruc de Porta are one and the same person, straightway makes the brother of Nachmani. I have already proved, in 1865, the untenableness of this hypothesis, by reason of No. 323 in the *Documentos ineditos del Archivo general de la Corona de Aragon*, VI, 167, which was afterwards printed in full in Girbal, l. c., p. 69, and the new data which have now been obtained have only served to strengthen me in my conclusion. While in the matter of the dispute with Fr. Pablo, in the record of October, 1263, "Moyses magister Judeus" is distinctly mentioned by Girbal, l. c., p. 66, by Tourtoulon, Jacme le Conquérant, and by others, in all later records referring to the dispute with R. de Peñaforte, Fr. Pablo, and the other Praedicators, mention is always made of Bonastruc de Porta. Nachmani never bore the name Bonastruc de Porta, and certainly King Jayme, who was himself a scholar, and was acquainted with the learned Rabbis of his country, did not confound "Moyses magister Judeus" and "Bonastrugus de Porta magister Judeus" with each other. It is significant that in March, 1264, the punishment of Bonastruc "por haber mal hablado de Jesu-christo" was remitted, that four months later (289) full absolution was granted him by the king, that finally the decree of banishment against him was revoked, and he was no longer detained for further consideration of his case. That Bonastruc, who, like his son Vidal, advanced money to the court (313, 314), was the brother of Benveniste de Porta, is evident from the record communicated by Mr. Jacobs (Appendix IV). This Benveniste, who also bought corn (167 a)—for "foneca," read "fanega de trigo"—and had his own mills in Barcelona, advanced large sums to the king, and helped him generally when he found himself in money difficulties. When the Bishop of Barcelona and the Count of Ampurias journeyed to France, in 1263, on a mission of the king's, Benveniste lent them the sum of 15,000 solidos for their travelling expenses (355, quoted already by Tourtoulon, l. c., II, 472); on the other hand he received, besides permission to coin money, some landed property (232), the assignment of the king's taxes in Perpignan (339), &c.

The richest and most powerful Jew of Aragon was Jehudano or Jehuda de Cavalleria of Zaragoza, the founder of a widely branching and highly respected family, which played a great part in Spain, especially in the fifteenth century. He was a tax-collector or Bayle in Zaragoza, and at a later period Treasurer-General of Aragon; he advanced the king D. Jayme enormous sums of money and rendered him and the country important services. When in 1274 D. Jayme proceeded to the "Concil" which Pope Gregory X had assembled,

Jehudano sent him 10,000 sueldos (538). As security for the sum thus advanced to the king, the revenues from the salt-works of the whole of Aragon were made over to him (298), as was also the Herbage or tax raised on small cattle such as sheep and goats (352), an impost which was introduced in Jayme's reign. He received also estates in Valencia—"Donacion à Jahudan de la Paza de tierra" should run "Donacion à Jahudan de la plaza de tierra en Valencia" (240)—and a tower with several houses in Valencia, which the king gave him for a present (475). Jehudano, who discharged various functions in the administration of justice, and in fact, as may be gathered from No. 572, possessed unlimited powers, so that he could order the property of persons who had committed murder to be sold, obtained permission to keep a Cosador, or rather Casador, a judicial official who carried out a judicial decision (267). Jehudano, who was not one of the strict members of the congregation of Zaragoza, having been indeed once charged with being irreligious (408), had several sons: one of them, Salomon, was Bayle of Murviedro and other places (517); another bore the name of Chisdai, as we should probably read instead of Hizde (562). At a later time they carried on the business in conjunction with their father.

The position of Bayle of Tortosa, Morella, and other places was occupied for many years by Astruc Jacob Xixen, to whom assistance was afforded by the Justicia, at the king's command, in his suit against his noble debtors (251), and who stood in such high favour with D. Jayme that he was exempted from various burdens and taxes (405), received for life half of the crops which fell to the king from his property near Morella (407), and obtained permission to erect baths in his house (for "en su habitar" read "habitacio," 386). Vives, the son of Jucef Abenvives, discharged the duties of Bayle or collector of Alfandich, Cervera, Algeciras, and other places, while the Bayle of Murviedro was Jucef ibn Shaprut (Avenxaprut), who also received gifts of landed estates from the king (402). An interesting personality, concerning whom several other records are extant in the archives at Barcelona, is Astruc Bonsenyor, mentioned in No. 159 and identical with Astruc Bonseignor (369), who acted as Arabic secretary in the service of D. Jayme. His son, the not unknown Jehuda Bonsenyor and his grandson, Bonsenyor, the royal physician of Barcelona, who was held in such high esteem by the king, lived in the same house as Astruc. That Solomon Adret, who is named in a bond which is printed in full (Appendix III), is the celebrated Barcelona Rabbi of the same name, as Mr. Jacobs assumes, is open to serious doubt. In the year at which the bond is dated, viz. 1262, R. Solomon Adret was twenty-two to twenty-five years old, and it is certain that

he did not carry on any money business. The Solomon Adret referred to was, we suspect, the grandfather of that Solomon Adret in Barcelona who in the year 1391 embraced Christianity and took the name of Ludovico Guixar[1]. A Solomon Adret was, according to the deeds of the Valencia Inquisition, punished in October, 1490, by that Inquisition, together with his wife Isabel, "por la ley de Moysen[2]." The name of the private court physician, to whom in 1271 an annual pension of 500 solidos Jacc. was granted, is not Jucepho Abentudi, as Mr. Jacobs writes (400), but Jucef Abentrevi; and the Isach mentioned in No. 724 was not called Jaffies (Jafe), but Jaffiel, Jafiel = Jahiel. Mosse el Neyto (651) has nothing to do with the family name of Nieto, as Mr. Jacobs supposes, p. 261; instead of Neyto, we should read viejo—Mosse el Viejo, which means Moses senior or the elder. That the Jews who were banished from France found an asylum in Aragon has been already established by me[3] on the testimony of records which Mr. Jacobs also communicates; and the municipal regulations affecting the Jews, which he copied in the Archivo municipal at Barcelona, are to be found for the most part in my article on the Jews in Barcelona[4].

As regards the library of the cathedral, or the archiepiscopal library in Barcelona, I can assure Mr. Jacobs, that even if the cathedral had not just been undergoing repair and if "the librarian had not seized the opportunity to take a little holiday" (p. xxxviii), he would scarcely have obtained admittance to it. During my stay in Barcelona, I preferred a request to the archbishop, through Dr. Balary Jovany, Professor of Greek Language and Literature at the University of that city, asking him to be kind enough to grant me the use of the documents and manuscripts in the archiepiscopal library, among which are said to be also some Jewish ones; but, on some pretext or other, my request was absolutely refused.

In Alcalá de Henares Mr. Jacobs copied an astonishing amount in a few hours; but to use with some profit the excellently arranged documents of the Inquisition of Toledo, which are placed in long halls—to say nothing of those of Valencia, which, as late as 1892, had not yet been entirely reduced to order—requires further preliminary studies extending over many months, if not years. Also it may not be known that very many Relaciones of the Autos-da-fé which took place in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries have

[1] *Revue des Études Juives*, IV, 60.

[2] Kayserling, *Christopher Columbus and the Participation of the Jews in the Spanish and Portuguese Discoveries* (New York, 1894), p. 90.

[3] *Revue des Études Juives*, XXVII, 149. [4] *Ibid.* XXVIII, 106 ff.

appeared in print, but are seldom to be met with outside Spain. Thus concerning the persons mentioned on p. 3, No. 21, further details are to be found in the printed Relacion on the Auto-da-fé held on Sunday, March 15, 1722, in the church of the Convent of S. Pedro Martyr in Toledo. Manuel de la Mota, called also Francisco Manuel de Torres; his wife, Maria de Soto; their eighteen-year-old daughter, Laura Maria de la Mota; also Fernando Diaz Cordiza, who at the age of forty-seven had married in accordance with the Mosaic law; his wife, Maria de Espinosa; their children, Francisco and Manuela Diaz Cordiza; Francisco de Mendoza y Rodriguez, a resident like the others mentioned in Granatula near Murcia, who had married Leonor de Espinosa according to the Mosaic law; their children, Maria and Anna de Mendoza Rodriguez y Espinoza, Josefa de Mendoza y Rodriguez, the sister of Francisco, thirty-five years of age; all these were sentenced to "carcel perpetuo," while Manuel de la Mota was to receive besides two hundred lashes.

In the Escurial Mr. Jacobs gave himself unnecessary trouble to note down the titles of several Spanish works composed by Jews or affecting Jews and Jewish literature. Most of these, if not all, are already known, and many, like the *Consejos de Rabbi don Santob de Carrion*, *Tizon de España*, *Pugio Fidei*, have also been printed. Of more importance is the list of documents and works in manuscript at the National Library at Madrid. "Rabbi Samuel de Naunecos" (267) is "Samuel de Maruecos," the same who (1261) addressed the well-known *Epistolas* to R. Ishae de Sujurmenza. Whether the manuscript copy of the *Scrutinium Scripturarum* of Paul de Burgos contains more than the printed work is not stated. The *Dichos y Sentencias* of Jafuda Bonsenyor (1329) were already partly worked at in 1859 by Ad. Helfferich, and appeared complete in print some years ago. Mr. Jacobs would have earned special merit as regards our knowledge of history if, in addition to taking copies of the historical records (XIII–XVII), he had also copied the rest of those of which a very few are known through De los Rios, especially, for instance, from No. 1280 to 1305.

In Simancas there is surely more material than Mr. Jacobs mentions, p. 124 f. In the Camara de Castilla are Leg. 1–55: "Papeles sobre la expulsion de los Judios," and Salas XXXIX, XL, and XLI are full of records of the Inquisition de Aragon y Castilla desde su Fundacion. Regarding the Jews of Manresa, D. Eduardo Támaro gives a short extract from the history of that town, written by Sr. D. Mas y Casas. If we mention further the records, chiefly Portuguese, taken from the British Museum, which refer to the general pardon conferred in 1674 upon secret Jews or Christãos-Novos—the bull of Pope Innocent XI,

which is here mentioned (No. 1238) without date, is dated November 28, 1676—also a discourse by the author on Jewish historiography in general and on Spanish-Jewish history in particular, reprinted from the *Boletin de la r. Academia de la Historia in Madrid*, XV, 152 ff.; and finally an Introduction, which is a sort of index to the work and which was already published in the JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, VI, 597 ff., we have exhausted the subject-matter of the book. The volume concludes with several lists compiled with extraordinary industry, and including a register of Spanish-Jewish authors, and a Spanish-Jewish bibliography which admits of amplification and from which the tables of contents of the historical works of J. Amador de los Rios and H. Graetz might conveniently have been omitted, for here and there errors have crept in respecting the names of places and persons occurring in the lists which are given. Abner de Burgos was not called Abraham, but Alphonso de Valladolid; the name of the German translator of *Prince and Dervish* is not Veislovitz, but Meisel. Abraham Zacuto, the author of the *Jochasin*, lived and laboured not in Zaragoza, but in Salamanca. For "Diego Bacorassa" we should read "Barrassa," &c., &c.

With all respect for the author and with full acknowledgment of his achievements, we still cannot refrain from making one or two observations. Several entries are so compressed that they remain quite unintelligible; thus, for example, 1115, "Promesa . . . 5 años deudores Lerida, Zaragoza, Valencia, or 1140, Promesa, Monzon; 1148, Promesa, Alcolea," which in reality should run: "Promesa de no inquirir en 5 años por usuras contra los Judios de Alcolea." If the various entries with the initial word Promesa are to be referred to 1063 or 1125 as being of the same tenor, this should at least have been indicated in a note. Very confusing also are the many words in the registers and documents, which are so distorted as to be unintelligible. A whole list of these could be drawn up; we will only note a few of them: "Genova" (756) for "Gerona"; "Liria" (1039), or in the index "Lizia," for "Lerida"; "Junes de Ablitas" (1409) for "Judas"; "Azac Abdfaza fijo de D. Abran Abolbaza" instead of "Abolfada" (1403); "avenguanar" for "averiguar"; "Maer Zabaira" (716) for "Micer"; "Castan" (1087) or "Caston" (1213) for "Castellan"; "taxo de Castos" for "Gastos"; "copradia" for "confradia"; "Vealenga" (1198), "Veslingo" (1201), "Vealengo" (1208) for "Realengo"; "Tazas de Arger" for "argent"; "Rey Davagon" (1455) for "d'Aragon"; "mernidad" or "merntridad" for "merindad," and many others.

Nevertheless Mr. Jacobs' *Sources* form a valuable contribution to the history of the Jews in Spain, and will render very real service

to all those who engage in its study; the *Sources* will indeed long occupy a place in literature as an authority on the subject.

M. KAYSERLING.

THE BEGINNINGS OF HEBREW GRAMMAR.

Die Anfänge der hebräischen Grammatik, von Dr. W. BACHER, Professor an der Landes-Rabbinerschule zu Budapest. Separat-Abdruck aus dem 49 Bande *der Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft.* (Leipzig, Brockhaus, 1895, 120 pp.)

PROF. W. BACHER, whose energies seem unlimited, describes in this essay the origin and development of Hebrew grammatical science during the centuries preceding Hajjug. The scientific study of that language was inaugurated with the advent of this writer, so that Abraham Ibn Ezra in the *Sefath Jether*, No. 74, rightly remarks: "Hebrew grammar did not exist till Jehuda ben David arose, chief of the grammarians." Before Hajjug, however, we may already discover germs and traces of Hebrew grammar, which ought not to be passed over by the historians. These Dr. Bacher has grouped in nine chapters, and collated systematically.

The first chapter (pp. 3–7) notices grammatical elements in traditional literature. The author correctly points out that current conceptions of the existence of grammatical elements in Talmud and Midrash are exaggerated; it is not proper to speak of a grammar of the Hebrew language in the period that produced the Talmud. Only an exiguous number of merest traces of linguistic categories of a very general character exist, and these afterwards became constituent elements of grammatical terminology. The contributions of traditional literature to later Hebrew grammar, Dr. Bacher exhaustively collects and enumerates.

The second chapter (pp. 7–12) indicates the extent to which the Massorah, by its isolated rules and technical terms, prepared the way for Hebrew grammar. The author justly styles the Massorah the cradle of Hebrew grammar; because, for the sake of preserving the true text, the Massorites carefully distinguished the various forms and grouped together those that were similar. On the other hand, these Massorite lists lack grammatical character. The Massorites, only concerned with the correct reading of the text, for instance, jumbled together Hebrew with Biblical Aramaic. Their interest centred not in Hebrew as a language, but in the text of the Hebrew scriptures.

Chapter III (pp. 13–20) treats of the vowel points. The author favours Graetz's hypothesis that the first vowel characters were written over as well as under the words. Of the two systems of punctuation—the Tiberian and the Babylonian—the author proves that the latter was the original and simpler, and accordingly the more ancient.

In Chapter IV (pp. 20–23), the elements of Hebrew grammar, gathered from the *Sepher Jeẓirah*, are discussed. This original work was the first to give the classification of Hebrew consonants which was afterwards adopted by the grammarians. We also learn from it that the *Resh* was pronounced in two ways.

Aaron b. Moses b. Asher, discussed in Chapter V (pp. 23–28), represents the transition from the Massorites to the grammarians. His Massorite rules (collected in דקדוקי הטעמים) are permeated with grammatical conceptions. Ben Asher is the first who discusses the seven vowels which he names "kings" (שבעה מלכים). Both nomenclature and number were accepted by all grammarians till Joseph Qimhi. Ben Asher's chapter on the parts of speech (דקדוקי הטעמים § 71) shows that he really had some idea of exact grammar. This chapter is headed סדר כל משמע אומין המקרא, in which משמע does not perhaps signify elements of audible speech (see Bacher, p. 32), but, as among the Karaites, is identical with כתוב (see *Eshkol Hakkofer*, No. 168, letter ב). The expression מצדירות, a Hebraic form of the Arabic מצדר, is remarkable as denoting the Infinitive. Ibn Parchon, as well as his contemporary, the Karaite Jehuda Hadassi, calls the Infinitive simply מצדר (*Eshkol*, No. 33, letter ע; No. 163, letter ו; compare *Monatsschrift*, XL, 120). I here take the opportunity of remarking that the composer (or translator, see Steinschneider, *Die hebr. Uebersetz.*, p. 939) of a small grammatical essay ספר הבנין (MS. Bodl., Catal. Neubauer, No. 1467) uses מצדד as a term for the Infinitive. The reason is given as follows: שנופל לכל צד לזכר ולריבוי ולעתיד וזולתם (f. 58 c).

Ben Asher is greatly surpassed by his contemporary, the Gaon Saadiah, of whom the sixth chapter treats (pp. 38–62). Saadiah was the first to write a book exclusively devoted to Hebrew grammar. This was composed in Arabic, under the influence of the Arabic language, and consists of twelve chapters. According to Dr. Harkavy (*Studien u. Mittheilungen*, V, 34) it was intended as an appendix to the second recension of Saadiah's *Agron* (or *Egron*). Dr. Bacher, however, with some plausibility, argues that it formed an independent work[1],

[1] The grounds for Dr. Bacher's views were communicated to the *Revue des*

with the title כתב אללגה, and endeavours, principally from Saadiah's citations, in his *Commentary on the Sepher Jeẓirah*, and from the quotations in Dunash ben Labrat's critique, to reconstruct the contents of the twelve chapters. The subjects of this work were, Dr. Bacher thinks:—(1) The Letters; (2) The Gutturals; (3) Peculiarities of other letters; (4) Changes of Letters; (5) Changes of Vowels; (6) Dagesh and Raphé; (7) Assimilation of Consonants of the same class; (8) Radical and Servile Letters; (9) Conjugation of Verbs; (10) Declension of Nouns[1]; (11) Anomalies; (12) Syntax.

Jehuda Ibn Qoreish, discussed in Chapter VII (pp. 63-70), probably made use of Saadiah's writings; but nevertheless represents an earlier and less advanced stage in grammatical science. The importance of his work mainly consists in the fact that he was the first to institute a comparison between the Semitic tongues. Apart from this, he only plays a secondary part in the history of the beginnings of Hebrew grammar. He has, withal, a number of grammatical peculiarities which deserve notice.

The last two chapters, the eighth (pp. 70-95) and the ninth (pp. 95-114), treat of the efforts of the first representatives of Hebrew linguistic science in Spain, Menahem b. Saruq and Dunash b. Labrat. Menahem composed a complete dictionary of the Hebrew language, which he probably edited in two recensions. The first, according to Dr. Kaufmann (*Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, XL, 370), forms the basis of a Berne MS. The Bodleian Library possesses a recently-acquired fragment of Menahem's Lexicon, which gives a portion of the Introduction and of the Letter Alef, and is more condensed than the printed edition, from which it differs in the arrangements of the radicals. I was unfortunately only able to examine it cursorily, and could therefore not determine whether it corresponds with the Berne MS.

As Menahem wrote his Lexicon in Hebrew, he had to construct a terminology and invent technical terms. Thus, for example, he was probably the first to introduce the word גזרה (p. 94). It would be highly desirable, if Dr. Bacher were to compile a list of Menahem's

Études Juives, XXIV, 310, 313. Dr. Harkavy, however, still maintains his own theory, and promises to adduce proofs. (See his חרשים גם ישנים, No. 5, in היקב, p. 44.)

[1] The citation from Dunash's *Criticism*, No. 89 (p. 56), should undoubtedly be corrected thus, ואמר תהלת כמו תהלתי אף נהלת נהלתי לפי דוך התרגום. Saadiah always treats these forms as nouns with the first person singular pronominal suffix. Cp. my essay, *Mose b. Samuel Hakkohen Ibn Chiquitilla*, &c., p. 130.

terms, marking those of which he is the originator. (Most of them are to be found scattered in Dr. Bacher's essay, *Die grammatische Terminologie des Jehuda b. David Ḥajjuġ*, Vienna, 1882.) But, although Menahem avoided Arabic terminology (p. 71), he was, nevertheless, consciously or unconsciously, influenced by it. Apart from the examples given by Dr. Bacher (pp. 71–72), the division of the nouns into שמות and מפעלים (p. 85) is an imitation of the Arabic אסם גאמד and אסם משתק (see my *Beiträge z. Gesch. d. hebr. Sprachwissensch.*, i. 14–15, and Dr. Bacher, *Monatsschrift*, XL, 119). Thus, too, Menahem's expression (p. 48) ראשוני המלה ותיכוניה ואחרוניה is a literal translation of the Arabic אויל אלחרוף ואוסאטהא ואואכרהא (see *Grammatische Terminologie des Ḥajjuġ*, p. 22, no. 2). The opening paragraphs of the Introduction are modelled on an Arabic pattern. How remote Menahem still is from a scientific conception of the Hebrew language is proved by the circumstance that, like the Massorah, he does not accurately distinguish the Hebrew from the Aramaic element in the Bible (p. 72, no. 3). Both in Menahem and the Massorah, the subject of interest is not Hebrew, but the language of the Bible. Even the Karaite author of the *Mushtamil* (see below), who lived at the beginning of the eleventh century, gives, in the seventh part of his work, examples from the Aramaic in illustration of the variation in meaning produced by transposition of consonants[1]. Of Saadiah's writings, Menahem, according to Dr. Bacher, only knew the *Agron*. This can have reference only to the Gaon's *Grammatical Writings;* for Saadiah's exegetical writings were probably known and used by Menahem. Thus, Menahem's refutation of the derivation of זרית (Ps. cxxxix. 3) from זרת (p. 86, note), is probably derived from Saadiah (see Pinsker, *Likkute Kadmonioth*, p. 174). So also, Menahem, in disproving (fol. 83 b) the identification of מזרות (Job xxxviii. 32) with מזלות (p. 82, note 5), does not aim at Ibn Qoreish, but rather attacks Saadiah, who translated מזרות with אלנגום. Cp. my Essay on *Ibn Chiquitilla*, p. 183, and the passage there cited from Dunash's *Critique on Saadiah*, no. 84, מורות כמו מזלות (ר"ל רב סעדיה) ופתר[2].

[1] I content myself with one example from the Article יבר (Brit. Mus. MS. Or. 2592, f. 39 b): עבר אוא אנתשמת הוא אלאחרף פי לשבה עלי הוא אלחד מן אלנמאם כאן להא מצאני .... ואוא הגירת .... בהוא אלצורה ערב כאן להא מצאני אחרהא אלצמאן כך׳ ערב עבדך לטוב (Ps. cxix. 122) .... וכאמסהא מן אלאלתאש כך׳ ויתערבו בגוים אלך (Dan. ii. 43) מהתערבין להון .... (ib. cvi. 35).

[2] I would like to add to Dr. Bacher's chapter on Menahem, that the expression לשון ערומים (p. 90, n. 1) probably refers to the well-known passage in T. B. Pesachim, 3 a.

Menahem's Lexicon was notoriously the occasion of a severe personal attack on its author by Dunash b. Labrat. Dunash does not attack Menahem's system ; his criticism is directed only against single passages. Dunash states that he discussed 200 passages ; in fact only 160 are examined by him. Dr. Bacher (p. 96) believes that, voluntarily or involuntarily, Dunash gave up his task. I incline to the alternative hypothesis, mentioned by Dr Bacher, that Dunash's critique has not come down to us in a complete form. It is not to be supposed that in this, his first work, dedicated to the statesman Hasdai ibn Shaprut, Dunash would have promised more than he was able or willing to perform. A missing fragment in Dunash's critique on תשוקתך (Gen. iii. 16) I restored in my Essay on *Ibn Chiquitilla*, p. 126. Besides the critique on Menahem, Dunash also composed a criticism of Saadiah, which apparently was never completed. It is remarkable that Dunash, in his first work, speaks of Saadiah with great respect, styling him זקני. This expression has frequently given rise to the error that Saadiah was Dunash's grandfather. זקני, however, is the Hebrew equivalent of the Arabic שיכי (p. 97, note 1. Cp. Harkavy, *Studien u. Mittheilungen*, V, 89). I do not see the necessity of assuming that זקני, any more than the Arabic שיכי, means "teacher"; the Arabic term for "teacher" is אסתאד. The words of Menahem's disciples (ed. Stern, p. 27), וקיתָה בעת קהוא צעיר אחרי שומך אותו זקנך, and (ib. p. 48) תלמידיו בכל שכל ובלשון הערב וכו׳ ורבך, do not imply that Dunash was personally a pupil of Saadiah.

"Dunash awoke," Ibn Ezra remarks (*Safa Berurah*, 25 b), "from the slumber of folly," i. e. in grammatical science he took a higher rank than his predecessors. This is especially exhibited in his *Critique on Saadiah*, in which, according to Dr. Bacher (p. 98), "The great event in Hebrew grammar, the discovery of the weak radicals and their laws is foreshadowed." But that does not prevent him from occasionally diverging from the lines correctly marked out by the predecessors whom he criticizes. Still, I think אדדם (Ps. xlii. 5) should be excluded from the examples given by Dr. Bacher (p. 103). (See my notice in the *Revue des Études Juives*, XXXI, 118.)

The dispute between Menahem and Dunash was notoriously continued by their disciples. Bacher, however, does not discuss the controversial writings of the latter; as they did not travel beyond the sphere of grammatical knowledge covered by their teachers. The author here, too, accepts the identification of Jehudah b. David, Menahem's pupil and collaborator, with Hajjug. The latter's efforts, however, no longer belong to the beginnings of Hebrew grammar. The manner in which Hajjug, in the introduction to his *Essay on the*

Weak Radicals, cites Menahem, makes it improbable that he was the latter's pupil (see also my *Beiträge*, &c., p. 28). In my opinion, an argument for the same view is the circumstance that the term זקני mentioned above was not, as I have already explained, used by Dunash in the sense of "teacher."

Dr. Bacher has excluded the Karaites, as well as Menahem's disciples, because their grammatical outlook was not wider than that of their non-Karaite contemporaries, and because they exercised no influence on the development of Hebrew grammar. It would, however, be eminently desirable that the little which the Karaites actually did accomplish in the field of Hebrew linguistics were put together, so as to help us to form some clear notions of their work and influence. We trust that the author, who has recently turned his attention to the Karaites, will undertake this task, which, we are sure, he would accomplish in his usual masterly manner.

In a concluding note (pp. 115–117) the author tells us that, of the earliest "Masters of Hebrew" whom Abraham ibn Ezra enumerates in the Introduction to the *Moznaim*, he would leave out two; the "Anonymous" from Jerusalem and Dunash b. Tamim. On the first, the author has shed sufficient light in the *Revue des Études Juives*, XXX, 232–256, where he has put to good use the material supplied by Kokowtsoff. We now know that this "Anonymous" is identical with Abulfarag Harun, that his essay, the full title of which is בתאב אלמשתמל עלי אלאצול ואלפצול פי אללגה אלעבראניה, consisted of eight parts, and it was completed in the year 1026 C.E. It does not belong to the beginnings of Hebrew grammar[1]. The second, Dunash b. Tamim, lived before Hajjug; but the accounts that have come down to us concerning him are very meagre. He composed work which Abraham Ibn Ezra characterizes as ספר מעורב מלשון עבר וערב. Its object is the examination of the mutual relation of Arabic and Hebrew, but only from a lexicographical standpoint, as appears from Moses Ibn Ezra's Poetry (ed. Kokowtsoff, *Wostochnifa Zamjetki*, p. 215, ll. 16–18). It would accordingly be incorrect to take Abraham Ibn Ezra's words to mean that Dunash's work is partly in Hebrew and partly in Arabic. (See Harkavy, חדשים גם ישנים, No. 2, p. 6, n. 3; also Geiger, *Jud. Zeitschrift*, X, 231.) To the authors mentioned by Dr. Bacher (p. 117) who have quoted from Dunash's book should be added the

[1] Of the Mushtamil, I found, in the British Museum, besides the MS. Or. 2592, mentioned above, p. 5, note 1, another portion of the second part in MS. Or. 2561, and a fragment of a Compendium of the Mushtamil in the Bodleian. I hope shortly to give some further information about these manuscripts.

name of Ibn Bal'am, who cites Dunash in his Commentary on Deuteronomy xxviii. 27 (Fuchs, *Studien über Ibn Bal'am*, p. xx). Ibn Bal'am, again, is drawn upon by Tanhum Jerushalmi, in his annotations on 1 Sam. v. 6 (see Fuchs, *ib.*, p. xli, and Munk, *Notice sur Aboulwalid*, p. 59, n. 1). Among the few quotations in Abraham Ibn Ezra, one has remained unnoticed. It occurs in the first Commentary on Genesis i. 31, ed. Friedländer, p. 33: ור' אדונים בן תמים אמר כי ביום הראשון היה אור וחשך כדמות הלבנה וההבדלה ביום השני כי כן דרך כוכב והדשאים בשלישי כי נגה לאות על כל מאכל וכו'. Still this passage may not come from Dunash's philological work; but, as is more probable, from his Commentary on the *Sepher Jeẓirah*. This citation may help to clear up the obscurity in which this commentary is wrapped up (see Steinschneider, *Die hebr. Uebers.*, pp. 394–401)[1].

Appendices and Corrections (pp. 117–118) and a list of the quoted and elucidated Hebrew and Arabic grammatical termini (pp. 118–120) close Dr. Bacher's in many ways instructive and stimulating essay, which has again earned the author the sincere thanks of all friends of Hebrew linguistic science.

SAMUEL POZNAŃSKI.

BERLIN, *December* 29, 1895.

A NEW GRAMMATICAL TEXT BOOK,

BY PROF. STRACK.

Abriss des biblischen Aramäisch. Grammatik, nach Handschriften berichtigter Text, Wörterbuch. Von Prof. Dr. HERMANN L. STRACK. (Leipzig, T. C. Hinrich'sche Buchhandlung, 1896. 32 and 47 pages, 8vo.)

PROF. STRACK has published a grammatical compilation on the Aramaic used in the biblical books Ezra and Daniel, as a sequel to his Hebrew grammar published in 1893 (fifth edition). He had announced this *Abriss* as early as 1885 in the series which he has edited entitled "Porta linguarum orientalicum." In the introduction to this work, Prof. Strack gives his reasons for the delay and for its

[1] Of the manuscripts enumerated by Dr. Steinschneider, I have examined two, the Berlin MS. 78, and MS. Bodl. Reggio 51 (of Steinschneider's copy), but have not found in either the words cited by Ibn Ezra.

exclusion from the collection above mentioned. A grammatical compendium by Prof. Strack does not need to be specially recommended, everybody knows the merits of his Hebrew grammar and his other works as aids to teaching, as well as his editions of several Mishna-Tractates and his introduction in the Old Testament. The present compendium shows in like manner the same qualities, viz.: the greatest brevity combined with perfect clearness, exact statements founded on a thorough mastery of scientific philology. Above all his constant regard for the wants of the student must be specially commended. This compendium is the work both of a true scholar and a practically experienced teacher. He has thoroughly succeeded in attaining the aim explained in the introduction, viz.: "To offer, in the space of only twenty-four pages, a grammatical introduction to the Aramaic portions of the Bible, completely sufficient for students of Theology and for clergymen." This abridged grammar opens excellently with a paragraph dealing with the consonants of biblical Aramaic as compared with that of the Hebrew. It is of great advantage to the beginner, fresh from the study of Hebrew, to be at once informed as to the close relation, but also at the same time of the decided difference existing between the Hebrew and Aramaic. The last paragraph is likewise of practical value, where all the forms of the verbs contained in the biblical Aramaic are put together. As to particular details I have only to remark as follows: It would perhaps have been useful if the author had devoted a paragraph to a review of the *Hebraisms* occurring in the biblical Aramaic, which is as such of a peculiar character. In the paragraph on the vowels I notice the absence of a remark about the spelling of the Shwa-compositum (chateph) in such cases as גֲלִי or גְלִי. In § 9 the passive form Pe'il is given as co-ordinate to the other stem forms (Prof. Strack calls them stem-modifications), as standing in a line between Qal (Pe'al) and Pa'il; it is, however, nowhere stated that this form, which is applied as a perfect tense, is in reality the passive participle of the Qal which serves as equivalent to the perfect. Prof. Strack (also Nöldeke) would do away with the cases in which the active participle is applied as tempus historicum as in Dan. ii. 5, עָנֶה, v. 7, קָרֶא, by supposing these verbs to be spelt originally otherwise, viz. עָנָה, קָרָא; this emendation, which extends over a succession of examples, seems to me doubtful and also unnecessary. Prof. Strack has not devoted a separate paragraph to the syntax, but has inserted the important points to be noted in the respective paragraphs on the nouns and verbs. The annexed text to be used as a grammatical exercise book comprises Ezra iv. 7–vi. 18, vii. 12–26, and Dan. ii. 7–vii. 28, to which are added also the Aramaic words and sentences from Gen. xxxi. 47 and Jer. x. 11, comprising con-

sequently all Aramaic pieces of the Holy Scripture. The text of Baer is the basis of his text, in addition to which, however, four MSS. were consulted with great care, two with Tiberian punctuation and two South Arabian, with superlinear punctuations of the simpler system. The critical notes are composed in Latin. A welcome novelty in this text is the non-punctuating of such words, the punctuation of which affects only the Qerê. Where these words occur only the consonants are given in the text, consequently the Kethib, whilst the punctuated Qerê is indicated in the notes. In the vocabulary the roots are translated into German, and all the requirements of the learner are supplied. It is needless to say that the book is very accurately printed, as such is quite expected of a publication by Prof. Strack. I have noticed neither a slip of the pen nor a misprint. I hope that this excellent little book may meet with the wide reception which it so well deserves.

W. BACHER.

INTRODUCTION TO THE OLD TESTAMENT.

Einleitung in das Alte Testament einschliesslich Apokryphen und Tseudepigraphen. Mit eingehender Angabe der Litteratur von DR. HERMANN L. STRACK ao. Professor der Theologie an der Universität Berlin. Vierte, ganz neu bearbeitete Auflage. (München, 1895.)

THIS introduction, as the author remarks in his preface and indicates by the title of his volume, differs from similar works in two points. Stress is not laid on critical inquiries; pains are rather taken to supply a full and detailed account of the contents of the various books of Scripture and the literature indispensable for their scientific comprehension. With this view, the general introduction which forms the volume is preceded by a special introduction; of the two hundred and sixteen pages of the book, one hundred and sixty-one are devoted to the former and thirty-five to the latter topic. The remaining twenty pages with the headings "Auxiliaries to the linguistics of the Bible" and "Auxiliaries to exegesis" consist of bibliographical notices. The prefatory remarks briefly treat the names, conceptions, history and literature of the science of Biblical Introductions.

The author has aimed at furnishing a text-book for beginners in the strictest sense of the term. It must be acknowledged that he has executed his task briefly and concisely, and in a manner which proves

that he possesses practical skill as a teacher and remarkable gifts as an expositor.

The contents of an entire Pentateuch are compressed in four pages. It is questionable whether beginners will be able, from this short summary of headings, to obtain a clear idea of the history and legislation of the Pentateuch. It may, however, be said that such a summary, though useless for beginners, cannot hurt advanced students. The author is not so sparing of space in the treatment of most of the other books, so that his reviews, followed as they always are by a statement of critical problems, afford really a clear idea of the contents of the Scriptures. The author, it appears, had his own particular class of students in view. Long experience has taught him which parts of the Bible are more and which less known to them. This statement of a fact is not intended, the reader is begged to observe, as a stricture on the author's method. Prof. Strack's attitude towards Scripture may be described, if we may use that expression, as conservative-liberal. He accepts all the results of criticism, but he endeavours, at the same time, to combine with them conservative views. This tendency to harmonization has notoriously many prominent representatives in German Protestant Theology. This phenomenon is not altogether without interest, in view of the diversity of opinion on Biblical Criticism that prevails at the present day within the Jewish camp. At all events, it teaches a lesson of toleration which we should never weary of enforcing. The critical problems are treated concisely and luminously. Every beginner can gain an insight into the nature of the difficult and complicated questions, such as is not always afforded by a wider and deeper treatment. Prof. Strack possesses the knack, rare with scholars, of extracting the kernel of a subject and presenting it to the learner in a clear and attractive form. The same qualities characterize his other widely disseminated works, e.g. the Hebrew Grammar, which has already reached its fifth edition, and the ethical text-book, as I would style it, "The Blood Ritual and Blood Superstition," in which the diabolical charge of Ritual murder is, for the benefit of insane Anti-Semites, refuted by conclusive proofs. Of this brochure, now in the fourth edition, thousands of copies have been circulated.

The bibliographical references are not only full and precise, but they are marshalled in splendid order—a feature for which the reader will feel grateful. Yet it would have been desirable for the benefit of the classes which the editor aims at reaching, if he had indicated by an asterisk the more important works, as he has done in other of his writings. And, indeed, in various parts of the book we are furnished with signposts from which the student may easily gather

the author's confession. Many, however, may be misled by the occasional criticisms in brackets which surprise one by their inaccuracy and sometimes even injustice. As these remarks occur seldom, the uninitiated may, contrary to the author's intention, attribute to them an exaggerated importance, under the mistaken impression that he is reading generally accepted results and not merely the writer's individual impressions. New researches the author does not promise. He simply desires to represent objectively the present scientific standpoint of Biblical criticism ; and, as far as I can judge, has been eminently successful in the accomplishment of his aim. There are a few, mostly insignificant, errors which I think ought to be corrected. *En passant*, some minor points will be noted. We miss the names for the whole collection of Scripture. They are not to be found on p. 15 nor on p. 162, on either of which they might have been expected to appear, and where a single line could have contained them all. On p. 15 the titles חומש and חמשה ספרי תורה, which already occur in Tannaite texts, are missing (cf. Blau, *Introduction to Holy Writ*, p. 41). Incorrect is the statement that the last three books of the Pentateuch had titles which indicated their contents. This does not apply to the Book of Numbers, which does not exclusively consist of accounts of the numberings of the Israelites. The title חומש הַפְּקוּדִים—not הַפְּקוּדִים as Prof. Strack persists in punctuating it, in spite of my correction (*Zur Einleitung*, p. 47, n. 4)—is borrowed from the contents of the first chapters. שְׁמוֹת should be שְׁמוֹת, as is evidenced by Origen's *οὐαλεσμωθ*. This fact is explicitly stated in my essay, already quoted p. 46 in a note. For the construct מוֹרַה, p. 14, read the absolute מוֹרָה, though the latter would be grammatically permissible. On the origin of the tradition that Joshua and Samuel are the authors of the books bearing their names, a suggestion is offered in my essay to which Prof. Strack (p. 60) might with advantage have explicitly referred. The sentence, "The Book is called after Joshua in the same sense in which another historical work is called after Samuel," conveys no definite idea to the reader, who is not told why the Book of Samuel bears its particular name. In so brief and concise an Introduction an argument of the following character for the division of the Book of Isaiah into Isaiah I and II has no legitimate place. "The most ancient order of the Greater Prophetical Books in the Hebrew Canon," says Prof. Strack, "was Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Isaiah (T. B. Baba-Bathra, 14 b). Consequently, an anonymous scripture appended later on might easily have been regarded as a part of Isaiah, especially when it showed a correspondence in idea and expression with that work" (p. 84). The author seriously assumes

that this Talmudic tradition existed centuries before the common era! On p. 177 is repeated the old familiar statement, "A written Targum of Job is mentioned in the middle of the first century C. E., composed during the Patriarchate of Gamliel I (T. B. Sabbath, 115 a) and at the end of the same century in the Patriarchate of Gamliel II (Tosephta Sabbath, 13. 2, ed. Zuckermandel, p. 128)." No hint, however, is given of the difficulties raised by this hypothesis and of their attempted solutions (cf. *Zur Einleitung*, &c., p. 79). Of the Coptic translation, the author says (p. 189), "The Manuscripts, according to Prof. Cornill (Ezekiel, pp. 36–48), show that there were two versions, an older Recension based on the LXX and one of more recent date, for which the Hebrew texts have in some parts been utilized." This intrinsically improbable view should not be accepted without further proof. Whence did the Coptic Christian scholars derive their knowledge of Hebrew? On this point I would beg the reader to study my remarks on the Coptic Version, with the request that Coptic scholars might, without prepossession or prejudice, determine for themselves whether this version is not of Jewish origin. Bearing in mind the spread of Jews in all parts of the world in ancient times, this theory is not so very improbable. It is generally believed that it was Adolf Jellinek who first edited (Vienna, 1876) the Introduction, Title-page, and Appendix of Jedidiah Salomon Norzi's Massoretic Commentary on the Bible. Prof. Strack assumes this (p. 173). This, however, is incorrect, the whole had already appeared under the title מקדש יה in a quarto volume, Pisa, 1819. The booklet is also noted in Ben Jacob's אוצר הספרים, II, No. 2095. In this bibliography, the title is incorrectly given as הקדמת ס' מעשה אפד, because it begins with פתיחה קטנה לקוחה מהאפודי. This error has, as far as I know, up till now, remained uncorrected. These remarks are not made in a carping spirit, and reflect no disparagement of the great value of Prof. Strack's Introduction, which is heartily recommended as a first Introduction to all desirous of obtaining a clear notion of the Problems of Modern Criticism—every one, of course, reserving his right of private judgment on these problems.

LUDWIG BLAU.

BUDAPEST, *October*, 1895.

MISCELLANEA.

THE EGYPTIAN PURIM.

THE Megillah, which even at the present day is read in Cairo on the 28th of Adar in commemoration of the wonderful escape of the Jews under Ahmed Shaitân, was published thirty years ago by Dr. Löwe, the travelling companion of Sir Moses Montefiore. In Nos. 7–9 of the Hebrew magazine *Hamagid*, from February 14–28, 1866, the text of this Megillah, as read in Cairo, is printed, together with the most important explanations indicated by the Arabic translation, which Dr. Löwe had also made use of. It seems that Professor Graetz did not use this publication, for, although he refers in the third edition of the ninth volume, p. 22, n. 1, to *Hamagid*, 10—he quotes erroneously pp. 7–9—he only knows that "formerly" a Megillah existed, an observation which induced Mr. Margoliouth to talk of "the long-lost Megillah of the Egyptian Purim" (*J.Q.R.*, VIII, p. 274). In the same volume of *Hamagid*, No. 16, Supplement, mention is made of this Purim by Gurland, who publishes, from a St. Petersburg manuscript, Samuel ben Nachman's note on these events, which was edited in the same year by Dr. Neubauer (*Aus der Petersburger Bibliothek*, p. 118, N. XXI a).

The text which lay before Mr. Margoliouth is the same which was made known to us by Dr. Löwe, except that it is more correct and complete, owing to the fact that the numerous gaps, occasioned by similar endings, are filled up. For the sake of attaining still greater accuracy I give here a few corrections, offered by a comparison of both texts.

Page 277, line 10, instead of המם probably החמם.
„ „ „ 1 from bottom, read אלף איש.
„ 278, „ 4, read ויפיליה instead of ויפלהו.
„ „ „ 18, read זעקה and ויקראו צום ובכי.
„ „ „ 20, read שועתם instead of בכיתם.
„ „ „ 4 from bottom, read איש יהודי.
„ 279, „ 2, read ינתן.
„ „ „ 6, read שלל.

Page 279, line 9, במהרה אמיתכם. It is noteworthy that *Sambari*, p. 145, also must have had the reading במהירות in the text of the Megillah.

„ „ „ 18, read מקצת היהודים.

„ „ „ 24, read לאבד, בשבעה עשר.

„ 280, „ 2, the words ויקחו, וישבעו איש לאחיו are missing.

„ „ „ 5, reads correctly וירדפו אחריו חיל המלך שלמה ולא מצאוה ויהי כראות.

„ „ „ 13-14, always בשדה הקנים.

„ „ „ 19, read וכל חילו.

„ „ „ 21, read ויחר[י]בו.

„ „ „ 22, read וביום שבעה ועשרים.

„ „ „ 25, read אותו, תלוי.

„ 281, „ 2, read והשיב עמלם.

„ „ „ 4, read ועשרים בו.

„ „ „ 5, read מיד שונאיהם ומבקשי רעתם.

„ „ „ 10, כל אויביך ה׳ ושונאי סגולתך.

The conclusion reads more completely: הושיענו ה׳ אלקינו וקבצנו מהרה מן הגוים להודות לשם קדשך להשתבח בתהלתך ואנחנו עמך וצאן מרעיתך נודה לך לעולם לדור ודור נספר תהלתך.

The 28th of Adar is, according to the plain statement in the Megillah and the tradition of the Egyptian Jews, the Purim of Cairo[1]. Samuel b. Nachman's statement that Ahmed Shaitân was beheaded on the 15th of Adar is an error. Although he was an eye-witness of the events, and a victim of the plundering—ולקחו גם כן כל אשר יש לי בביתי (not לו בבית as Dr. Neubauer reads)—yet the date of the 28th of Adar is too well attested to underlie any doubt. It seems that the 14th of Adar was the day on which the danger was worst, and this lost Purim day should be replaced by an everlasting new one. The latter was to be fixed a fortnight after the 14th, and should be always celebrated on the same day of the week as the old one. Thus I understand Sambari's words: ולפי שביום שיפול פורים בי״ד לחדש יפול ג״כ אותו היום שהוא כ״ח לחדש. The colophon רדף אויב, given by Sambari, corresponds with the year 1524. His other indication, however, ועוד עשו סימן אחר יאר פניו אתנו שנת אלף ותנו לשטרות, is evidently false. For not 1456, but 1835, corresponds according to the aera contractuum with the year 1524. But it is clear that we must read here לחרבן הבית for למנין שטרות, for 1524 - 68 = 1456. Sambari's Chronicle well deserves a new edition, in which Dr. Neubauer's omissions might be supplemented and a distinct line drawn between that which is borrowed and Sambari's own information.

D. KAUFMANN.

[1] See Zunz, *die Ritus*, p. 130.

THE DISPUTE ABOUT THE SERMONS OF DAVID DEL BENE OF MANTUA.

By Prof. David Kaufmann.

The Jews of Italy cultivated the knowledge of the secular literature of the people among whom they dwelt, and felt its influence, before those of any other country. Ever since the days of Immanuel b. Solomon their Hebrew poetry shows the effects the national poetry had upon them. Unlike other countries, the light of culture had not forced itself in their Ghetto all of a sudden. Their connexion with their time, with the living surroundings, was never interrupted.

Nevertheless, traces of struggles were not absent, even amongst them, against the admission of that which was alien, evidences of the profound excitement with which the adoption of that which was imported from abroad was refused and rejected. As everywhere, here also it was the sermon, this most sensitive of all gaugers of culture, in which above all the alien elements of the mind commenced to ferment and to act, and to challenge the contradiction of the zealots of the faith.

We owe the preservation of such a dispute, of which the history of our culture has left no other traces, called forth by the Jewish sermon, to Abraham Joseph Solomon Graziano of Modena, an industrious compiler imbued with the spirit of historical research. I have in my library a volume of his compilation, in which he reluctantly—and therefore with the greater credit to his scientific spirit—has preserved two letters which open for us a clear insight into those memorable events.

It was in the spring of the year 1598 that Israel Sforno in Modena felt himself called upon to conjure up a castigating storm of the greatest Rabbis of his time over David del Bene of Mantua. Elieser David Mehatob, or, as his surname was in Italian, del Bene, had already drawn the notice of the public of his native town Mantua upon himself by his talents as preacher, in spite of his youth. His addresses in the synagogue had collected round him an assembly of enthusiastic friends and followers. There was a novel element in these sermons which dazzled and fascinated the audience, the quotations from Italian authors and from national poets. Mythological names, as they never before had been heard in the synagogue, goddesses and gods of the heathens appeared in these sermons. It happened even that the orator forgot himself so far as to speak of the holy Diana, quella santa Diana. Just as once before in the synagogues of the Provence the abstractions of the Aristotelian philosophy

commenced to spiritualize the historical figures of Holy Writ and to sublimate Abraham and Sarah into Matter and Form, till Solomon Ibn Adret's decree drove the shadows out of the house of God, thus here also a new allegory seemed to make its entrance into the Jewish sermon. The gods of the Greeks and the Romans were to explain the dicta of the Agada. And as on the former occasion Abbamare of Lunel[1] had undertaken the part of zealot, it was now, in Mantua, Nissim Sforno who felt himself compelled to destroy the new, heretical mode of preaching. His brother Israel, of Modena, to whom he opened his heart in a letter, was to call forth the storm against the youthful innovator.

Two of Israel Sforno's three sons, namely, Obadiah and Abraham, had taken up their abode in Reggio Emilia; the third, Chananel, lived in Constantinople. Israel Sforno, indignant and determined to carry on the struggle to the end, made first a representation to Obadiah, who at a later period left several monuments on the pages of Jewish literature[2]. R. Menachem Azariah di Fano was at that time at the head of the Rabbinate at Reggio Emilia. He was esteemed and famous for his undisputable mastery both of the Talmud and the Cabbala, and was the centre of a considerable circle of disciples. Chiskiah b. Isaac Foa[3], a novice in the office of Rabbi, and, like Obadiah, an assistant of the Rabbinate, co-operated with him. These men were to proceed against the preacher of Mantua, and should unhesitatingly hurl against him the excommunication to which he had made himself liable according to the old decision of Ibn Adret. However great and far-reaching Menachem Azariah's authority was, Israel Sforno was not satisfied with his sentence only. He was rather determined to appeal against the innovator to the other authorities of his country, Samuel Archevolti, the celebrated Rabbi of Padua, and the Rabbinate of Venice, with Judah Loeb Saraval and Isaac Gerson at their head. Israel Sforno had a brother David in Salonichi, and a son Chananel in Constantinople, who were to assist him in summoning the Rabbis of Turkey and the Holy Land to the holy strife against the thoughtless preacher of Mantua.

The want of documents prevents us from judging of the effects of the campaign called forth by this zealot. But the fact that there was no want of authorities ready to excommunicate del Bene is attested by the letter of Nathaniel Trabotto, the Rabbi of Modena[4], who was at that time thirty-two years of age. He summoned the Rabbis and

[1] H. Gross in *Revue des Études Juives*, IV, 192 sqq.

[2] M. Mortara, מזכרת חכמי איטאליא, p. 61. [3] Nepi, זכר צדיק לברכה, p. 113.

[4] D. Kaufmann, in *Monatsschrift*, 39, 353, n. 3, where read, "1653," and "in the eighty-fifth year." According to אוצר טוב, in Berliner's *Magazin*, 14, p. 12, Trabotto was in his eighty-seventh year when he died.

scholars of that city to the struggle against their fellow-citizen, who had so prematurely achieved fame. He was led to do so by the pressure brought to bear upon him by the reports from Mantua about del Bene's sermons. That which had been done by del Bene appears to him much more criminal than anything which had come to the knowledge of Ibn Adret about the preachers of the Provence, for he had repeatedly promulgated his impudent allegories in the synagogue before the congregation. His name is therefore in peculiar contrast with his actions. At the same spot where his objectionable profanations had been heard, he should solemnly recant.

It seems that the next consequence of this measure was, that del Bene retired from the pulpit, discontinued his offensive sermons, and resolved again to begin his schooling and to acquire, under the direction of a recognized master, in the customary way, the undisputed qualification of a Rabbi. He was still a young man, and it was not difficult to find a master of approved authority. R. Menachem Azariah of Fano, who was to have been his judge, became his teacher. His youthful imprudence was soon forgotten, and David del Bene became a man to whom the distinguished congregation of Ferrara did not hesitate to confide the office of Rabbi. He had the privilege of filling that post for thirty-six years[1], and of sending forth responses to difficult questions addressed to him from all parts of Italy. His fellow-disciples, who had sat with him at the feet of the great master of Reggio Emilia, all highly praised and acknowledged del Bene's conduct and piety. They included men of ascetic piety, such as Aron Berachja, of Modena, the author of *Maabor Yabok*, who died July 28, 1639[2]; the two Isaac Berachja, the one the son of Menachem Azariah, the other his son-in-law, afterwards Rabbi of Lugo; Elieser Nachman Foa, who used to sign himself Arnon[3]; David Diena, the grandson of the great Rabbi of Sabbioneta, Azriel Diena, the opponent of David Reubeni[4]; Isaac b. Mardochai, of Poland, later the friend of Menachem Azariah, and editor of his responses. Graziano quotes also in testimony of del Bene's piety Mordechai b. Ismael Cuarossi and Isaac Rabenu, both of Reggio, with whom he had been personally acquainted[5].

[1] כסאות לבית דוד. Preface: בל"ו שנים ממנחר חייו שעמד פה.

[2] Zunz, *Literaturgeschichte der synagogalen Poesie*, p. 424 sq., and *Monatstage*, p. 42.

[3] M. Mortara, l. c., p. 23.

[4] Kaufmann, *Revue des Études Juives*, XXX, 304 sqq., and XXXI, 65 sqq.; and Löwenstein, *ibid.*, 120 sqq.

[5] Graziano asked in 1658 through Isaac Rabenu, whom he calls החכיר המקובל, ימין רוממה, as he says at the beginning of the manuscript.

It was these events, perhaps, to which David's son, Jehudah Asael del Bene, alluded in his *Thrones of the House of David*, a book dedicated to the memory of his father, when he combats the exclusive study of the language and literature of the country. He sees in the neglect of Hebrew and the preference of Italian by the men an offence against which he had vowed to write his book[1], but he considers the instruction of girls in the Italian national literature altogether as a danger to morality, because female youth became corrupted and poisoned by a premature awakening of impure thoughts and the excitation of love[2].

From information given by Jehudah Asael we know that it was the influence of the great preacher, philosopher, and grammarian Judah Moscato, a man thoroughly acquainted with the whole cyclus of the civilization of his time, which manifested itself in the sermons of David del Bene, and which gave offence by being pushed to the extreme[3]. The profound philosophy, although borrowed from Greek, Roman, and Italian thinkers, exhibited in the sermons of the master, never denied or offended Jewish consciousness, and was, therefore, admired and imitated. But in the method of the followers that which was imported from without had not been converted into flesh and blood, but was applied in its crude alien garb, and met, therefore, with opposition and gave offence. But Moscato remained also the son's master. Jehudah Asael admits that it was owing to Moscato's writings that he had acquired his skill and mastery in the use of Hebrew, and a portion of the elegant sayings and *facetiae*[4] which he had introduced into the Hebrew, in order to make that language compete successfully with the Italian.

David del Bene's family had been long settled in Italy. Jehudah Asael carries his pedigree back for eight generations, in which learning and the dignity of Rabbi had descended from father to son[5]. It must be left to further research to trace and identify that string of scholars. But even now, in connexion with our event in the house of del Bene, at least two names of that family may be mentioned, of which, thus far, traces can be found only in certain letters contained in Italian manuscript compilations, with which I became

[1] כסאות לבית דוד, f. 24 b. [2] Ibid., f. 26 b.

[3] Ibid., f. 34 b, מבעל המורה דאבא מארי הנאון מוסקאטו זצו"קל . . . כי כאשר רוב ימיו ושנותיו ישב לכסא כבוד לתורה וגדולה בבולונייא באנקונא ובמנטובא משם ראה מאורות המליצה אשר לראשי בתי אבות צחות הלשון ומבטא המליצה ונעשה מליץ גדול ורם.

[4] Ibid., ערמומיות ונעימיות.

[5] Ibid., preface, שכבר קדמוני בטל אורות זיו ההכמה אלופי המסובלין זקני משפחתי זה שמנה דורות איש מפי איש ודור אחר דור.

acquainted from the manuscripts of Marco Mortara, the last Rabbi of Mantua, which have come into my possession.

Jacob del Bene, of Bologna, to whose memory an unknown poet composed an elegy in the form of a letter of consolation to his wife and children, cannot yet be further identified[1]. But all that we read in his praise shows that he had stood at the head of the congregation of Bologna, probably as its president, and that his life had been devoted to the promotion of the peace of the community and the solution of all disputes. He must certainly have enjoyed great esteem among large circles, and his memory has been preserved in this faint trace.

Abraham del Bene, to whom the two letters of Salomo di Modena are addressed[2], and whom we find to have had intercourse with the brothers Elchanan and Ismael di Riete[3], seems to have been a distinguished merchant, whom we can assume to have lived about the half of the sixteenth century. Salomo di Modena was commissioned to cash in Siena and other places money due to Abraham, but did not succeed in spite of his exertions. These business letters are written in so remarkable a Hebrew style, that they are also of value for literary history.

Sources:

I.

The Letter of Israel Sforno to his son Obadja in Reggio Emilia.

בהנוא

טופס האגרת אשר כתב החכם כמו"הר"ר ישראל ספורנו זצ"ל אל כמוה"רר עובדיא ספורנו זצ"ל בנו בעיר ריו"ו · ע"ד מהר"ר דוד מהטוב נ"ע · המכונה די"ל ביני בלעז · מפני שבתחילת בחרותו היה דורש ברבים בק"ק מנטובא (במקצת דבריו) דברי התולים וחשק וצורות לפי מה שכת' מוהר"י ספורנו הנ"ל (ואולי לעורר לבות השומעי' לדרשותיו) והיה מבקש מוהר"רי ספורנו זצ"ל הנ"ל · מבנו מוהר"ר עובדיא ספורנו זצ"ל ה"נל שידבר על זה אל הגאון כמוהר"ר מנחם עזריא מפאנו זצוק"ל שאז היה יושב גם מעלתו בריו"ו · וגם אל כמוהר"ר חזקיא פואה נ"ע · כדי שמעלותיהם יהיו מזהירי' למוהר"ר דוד מהטוב זצ"ל הנ"ל · כמו שנהוג הוא להוכיח את הבחורי' על דברי' אחרי' · שמחמת רתיחת הבחרות ושגם הוא יניח הדרך ההיא בדרשותיו — ועיין לקמן

[1] In Cod. Mortara, 58, as N. 244 of the fragment of a collection of Hebrew letters.

[2] In Cod. Mortara, 18, as N. 102–104.

[3] D. Kaufmann in *Revue des Études Juives*, XXVI, 90 sq.

בדף השני שאחר זה · את האגרת שכתב לחכמי מנטובא בשנת השׂנ״ח ע״ד זה האשל הגדול כמוהר״ר נתנאל טרבוט זצ״ל מ״ו וקרובי · —

הבן יקיר לי שלו׳

קול תרועת מלחמה במחנה העברים ק״ק מנטובא · על עור״י אחד חציף נער בער · דוד מהטוב שמו עז פנים אשר מלא פיו צואה רותחת אותיותיו אותיות מות נכרו ונודעו בחוצות · לדרוש ברבים דרשות של דופי אשר כל שומעיהם חייב לקרוע קרע שאינו מתאחה לעולם · ועם ליצנות מספרי אומות העולם · כאשר תקרא באגרת אחי הגדול כמ״הר״ר נסים (ספורנו) יצ״ו · אשר אני שולח העתקה אליך עם יתר אלה המכתבים · ממנה תראה קצת דופי דרשותיו וחרופי דבריו · והנה גלוי ומפורסם לכל יודעי תורה ואפי׳ לדרדקי דבי רב כי יש חרם ונדוי הראשונים החיים בג״ע שלא לדרוש ברבים דרשות של דופי ושלא להזכיר שמות ההבלים ולערבם בדברי תורתנו הקדושה הנעלמה · והנה זה חלול ה׳ ותורתו הנשמע עתה במקומות אלה כי יצא שובב אחד לחרף ולגדף אלקים חיים · וגם שהוא יחידי ונער בער יש אתו אחזת מרעים ואגודת פועלי און מינים ואפקורסים מחזיקים ואומרים לו הגבה שכולתך מחציפים פניהם נגד יראי ה׳ ושומרי תורתו · עד שרבים מיראי ה׳ אשר באותו הקהל כובשים פניהם בקרקע כאלמים שומעים ושותקים לא מזכירים ומשבחים ולא משחקים · מעתה עת לדבר לכל אשר בשם ישראל יכנה · החלש יאמר גבור אני קומו בעלי התריסין כל יראי ה׳ אשר בידם תורה ומצות ומעשים כשרים · כתו אתכם לחרבות ואתכם לרמחים · והלחמו מלחמתה של תורה וקומו לכבוד ה׳ ותורתו אל תיראו ואל תחתו כו ה׳ אתנו · התחזקו והיו לבני חיל הנה שכרו אתו ופעולתו לפניו · גם אתה בני (ר׳ עובדיה ספורנו) חזק והתחזק לכבוד ה׳ · ואל תאמר נער אנכי כי במקום שיש חלול ה׳ אין מכבדין כבוד לא ליחיד ולא לרבים · ראה ציויתיך אל תתרשל בדבר קום כי גם עליך הדבר לקנא לה׳ ולתורתו · וכל אשר תעיר לכבודו לכבוד את ה׳ האמרת היום להיות לך לאלקים · והוא יאמיר אותך ואת זרעיך על כל יושבי הארץ שונאיך ילבשו בשת וחרפה תכסה פניהם · קרא גם אתה בגרון אל תחשוך כשופר הרם קולך והחרם תחרם בחרם ב״ד העליון ובחרם ב״ד התחתון אותו הנבל נער ובער דוד מהטוב כי לא טוב עשה בעמו ועם תורת ה׳ · ועם שכבר נדוהו והחרימוהו מן השמים ע״י זקנינו חכמינו וחסידי אומתנו אשר הם חיים בג״ע כנראה בהרשבא ובדבר פחות ממה שהתרים ועשה הוא פעמים רבות בב״ה · מ״מ מפרסמים את החנפים בעד המתים אל החיים מפני חלול ה׳ · ראה קום ועשה ואל תחוש לזקנים וחכמים ממך וממני

שבדור · יען כבוד ה׳ יתברך ותורתו קודם לכל וגם הם חייבים בכבודו · ואמנם על כל דברי יישמע שתראה ותודיע הכל למעלת האלוף והגאון (כמוהר״ר מנחם עזריה) מפאנו · ותראה לו אגרת אחי כמה״ר ניסים יצ״ו (ספורנו) על כל או רוב דופי דבריו וליצניותיו אשר החציף לדרוש ברבים · מלבד עוד כהנה וכהנה רבות אשר נשמעו בפה מקצת ק״ק · אומרים קווי״לה סאנטה דיאנה וכו׳ שאסור לספר בדברים האלה · כי אין ספק שמ״כתור״ לא שמע מהנה דבר · שאלו שמע לא החריש · כי יותר ממני וממך הוא חייב בכבוד שמים כי כאיש גבורתו וקטנו עבה ממתנו וממתני אחרים שבדור · ודבריו נשמעים בכל גלילותינו · וכבר נמנו ואמרו כל מי שיש בידו למחות וכו׳ · והני דריש גלותא מתפשי וכו׳ · ידעתי כי נורא הוא על כל סביביו ודבריו יקימו את מזבח ה׳ ההרוס · וכמו כן תראה האגרות האלה לשאר החכמים הנמצאים ברייו כי כלם חייבים בכבוד ה׳ ובכבוד תורתו · וכמו כן החכם כמהר חזקיה פואה אין לו התנצלות לנסוג אחור כי כבר קבל עליו דיני חברות · ובמה יוודע כחו אם לא לכבוד התורה ושמו ית׳ · ע״כ חייבים כל מי שיש בידו תורה ומעשים כשרים לנדות ולהחרים אותו הדוד שלא טוב עשה הוא וכל המחזיקים בידו · ולא יהיה עוד לפוקה ולמכשול לפליטת עמו אשר בסביבותינו אלו · ואין ספק כי מנסה ה׳ את עמו לראות היש משכיל דורש אותו ומקנא לשמו ותורת · אני לא אנוח ולא אשקוט עד יצא כנגה צדקת ה׳ · ואכתוב בפדובא אל מעלת כמהר״ר שמואל ארקיבולטו · ובויניציאה לחכם סרבאלו · והחכם (כמוהרר יצחק) גרשון · ובסאלוניקו ע״י אחי כמה״ר דוד אל החכמים משם [1] · ואל בני כמה״ר חננאל (ספורנו) · בקוסטאנטינא · ואל קרובי ומיודעי שמי שבארץ הצבי עד אשר אשיתהו בתה ויהיה לאלה ולשבועה · לכן אל תירא גם אתה פני אדם עשה תעשה ויכול תוכל כי ימשחך ה׳ למלך על מקנאי שמו ובפנחס בן אלעזר הכהן תזכה לעבודת הקדש ולהקרא בכלל יראי ה׳ וחושבי שמו · אך ראה שלא תחמיץ המצוה ולא תפסל בלינה כי לית דין צריך בשש · ולהיות השליח נחפז לילך לדרכו לא אאריך עוד על הדבר הרע הזה רק אתחנן אל ה׳ אלקינו המגביהי לשבת יופיע עליך ברכות שמים מעל הרוחניות עם המדומות מעתה ועד עולם אמן: מודינא · איביך ילבשו כלימה לספירה · שנת השנח ליצירה:

[1] Marginal note in Graziano's handwriting: צריך לידע כי החכם כמוהר״ר ישראל ספורנו זצ״ל · מחבר האגרת הזאת · היו לו שלשה בנים רבנים · שנים מהם היו יושבים בעיר רייו · היינו כמהר״ר עובדיא ספורנו · וכמוהר״ר אברהם ספורנו נ״ע · והשלישי שהיה הגדול שבהם נקרא שמו כמוהרר חננאל ספורנו זצ״ל שלחו בעיר קוסטנטינא כנז׳ כאן · מפני שהיה רצונו לילך שמה כמי שעשה:

הטרוד אביך ישראל ספורנו

(על גב הכתב הנ״ל) אל היקר והנחמד בני כמה״ר עובדיה ספורנו יצ״ו הדר להווה בעיר רייו: *אוי לי[1] לצעיר המעתיק · לכתוב כאן את אשר שמעתי על כמוהר״ר דוד מהטוב זה זצ״ל שאחרי עבור מעשה הזה הלך ללמוד תורה בתמידות אצל המקובל הקדוש כמוהר״ר מנחם עזריא מפאנו זצוק״ל · ברייו · עם חברי׳ מקשיבי׳ ותלמידי׳ אחרים · הלא הם כמוהר״ר אהרן ברכיא ממודינא וכמוהר״ר יצחק ברכיא מפאנו שדר אח״כ בלוג״ו · חתנו של הגאון הרמ״ע הנ״ל · וכמוהר״ר אליעזר נחמן פואה · וכמוהר״ר דוד דאיינה · וכמוהר״ר יצחק ברכיא בנו של הרמ״ע הנ״ל · וכמוהר״ר יצחק בכ״ר מרדכי זצ״ל איש פולונייא וחכמי׳ אחרי׳ כאשר אמרו לי כמהר״ר מרדכי קוארושי בכמ׳ ישמעאל ז״ל · והזקן הנכבד כמ׳ יצחק רבינו ז״ל · שהיו גביהם יושבי׳ ברי״ן · — ולא נשמע עוד אח״כ שכ״מוהר״ר דוד מהטוב זצ״ל הנ״ל · חזר על הראשונות לדרוש בהחכמות החצוניות · ולספר מדברי ספרי א״ה ומשליהם וחידותם · כאשר הגידו ג״כ אנשי אמונה מק״ק פירארא · אשר שם הרביץ תורה ברבי׳ יען שלקחוהו למורה צדק שלהם ולדורש טוב לעמו · הרבה שני׳ בקצין וראש שהיה עליהם · ושוב לא נשמע דהוי סאני שומעניה:

II.

The Letter of R. Natanael Trabotto to the Community of Mantua.

אגרת שכתב ושלח הגאון כמוהר״ר נתנאל טרבוט זצ״ל · מ״ו · אל מעלות החרמים והרבנים של מנטובא נ״ע · על כמוהר״ר דוד מהטוב זצ״ל · המכונה די״ל בינ״י · שבשנות בחרותו אמרו עליו שהיה דורש בק״ק מנטובא מקצת דברי׳ חצוניים והיה עושה צורות במאמרי חז״ל ואולי עשה זה כדי להלהיב ולעורר לבות המון העם לשמוע בלמודים · — וכבר השיג כמוהר״ר ישראל ספורנו שהיה יושב גם מעלתו בעיר מודינא · נגד מע׳ החכם מהטוב הנ״ל · בכתו׳ לאחור בדף שאחרי דף הלז · בכתב אשר שלח לבנו כמוהר״ר עובדיא ספורנו זצ״ל בעיר רייו · בשנת השנ״ח ליצירה · ע״ש:

אליכם מורי התורה אשר במנטובה · שלו׳ שמעה אזני ותבן את אשר קרה אתכם עם מר דעביד נפשיה מדרבנן · ואנא לא קימנא בגויה ולא ידענא טיביה · אמנם מתוך מעשיו ניכר · שילדות גמורה נזרקה בו · לזלזל בכבו׳ חכמי׳ רבנן סמיכי · ותיתי לי דלא מזיגנא רישאי אבי סדיא עד דמהפיכנא

[1] Note of Graziano.

בזכותא דצוכבא מרבנן · מההוא עובדא דר״א ב״ר שמעון בפ׳ הפועל[1] במקו׳ דאיכא חלול הש׳ ותורתו · וידוע הוא שכל המדבר נגד ת״ח חייב נדוי · כ״ש מי שחרף אותו כמו שכתבו הפוסקי׳ ז״ל בספריהם · וע״כ אחרי אשר שמעתי מכמה אנשי׳ ידועי׳ את אשר פעל ועשה ההוא מרבנן ודוֹד שמּוֹ לדרוש ברבי׳ מדברי הבלי׳ של טיאטראות וקרקסאות של כותי׳ · מאד חרה לי ע״ז · כי הלא ידעו כל הנהו מאן דידעי וסברי · מה שכתב הרשב״א בתשובה סי׳ (מ״ד) [תי״ד] · על אותם הדורשי׳ אגדות של דופי · מדברי ארסטו וחבריו · והחרימו הוא ובית דינו על ככה כמו שכתוב שם בארוכה · והגם שהחכם בדרשי השיב על דבריו · לא לסתור דברי האשל הגדול הרשב״א בא · כי מי ישלח פיו ולשונו נגד עמוד הימיני · אלא · הודיע לרב ההוא שלא דברו? סרה? נגד תורתנו: אף לא נגד דברי רז״ל · אבל אין הכי נמי שהורה · שאלו הדורשי׳ הגדות של דופי · ומהפכי׳ דברי אלקי׳ חיי׳ למינות שצריך להחרימם ולנדותם · כי אין לך אפוקורס גדול מזה · ומדברי הרשב״א נלמוד ק״ו לנד״ד · דהתם בשביל שדרש מאמר ר׳ בנאה[2] . . . מעט קושי דבריו שלא כפשוטו ואמ׳ דאברהם ושרה דהתם רומזי׳ אל החומר והצורה · קצף הרב ז״ל · עליה דההוא מרבנן · כ״ש בנד״ד שהפך? סעודת? ד״ד? צדיקי׳ לדברי התולי׳ וחשק · שראוי לכל אשר בשם ישראל יכונה · לגעור בו בנזיפה · עד אשר ישוב מדרכו הרעה · ולא יוסיף עוד כן ומה? אאריך עוד · ואיתא בפ׳ חלק[3] כי דבר ה׳ בזה · זה הדורש דרשות של דופי · פוק חזי תמן · ואמ׳ בספר בן סירא אמרי׳ התם דאסיר למקריה · דאית ביה דברי׳ דלית בהו צורך ברייתא · ומילי דכדיבי · כ״ש בספרי׳ חוצני׳ פאוולי? שאסור לאמרם · ולעיין בהם · ומי שמאבד בהם זמנו עתיד ליתן את הדין · ומי סני ליה משו׳ דאמור רבנן · אי בעי למעבר ההוא מרבנן בדרשותיו נמי כדהוה עביד ר׳ מאיר · ע״כ אני אומ׳ בטח שההוא? · הגם שהוא מהטוב · לא טוב עשה · ולאו בתר שמיה אזלינן · אלא בתר טעמא · כדאי׳ במהרי״ק שורש פ״ג · וחטא על הנפש · נגד ה׳ · ונגד תורתו · ונגד חכמיו · ואפי׳ אם יקריב כל אלי נביות לא יכופר לו עונו · עד שישוב במקום שאמ׳ הדברי׳ · למיבעי מטו מהקב״ה ומתורתו · ומהחכמי׳ ההם · אשר פקר נגדם · ומובטח אני בו · כשיראה דברי אלה · שלא ירבה במחלוקת · כי גורם לשכינה שתסתלק מישראל · וגם שיבין לסוף דבר ולא יחטא עוד · כי מי . . . ואם ח״ו יתן כתף סוררת לשוב על דרכו הקדומה · אז אני אעשה

[1] *Baba m.*, f. 84 b, comp. Josef Almoznino's צרות ניהוסף, II, No. 31, f. 67 b, where the same story is alleged as a source of practical decision.

[2] *Baba b.*, f. 58 a.

[3] *Synhedrin*, f. 100 b.

בהורמנא דמלכא המוטל עלי · עם יתר רבותי וחבירי · אשר בגלילות · להכותו במדת הדין קשה · בסלוא דלא מבע דמא[1] חויא דרבנן דלית ליה אסותא[2] · כי עתה לא אעשה לו כדרכיו · דאין מלקין אא״כ מתרין · ואם ישוב וישמע לכל אשר אמרתי . . . שיהיה נאה דורש ונאה מקיים[3] ושלו׳ לרבנן ולתלמידיהון דעבדין עובדוהי דאהרן · מודי׳ כ״ז אייר השנ״ה :

עיין בהגהתי באגרת כמוהר״רי ספורנו זצ״ל הנ״ל · שהעתקתי לעיל · בדף השני · אחר דף זה · שכתבתי שם שכמוהר״ר דוד מהטוב זצ״ל הנ״ל · חזר בו מכל וכל · ממנהגו הראשון · שספרו עליו · שהיה נוהג · ודורש ברבים · בתחלת בחרותו דברי משל ומליצה של מליצי א״ה · ושלא פירש עוד מאמרי חז״ל בלשון צורה · וכיוצא · יען שהלך אחרי עבור מעט קט זמן לדרשותיו · שהתחיל לדרוש באמור · בעיר רייו · בבית מדרשו של הקדוש חסיד ועניו · הגאון כמוהר״ר עזריא מפאנו המקובל זצוק״ל · עם שאר בחורים חשובים · נבונים וידועים · כמוהו · יראי ה׳ זחושבי שמו ושם זכה לכתר תורה וכתר שם טוב · והשלים את עצמו בעיון ובמעשה · עד שנבחר מק״ק פירארא להיות לראש ולקצין עליהם · ולמורה דיעה · ומבין שמועה · ולנאה דורש · ונאה מקיים שלהם שנים רבים — :

III.

A Letter on the Death of Jacob del Bene in Bologna.

קינה על פטירת כמר׳ יעקב מהטוב ז״ל
שלוחה לאשתו תמ״א[4]

רמד דרך שלו׳ לא ידעתי וכאין עינים בצהרים בנשף אגשש · לנגוהות כאפלה יתהלכו כחותי עם כל בנות עירי כאשמנים כמתים · מקולות בכי רבים עורי נפשי לאדירים משברי לב גם את לבשי רוח קנאה ובמספד מר תתמרמר כי המר שדי עם בת עמי · התקוממי נפשי ובשיחי תשתוחחי כי ריב לה׳ אל ההרים הרי ישראל בעברה וזעם וצרה אש אוכלת בראש ההר על הצור בחורב שמעתי קורא בגרון האספו ואגידה לכם כורתי ברית צדקה ומשפט כי עלה הכורת עליכם למען שפוך דם הניף ידו לאמר כי׳ יעק״ב בחר לו י״ה · ובת הרחמים צועקת לפניו מקלט מקלט למען יהיה עוד בארץ פליטה לישראל · עד אשר עליונים נתנאו בחזקתם וחסיד גמר שמש קדר וירח אומלל ועלטה היה שבין לילה אבד כל נאות יעק״ב · כחי נשבר ולבבי נהיה · יתפלצון ישתקשקון ברחובות נפשי תאניה ואניה על שבר בת רבים אצעק הוי אחי

[1] *Kethub.*, f. 91 a.
[2] *Sabbath*, f. 110 a.
[3] *Tos. Tebam.*, VII end.
[4] = הבורך מנשים אמן.

כחי ואוני יד ימיני אחזיק בציצת ראשי אמרט · ולא אחמול וגם את הזקן
תספה אריד בשיחה אהימה כנהמות ים · צור לבבי וחשקי אנה פנית אנה
הלכת ולמה היום בין רגבים ידובקו דודי אשר צפנת לי אללי לי מי מנה עפר
יעקב · ואת עניה סוערה כי נשבר גאון עוזך הרס ה׳ ולא חמל לקחת רדידך
מעליך אנה תנוסי לעזרה שאי קולך אל תתני פוגה אנושה מכתך אין מזור ·
אוי לי שראיתיך בכך כי ספח ה׳ קדקד תפארתך וברגע שאול יחת למה
תרגעי · למה תדומי התפלשי באפר מאין אונים וכיונים תהמי אל תדמי אנה
פנה דודך אם נבקשנו עוד · ואת ובניך למה תחרישו שאו על שפיים קולכם
לאמר אל ההרים כסונו שמה תביאי בניך בחוצן ובנותיך על כתף לתנות קינות
על ארץ חשך תילילו כי עלה מות נגע בכף ירך יעק״ב · אי לך ארץ בולונייה ·
שכולה וגלמודה התרפית ביום צרה ולא שמרת על אדוניך איך לא עמדת
בקשרי המלחמה ביום הלקח מקרבך תפארת הצדיק תנצב״ה אשר בצלו שכנת
בנוה שלו׳ הלא הוא ברכת בני עמו השקיט מימי המריבות · ובכל גבולך
נתן העקוב למישור ואיך לא סגרת הדלת בעדך לבלתי יגש להקריב אופל
וצלמות ביריעות משכנותיך · ולבלתי ידח מקרבך נפש הצדיק ז״ל · הסבי עיניך
וראי עוד מי לך פה יחזק במעוזך יעשה שלום הלא אך יצא יצא יעק״ב · זאת
אשיב אל לבי ע״כ אחריש אתאפק כי ידעתי הצדיק באמונתו יחיה לעולם שכלו
ארוך וידיו יריב לו בחסד וברחמים הוא מרומים ישכון לפני אדון צבאות
בעטרת זהב גדולה ובתכריך בוץ יושב ונהנה · ואם הגש״ם חלף הלך הנפש
תשוב טבולה במי טהרה ויישבה ודגרה בנוה צדיקים אדירי כל חפצי בם
ומשם באברתו יסך לנו · ואת ובניך תחיי · תרעי את גדיותיך על משכנות
שאננות כי על כל חכמת נשים חלק ה׳ לך עשר ידות ובתבונה ודעת עלית
על כלנה · ולסוכתך הנופלת תעשי סמוכות ומוסדי בניך תקוממי עד אשר
יאמרו יעק״ב אבינו לא מת וגם אנכי כאשר הלכתי בברית עם הצדיק ז״ל
לאהבה ולדבקה בו כל ימי חייו · כך יש עלי לקיים עמך עד עולם · ההרים
ימושו והגבעות תמוטנה ודבר שפתי ויהיה ברכי הכושלות וידי הרפות אחזק
לעשות לך נחת רוח בכל קראך אלי · וזכרתי את בריתי יעק״ב:

IV.

Letters of Salomo di Modena to Abraham del Bene.

כתבי כמ׳ שלמה ממודינה לכמ׳ אברהם מהטוב
ע״ד מעותיו

קג הן על כפי לבבי חקותיך למן היום אשר ירדתי אל קצבי ההרים האלה
ותמונת מצותך אשר צויתני שמרתי ולא אט · חשפתי זרועי להביא מרחוק

כספך וזהבך אשר אמרת היה לך לקבל מאנשים מתחלפים האלה שלמים · ואנכי חזון הרביתי למען הביא אנית כונתך אל היבשה · והנה מראש ראיתי מחיצת ברזל מפסקת מעבור תפלה כי תסבנה מחשבות השלמים האלה בעמק חשבון דברי׳ לא נתנו ליכתב אף אחרי ההשתדלות אשר עשיתי בידי ובלבי אמונה · ולשוני תהלך לצדד אחרי זכיותיך בצל ידי כסיתיך ותושע לך זרועי להביא אל אח ברכה אב המון גוים נתתיך בלבות כלם אמצתיך אף עזרתיך להסיר מעליך כל תלונות ותואנות תפלו עליך שקר אנשי מצותיך והלבש אותך מחלצות אהבתם המקשקשת לפניך כפעמון משכתיך חסד ורוחי היתה מרחפת על פני מי אהבתך הנגרים במורד כליותי ולבי · והנני שולח אליך אדו׳ ע״י זה המוביל כך וכך ואל נא תשת עלי חטאת אם בוששו זמורות השתדלותי לתת פרים עד עתה כי ארץ הנגב היה מקום נטיעותי בית השלחין על הר נשפה שאינו מסתפק ממימי הגשמים אך רובי תורותי אם אחלי נכונו תמיד כל היום לגלגל עליך את מדת הרחמים המה היו טל אורות להפריח כדשא את אשר שאלת מעמדי לעשות עמכה בזה · וכמשפט האוהב נאמן רוח עשיתי עמך היום כי אהבת עולם אהבתיך בריתי היתה אתך החיים והשלו׳ חסד לאברהם

עוד כאמור למעלה

הן על כפים חקותיך מאז באתי הנה סיינא עד היום הזה למדתי סנגוריא עליך אדו׳ · בדקתי עד מקום שידי מגעת למצוא חפצך ולהשיג אליך צרור כספך אשר אמרת היה לך לקבל מאת האנשי׳ האלה שלמים · נכנסתי ונתבישתי · כי לא מצאה ידי למלאות שאלתך ולא אסתייעא מילתא · אולי מלאכי צבאות עיינו בתפלתי ראו כי לא הספיקו זכיותי להביא אניות כונתך אל היבשה אמרו הנה קטנתי מכל החסדים עד אשר קצרה ידי זכיותי מהיות רצוי אל אדו׳ אשר על זה דוה לבי · גם הטב חרה לי · הן אדו׳ אתה ידעת כי כל מעייני בך · נכספה גם כלתה נפשי לעשות לך אדו׳ נחת רוח · ואם אלקים מצא את עוני הפעם כי לא יכלתי להיות מעיר לעזור כחנני ונסני נא בעסק אחר בלת[י] תלוי בדעת אחרים · אז אראה אם בעט ברזל ועופרת שמתיך בנקרת לבבי · אם אין · עשה זאת איפה אם אהבתני · שאי נא אל פני האלוף צבי הבחורים ב״ר פ׳ יצ״ו שלומות לאלומות כי הוא אח׳ ואשתחוה לו · עד כדי שיראה איסר מכנגד לבי[1] · אשקל גם שני(ה)[כ]ם[2] במאזני לבבי · והנה מצאתי ראיתי כי אתה כהן לעולם על דברתי · והוא מלכי צדק שלו׳ אבי״ר :

[1] *Berach.*, f. 28 b. [2] Allusion to 1 Mos. 27, 45.

NOTES ON THE LIFE OF MENACHEM DI LONSANO.

By Prof. David Kaufmann.

So little is known of the life of Menachem ben Jehudah ben Menachem di Lonsano, the excellent Masoretic and Midrashic scholar, lexicographer, and poet[1], that even ever so small a contribution tending to throw some light on his biography deserves to be thankfully received. We find such contribution contained in an epistle, which I publish herewith for the first time from a manuscript collection of letters in my possession (formerly Mortara, 12). We learn here a fact which was hitherto unknown ; namely, that Lonsano, at a very advanced age, was compelled by poverty to visit Italy and to appeal to his countrymen for assistance. Lame on both legs, blind in one eye[2], bent and broken by age, the old man saw again the land which he may have left when a boy, after having dwelt in Jerusalem for forty years, for it cannot even be said with certainty that Lonsano had been born in Italy[3]. The fame that had gone before him, and which was enhanced by his ethical and didactical work, *The Way of Life*, which had perhaps then already appeared in print[4] in Constantinople, was far surpassed by his appearance and exuberant erudition. His learning became particularly apparent in his sermons which he was twice permitted to give in the synagogue of the Italian congregation where our letter was written. He showed that he surpassed all others in his mastery of the whole field of Midrashic literature. People therefore did not merely content themselves by aiding him and seeing him off on his journey ; but, mindful of the fatigues of the road, doubly dangerous for a man stricken like him, tried to relieve him of them as much as possible. We do not know the name of the man to whom the letter of recommendation was directed, but he must have been a man of great wealth and princely generosity, otherwise they would not have sent him this letter in behalf of Lonsano by special messenger.

Lonsano himself has almost always been anxious not to make use of the opportunities, offered him by his poems, to give information about his own life; and the heaviest blow that had befallen him

[1] Compare particularly Landshut, עמודי העבודה, I, 178–185.

[2] Ever since he was ten years of age he had been compelled, on account of his weak eyes, to wear spectacles, see שתי ידות, f. 81 a: עני ואביון אני חלוש השבע מאד ומוכן לצורעניות וכל ימי מכאובי' וכעס עיניי והיותר רע כי חצי עור אני כי כבן עשר שנים הייתי כשהוצרכתי להתחיל להשתמש במראות.

[3] Ad. Jellinek, מערך, V, n. 1.

[4] This seems to follow from the words of our epistle.

from a friend, whom he had induced to come to Jerusalem, and who ruined him in the most treacherous manner, is no more than hinted at by him[1].

When we consider the frequent and violent attacks made by him, in his lexicographical work *Maarich*, on the celebrated commentator of the Midrash Rabba, Rabbi Issachar Baer Cohen Ashkenazi, of Szebreszyn, we are led to believe that a personal quarrel, a profound discord, must have separated these two men. At any rate, the assumption that Menachem di Lonsano had made R. Baer Cohen's acquaintance in the Holy Land cannot well be rejected. The tradition that the author of the *Mathnath Kehunah* died in Jerusalem is undoubtedly correct[2]. It is true Jacob Reifmann thought he had finally settled the question by simply referring to the tombstone which is said even at the present day to mark at Szebreszyn the grave of the great commentator of the Midrash[3]. But on a closer inspection of the alleged epitaph, it becomes apparent that we have here a memorial tablet and not a tombstone. The inscription shows no date whatever, not even the year of death. It has been a custom, which even now survives, to erect memorials in the cemeteries for great men that were born in the town or the province, even when they had died in ever so remote a country. The Jews in Poland follow this usage for their Rabbis or learned men that died abroad. Ch. N. Dembitzer[4] has proved this especially for Lemberg. Issachar Baer Cohen is not, therefore, buried in Szebreszyn, but in the Holy Land, where also the remains of his great critic, the unhappy Lonsano, rest[5].

עו, f. הנה פה עמנו עומד היום חכם א׳ מירושלם עיר הקודש שמו כמהדר מנחם מלונצאנו יצו שם נמצא ושם היה יותר מארבעים שנה מסתפח בנחלת השם והוא חסיד לאל עליון · יעיד עליו חבורו ספר דרך חיים · אשר משם יראה הרואה כמה רב גובריה בענוה ויראת חטא · לשמע אזן שמענוהו · ועתה עיננו ראתהו ובאזנינו שמענו כמה מילי מעלייתא די נפקו מפומיה בשני דרושים

[1] שתי ידות, f. 140 b, half a verse is missing, which may have contained the name of his faithless friend :

אשר ארח לחברה
אשר אני הביאותיו לציון — אהבהיהו ושמחיו לי גבירי
והוא חנם צררני ושפך — דמי לבי ואכל את בשרי
וסבב אלמנות היות לאשתי — וגלות לי ואוי לבני ולברי

[2] David Conforte, קורא הדורות, ed. D. Cassel, f. 41 a; Luncz, *Jerusalem*, I, 120, n. 198, who, however, follows Reifmann.

[3] בית אוצר הספרות, ed. Gräber, I, 2.

[4] כלילת יפי, I, 41 a. [5] Luncz, *Jerusalem*, I, 115, n. 184.

עשה לעינינו · מצורף למה דתהינן ליה אקנקניה ואשכחנוהו על חד תרין ממה ששמעה אזננו ותבן הלא הוא זקן ושבע ימים פסח שתי רגליו ושתום העין ועינו אחת רעה עכ"ז רוב צערו וגודל עניו הכריחוהו לבא בגלילות אלה לבקש אוכל לנפשו ולנפש בני ביתו העטופים ברעב בהר הקדש בירושלם · ויהי כי בא אל המלון הזה כראות הקקי את האיש ואת שיחתו הצריכה תלמוד · נכמרו רחמיהם עליו ועשו אתו ברכה במנה הראויה להתכבד · אך אין הקומץ משביע כי לחזור אל הארץ אשר שם נתקבל צריך לאסוף על יד מעות לא מעט · באופן כי צריך הוא להיות נודד ומכתת רגליו מעיר לעיר וממדינה אל מדינה למצא סייוע שיהיה בו ממש לשוב אל מקומו · אי לזאת עלה במחשבה לפניו לבא אל משכן כבודו · כי היכי דלימטייה למר חלק במצוה רבה זו דהכל מעלין לארץ ישראל אמנם אנחנו שראינוהו נגוע מוכה אלקים ומעונה בח(ו)[מ]לת[נ]ו עליו לא הנחנוהו לצאת כי חשבנו למשפט תרגז עליו הדרך נתרבה ההוצאה ולכן יעצונו כליותנו להנאתו ולטובתו של צדיק זה לשלוח שלוחנו זה במקומו כי ידענו תעלה אגרתנו זאת לפני מזבחך לרצון כאלו בא אתו החכם בעצמו בארצך ודרך בארמנותיך נא למען השם צא נא לקראת שלוחנו זה בפנים מאירות והענק תעניק לו מן הטוב ההוא אשר הטיב ה' לך כי בגלל הדבר הזה מן השמים יטיבוך וירבו לך שנות חיים ושלו' :

A RESPONSE OF SOLOMON B. ADERET.

(See *J. Q. R.*, pp. 228–38 and 277–81.)

I HAVE also in my possession a copy of pp. 228–38 of the responses of Sol. b. Aderet published by Prof. Kaufmann, together with some corrections by Edelman, and two references by Dr. Steinschneider to his H. B. viii. 88 and xi. 135 (comp. also above, p. 222, notes). My copy however contains also the verdict which follows immediately in the MS. the responses mentioned, and which Dr. Steinschneider quotes: מכתב ר' יוסף בלשום בונדואה פלכון וכו'. Dr. Neubauer, *Cat. Bod.*, p. 763, cites the first part of it and gives all the signatures. The whole of this verdict is already printed in the collection of responses of Isaak b. Sheshet, No. 220, and is entitled לחכם הרב רבי משה אברבאליה ששלח אלי תשובות חכמי גירונדא. The signatures of the learned men of Gerona are the same as in the MS., with the exception of a few variations only; the names of שאלתיאל חן and שלמה רבאליה are missing. On the other hand, the transmitter of the verdict of the learned men of Gerona to Isaak b. Sheshet, who signs last as

משה אברבאליה, occurs here. This Moses Abarbalia, or, as he is styled in the MS., שלמה רבאליה, or perhaps both names, if they do not refer to the same person, are to be added to the names quoted above, p. 222, notes. I have further specially noticed the following variations:—

Above, page	229,	line	7,	מרעים	in the copy	מריבים	
,,	,,	,,	13,	החבלים	(by Edelman)	החובלים, compare hereto and to נעם Zechar. xi. 7	
,,	,,	230,	,,	14,	שישיבה	in the copy	ביישיבה
,,	,,	,,	,,	15,	לכנס	,,	אכנס
,,	,,	,,	,,	25,	שחרים	,,	שוחרים
,,	,,	231,	,,	9,	טיען	,,	טוען
,,	,,	,,	,,	17,	לא	,,	לאל
,,	,,	232,	,,	9,	מיהו	,,	איהו
,,	,,	,,	,,	21,	על אי	,,	על אלי
,,	,,	233	,,	1,	א״פ	,,	אע״פ } Edelman
,,	,,	,,	,,	13,	אצל	,,	אצלו }
,,	,,	,,	,,	15,	שנ״א	,,	שנא׳
,,	,,	234	,,	29,	י׳ע״כ	,,	ע״כ׳
,,	,,	235	,,	14,	להעוד	,,	להעיד
,,	,,	,,	,,	26,	והרג	,,	הרג
,,	,,	238	,,	7,	וכ׳ אפי׳	,,	וכ׳ אפי׳

S. J. HALBERSTAM[1].

MS. OF HAFTARAS OF THE TRIENNIAL CYCLE.

AMONG a large mass of Hebrew and Arabic MS. fragments which, by the courtesy of the Cairene Hebrew community, I have just been permitted to bring away from the *geniza* at Fostat, is one consisting of four quarto pages of what appears to have been a collection of Haftaras of the Triennial Cycle.

From the state of the paper and style of writing, and by comparison with dated MSS. found by me in the same place, this fragment would appear to be of the eleventh or twelfth century. It is written in a bold, square character, with a few vowel-points added by a later hand. The fragment is interesting, not only for adding five late Haftaras to the seventy early ones in the MS. of the Bodleian Library, described by Dr. Büchler in the JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, vol. VI, p. 39 sqq.,

[1] Herr Halberstam also calls attention to the fact that the *Megillath Mizraim* has already been printed. See p. 511, above.

but also for giving the popular names of some of the triennial Sedrahs. Each verse of the Haftara is followed by its Targum Jonathan, the text of which presents few important variants from that of the Targum in the Amsterdam מקראות גדולות.

The fragment begins with יען דבר יעיר בבקר (Isaiah l. 4) down to (*sic*) מכלמות ורחוק (l. 6), concluded by the consolatory verse li. 3. This is evidently part of the Haftara for a medial portion of בלק. Then comes a Haftara headed

וישב ישראל בתרי עש׳ והיה ביום ההוא יטפו בת
בסדר וקצרתם עד סוף מגילה.

This is the Haftara for the portion Numbers xxv. 1–10, consisting of the last four verses of the last chapter of Joel, followed by the first five verses of Amos i, and concluded by the seventh verse of Amos iii. Next comes a Haftara headed

פנחס בן אלעזר בתרי עשר

and beginning with the first verse of Malachi ii. 5. The page ends with the second word of the next verse, אמת. This very appropriate sacerdotal Haftara is one of those suggested by Dr. Büchler (JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, vol. VI, p. 37).

Another page of the fragment begins והקריתם לכם ביהוש׳ (Numbers xxxv. 11), and consists of Joshua xx. 1 to xxi. 3. The Haftara is followed by the remark, תם אלספר אלרבע ד׳; after which the heading

אלה הדברים בתרי עש׳

and the first verse of its Haftara, Zachariah viii. 16, which begins with the same words as the Sedrah. This is a different Sedrah from that suggested by Dr. Büchler (ib.). The fragment ends in the middle of the Targum of such verse, מלילו קושטא גבר.

The Haftara of וישב ישראל is remarkable for consisting of ten verses, while the Sedrah itself has only nine. It is also worthy of remark that Joshua and Isaiah supply Haftaras, though the Minor Prophets in point of numbers remain the favourites.

E. N. ADLER.

WOMAN IN THE MIDRASH.

"And Isaac brought her into his mother Sarah's tent[1]."

All the days of the life of Sarah, a pillar of cloud rested over the door of her tent. She died; the pillar of cloud vanished. Rebecca came, the pillar of cloud returned.

[1] Gen. xxiv. 67.

All the days of the life of Sarah, the doors were open to the wayfarer. When Sarah passed away none opened the door of hospitality until Rebecca arose, when once more the wanderer found a resting-place.

All the days of the life of Sarah a blessing lurked within the dough. With Sarah's death the blessing waned, until the coming of Rebecca.

All the days of the life of Sarah a light burned from the eve of one sabbath to another. She died, and the light went out; but when Rebecca came the light again burned bright.

And it came to pass when he saw that her ways were like unto the ways of his mother, he forthwith brought her to the tent.

Midrash Rabbah Genesis, LX, 16.

As it is said, "Look unto Abraham your father, and unto Sarah that bare you [1]."

"Give her of the fruit of her hands [2]."

As it is said, "And the life of Sarah was [3]." When she died, then old age seized upon Abraham. Therefore is it written, "And Abraham was old [4]." *Midrash Tanhuma Genesis*, IV.

Who were the nurses?

Rabbi Shemuel, the son of Nachman, saith, "Mother and daughter, Jochebed and Miriam."

"The name of the one was Shiphra [5]." Shiphra, because her works were goodly before God.

Puah, because she made Israel glorious before God.

Midrash Rabbah Exodus, I, 17.

"But the nurses feared God [6]."

Of them it is said, "The woman that feareth the Lord, she shall be praised [7]." "They saved the men children alive [8]."

The nurses went forth to draw water and obtained food from the dwellings of the rich; and therewith sustained they the poor.

Therefore is it written, "They saved the men children alive."

Idem, I, 19.

"And every wise-hearted man among them that wrought the work [9]."

And this wisdom, whence did it come? From Miriam, as it is said, "He made them houses [10]." What were these houses?

[1] Isa. li. 2. [2] Prov. xxxi. 31. [3] Gen. xxiii. 1.
[4] Gen. xxiv. 1. [5] Exod. i. 15. [6] Exod. i. 17.
[7] Prov. xxxi. 30. [8] Exod. i. 17. [9] Exod. xxxvi. 8.
[10] Exod. i. 21.

The priesthood and the throne. Jochebed was the mother of Aaron, the high priest, and Moses, the ruler, as it is written, "And he was king in Jeshurun[1]."

And from Miriam went forth wisdom, and the spirit thereof rested upon Bezalil. Yea, David, the king, was a scion of her house. As it is said, "And she (Ephrath) which bare him Hur[2]." And it is written, "David was the son of an Ephrathite[3]." *Idem*, XLVIII, 5.

"Thy wife shall be as a fruitful vine[4]."

Fruitful, meaneth that her fruit shall be goodly and not like unto that of "an empty vine[5]"; for she meriteth to have children. "On the sides of thine house[6]." As she hath loved the Law and in that she is virtuous, so shall her children be men learned in the Law, learned in the Mishnah, and men who perform good works.

Idem, Numbers, VIII, 10.

"The burden which his mother taught him [Solomon][7]."

All the wives of thy father's house did make vows and prayed, "Oh that I might have a son fit for the kingdom's heir!" But as for me, I vowed and prayed, "Oh that I might have a son, zealous, radiant with the spirit of the Law, glorious as the vision of the seers!"

Idem, X, 8.

"Then drew near the daughters of Zelophehad[8]."

The women of that generation builded up that which the men brake down. For thou findest that Aaron said, "Break off the golden rings, which are in the ears of your wives[9]."

But the women were unwilling to comply, and resisted their husbands' plea, as it is said, "And all the people brake off the golden rings[10]" [themselves]. And the women took no part with them in the making of the calf. Thus it was also in the matter of the spies, "who returned, and made all the congregation to murmur against him, by bringing up an evil report against the land[11]."

Then went forth the decree of their doom, because they said, "We be not able to go up[12]." But the women followed not this counsel, as it is written, "For the Lord had said of them, They shall surely die in the wilderness, and there was not left a man of them, save Caleb the son of Jephunneh, and Joshua the son of Nun[13]." The text saith, "There was not left a man"; for they yearned not to

[1] Deut. xxxiii. 5.
[2] 1 Chron. ii. 19.
[3] 1 Sam. xvii. 12.
[4] Ps. cxxviii. 3.
[5] Hos. x. 1.
[6] Ps. cxxviii. 3.
[7] Prov. xxxi. 1.
[8] Num. xxvii. 1.
[9] Exod. xxxii. 2.
[10] Exod. xxxii. 3.
[11] Num. xiv. 36.
[12] Num. xiii. 31.
[13] Num. xxvi. 65.

enter the promised land. But the women drew nigh to seek an inheritance. Therefore are these records set side by side, showing, the men brake down, the women builded up. *Idem*, XXI, 11.

"See life with the woman whom thou lovest[1]."

A man that hath no wife he dwelleth without good, without help, without joy, without blessing, without atonement. Without good, as it is said, "It is not good that the man should be alone[2]." Without help, "And I will make him an help meet for him[3]." Without joy, "And thou shalt rejoice, thou and thine household[4]." Without blessing, "To cause a blessing to rest on thine house[5]." Without atonement, "And make atonement for himself, and for his household[6]." Without life, as it is said, "See life with the woman whom thou lovest." Without peace, as it is said, "Peace be both unto thee, and peace be to thine house[7]." Rabbi Chayah ben Gamaah saith, "Moreover man is not perfect that hath no wife," as it is said, "And blessed them and called their name Adam[8]." Inasmuch as the two are one, are they called Adam. There be those that say "Man without woman hath but a small measure of the divine image," as it is said, "In the likeness of God made he man[9]." *Midrash Rabba Koheleth*, IX, 7.

"And Elimelech, Naomi's husband, died[10]."

To all, death cometh; happy is the man who goeth forth from the world with a good name. When a man dieth who mourneth him more deeply than his wife? as it is said, "And Elimelech, Naomi's husband, died." When a woman dieth, who sorroweth more than her husband? as it is said, "And as for me, when I came from Paddan, Rachel died by me[11]." Saith Rabbi Jochanan, "Upon me the death of Rachel did weigh sore." Jacob our father said, "The death of Rachel was more hard to bear than all the sorrows which fell upon me." *Midrash Ruth Rabba*, II, 7.

"And Ruth said, Intreat me not to leave thee, and to return from following after thee[12]."

What meaneth this word "Intreat." Lay not this sin upon thyself, of intreating me to leave thee.

"To leave thee and to return from following after thee; I yearn to follow after thee; it is better that thine hand should lead me than the hand of a stranger." When Naomi heard these words she set before her the laws concerning proselytes, and thus she said unto

[1] Eccles. ix. 9. [2] Gen. ii. 18. [3] Gen. ii. 18.
[4] Deut. xiv. 26. [5] Ezek. xliv. 30. [6] Lev. xvi. 6.
[7] 1 Sam. xxv. 6. [8] Gen. v. 2. [9] Gen. v. 1.
[10] Ruth i. 3. [11] Gen. xlviii. 7. [12] Ruth i. 16.

her: "My daughter, it is not the way of the daughters of Israel to enter the pagan houses of frivolity."

She made answer, "Whither thou goest, I will go[1]." Once more spake Naomi: "My daughter, Israel lodgeth not in houses save where the door posts are inscribed with the words of the sacred Law."

"Where thou lodgest, I will lodge. Thy people shall be my people[2], in that the penalties and warnings shall be within my heart; and thy God my God[3], in all that he hath commanded."

Idem, II, 23.

"A virtuous woman who can find[4]?"

It is related of Rabbi Mier, that one Sabbath day, while he was seated in the house of learning at the hour of the Mincha prayer, his two sons died. Then their mother laid the two of them upon the bed and spread a covering over them. At the going out of the Sabbath, Rabbi Mier returned from the house of learning and said unto his wife, "Where are my two sons?" She replied, "They went to the house of learning."

"But," said the Rabbi, "there have I been, yet did I not see them."

She gave him the cup for the Habdallah, and once more he asked, "Where are my two sons?" She made answer, "Peradventure are they gone out for a while." She set food before him, and when he had pronounced the blessing, she said, "Rabbi, a question have I to ask of thee." He answered, "Tell it unto me." Then she spake: "Yesterday, there came a man who gave jewels into my keeping, and now he cometh for them, shall we return them unto him or not?"

He said unto her, "My child, he that hath jewels confided unto him should he not assuredly return them to the owner?" She said, "Without thy knowledge how could I give them up unto him?"

Then she led him by the hand and brought him into the chamber. She drew him near to the bed and removed the covering, and behold his sons lay there before him, dead.

"My sons, my sons," he wept; "How oft hath my face shone with joy as I have listed when ye spake sage wisdom of the Law." Then said she, "Rabbi, didst thou not say unto me, unto the owner must the jewels surely be returned? 'The Lord gave, and the Lord hath taken away[5].'"

In this manner did she comfort him. Therefore, it is said, "A virtuous woman who can find?" *Midrash Mishleh.*

ELSIE DAVIS.

[1] Ruth i. 16. [2] Ruth i. 16. [3] Ruth i. 16.
[4] Prov. xxxi. 10. [5] Job i. 21.

THE SILVER BOWL.

JOSEPH EZOBI, the author of the poem קערת כסף, belonged to a family whose native home was Provence. This family, so far as it has been preserved in literary history, consisted of the father, Chanin Ezobi, and his three sons, Eleazar, Meshullam, and Joseph. They lived in the thirteenth century. Each of them acquired some literary fame, local at least, while in the case of Joseph the fame was universal. In the thirteenth century the Jews of Provence enjoyed a political and social tranquillity which enabled them to apply themselves to the study of those subjects which at that time occupied men's minds. Among the Provençal Jews the Ezobis rank high in literary merit. The father, Chanin b. Nathan, earned a reputation as a poet and grammarian. Abraham Bedarshi in his work אלף אלפין speaks in terms of eulogy of one Ezovi who was his teacher. There is a little disagreement among scholars as to who this Ezovi was. Carmoly asserts that it was the father, Chanin Ezobi (Ezovi being merely another form of Ezobi). Zunz, however, believes that Bedarshi refers to the more famous son Joseph. Graetz, who also refers it to Joseph, chiefly, and it seems only on the authority of Zunz, proceeds to determine the approximate date of Joseph Ezobi. Abraham Bedarshi wrote an elegy on the burning of the Talmud (1241-1244); therefore his master Joseph Ezobi must have lived in the first half of the thirteenth century (1230-1350). But it is questionable whether this is correct, or rather whether Graetz is justified in assuming that Joseph was the teacher of Bedarshi. For it is certain that Meshullam, Joseph's elder brother, published in Segovia a Hebrew Grammar entitled *Agudath Ezob* in 1272, while a young man and a tutor in Spain. Now, taking this date as a criterion, and if we accept the computation of Graetz, we have an elder brother flourishing a generation later than a younger brother. It would therefore seem more correct to accept Carmoly's statement that Bedarshi's teacher was the father, Chanin, and hence that Joseph's date is the latter half of the thirteenth century. There is a further disagreement as to the exact origin of the name Ezobi, האזובי. All agree that it is the name of a town in the South of France, and that the family styled themselves "Ezobi" from the town in which they lived. But four towns have been suggested as being identical with this אזובי, Avignon, Orange, Orgon, and Vaison. Munk suggests Avignon. Cassel thinks it is Orgon (=ὀργεινον, Sp. Origano = אזוב). Carmoly maintains it is Vaison, while Graetz does not decide between Orange and Vaison. However, Avignon is probably wrong, and there is no foundation for Orange, the only indecision lies between Orgon

and Vaison. (See Carmoly, *Biographie des Israélites de France.* Francfort, 1868, p. 79.)

The title of the poem, קערת כסף, refers to the priestly bowl of Num. vii. 13. The number of distichs, all of which rhyme with the syllable ה, is 131. It should be 130, for the author says that he wishes the number of his verses to correspond to the 130 shekels, the weight of the bowl. It is a marriage poem in which the father, Joseph Ezobi, instructs his newly-married son as regards his duties and work of life. The popularity which this poem enjoyed for several centuries was due to its simple ethics, its purity of style, and its fine application of religious principles to ordinary life.

My darling son, that art my soul's delight,
My hope, my joy, my strength in thee unite.
Peace to thee, Peace, my glory and my love,
Thy will is God's, its fount is Heaven above.
The song I sing is thine, accept the gift,
'Tis offered to thy soul, with heart uplift.
Compare it not to silver nor to gold,
Canst thou?—a song it is of price untold.
My son, a "Silver Bowl" of poesy,
Thy father's gift, thy father Ezobi;
A dish that tunes sweet words of gentleness,
In lines of pearls, in words of costliness.
The Silver Bowl is filled with songs of Truth:
Rejoice! but turn it not upon its mouth.

List now, my son, accept this gift divine,
A father's gift whose soul, whose life, is thine.
A wedding gift, to smooth thy path most fit,
Stay, then, all festive song, all clam'rous wit.
Thy father strives his happy son to teach;
Who else? none else thy heart can better reach.
Say not then thou wilt all despise my song;
Though pierced of yore, I grieved, in pangs of Wrong.
Though named the "Hyssop," cedars are my words,
My speech is clear, as though 'twere song of birds.
In heart a lion, though in mien a fox,
My song to me is strength, the strength of rocks.
A bee in nature, sweetness have I shown
To them that love—I scorn the brawler's frown.
Thy father speaks, give ear, he yearns for thee,
For soon thou wilt be gone, by God's decree.
A joyous feast I now for thee prepare,

Thy meal is Homily, and Faith thy fare.
The silver dish, as well its gladd'ning song,
Is here, alone, in no unseemly throng.
Its weight is measured as the priestly bowl,
When brought to God, to cleanse the erring soul.
To teach for this reward, I am content,
An honoured name, a life in virtue spent.
Knowest thou not, thou bear'st thy grandsire's name,
"Good Samuel the Lion," first in fame.
Thy name is his, be thou his counterpart,
Upright and pure in thought, in deed, in heart.
Fear thy God, yea, more than man fears man:
Was he not God? long e'er this world began.
Is he not God? that now the world is grown,
Eternal Majesty! yet still Unknown.
God bade the Heaven o'er the earth be spread;
He is the First, he lives when all is dead.
His glory streams from Heaven, it fills the earth,
Beyond the vastest circuit Mind can girth.
Take this encirclement, extend it more
And more, to God 'tis small as e'en before.
Because he chose on Zion's hill a shrine,
Wilt thou to him a finite Place assign?
Thou dar'st not God in any form confine,
"He spake," "He saw," "He stood," are but his sign.
In one short week creation's work fulfill'd,
No work of craftsman, but divinely willed.
To Nature's Law earth moves obedient,
But God this power to Nature hath but lent.
He can withhold it, as it was withheld
When fountains madly gushed and waters swell'd.
And who is he that dares transgress his word?
Not thou, my son, for wisdom thou hast heard.
Seek men of virtue, goodness, knowledge, truth;
Honour their crown appears, waste not thy youth.
The company of fools with scorn forgo,
Nor friend with boorish herds in caverns low.
Avoid smooth lips that utter flattery:
Their kiss is false, their smile a treachery.
Their trifling folly will thine ire incite,
Their lips are honey'd, but they breathe despite.
Seek not youth's counsel, it is worse than guilt,
Its castle totters, as on ruins built.

To teachers, not to books, entrust thy mind;
Thy soul with living words, not dead, e'er bind.
The written book appears expressionless,
Thy teacher's wand doth give it rich address.
Put not thy faith in Grecian Sophistry:
To climb its vineyard's fence, no man is free.
Its draught will make thy footsteps vacillate
From truth; will make thy heart to curse and hate.
But askest thou in what to set thy lore,
In Grammar much, but in the Talmud more.
To know the secret of the Law's restraint,
Wherein the "holy" and wherein the "taint."
To fine the "goring ox," the "open pit,"
The cattle's lawless graze, the haystack lit.
Alfasi, glory to his memory,
Alone did bring the law to harmony.
The hungry soul from out his wisdom fed,
His touch gave life to what would else be dead.
And after, rose a man of piety,
Maimonides, the Sage of God's decree,
Whose books, that on the world their lustre shed,
In Hebrew and in Arab tongue are read.
Breathe thou the incense of his off'ring soul,
The path of rectitude his words extol.
Accept his laws of life, for he will guide
Thee near to God; in him thy trust confide.
Now here, now then, list to the Midrashim;
How oft they brighten words that seemèd dim.
And like thy father sing in tunefulness:
Hark thou, a barren soul is profitless.
Purge well thy soul, no stain therein to leave,
Remove its grosser parts in virtue's sieve.
When thou a letter sendest to thy friend,
Is it neatly written? nay? 'twill sure offend;
For in his penmanship man stands revealed—
Purest intent by chastest style is sealed.
Be heedful then when thou dost pen thy songs;
To lofty strains a goodly hand belongs.
Stay yet, my son, a little longer stay,
Agree what grace reposeth in my lay.
In scales of prudence weigh what thou wilt do,
Or say, in scales of resolution too.
The golden mean in all has nameless price;

E'en virtue in extreme doth turn a vice.
Thy body's strife against thy soul, let cease;
Between the two contrive a bond of peace.
The flesh of man must needs be satiate;
Remember too the soul hath claims as great.
But if the grip of lust seize hold of thee
Kill lust, lest thou be doomed to slavery.
In vestments wilt thou go beyond excess?
'Tis Folly rests its honour in its dress.
A little sleep, my son, invigorates;
A sluggard's sleep, my son, his life prostrates.
From languid wantonness restrain thy soul,
Yet overhaste and vehemence control.
Inquire and learn wherefore the laws divine,
What mean the words "these statutes—they are mine."
On festive days, be thine to joy in feast,
But spare debauch on flesh of fatted beast.
Waste not the holy days in wine and meal;
Look more, the sickness of thy soul to heal;
Thus make the seventh day, the Day of Rest,
With higher, nobler influences blest.
Seek thou the House of God at night or day,
All humbly open thou thy lips, but pray.
Rage not because thy 'lotted place is low;
There lurks no nook too small for God to know.
In manly virtue set thy manhood's worth,
No place can lessen it, nor lowly birth.
From town to town, if thou dost make thy way,
And find'st men strict, be thou as strict as they.
But dure not long when visiting thy friend,
For he will loathe thee, though he else pretend.
See how the heart of man doth long for rain:
A constant downpour? no, 'tis shunn'd a bane.
Thy word, an answering truth in heart demands,
Be not smooth-mouthed while bristles mark thy hands.
Be prone to charity, but vaunt it not;
Love thou the poor, for joyless is their lot.
According to thy purse help those who need,
For every gift doth bring an equal meed.
If thou hast nought to give to him who craves,
Yet gently answer him, a word oft saves—
As kindliness alone can urge the youth,
Not rage that bellows from a thund'ring mouth.

Flee from the slanderer as from a pest,
His tongue with poisonous fangs ne'er lies at rest.
Speak thou the truth, the saving truth instil,
Why should man's words e'er pierce and wound and kill?
Thy friend will sometimes whisper thee apart
His secret; hide it deep within thy heart.
Thine own secret from all must be conceal'd;
E'en to thy friend, it dare not be reveal'd.
He once was bound to thee, thy prisoner;
Reveal, he now doth stand thy conqueror.
Abandon wrath; through anger heroes fell,
Ungodly rage made God's own seer rebel.
All loathsome pride detest and scorn—
The haughty fool, would he were never born.
Do thou, my son, pursue humility,
In it behold the grace of dignity.
All friends with kindly cheer to thee enfold,
Acquire their hearts without or gift or gold;
But strive alway to honour every man—
The prince, as well the humble artisan.
A man may walk abroad in simple dress
And yet within a priceless soul possess.
All gambling games of chance abominate
As idol groves, with rites contaminate.
Flee from the reeking dens, with dicing rife,
Where spendthrifts waste their every day in strife.
My son, on this thy wedding day rejoice!
To song of mirth, attune thy heart and voice.
Take thou the graceful doe, thy royal bride;
With her thy joy and happiness divide.
A comely form, my darling son, is thine;
Corrupt it not, for 'tis a gift divine.
If evil inclination thee incite
To wrong, depart not from the way of right,
But drag the tempter to the house of prayer—
There thou canst lay his evil purpose bare.
A power above men's inmost thoughts doth know,
So that men reap according as they sow.
While yet youth's glowing ardour thou dost feel,
Fan it to flame with fire of burning zeal.
If thou would seek the gates of Paradise,
Withhold! on earth thy work will thee suffice.
Yea, many rushing heaven's heights to scale,

In fruitless quests their misspent life bewail.
Behold reveal'd creation's mystery,
List to the strains of heaven's symphony;
And when the day of good report is nigh
E'en as Elijah thou shalt rise on high.
Three crowns there are, and these the world may love;
A blameless name is more, all crown above.
Humbly pray God may crown thee with his Light,
To live 'mid men, with heart, with soul, with might.
Rejoice with her, thy graceful tender dove:
God bless you twain, with love as angels love.

I. FREEDMAN.

THE

JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW

JULY, 1896

EGYPTIAN FRAGMENTS.

מגלות, SCROLLS ANALOGOUS TO THAT OF PURIM, WITH AN APPENDIX ON THE FIRST נגידים.

THE Rev. G. Margoliouth published in the Jan. number of this Review a scroll concerning a calamity which befell the Jews of Cairo in 1524 A. D.[1] There is an analogous document in Hebrew which refers also to the Jewish community of Cairo sometime in the second half of the twelfth century, before 1196 A. D.[2] It bears at the end the title of *Megillah*, and is written in rhymed prose, which makes a translation difficult, and many sentences are unintelligible or at least doubtful even where the MS. is in the best state, which is not always the case. The salient points are the following:—

(1) A certain Zuta[3] or Sar Salom[4] tried to obtain from the king the right to farm the revenues of the Jewish com-

[1] See JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, VIII, p. 274, and ibidem, p. 511. To be added (1) Elijah Kapsali's account in his work with the title ספר רבי אליהו, extracted by the late Rabbi M. Lattes with the title of לקוטים שונים (Padova, 1869, p. 91 sqq., and p. 113, note 65, where other references are given); (2) יחסין ס by A. Zakkut, ed. Constantinople, at end of sheet מב 2b, l. 18 (ed. Cracow, fol. 153, l. 7).

[2] See the date at the end (p. 551).

[3] Pages 547, ll. 7, 10.

[4] See pp. 545, note 2; 547, ll. 11, 16, and Appendix II; also יחיה (Arabic يحيى?), p. 547, note 10.

munity after the death of Samuel han-Nagid (the prince). The chief function of the Nagid was to collect the taxes for his chest. This function went in various countries under different names. In Bagdad it was the *Nasī* (נשיא), in Persia the *Resh Galutha* (ריש גלותא), in Egypt from the tenth century, and in Spain in the eleventh century, *Nagid* (נגיד or אל נגיד)[1]. The date of Samuel Nagid's death is at present not known, the history of the Jews in Egypt has still to be written, and we hope that an attempt may be made by using the fragments of Hebrew and Rabbinical as well as Arabic documents discovered in the last three years (see further on, pp. 556–559). Unfortunately they are not all in the possession of public libraries, and private possessors are not invariably inclined to make them accessible.

(2) There is a mention of a new king of Egypt, which probably means Salah ed-Din (Saladin), who reigned from 1169 A. D. to 1192 A. D., since it is said of him that he went to the Holy Land (in the years 1189 to 1192). With his licence, Zuta farmed the revenues, which he had in hand for four years.

(3) Further on we read of the arrival of Maimonides in Cairo, who, owing to his great reputation, succeeded in crushing the power of Zuta. The last two items, viz. concerning Salah ed-Din and Maimonides have been already pointed out by Dr. Harkavy [2]. Maimonides' influence in public affairs could scarcely have begun before 1175 A.D.[3], and Salah ed-Din went to conquer Palestine in the year 1189 A. D.

(4) Further on, a certain Isaac, a rabbi of importance, is mentioned as saving the Jews from the calamity caused by Zuta. Dr. Harkavy may be right in identifying him with

[1] Arabic form Nagdela or Nagdallah, not Nagrella, as the late Professor Graetz writes, following Dozy's editions of Arabic historians, saying that *d* (د) and *r* (ر) are not easily confounded (*Geschichte der Juden*, VI (2nd ed.), p. 382). Quite on the contrary these two letters are exchanged frequently in Hebrew and Arabic.

[2] In המצפה, see p. 543 (1).

[3] See Graetz, *op. cit.* (note 1), p. 310 sqq.

R. Isaac ben Shoshan had-Dayyan, who was a member of the בית דין, presided over by Maimonides[1].

Dr. Harkavy[2] supposes that Zuta was a Karaite, like his namesake, against whom S^{e}adyah Gaon wrote a controversial treatise. But the antagonist of S^{e}adyah is called *ben Zuta*, and moreover Zuta boasts, in the *Megillah* here printed, that he is versed in the Bible, Mishnah, Talmud, Halakhoth, Boraithoth, Toseftoth, and the commentaries[3], learning which is hardly suitable in the mouth of a Karaite; besides the composer of this document would not have omitted to mention in condemnation that Zuta was a Karaite by the side of epithets like רשע, שוטה &c.

As to the מרדכי, mentioned in the *Megillah*[4], see Appendix I (p. 553).

I have to mention a last item before I begin with the bibliography of our document. That is, that the document in one MS. is dated the fourth of Ab, 1508, of the era of Contracts or Seleucides, which is 1196 A.D. The writing of this MS., which seems to be written in Yemen rabbinic characters, is scarcely as old as that. The date seems therefore to be that of the composition, but the event or calamity must be older, since the author of the document says that his father told him concerning Zuta's doings. But the author of our document cannot be (as we shall see) Abraham son of Maimonides, as Dr. Harkavy hints, saying "if the sentence 'My father, my splendour, and my honour' refers to Maimonides, we have to conclude that our document was written by his son Abraham[5]." We shall see that the author of this document is Abraham ben Hillel[6]; the latter is perhaps identical with Hillel ben Nissim or Hillel החבר, whose name is in documents in the Bodleian Library, Hebrew *c.* 13.

Our document is taken from three sources:—

(1) From a fragment belonging to my friend Dr. Harkavy,

[1] In המצפה.
[2] Ibidem.
[3] See p. 547.
[4] See p. 545, ll. 16, 25.
[5] *Op. cit.*, p. 3.
[6] P. 544.

published in a Hebrew Quarterly called המצפה, edited by Alexander Zederbaum, No. 2, 1885 (חדשים גם ישנים, 3), St. Petersburg, in the following order:—

(2) From the MS. in the Bodleian Library, Hebrew *d.* 35, ff. 1 b to 3, obliterated containing fol. 1.

(3) From a MS., ibidem, Hebrew *e.* 56, ff. 33 to 39, lacuna at the beginning.

The missing part cannot be considerable [1].

It seems that other pieces were composed, or at least another one in verse; indeed the MS. *d.* 35, fol. 1 contains the following end of a second composition.

I.

כחיה בטרף במצאה קשיטה
ואינו כליש אבל שור ותיש
ויגעה בדיש ויבעט בעיטה
ועושק כמהים דלים ונוהים
ומוכר אלהים בשוה פרוטה
והוביש כגנב ונשאר לונב
ודומה לענב בשחטו שחיטה ׳
והושב חמסו בראשו וכעסו
וצור חש לנסו וקרא שמטה ׳
ונדחף לביתו חפוי ראש כדתו
ושמחה עדתו ונחה ושקטה ׳
ועשתה לפורים בשמחה ושירים
ושרות ושרים עלי כם ומטה

II.

[2]נאום אברהם בר הלל ׳ ראשית אמרי
אהלל ׳ לאל המהולל בכל יום וליל ׳ כי אם
בזאת יתהלל המתהלל:

[1] [ ] means conjectural reading for passage of the MS. *d*; ( ) reading from Harkavy's text, missing or obliterated in MS. *e*. The lines of this MS. only are put as in the original.

[2] From MS. *e* to חמס, p. 545, l. 10.

רצוני שתהא זו האגרת · לעונות זוטה
מזכרת · כתובה בספר מהודרת · בעט
ברזל ועופרת : ויהי מקדמון · ביטי
מלכות הארמון[1] · היה מלך אוהב ממון ·
ויתן לו באלף דרכמון · כרם היה לשלמה[2]
בבעל המון · ויסובו עליו השוטרים ·
ויאמרו האלף לך שלמה[2] ומאתים
לנוטרים · ויבוא אל כרם שורק ·
וישימהו נעור וריק · פרץ גדרו ·
והשחית הדרו וירדהו באף וחמס

(lacuna)[3] משען לכל הל[ך · ורשות][4] לעמוד בה[י]כל המלך : מעלה יתירה ונדולה ו···· כל בכל ענינות · ושמעו הלך בכל המד[ינות] · [נותן] מנות : בסתרים ובגלויים · לאביו[נים ו]לעניים : ושולחנות ערוכות לשבעים ולרעבים · ולרחוקים ולקרובים · ולכל עוברים ושבים : וצדקות בכל רגע ועונה · לגר ליתום ולאלמנה : ולכל חשוב אשר מנכסיו הוסר · יתן די מחסורו אשר יחסר : פנה החדר מנהל מהעדר כסדר : מרדכי הז[מן ·] עם קדושים נאמן : החליף זה הרשע האור באופל · והע[שיר בשפ]ל · והנפילים בנפל : ונטע נעמן בצרעת נע[מן · ונא]מן לב יצא ויבוא המן : מכוער בתבניתו · מבוזה בכל[משריתו :] רע במפעל וענין · לסטם מזוין : חנף ומרע כמו חפרע · אוי לרשע רע : מרשיע בכל דרכים ומסלולים · והאיש קשה ורע מעללים : נהפך לאבל הדגל · וקשה לישראל כיום שנעשה בו העגל : ונעתם אור צהרים · ויהי חשך אפילה בכל ארץ מצרים : ונתאבלו הדיינים והזקנים · ויהי העם כמתאוננים : וישבו השרים בבתיהם ענומים · וכל הקהל בצרות וזעמים · ששים יום וששת ימים : ונחשבו אצלם מרוב המגינה · יום [לשנה יום] לשנה : עד שהגדילו צעקתם · וישמע אלהים את נ[אקתם : החי]ש ישועתו · ויזכור להם את בריתו · וישב מרד[כי למקומו] והמן נדחף אל ביתו : כמקדם ומראש · אבל וחפוי ראש : וחרפת עמו הסיר · ועליהם שמואל הנגיד השיר : והסיר האופל מנתיבותם · ולכל בני ישראל היה אור במושבותם :

[1] Armenian, allusion to Saladin, who was a Kurd; ארמון would mean a Christian, out of place in Egypt at the epoch.

[2] Perhaps an allusion to the name שר שלום (see p. 542, note 3).

[3] Here begins MS. *d*.

[4] The letters and words in [ ] to l. 3 are obliterated in the MS., mostly supplied by Dr. Friedländer. Further on [ ] means from MS. *d*, and ( ) from Dr. Harkavy's MS. See p. 544 (1).

צח ואז נשאתי משלי · לעיני כל קהלי:
ג בתי כנסיות לבדד ישבו (בו) כל ימי פגעם אשר נגזרו ·
דמו ליולדת בשבתה עד מלאת ששה וששים יום וע[ב]רו[1]:
ונשאר כמה שנים בצרות ויגונים · לעג וקלס לכל המונים · והוא מקבץ הדרכמונים · מכל צד ופינים · משוד עניים מאנקת אביונים: מאכלו שעורים · וח[י]יו כחיי החמורים: לבושיו בלויי סחבות · ובתיו חרבות: ואשתו ובניו לעין הכל · ברעב ובצמא ובעירום ובחוסר כל: הממון יצפננו · ולא ישליטנו האלהים לאכל ממנו · כי איש נכרי יאכלנו:

ויהי אחרי כן וימת שמואל · ויספדו לו כל ישראל: וישמח הרשע[2] במותו · וישיג גאותו: וילך אל המלך וימסר בו · ויאמר המן בלבו: למי יחפוץ המלך לעשות יקר יותר ממני · עתה ילוה אלי ויאהבני: כי אקבץ לו הממון · ואוציא אליו כל מטמון: וידבר אליו כזבים · ויאמר כי תחת ראשו עשרת אלפים זהובים: וישלח המלך עמו גברים · וימצאו דבריו שקרים: ויכעס המלך ויאמר בהבל תפצה פיך · ויאמר לבנו עלה וקבור את אביך: ויאמר צא ואל תוסף ראות פני · דובר שקרים לא יכון לנגד עיני: ויצא מלפניו בבושת פנים · ויאמרו כל העם לרגום אותם באבנים:

ויהי בימים הרבים ההם[3] וימת מלך מצרים · ויקם מלך חדש על מצרים: ויערב ממנו השררה[4] במאתים [דינר][5] בכל שנה: ויאמר אנכי אחטנה · מידי תבקשנה: ויושיט[6] שועל · ויקח מיחף[7] נעל: וישר כמו ארבעה שנים · והקהל מרודים מעונים · ודמעתם[8] כעננים · עד השקיף צור ממעונים · וריחם על המונים · כרחם אב על בנים · והשקיט השאננים · ומחה יי אלהים דמעה מעל כל פנים: ושלח[9] ציר אמונים · אות הדורים[10] מופת הזמנים: משה הרב · נר מזרח ומערב: האור הבהיר · והכוכב המזהיר: יחיד הדור ופלאו[11] · ממזרח שמש[12] עד מבואו: והשיב הדת לישנה · והעמידה[13] על

[1] The ע is distinct in the MS. The reading וישהרו is genial but impossible according to the MS. (see גנזי ירושלים, by Rabbi S. A. Wertheimer, I, p. 38, l. 15, and Postscript I, below, p. 559).

[2] Continuation of *e* to בימי (p. 547, l. 15).

[3] Beg. in H, p. 3 to והוא, p. 4, l. 5 (our text, p. 547, l. 11); next comes הפך, p. 5, l. 6 to end (our text, p. 547, l. 11), followed by יצא, p. 4, l. 5 (our text, p. 549, l. 5), to רפות, p. 5, l. 5 (our text, p. 550, l. 13).

[4] *e* השרהה.

[5] Only in *d*.

[6] So all, *d* blotted.

[7] *e* blotted.

[8] MS. H ודמיצדתם.

[9] So both, H ששלח.

[10] So both.

[11] In *d* injured.

[12] *d* H ויצמידה.

[13] Here begins MS. *e*.

מכונה : ויסר הצלם *מן הה(י)כל · ויפתה ויוכל[1] : ותהי ראשית ה(ת)שועה (ע)ל ידו · לזרע[2] ידידו : ובראו(תי כי) זה זוטא (העוכר · ברוע) מעשיו יזכר : כי הם רבים מלמ(נות · ועצומים מלשנות ·) ודתיהם שונות · מכל הלשונות : התמהמהתי (ותמהתי) ונלאיתי[3] לספר קצותם או לחוותם : ואין חדש בהזכירם · כי אין איש שלא יודעם[4] ומכירם : לולי הנס הנאדר · הבא באדר הנהדר : מיד חשתי ורחשתי · ואם לא ניחשתי ·[5] ואילו לעבדים ולשפחות נמכרנו החרשתי : כי זה זוטה[6] הרשע והחוטא[7] : בקש[8] לאבד זרע ידידים · כהמן צורר היהודים : ולכן אגיד מעט ולא אספיק אחד מאלף שערים · אבל ראשי דברים מעידים על הנשארים :

הגדני אבא מרי (הודי ויקרי) כי זה זוטה · אשר כלימות עוטה : בכל חרמין ולוטין[9] יהיה · קראוהו יולדיו יחיה[10] : והוא הפך שמו שר שלום · במתג ורסן עדיו לבלום · ויקח אדרתו ויגלום : וירדוף אחר[י] השררה · והיא בורחת ממנו וסרה : ויאמר בשטותו · ועוצם טפשותו : הלא המשרה קבועה בשמי · ירושתי מאבי ואמי · אף אני בחלומי · ראיתיה על שכמי · נחמו נחמו עמי : כי קרן ישועה בימי תצמח · וממני יקבל המשיח : ולא בש[11] בכתבו שמו בה[עלם · לפנינו ש]ורשלם:[12] ויבט אל עדתו ה[יושבים] · ויאמר א[ינם אצלי] חשובים: הלא תדעו כי אין כמוני · בכל המוני · ראש תחכמוני · וכל חכמות על ציצית[13] לשוני : מי יחפוץ יבוא ויקח · בטרם אלקח : הלא עלי בת קול תענה משמים · הוי כל צמא לכו למים : אם בתורה · אני לה עין מאירה : ואם בנביאים · אחפש בם מחבואים[14] · ואם בכתובים · אני להם נטפי רביבים : ואם במשנה[15] · בין שפתי שנונה : ואם בתלמוד · אני לו בעמוד : מחזיק יסודותיו · ומבאר סודותיו : ואם בהלכות · לפני ערוכות · ועלי סמוכות : ואם בבריתות ותוספתות · פשוטות לי בכל עתות · ופתות אותם פיתות : ואם בפירושים · אני להם חכם חרשים · ורכב ופרשים : ואם בחכמת היונים · (אפרש בהם) כמה גוונים : וכמה יש לי חיבורים · [ועניינים] יקרים : (חדשים לבקרים · ואם בדבור · אני כמעין המתגבר · שמעו כי

[1] H מהיכל, וגם יוכל analogous to 1 Kings xxii. 22. Perhaps an allusion to the many conversions of the Karaites to Rabbanism soon after the arrival of Maimonides in Egypt. See גנוי ירושלים, I, p. 39, note xx.

[2] H מורע. [3] H ונלאתי. [4] H corr. ידעם.

[5] H נחשתי, *d* omits the last three words. [6] H וזטא (everywhere).

[7] H MS. והחטא. [8] *e* שבקש. [9] *d* and *e* ולויטין.

[10] The allusion contained in the words יהיה . . . יהיה is difficult to guess. Dr. Harkavy proposes the name of يحيى. Dr. Friedländer thinks that יהיה is an allusion to Genesis xvii. 18 and xvi. 12.

[11] H בוש. [12] Put for שר שלום, above, l. 11.

[13] H תחת, but corr. על צציח. [14] H מהבאים. [15] In *d* follows אַ.

נגידים אדבר): ואם אשיר שירים · בלשוני צחות מדוברים · ומפתח שפתי מישרים: ואם בספרי הרפואות · אני בהם אות: אכלו לשבעה ושמו בכליכם · גר ותושב אנכי עמכם: ויפן אלי · וישם עינו עלי: ויאמר חוש לשלול מן החכמות · פן תנחם אחרי מות: עניתיו כמה תרבה כזב · והלב נמס וזב: התחשוב לפניך היהודים · לפניך עתודים: הלא אתה כשור חריש · ומי יתן ותהי אויל מחריש: הן שמך לא תדע תתנהו · ויאמר אולי משגה הוא: והייתי טועה · ואני תועה: עניתיו השור על בלילו גועה: והרבו השחוק לבלי חוק · הקל נשמע עד למרחוק: וילחישני נא כבדיני: כי אני זקן[1] · ומהיום מעשי אתקן: עניתיו אין לך מיד כסיל פורקון · מעות לא יוכל לתקון: הנה חכמות שלא גמרתה · וידעתה ומזמות שלא חקרתה · אמנם בזבתה ובכל שקרתה: אבל אנה השירים · אשר לך מיושרים · ויאמר בפי שירות ושירים: והם הרבה הרבה · כמו הארבה: עניתיו אנחנו חפיצים לראותם · הוציאם אלינו ונדעה אותם: שיר לנו אחד מהם · עדי נראה ענינים · ונלמוד מדרכיהם: ויען לא אשמרם · כי מדול ימים ירבו אם אספרם: הנ׳[2] עניתיו הלא הם כתובים בספר · הראינו אותם ומדברך אל תפר · ויען היו כאשכל הכופר · וגונבו מביתי ולא מצאתי להם כופר · אבל יש שירה תדמה לעופר · הנותן אמרי שפר: ואמר הראנו · ואל תניאנו: בענין שנ׳ הראיני · את מראיך השמיעיני: את קולך כי קול[ך] תפל · ומראך אופל: ויחפש ויוציא *חטאנו · ולקרותה הטינו[3]: ויאמר ראו כי הוא על שמו · ואין לאחר עמי: ונשבע כי מלבו בדאה · ומקרבו הוציאה: עניתיו קראנה · עדנו מפיך ונשמענה: ולא הבין בה מילה אחת · אבל החשיך תארה ושחת: ואומר לו כמה שבועות תשבע לשקר · לא דין לך ולא עקר: הלא היא פליפת סניא נהור · ואתה חמור: והוא בכל זאת לא יתעלם · ולא יבוש[4] ולא יכלם: ולא יבריחנו בן[5] קשת · ולא ידע עול בושת: ועד באתי ביום אחר לבית הכנסת · והויא יושב על הכסת: והוא ישפוך מבטנו כקיתון · ויפתח יי את פי האתון: ויען והוא מסבר · כי חיילים יגבר: וענינות יבאר · ולא יפאר ויאמר כמתפאר: שמעו אחים ורעים · הלא עבדכם מן הרעים · ולא מן הרועים · ויענו כל השומעים · אף מן החטאים והרשעים: אמת כן דברת · אך הפעם לא שיקרתה: ואומר אוי לך מגולם · לא תפריש בין קמץ לחלם: לא תדע אלא ישיבת המצבה · ותקרא ראש ישיבה · ואתה זקן אשמה וחובה: אין אתה באמת · אלא ראש כלב מת: ומה אספר מתועבותיו · ורוע נתיבותיו: ושבועותיו השקרים · אשר לא נחקרים: כי הם ידועים לכל

[1] MS. זק. [2] So MS.; הנה? [3] So MS.; perhaps חסינו ולקרותה הכינו.
[4] Repeated in MS. [5] MS. בין.

רחוק וקרוב · שלא ימנו ולא יספר מרוב: ומושבו מושב לציים · וכל מעשיו מעשה פריצים: והוא בכל זאת לא יחפיר ולא ילבין · כסום כפרד אין הבין: אבל באילו הימים · הנאהבים והנעימים · היו תאומים: כי יצא חוטר מגזעו · ויצא טבעו ברשעו: והוליד בן פריץ כמותו · וכצלמו וכדמותו: ויינק חמת תנינים בשפע · כי משרש נחש יצא צפע: וילמוד דרכיו · וילך במהלכיו: כהיום וכאתמול · ולא סר ימין ושמאל: אבל הוסיף ולא חיסר · עד [ש]לא השיג[1] האב ממנו המעשר: והוא (מכל) צד ברשעותו עומד · עד בא האב ללמד[2] ונמצא למד: ויאמר לאביו אני אתמוך ידיך · ואחזק במשרה מצעדיך · הנני עמך כנפשך ואשר יצא ממיעיך הוא יירשיך: וישמח האב בחמודו · יראו עיניו כידו:

ובראותם כי המלך [מלך] צדק · מחזיק הברק [ומסיר החרק]: מעביר הפחד · ולא יקח שוחד · וימסרו בכל היהודים יחד: ולקחו מועצות וירעו · חכמים המה להרע ולהטיב לא ידעו: ויאמרו הבה נתחכמה להם · ויפול פחדנו[3] עליהם: ויאמרו למלך ולשרים · כי אויבי המלך היהודים מעזרים: ויחבאום[4] בבתיהם · ומאתם לחמיהם[5] ומימיהם: ובגלל שהודענו למלך דברים כדי לדרשם ולחקרם: קמו עלינו כולם מקטנם עד[6] גדולם · ויאמר המלך הן עם אחד ושפה אחת לכולם: וזה החלם [לעשות] ועתה לא יבצר מהם · כל אשר יזמו לקמיהם[7]: כתבו לזה שישוב למקומו[8] · ויהיה עין למלך בעמו: ויירא[9] העם יראה גדולה · ונמלאו[10] מתניהם חלחלה: וימסרו אחרי זאת בידו שנתים · וימס לבב העם ויהי למים:

ויהי מקץ שנתים ימים · בשוב יי את שיבת ציון היינו[11] כחולמים: כי אמרנו[12] השר שעזרו הלך לארץ הצבי · (אמרנו) אולי ננצל מידו כצבי: ואנחנו עת ממהרים · ועת מאחרים: קם בנו הרשע העקש[13] · לפח ולמוקש · כי תואנה הוא מבקש: ולקח שלשה אנשים · יהודים גרים ורשים: ויאמר לאשר על בית המלך · המושל בכל הפלך: הלא אילו המורדים · אשר החביאו היהודים: ויבואו מארץ רחוקה לארץ מצרים · ויכלכלום לחם ומים: ויכם ויאסרם בנחשתים וימותו בבור[14] שנים: ושאר הקהל חייהם נצמתים · כי אמרו[15] כולנו מ(ת)ים: מיד קמו ולא התמהמהו · [ו]בספרי תורות[16] החרימוהו: אב[17] ובנו באלה ובברית · תהא אחריתם להכרית: ועמדו והפילו שנים יהודים

[1] So H *e*; W. השיב. [2] O ללמוד. [3] *e* פחדינו. [4] *e* ויחביאום.
[5] H לחם; O ומאיתם. [6] H ועד. [7] H לעישות בקמיהם. [8] H על מקומו.
[9] *e* ויראו. [10] *e* ונתמלאו. [11] *e* היו. [12] *e* H ראינו. [13] *e* והעקש.
[14] H proposes [ימים]ב. [15] H supplies [רו]אמ. [16] *e* תורה.
[17] *e* האב.

אחרים · ואמרו אילו מכלל המחביאים[1] הצרים: ובראות הרב רבינו יצחק · יהי שמו לעולם ובספר חיים יוחק: (ו)כי כבד מאד המשא והאלהים נסה[2] · והנגע כי פשה · וידע את כל אשר נעשה: (ו)חם לבבו כאש בוערה · ויאמר אהה זו כלייה גמורה · ויצעק[3] צעקה גדולה ומרה: ויאמר זו רעה[4] חולה · מה אעשה לעם סגולה · עתה כמעט (י)אבדו בגולה · ויחרד יצחק חרדה גדולה: ויצא בתוך העיר מבוהל · ויקבוץ את כל הקהל: ויאמר דעו כי עצם הכאב וכבד · קראו צום ושפכו[5] דם לב וכבד · אולי יתעשת האלהים לנו ולא נאבד: שמעו אחי וכל המוני · עשו תשובה לשוכן מעוני · נחפשה דרכינו ונחקורה ונשובה עד יי: נתחנן אליו ברחשינו ונשפוך לפניו נפשנו · כי הוא טרף וירפאנו יך ויחבשנו: חזקו ידידים וידיכם אל תרפנה · [כי הוא יכאיב ויחבש ימחץ וידיו תרפנה: כי] דעו כי זה [ה]שטן מפגיע · לא ישקיט[6] ולא ירגיע · עד [אשר] חפציו יגיע · צומו וקולכם במרום להשמיע · עת צרה [היא] ליעקב וממנה יושע: רוצו ידידים ואל תערוצו · חזקו ידים רפות וברכים כושלות אמצו: אף אני עליכם צמתי ואפר רבדתי · ובכן אבוא אל המלך אשר לא כדת וכאשר אבדתי אבדתי: ויענוהו הדבר עד מאד קשה· התפלל בעדינו וממנו אל תחשה · רק יהיה יי אלהיך עמך כאשר היה עם משה: נחו משכים בחבליך · בזכותך ויופי מפעליך · הנה כל דבר ממהר אליך · ע[י]ני כל ישראל עליך: ראה כי הסיר נפוח · ועליך תלואות כל נפש ורוח: אולי זכותך יהיה עלינו סרוח · ויצא יצחק לשוח: והשקיף ברחמיו הבורא · ועשה למען חסידו הירא · כי ביצחק יקרא: וישמע לתפלתו · ולא ישחית נחלתו · כי יעקב בחר לו יה ישראל לסגולתו: והציל עמו מדוחק · ושם רשעים מחק · ויברך אלהים את יצחק: שלומותיו יגביר האל · ויחיש בימיו הגואל · תחת אשר קנא[7] לאלוהיו ויכפר על בני ישראל:

ובבואם לפני המלך · משען לכל הלך והחלך: הודיעוהו ענינם ומצפונם · אמר אני אסירם מעליכם · הקהילו אלי את כל זקני שפטכם · ושוטריכם שובו אלי ואשובה אליכם: ושבנו אליו ושמע לקולינו · והסיר חרפתם מעלינו: ושבו בבושה וכלימה · ועשינו בהם נקמה · ונפלו בלא קימה · ולא היתה להם תקומה: ועמדנו ובשמותא[8] שנית החרמנו · חסדי יי כי לא תמנו: ובזה העינין שוררתי · ושיר חדש עור[רתי][9]: אהה לזמן הנחותיו חשכן · וישמחותיו באנחותיו הפכן: וטובותיו ברעתיו דחפן · וכוסותיו ברוש פתן מסכן · והוליך כל ימותיו הנעימים אחורנית ועיות מהלכן: וזה דרכו אבל

[1] H e המחבאים. [2] d e נשא. [3] e ויצחק. [4] MS. H רועה.
[5] H וישפכו. [6] H ישקוט. [7] MS. קנה. [8] MS. ובשמותם.
[9] On margin ה.

הוסיף תלאות בכל שבר ושוד לא אעריכן: מסרנו ביד רועה אויל וחמור נוער להושיבו בדוכן: שמו זוטא אשר חטא והחטא וכל ארחות מתועבות דרכן: והחשך בפניו שף מעונו והאופל בעיניו נחשכן: ולא[1] יביט בפניו האפלים ולו בפני מאורות החשיכן: ולו בקש יהיה רועה אתונות אזי בו מאנו להיות נסיכן: ולו יהיה בכלבי הכשבים אזי בו מאסו להיות בתוכן: ובא לקח במסרותו למסרת קהילות אלו להרג משכן: והוליך בן פריץ חיות בצלמו וכדמותו וידיו הוא סמכן: עלי ראשו[2] יחילון דמי נפשות נקיים ששפכן · ודמו כי בדמים יחזיקום ידי מלכות ויושיבון עלי כֵּן: והשיב אל עלי ראשם עמלם וכתנין עלי עקב נשכן: והוא עשה לרב יצחק צחוק עם קהלותיו ובצלליו סַבכן: והסיר מעלי שבמם חרפות ורגליהן במעגליו תמכן: וחברתי מגלה זו בענין ימי פורים ומגילת ממוכן · ושירה זו תהי לעד ערוכה בפי שרים ושרות עם חניכן: ועובר זה בעבדו עם ישורון עבדו אל בזה היום כעכן:

תמה ונשלם[3] לבעצהם

אשר יגע וקנה לו ספרים ולבו מאשר בם ריק[4] וריקם:
בפסח אשר חקק עלי[5] קיר דמות רגל ובא לקום ולא קם:
ושלום

י דוֹ דאב יהפך לשמחה אתקח לשטרות מצרים
מבלה נר[6]

APPENDIX I.

Origin and Growth of the Nagid Dignity.

Dr. A. Berliner, in his German essay (in *Magazin für die Wissenschaft des Judenthums*, 1888, p. 50 sqq.), says that the *Targum* of the *Haftorah* for פסח gives this title to Joshua; and then it occurs as the title for Samuel hal-Levi at Granada (eleventh century). In a chronicle recently published from a unique MS. in the

[1] MS. ולו. [2] *e* ראש וראש אביו. [3] MS. ושלום.

[4] See Graetz, *Blumenlese* (לקט שושנים), Breslau, 1862, p. 33 ב. MS. רק. These two lines are attributed to Samuel han-Nagid, of Granada, Graetz, *op. cit.*, p. vii (? of Egypt).

[5] Graetz read אלי.

[6] Dr. Friedländer, to whom I owe various suggestions for the difficult and corrupted text, gives the following reading: נשלם בין מצרים ד׳ אב יהפך לשמחה אתקח לשטרות הקצב להגר, i. e. Wednesday, the fourth of the month Ab, 1508 Sel. = 1196 A. D. = 592 of the Hejra.

Episcopal Library of Toledo, in the *Mediaeval Jewish Chronicles*, II (Clarendon Press, 1895, *Anecdota Oxoniensia*), p. 129, we find that a R. Paltiel bore that title in the time of al-Moez, who became king of Egypt in 959 A.D. This seems to agree with Sambari's *Chronicle* (*op. cit.*, I, p. 115), where he says that the *Nagid* dignity was instituted in the year 366 Hej. or 745 Sel. (the MS. belonging to the Alliance Israélite Universelle, Paris, read 748)=970 A.D. Sambari, however, is wrong in saying that At-Taya, Caliph of Bagdad, had married his daughter to a king of Egypt. My friend Professor D. S. Margoliouth drew my attention to the passage of Ibn el-Athir (VIII, p. 521), where it is said that the Caliph of Bagdad with the name عضد الدولة married in 369 Hej. a daughter of the king of Egypt. The correct reading in Sambari would be עצד אלדולה, which the scribes altered into עצר אלדולה; indeed the Paris MS. of Sambari has עצר both times. Paltiel was followed by his son Samuel (*Chronicles*, II, p. 130). Whether a son of Samuel succeeded we cannot say.—We know from a document brought to light by Mr. E. N. Adler, during his recent visit to Cairo, that there was a נגיד with the name of Judah who was a celebrated physician, probably towards the end of the eleventh century, or perhaps earlier (see E. N. Adler, *The Jewish Chronicle*, February 21, 1896, p. 18, and Document I further on, p. 556). He is perhaps identical with Judah הנשיא, son of Josiah הנשיא, who was a descendant of king David, came from Damascus to Egypt and became the נגיד (see Sambari's *Chronicle*, p. 133, l. 11; ed. Berliner, p. 32, l. 2 from below). We shall not take notice of Judah Hasid, mentioned in the *Mittheilungen aus der Sammlung der Papyrus Erzherzog Rainers*, I, p. 126 sqq., although we agree with our friend, A. Epstein (*Revue des Études Juives*, XXV, p. 227 sqq.), that this letter was addressed to Egypt and not to Babylon, as Professors D. H. Müller and D. Kaufmann think; for there is a difference between Judah חסיד and Judah נגיד.—There is a Nagid mentioned with the name of Meborakh, son of Seadyah the physician (see Document III), but no date is given, or it is missing[1]. Judah Nagid or Meborakh, according to

[1] In the next number of the REVIEW, I hope to give a document in which Meborakh is mentioned, who seems to be identical with our *Nagid*, although this title is not given to him.

their respective dates, was followed by Mordecai. Mordecai preceded Samuel. That Mordecai was a נגיד results from the fragment we have concerning him in the *Megillah* (see above, p. 545, ll. 11 to 16). Possibly our Mordecai may be identical with Mordecai בן אלחרביה, to whom an anonymous poet dedicates a poem of which only a part is preserved (see the periodical החלוץ III (1856), 153), for the following reasons: (1) The poet addresses him as נגיד עם אל, which is exclusively an Egyptian title, and sometimes in Spain, but not in Bagdad, as the late Prof. Graetz (*Geschichte der Juden*, vii (2nd ed.), p. 462) tries to identify him with Saad ad-Daulah, minister at the Mongolic Court. Here the title of נשיא was usually if not exclusively employed. (2) The incomplete poem says in the second line that Mordecai left the prison, and was treated with great honour when liberated. This point, Prof. Graetz says, is not known as concerning Saad ad-Daulah, in spite of the extended history of Saad given by Musulman writers. It is true that Makrizi does not mention this fact in his history of Egypt, but he does not give extended facts concerning the Jews. But it seems that the lines on p. 545 allude to some kind of disgrace inflicted by the king on Mordecai, which might have been mentioned in the lacuna, marked in the text, p. 545, l. 11. Moreover, to judge from the superscription, he had to do with the Sultan's finances.—Mordecai was succeeded by Samuel, son of Hanayah, who was still alive in the year 1468 Sel. = 1157 A.D., according to a document in the possession of Mr. E. N. Adler; see Document III (p. 557). The Bodleian Library possesses a leaf which contains the end of a קינה concerning his death, but has no date (see Document IV, p. 558), but it is certain that he died before 1171, otherwise Benjamin of Tudela would have mentioned him. We shall not here discuss whether he is the author of the מבוא התלמוד or not, and whether he came from Spain or not, but we must ask Dr. Berliner whether by mentioning *as Nagid* Abraham the son of Maimonides after Samuel, he means that the dignity was not filled up in the interval. I suppose that is the case, and in that he follows the authority of Sambari's *Chronicle*. On the other hand, the late Professor Graetz is sure that Nethanel, who is mentioned by Benjamin of Tudela, was the נגיד after Samuel. But among all the qualities which Benjamin attributes to Nethanel, he does not mention the word נגיד; he says (about 1171 A.D.) concerning Fostat, וביניהם רבי נתנאל

שר השרים ראש הישיבה והוא ראש לכל הקהלות מצרים להקים רבנים וחזנים . . . . We have an earlier date in which R. Nethanel is mentioned. In a marriage contract, dated Fostat, in Egypt, the 23 Adar I, 1471 Sel.= 1160 A.D., published by Prof. A. Merx with facsimile and transcription, p. 39 of his *Documents Paléographiques Hebraïques et Arabes*, 1894, we read the following: להדרת יקרת צפירת תפארת כבוד גדולת קדושת מרא ורבא אדונא גאונא נתנאל הלוי ראש ישיבה של גולה ירום הודו ויגדל כבודו . . . ; and further on we read רשותיה דהדרת יקרת צפירת תפארת כבוד גדולת קדושת מרא ורבא יחיד הדור ארי התורה . . . . Benjamin omits the epithet הלוי, whilst the two documents do not mention the epithet הנגיד. Was it abolished for a time? It seems that that was the case, for in our מגילה Maimonides' influence is greatly praised, whilst there is no mention of the נגיד. Indeed, as we have already said, Sambari makes Abraham Maimonides follow Samuel: Abraham could not be the direct successor of Samuel, who was contemporary of Judah Halevi (1141 A.D.). Possibly Nethanel would not accept the title of נגיד in the face of Moses Maimonides, to whom, as we know, it was offered, and he refused it. Perhaps Nethanel was the *locum tenens* of the *Nagid* during the life of Moses Maimonides. It seems that in the century the early נגידים became eclipsed by Maimonides, since none was mentioned in the prayer for the dead recited on the Day of Atonement, according to a fragment in the Bodleian Library (not classed yet), which seems to be part of a prayer-book for the feast-days (see Document V). Less plausible would it be to suspect that the writer of the *Megillah*, having been in friendly relations with the Maimonides family, would not associate Moses Maimonides and Nethanel. There is a document in the Bodleian Library, MS. Hebrew *c.* 3, fol. 6, a deed which contains a transaction of property between the son of a son of Abraham ben Hillel, אלשיך אבן אסחק אלבוארי בן אלשיך סיד אלאהל נ"ע כבוד מר אברהם בר הלל נ"ע, dated [the day blank] Tebeth 4974 A.M. and 1525 Sel.= 1214 A.D. To complete the mention of Nethanel, we shall state that in a MS. of the Bodleian Library, Hebrew *a.* 2, fol. 16, there is a letter by אלשיך אבו סעיד כנ"ג מרור חלפון הלוי היקר הנבון וטרח בר כנ"ג נתנאל הלוי הזקן הנכבד נ"ע. Finally, on the back of a leaf (the property of Mr. E. N. Adler), which contains four lines of Deut. ii. 25–28 (without vowel-points, paper), we read as follows: (these words crossed through) הק זה התיק עם ספר שבו כנ"ג מר ורב

(torn off) כבוד גדולת קד. Further on we read על שם אחיו כבוד גדולת קדושת מרנא ורבנא אלעזר קד (torn off) מר׳ ור׳ נתנאל שנת אתקכה, followed by ואת Deut. iii. 29. The date 1528 Sel.= 1217 A.D. This date is rather too late for our Nethanel. Anyhow the dignity of נגיד is nowhere attached to him. For a similar reason also, the identity of our Nethanel with the physician Hibet Allah ibn al-jami, physician of the Caliph Aladhid, and later on of Saladin, suggested by the lamented Professor Graetz (*Geschichte der Juden*, VI, 2nd ed., p. 284), is doubtful, for Nethanel is never called "physician," an epithet which no one would forget to mention, more especially for the physician of a monarch. While on this subject I should like to mention another fragment in the possession of Mr. E. N. Adler, which begins: *b*. Leviticus without vowel-points; we read on *a*. פתח אהל מועד [חזק] לשיך הבה אללה.

The list of the *Negidim* is probably the following :—

Paltiel.
Samuel his son, his grandson ?.
Judah. } or *vice versa*.
Meborakh. }
Mordecai.
Samuel, son of Hananiah.
Substitute ? Nethanel, but in reality Moses Maimonides.
Abraham, son of Moses Maimonides.

APPENDIX II.

Sar Shalom.

In MSS. Heb. *a*. 2, fol. 9, and in another miscellaneous MS. not yet classified, we find mentioned the premises of Sar Shalom hal-Levi, the dates 1185 and 1189 are given. We give only the text of one of them: בתרי בשבה דהוא תמניסר ימי לירח טבת שנת אלפא וארבע מאה ותשעין ושית שנין לשטרות בפסטאט מצרים דעל נילוס נהרא מותבה רשותיה דאדונינו גאונינו שר שלום הלוי נאון יהי שלום לעולם בן הוה אירם . . . Sar Shalom is not a very usual name, and the date suits our personage of that name, but the epithet of לוי would be against the identity. Besides, a Gaon or a person so highly esteemed could hardly be so rudely handled as Zuta is. We shall have to wait for other documents, if there are any in existence, before venturing to identify the two.

DOCUMENTS.

I.

[ ] כי יהודה גבר באחיו ולנגיד ממנו וג יהי יי אלהיך ברוך אשר בחר בך
מכל שבטי ישר׳ וישימך לנגיד על עמו ישר׳

יַדיד האל [מעולם ועד עלם יהיה כאור] מפואר בחסידות אשר עלה עלי
כל ונכבדים ביראת (אל) מעשים מאושרים

הַלא נוד[ע] צעדהו חכמה עזרו עוז ובימין רוממה ׳׳ ליתחכם בתעלומה
ברוב בינה ושכל מפוארים

וְשמו אב לכל חכמי רפאות ונמנה ראש לכל מבין פלאות והוא רופא
לעצמות יבישות וחובש לכל לבבות נשברים

דְבריו הם מרפא לכל חולה והוא דורש ופני אל מחלה דבר האל יהיה ולא
יבלה וכל רשום ונכתב בספרים

הַמוני עם בשבח אל הודו והרבו שיר לנשגב ביחודו אשר בחר בנגיד זה
לעבדו והעצימו ועלה בגברים

הַכמוהו בכל מחוז ופלך ואח[ריו] אין בדרכיו [הל]ך וכי הוא ש׳׳ וצר׳׳
הוא משלך לנח [injured] רים

נַפשי בו [injured] היו ׳׳׳׳ ונגיד לכל גויה אלוה [injured] שאילה
לשמריהו לשנות דור דורים

גָדול דורים ונודע בשערים ומיבין כל סתדים וידיו נעזרים הלא עלה

יְחי ויזכה ונינו אז יחכה לגדולה ולישע יזכה ובו יקום אשר כל מחכה
לגאולה וקיבוץ נפזרים

דְברי אל יהיו לעולמים אשר דבר הלא הם בקיומים ולקחום עמים והביאום
להר מרום הרים

חָזו וראו זְמן קץ אשר נעלם ובינו בין בחזון אשר גלם חזון חמודות יהיה
וגם ישלם וכל סתום ונחתם בדברים

II.

יפיפית מבני אדם הוצק חן בשפתותיך וג
יצר סמוך תצר׳ שלום שלום כי בך בטוח:
שלום האציל האדיר יועצם תמיד והברכות לו יעמיד האל יו׳ כי ידבר שלום
אל חסידיו עושי רצונו מבטלי[1] רצונם מפני רצונו מייחלי טובו וחסדו כגון אשר

[1] MS. מבטבלי.

הוא הולך תמים ופועל צדק ודובר אמת וכול הולך צדקות ודובר
משרים וכל מדות
השבח בו קשורים הוא כבוד גדולת קדושת מרנו ורבנו אדוננו ועטרת
ראשנו מבורך
אלוף הבינות חכם הישיבה סנהדרא רבא שר השרים עוז כל בית
ישראל נגיד עם
יי אלהים ישמרהו ויחייהו ויברכהו וישוה עליו הוד והדר ויגדל כבודו
בישועתו
לתתו עליו לשם לתהלה ולתפארת יותר על ז[את ו]כזאת בן כבוד גד
קד מר ור סעדיה
הרופא ימצא מנוחה במלונו יעלזו חסידים בכבוד ישא אדוננו הנגיד
ברכה מאת יי וג וקידה וגחן והשתחויה ונשיקת יד מצעירו נרצעו
הנכסף לראות
יפעתו הנוגהת הזוהרת הנוהרת כאור הנוגה כזוהר הרקיע כצאת השמש
בגבורתו
יאריך ימים ושנות חיים בימי העץ וכחול ירבה ימים לקיים עליו והיה
כעץ שתול (cut off) כח הזקנה ותשות

On the recto is the following address (right margin cut) :—

. . ד גדלת קדשת מרנו ו־בנו אדוננו כליל תפארתנו מבורך אלוף
הבינות חכם הישיבה סנהדרא רבא
. . עוז כל בית ישראל נגיד עם יי ישמרו כאישון בת
עין ובצל כנפיו יסתירהו בן כב גד קד
[סעד]יה הרופא החכם והנבון נבע שלום רב יגיע אלקאהרה
אלמחרוסה בלעז אלדאים ישע יקרב

III.

1 בשעה מעלה ועונה מהוללה ושמחה וצהלה וחדוה וגילה . . לה ומילוי
כל שאלה
2 לאדוננו השר הגדול הנעלה נגיד הגולה ירום הודו מעלה מעלה
לחתן ולכלה
הנקהלה ישישו וישמחו יציצו ויפרחו יבנו ויצליחו . . ויצליחו לירח
ניסן דשנת אלפ[א ארבע] מאה ושתין ותמניא לשט[רות]

IV.

ועל כתם טוב שַׁשַּׁנָה והועם אעשה
על בוחר בדרכי ישרים · אשר יפל
וגם הובל לקברים · אעשה
על אומר תפלות לפני אל
ועושה צדקה לעם האל · אעשה
על דורש טוב לתמה ויונה ·
אבכה במר ואשא קינה · אעשה
על נגידים ומעשיו בחסד [יש]ועות ·
[injured] ועיני יזלו דמעות · אעשה
עליך ותם וגומל חסד לְמָכִים
אקונן במר ועיני למותו בוכים · אעשה
על טהור וצדיק נאסף לנוחו
יבוא שלום וגם ילך נכוחו · אעשה
תהי נפשך שמואל נגיד דורו ·
צרורו תוך צרור חיים פני צורו · אעשה

V.

כי נגידים · זקני איומה · אשר הוציאו לאור תעלומה · והוסיפו ביאור כדת קדומה · בברית שעל לוח לבם חתומה · להעמיד יסודי הדת על תלם · המה הגיבורים אשר מעולם · ועל גאוני ישראל הנעימים · הקדושים והתמימים שעמדו אחריהם · ונראה כבוד יי אליהם · אשר נשאם לבבם לקרבה אל המלאכה לעשות אותה · חכמות נשים בנת ביתה · הראשונים מהם והאחרונים · והחסידים הנבונים · אשר ירדו לגנים ולקטו שושנים · ובעשותם רצונך שוכן שמים · עזרתם עד שהעלו מים התלמוד לשמיו המרבצים מהם והדורשים מקור חכמה מאור עינינו ארי שבחבורה · כרב אשי דהוא בתרא אדונינו הרב רבינו יצחק בר כבוד ר׳ יעקב זכר צדיקים לתחיה ולברכה הוא וכל מיתי משפחתו דאיפטרו מן עלמא הדין ועל כבוד מעין החכמות · ומעין השלמות ונזר התמימות וזה הצדק ומכון האמת בדעתו הרחבה · ונפשו הנדיבה · המסתופפת לחסות בצל עליון פלגי מים בציון · שמעה ותשמח ציון · אשר החיה הנפשים · באוסף הנטוש׳ם · יועץ וחכם חרשים · אשר הביא ידי במסורת הברית · חן על פליטת השארית · ושם להם תקוה ואחרית · בעל חמדות הגבוהים והמעלות הנגוהים · משה איש האלהים · נר מערב ·

ואור מזרח · צדיק כתמר יפרח · עמוד התוך · אשר בית ישראל נשען עליו · בשמעו את הקול מדבר אליו · כל כבוד גדולת קדושת גאוננו מימון · ועל כבוד גדולת קדושת העניו החסיד מרינו ורבינו אברהם בנו · ועל כבוד הדרת פנת יקרת מרינו ורבינו עובדיה בן בנו החסיד · ושאר מיתי משפחתו דאיפטרו מן עלמא הדין · רוח יי תניחם · ובהקיצם תשיחם · ועל כבוד הנפש הישרה · הזכה והטהורה · אשר דבקה בחייה בכשרון · תשחק ליום אחרון · אשר שגתה באהבת אלהיה · ושמה יראתו מעיליה · ורחצה וסכה · ושמת שלמתו עליה · ככלה תעדה כליה · ביתרון דעת החכמה · תחיה בעליה · ורדפה האמת וחמדה יריעותיו · וגנזכיו ובתיו ועליותיו · ותיעבה[1] מחנות השקר והשוא · ודרכה שבילי היושר והשו[2] · כבוד הרב הקדוש מרינו ורבינו אליעזר הדיין אשר תורת אל בלבו · ויי אלהיו עמו ותרועת מלך בו · שנהרג על יחוד שמך בשיחו · לא כהתה עינו ולא נס לחה · הנחמד והנחשק והזבוד הנגנז תחת כסא הכבוד · ועל כבוד כלל מיתי הקהל חקדוש הזה ישמרם שוכן מעונם · מגדולם ועד קטנם · אנשים מהם ונשים · יחד כראשים ברשים · ועל כבוד רבותי ומרי · אשר האירו מאורי · והחיו פנרי · והכשירו אמרי · והישירו דברי · כבוד ר׳ משה בר יעקב המלמד · וכבוד הרב רבי מנחם · בר כבוד ר׳ יוסף וכבוד הרב ר׳ שלמה בר כבוד ר׳ יצחק יגונם האל בצל שכינתו · ורוחו תניחם תחת איברתו · ועל כבוד יולדי זכרם לברכה · לחיי העולם הבא · ועל שאר מיתי משפחתינו ועל כבוד שאר מיתי ישראל דאיפטרו מן עלמא הדין קודשא בריך הוא ישרי וישבוק וימחול ויסלח ויכפר לחוביהון ולחובנא ולחובי כל עמיה בית ישראל רוח יי תניחם תהי עמידתם בקרוב ילוה עליהם השלום · ועל מלונם יהי שלום · תזכרנה צדקותם יומחלו כל עונותם · ילינם האלהים במלון נחמד ונחשק עם שבע כתות של צדיקים בגן עדן · שלום שלום יבושרו ויועילם צדקתם ואמונתם וכל מיתינו ומיתיכם ומיתי כל עם יי צבאות בכלל הרחמים והנחמה ואמרו אמן: זמרו אלהים . . .

POSTSCRIPTS.

I.

April 14, 1896.

My essay was in type in February last, for insertion in the April number, but the infirmity of my eyes prevented me from reading

[1] So MS. [2] So MS.

the proofs, and I had to postpone the revision till the present date, when my learned friend S. J. Halberstam, to whom I had sent a copy of this paper, informed me that the Megillah has been published in the גנזי ירושלים, I, pp. 37 to 43, by Rabbi Solomon Aaron Wertheimer of Jerusalem, from the same MS., he believes, as mine. Yes, it is so, for the Jerusalem Rabbi sold it to the Bodleian Library after having taken a copy evidently for publication, without stating the fact when he offered it for sale. The same is the case with the letter of Jonathan of Lunel (גנזי, p. 35), and an item concerning the Jews at Narbonne (ibidem, p. 44), which I have published in the *Mediaeval Jewish Chronicles*, II, p. 251. I may add that this document is not Jonathan's autograph, as Rabbi S. A. Wertheimer believes. The leaves of the Midrash אספה and other *Midrashim*, published by him (see בתי מדרשות, III, p. 8 sqq.), were also sold to the Bodleian Library after copies had been taken from them for publication, without notice being given to the authorities of the Library. My reason for republishing the document is not only by right of precedence, and the wish of the Editors of this QUARTERLY, but also because I have filled up the lacunas in the MS. differently from the Rabbi; moreover, I give the beginning of the document from another fragment, and make use of the fragment published by my friend Dr. Harkavy from a third fragment. Further, our Megillah helped me to the early history of the נגידים, which I give in the appendix with documents, which will enable my successors in this field to enlarge and criticize it. I hope that Rabbi S. A. Wertheimer will continue to bring to light interesting documents as he has done up till now, but that he will remember the saying of the early Rabbis, טוב תורה עם דרך ארץ.

II.

Should Professor Kaufmann's *desideria pia*, concerning a third edition of Sambari's *Chronicle*, "in which my omissions might be supplemented, and a distinct line drawn between that which is borrowed and Sambari's own information" (*J. Q. R.*, VIII, p. 512), be realized, may I be permitted to draw his attention to the existence of another MS. in the possession of the Alliance Israélite Universelle in Paris? I mentioned this fact to Dr. Berliner, when he asked my permission to reprint Sambari's *Chronicle* from the

Mediaeval Jewish Chronicles, I. This MS. was lately lent to me by the kindness of M. Bigart, Secretary of the Alliance. It is defective at the end (from השׁשׁי, p. 82, l. 12), but has the missing pages of the Bodleian MS. (see Catalogue, No. 2410), of which a photograph was made and inserted in it. I had no time, and moreover the state of my sight would not allow me to collate it throughout. The few variations I saw by accident are the following: (edition Berliner) page 1, l. 2 עצר for נצר (see above, p. 552); l. 3 ותשפח (above, p. 552); l. 6 שבבבל; l. 7 מאה; l. 10 על כל for בכל.—Page 2, l. 8 זהו מה שהם נוהגים; l. 3 from below, אין for לא היו.—Page 3, l. 6 כתיבת יד ישן; l. 7 כזה for בזה; l. 9 דלך for דלקי.—Page 82, l. 3 אלאשקי for אלאשקאר.

The title is the following: ספר דברי יוסף אשר חבר ואסף את שלשלת הרבנים מסוף רבנן סבוראי עד היום ובכללם דברי ריבות ומריבות ומאורעו' רבות ורעות והנסים והנפלאות שנעשו לאבותינו בימים ההם משנת ארבעה אלפים ושלש מאות ושנים ושמונים ליצירה עד שנתינו זאת שהיא שנת הושיענו ונושעה (1677 A.D.) ליצירה פה מצרים

Ed. Oxford, p. 150, l. 8 (ed. Berliner, p. 62, line 3 from bottom), the Paris MS. has as follows: עשן . . . לפק ועתה נתחיל לכתוב דברי ריבות · מלחמות וקרבות · ברמחים וכחורבות · בשוקים וברחו בית אשר נפלו

III.

My learned friend, S. J. Halberstam, suggests that Judah Nagid (p. 552) succeeded Samuel (p. 553), according to Sambari, and that he was preceded by Abraham Maimonides. Sambari, however, takes no heed of chronology. If Judah had followed Samuel, an allusion would have been made in the Megillah (p. 546) to the supposed נגיד in connexion with Samuel's death and Maimonides' arrival.

A. Neubauer.

SOME REMARKS ON SAMARITAN LITERATURE AND RELIGION[1].

THE question has often been put to me, "Who are the Samaritans? Is their religion Jewish, Christian, or Mahometan?" Perhaps this paper may serve, though inadequately, as an answer to that question. There is no need to tell you of the origin of the Samaritan people: to inquire what remnant of the ten tribes remained after the deportation by Shalmaneser: to discuss the attitude of Jewish teachers, at one time regarding them as little, if at all, better than heathen, at another, as only one degree removed from true righteousness. To a gathering like this, such matters would be like twice-told tales. It may, however, be of interest to give a cursory description of the later development of this isolated remnant, or, if you like, of its decay and the causes of it. Until recently it was possible to say little on these points except from outside evidence, which, however valuable, is always inadequate when taken alone. But within the last half century, or less, considerable material has come to light, though it has been little used. First there is the chronicle of Abulfath, in Arabic, and the less valuable book of Joshua, also in Arabic. Secondly, and most important, the chronicle called Eltholideh in Samaritan, discovered and published by my revered teacher and friend, Dr. Neubauer. Thirdly, the large mass of liturgies. From these sources it is possible to obtain a very clear view of their history and beliefs; and so, even in this remote corner of research as

[1] A lecture delivered to the Jews' College on March 1, 1896.

elsewhere, the discoveries of our own day seem to eclipse all that went before. But for European scholars until the beginning of the seventeenth century, the only information accessible, outside the Bible, was that furnished by Jewish writers, Christian Fathers, and to a small extent by Arabic authors. Now neither Jews nor Christians were disposed to feel any strong interest in Samaritans; and any one who has had to work at mediaeval records knows the shameless manner in which statements are copied, or shall we say, the trustful, childlike way in which historians bow to authority. The mediaeval writer seems to say: "It's a long way off, and it ought to have been so, and any way I cannot be expected to know everything." It seems clear that the Church Fathers at any rate repeated and copied statements with regard to Samaritan doctrine, which, though they might once have been true, had ceased in course of time to be so. But there was no fresh source of information, and they were bound to furnish explanations, because of the frequent mention of Samaritans, especially in the New Testament. Hence we are told, for instance, that they worship a dove, that their God is Ashima, that they believe neither in angels nor in a future life. Whatever may have been the facts originally, to take this account without question as representing them, say, in the sixteenth century, was about as reasonable as when a writer of that date refers to Tacitus as an authority for the character of the Germans of his time. In fact it was still the age of authority: the spirit of inquiry, of testing facts, had yet to come.

But it is ungrateful as well as impolitic to kick down the ladder by which we have climbed, although from our exalted position at the top we are inclined to look down upon the harmless, necessary bottom rung, and so we must give credit to the great man who first introduced the subject. It was at the beginning of the seventeenth century—to be precise, in 1616—that Pietro della Valle, on his travels, procured at Damascus a copy of the Samaritan text of the

Pentateuch and their Targum, which he piously deposited in the Vatican Library. (He certainly deserves the gratitude of scholars, for it was he who also brought to Europe the first cuneiform inscription, although no results followed for two centuries.) These two texts were published in the Paris polyglott, and thence copied in Walton's polyglott with a (very inadequate) translation, and so made accessible. Naturally they made a stir, and the controversy respecting them has not even yet subsided. Consider the question as it presented itself to the learned world of that time. The history of the Masoretic text was known and accepted with all deference. Here comes a totally distinct recension, preserved by a tribe who admittedly had had no dealings with the Jews. It contained no evidence of the peculiar views attributed to the Samaritans, and therefore could not be an heretical counterfeit. Yet it showed some important differences of reading. Which was to be considered the inspired word of God? The most extreme views were taken; one side claiming all authority for the new text, others as strongly rejecting it. Perhaps the most reasonable view is that of Kennicott, that both texts must be examined, and the differences weighed on their merits. The question was for a time closed by Gesenius' investigations, but his results were by no means final, and there seems now to be a disposition to reopen it. Certainly I am not required to settle it here. When a really critical edition of the Samaritan text appears, it will be more possible to judge of its value. At any rate as a factor in textual criticism, and as awakening interest in the subject, its importance in the seventeenth century is not to be easily overrated. As to the Targum, it is (at least to me) a most interesting document, perhaps the more so from the difficulty of finding good MSS. to settle the text. Various views have been held as to its date and origin, the Samaritans themselves claiming that it was written by one Nathanael in the first century B.C. The real fact seems to be that no Targum was built in a day, nor probably by

one author. The same causes which led to the elaboration of Targum in Judah produced it in Samaria. Probably it was read in the synagogue; otherwise one cannot suppose it would be much read at all. But I know of no statement to that effect in the literature, and the only service in which it definitely appears is that for marriage, when the passage ואזל גבר [1] is read. This, however, is only a semi-religious ceremony, and partakes more of the nature of a festive occasion, a fact which would seem to indicate that Targum was not commonly read. However that may be, I cannot help thinking, from its frequent agreement with Onqelos, that both works had a similar origin, namely, that they are the fixed form of a floating traditional explanation common to all Syria, and that the line of division between Jews and Samaritans was by no means impassable in the early centuries of our era. I am inclined to think that it was reduced to writing and edited by the fourth century, though that question need not be discussed here. It is likely at any rate that Arabic became the vernacular soon after the Hejira, in which case it would not have been worth while to undertake an Aramaic work of these proportions; and it is certain that the Targum was no longer in common use in the tenth century. When, however, I say it was fixed at that time, the word is only to be understood relatively. The main value of the version does not lie in its exegesis, for it is very close to the text, and gives little information on that head, but consists in its being the earliest and most extensive monument of what may be called *classical* Samaritan, or, shall we say, of Palestinian Aramaic [2]. Now precisely in this respect, as a criterion of correct forms, the Targum text is by no means *fixed*. It has indeed been elaborately and carefully edited by Petermann and Vollers, but an examination of

[1] Exod. ii. 1.

[2] For comparative purposes the Palestinian Syriac forms are important. See the fragments published by Messrs. Gwilliam, Burkitt, and Stenning, in *Anecdota Oxoniensia*, Semitic Series, vol. I, pt. v and pt. ix.

their materials shows that the MSS. represent widely different recensions. All are close to the Hebrew, but differ in forms and even in words. Probably this is in many cases due to local differences of dialect: much may be set down to corruptions, since all the MSS. date from a time when Aramaic was as much a dead language as Hebrew. Moreover, in treating a dialect so little known as this, comparison is the only sound method. It is of no use to make up one's mind beforehand what ought to be the form, as the usual practice has been, but to try to discover what, as a matter of fact, it was. Yet the most important aid for this purpose was hardly available for Petermann's edition. The only literature of at all the same date as the Targum is that of the earlier liturgy (Marqah and Amram of the fourth century). Even of this there is only at present one MS. (Vaticanus) which is to be trusted for the forms. No edition therefore of the Targum can be satisfactory which does not take account of the forms of the Vatican liturgical MS. This brings me to speak, but only briefly, of the liturgies. They are of great interest, because they present a practically continuous history of doctrine for at any rate the last 1,600 years. The earliest compositions which can be dated with anything like certainty are those of Amram and Marqah—the latter being the more prolific of the two and the most famous of all their authors. According to the chronicle Eltholideh, mentioned above, Marqah lived in the time of Baba Rabba (ob. 362 A.D.). An angel appeared at his birth, and bade his father call the child's name Moses. As, however, this name was too sacred for common use, he was called Marqah, which has the same numerical value. He was of priestly family, though not High Priest. That is all that we are told definitely about him. We may conclude that his family was of some importance, that he was probably intimate with Baba, and that he wrote his hymns and prayers at the request of Baba, who, according to the chronicle, restored the synagogue services. It is note-

worthy too that, just as the miraculous story of his birth seems to indicate that he was called Moses as well as Marqah, so his father, Amram ben Sered, had a by-name Tutah, and his son was called Nanah. There is nothing strange in their having two names, but it is curious that the names have a Roman look: Tutah = Titus, Marqah = Marcus, Nanah = Nonus. This may show that they had dealings with the Romans, or were on friendly terms at least with some Roman family.

The Amram of the liturgies is not clearly identified. I believe him to be the same as Amram ben Sered, the father of Marqah, but the reasons for this belief may be omitted.

To return then, it will be seen that the liturgies are not very ancient, nor have they great literary merit; but they offer the most trustworthy means at our disposal for arriving at a correct understanding of Samaritan theology. I think therefore it may be of interest to you to consider the main characteristics, and some details of the beliefs implied in them. First, it is to be remarked, that the Samaritans represent the strictly conservative side of religion. The foundation of their faith was the same as that recognized in Judaea at the time of the second temple,—the law of Moses; and from the fact that they never received any other of the Jewish canon, the superstructure of religious belief was bound to be slight. Imagine Judaism without the Psalms, without the Prophets! I said before that statements were repeated by the Church Fathers which might once have been true, but had ceased to be so. For instance, they seem to be confounded with the Sadducees (so even by Maqrizi, and perhaps Qirqesani), and in this a basis of fact may be detected. For at the time of the separation, at the second temple, they were recruited and their theology was no doubt formulated, by members of the priestly caste from Jerusalem, who would have belonged to the conservative, or if we may speak of it so early, the Sadducean party. As the twig was bent so the tree grew,

so far as it grew at all. "They did, it is true, modify and enlarge their creed, and that in important particulars, . . . but . . . by the same process of absorption: it was in no sense a development of the religious feeling of the people[1]." Now both of the special properties of man, language and religion, are living organisms; and living implies growth. Judaism and Samaritanism, though starting from the same root, the law of Moses, have this difference: Judaism is ever growing, ever adapting itself to its environment, like Aaron's rod that budded, ever putting forth leaves for the healing of the nations. It lives. Samaritanism is like a tree that is dried up from the root. For a time it seemed to put forth shoots, even flowers. Then it died, and soon it will be cut down and buried. Of course, one cannot assign exact dates to anything so intangible as religious growth, but a more or less definite period may be suggested for it. We have no documents to show the state of their creed in the centuries before our era; but from the fact that we find it pretty fully developed in the fourth century, we must suppose that it had grown in the meanwhile. Even so early as St. John's Gospel, the belief in a Messiah was generally accepted; while in the writings of Marqah the belief e. g. in a future life, in angels, and in the supreme position of Moses, is taken for granted. Here, however, their vitality practically ceased. In the centuries immediately succeeding this Augustan age, so to speak, of Samaritan literature and theology, few writers flourished, and none of them was really great. Possibly the troubles under Zeno and Justinian demanded all their attention, and the nation never recovered from the severe treatment of the latter in 529. Literature was indeed produced subsequently, and in large quantities, but it bears all the marks of a silver age. We know how, in any country, literature will continue to drag its slow length along after the virtue is gone out of it. There are some prayers, in a rather debased Aramaic, of the eleventh

[1] Nutt, *Sketch of Samaritan History*, &c., p. 42.

century, and numerous treatises in Arabic on theological and other subjects in that and the three succeeding centuries. The chronicle of Eltholideh, too, belongs chiefly to the eleventh century. It is to be remarked that this period nearly coincides with Jewish activity in the same direction inaugurated by Saadiah Gaon. The fact is significant; and we can only regret that the Samaritan-Arabic literature is not yet accessible. A still later period of artificial vitality occurred in the fourteenth century, under Pinḥas (Finas) the High Priest. To that date belongs the chronicle of Abulfatḥ in Arabic, and the large mass of prayers and liturgical compositions for special occasions, written in a debased mixture of Hebrew and Aramaic. Since that time the literature is little else than a wearisome reiteration of the thoughts of earlier writers. Now in the fourteenth century, though there was activity, I say it was artificial. There is no real development, no larger view which is not to be found expressed or implied in the fourth century. The only new thing is a certain tendency to mystical and metaphysical doctrines. Who shall say whether or not these are evidence of decay?

With regard to their views, it may be said in general that there is little that is distinctive about them. The question rather is, how much of Jewish religious development they adopted. It will be, perhaps, of most interest if we consider specially those doctrines which, according to early accounts, they did not hold, viz. the future life, and the belief in angels. Remembering that all their theology was originally derived solely from the Pentateuch, let us see how far they advanced. The doctrine, then, of a future life, with rewards and punishments, is founded on Deut xxxii. 35 *seqq.*, with their reading of ליום for לי: so that it reads, "is not this laid up in store with me . . . till the day of vengeance: till the time when their foot shall slide," &c.; and the rest of the song thus has the same reference. The judgment-day is usually called "the day of vengeance and recompense" (יום נקם ושלם) from this passage, or simply

"the day of (the great) judgment." Already in Marqah it is an article of faith, but it is only later that we find any full account of the condition of souls after the judgment. First, the judgment is after death, as in the prayers for the dead, "After thee Death pursues, and the day of judgment after that[1]." "For thy work is stored up with him, sealed in his treasure-houses, against the day of resurrection, day of the solemn reckoning[2]." It is a time of rewards as well as of punishment. On the great day of resurrection there will be great deliverance for believers, who will go to dwell in the Garden of Eden. This side, however, is made less prominent. They insist rather on the fate of the wicked. "Surely a fire shall burn in their heart, and every one of them shall be ashamed of his works, . . . and a voice shall come unto them . . . though ye turn now to your God, yet shall ye be burned with fire[3]." Moses is the only intercessor: "Mourning shall not help the dying; Moses the chosen helpeth him[4]": "by whose prayers the burning fire shall be quenched[5]." Apparently forgiveness is not impossible in the next world: at least there would not otherwise be much point in praying for the dead,— "Pardon, O Lord, him who is taken away from this world and departs: grant him mercy as his portion, and his place in the Garden of Eden[6]."

With regard to angels the case is quite as clear. True Reland[7] maintained that angels had no place in Samaritan theology, and explained them away as "virtutes Dei." Yet all his ingenuity will not annul the fact that they do appear in the Pentateuch, and that therefore Samaritans were bound to accept them in some form. The contrary statement, as mentioned before, rested on a confusion with the Sadducees. But it had become untrue before the time e.g. of Leontius (seventh century) who makes it, and it was no less untrue in the time of Maqrizi, whose authority,

[1] Heidenheim, *Sam. Liturgie*, No. 124. 2. [2] *Ibid.* No. 119. 9 and 10.
[3] *Gesenii Carm. Sam.*, No. 7. 15. [4] H., *S. L.*, No. 121. 15.
[5] *Ibid.*, No. 100. 16. [6] *Ibid.*, No. 121. 20. [7] *Dissertt.* vii, 8.

a Christian Arab writer, had borrowed from the Fathers. Even in the Targum we find frequent mention of angels to avoid anthropomorphisms: e.g. Gen. v. 24, "and Enoch walked with God; and he was not; for the angels took him"; and ix. 6, "for in the image of the angels made he man:" but since the date of the Targum is uncertain, I shall say no more of it. Marqah in a quasi-Agadic fragment (Heid., *Sam. Lit.* v.) enumerates various appearances of angels, and lays stress on the fact that it was an angel who spoke with Moses in the bush and on Mount Sinai. "Moses saw a form sent forth by God," although in Exod. xxiv and xxxiii neither the text nor Targum has this reading. So in a well-known prayer he prays in the name of "the hosts of the Angels." They are even individualized. God spoke the ten words, but it was Cabod who gave the tables of the law to Moses, a personification which may be compared with כבוד יי in Ezekiel. Later perhaps the teaching on the subject may have become vague, as we find Abulḥassan of Tyre, in the eleventh century, writing a treatise in support of it. It is afterwards much extended. In a hymn of Meshalmah (eighteenth century) "the four quarters of heaven rest on pillars borne up by the four angels." Abisha, in the fourteenth century, says that the angels stand round the throne in the eighth heaven. Moses is said to ascend from earth to "the dwelling of the angels," who are in the first eight heavens. At the time when Moses was exposed on the river, four angels, Cabala', Penuel, Anusa, and Zilpah, came from heaven to earth to attend on him[1]. Finally there is a destroying angel, Meḥablah, who corresponds somewhat to Satan. They are distinct from created things, i.e. they were not created in the six days, but are higher than men, and were present at the creation and at the giving of the law[2]. In all this there is nothing strikingly at variance with views found elsewhere; still less can we say that they did not believe in angels or a future state.

[1] H., *S. L.*, No. 14. ר. 6.

[2] *G. C. S.* IV, 8 and 3.

I need not speak of the Taheb or Messiah, as I have already dealt with the subject elsewhere[1], but two points may be noticed which are rather more distinctive: (1) The Fanuta. During the time immediately following the Exodus, Israel enjoyed the divine favour, רחותה. This continued until the priesthood of Uzzi, contemporary of Eli, for the chronicles give a complete and independent list of priests from Aaron to the present day. It was Eli who caused a schism in Israel by deserting Mount Gerizim, the place which the Lord had chosen to put his name there, and instituting a priesthood, not of the true line, at Shilo. That was in the twenty-fifth year of the priesthood of Uzzi, 260 years after the entry into Canaan. In consequence of this wickedness, says Eltholideh, "the Lord made the holy tabernacle to disappear." The succeeding period, which still continues, is called פנותה (probably "turning away" of God's favour), and is the cause of all the troubles which have come upon them. "The Fanuta it is which causes all our distress, says Marqah, may it be accursed in every place." They look for the Taheb, or restorer, to bring back God's favour and the glory of Israel. (2) The other point to be noticed, is their mystical teaching, which would take long to explain, and even then you would not understand it—nor should I—such is the nature of mysticism. The two terms, with which the whole doctrine deals, are כסי, "the hidden," and גלי, "the revealed," and the system, if it can be called so, is an attempt to explain the old, old difficulty, as to the way in which God, or the soul, can have any relation to matter. Evidently we need not expect from the Samaritans any satisfactory solution of a problem which has puzzled philosophers ever since men began to think. You may remember, for instance, that Lucretius, who would have liked to be a materialist, felt the necessity of attacking the difficulty, and decided that the material body of man acts on something more refined than ordinary matter, and that again on the soul, and vice versa. But this is only

[1] *Expositor* for March, 1895.

removing the difficulty one degree, like the Indian fable that the earth rests on an elephant, the elephant on a tortoise, and the tortoise on nothing. Of course as long as כסי meant the unseen world, and גלי the material world, things are comparatively simple. This is perhaps all they meant in Marqah, but it was not enough to satisfy human reasoning. Hence we find later that כסי is the *ἀπέραντος δύναμις*, to adopt a phrase used to describe the philosophy of Simon Magus, the boundless potentiality existing in heaven, where all things are before they are. It seems again to be equivalent to חכמה, the divine wisdom as manifested especially in Creation, almost a person, as in Prov. iii and viii. It is in fact, if we push the doctrine to its conclusion, the *Λόγος*, which may be made matter. The גלי is conversely the same when *ἐξεικονισθεῖσα*. The distinction is well brought out when the creation and the law-giving are compared. Both are created by the word, and come forth from the hidden world to the world of sense (מן עולם כסיאתה אל עולם גליאתה) attended by the angels, or *powers* of the unseen. In both, the word, like the intermediate soul in Lucretius, is something slightly less spiritual than God, emanating from God, and thus able to affect matter, so that it takes form in one case as the material world, in the other case as the Law. An explanation of the process is offered in another passage where the world is compared to a child which comes obediently to the word of its teacher. The above is of course a very rough and imperfect account of the doctrine, but it is enough to indicate the origin of it. There are in it elements of Alexandrine philosophy, but beyond all it is due to the Qabbalah. If you insist on the late origin of the Qabbalistic system, in its developed form, there is of course a difficulty in making it the foundation of Samaritan metaphysic in the fourth century. But I have always believed that we ought to accept the early tradition of the Qabbalah, and that its teaching was much more wide-spread than is usually supposed. Evidence to the same effect has recently come to light in a chronicle published

by Dr. Neubauer[1]. If then we find it fully fledged in the ninth century, there is no difficulty in believing that the Samaritans had taken over (however clumsily) its main teachings in the fourth century, and had further developed it by the fourteenth.

Thus we see that in all important points they are indebted to Jewish doctrine. Nor is this surprising. Geiger has pointed out that it is not such abstract views, but differences in the observance of the Law, which cause lasting dissension in Judaism. (This point might be illustrated from the history of the early Christians.) They might well adopt so much, while hotly opposing the Jews on more technical grounds. Moreover, the difference was largely political, and of long standing. It is a continuance of the animosity between North and South, Israel and Judah, the revolt against centralization under Jeroboam I, explain it how we will. Whatever may have been the motives of that schism, wisdom is justified of her children. Judah has gone on ever since, with varying fortunes, but with the same aims—ever increasing, ever exerting an influence on the world: while Israel, for so the Samaritans believe themselves, has become, owing largely to its turbulent spirit, ever more and more obscure, till now the miserable remnant has no aims beyond its own petty quarrels and intrigues, and is hardly known outside its native town:

> Forgotten travellers of an age outworn,
> Left on the wayside by the wheels of time
> That pass and pass them.

In conclusion, I wish to make an appeal to you. One talks glibly about a writer's having lived certainly in such and such a century, and one does not dilate upon the toil and the headaches which that certainty has involved. But chronology is a most important thing in any history, and it requires special study in the case of the Samaritans, because the wildest statements have been made on the

[1] ספר יוחסין, in *Med. Jewish Chron.* II, p. 111 sqq., Oxford, 1895.

subject. I therefore set myself some years ago to this special study, than which there is none more distressing, baffling, and disappointing. The materials are, for the earlier period, the chronicles mentioned before and some occasional allusions in the liturgies. For the time since 1400 the chief material is in the colophons and epigraphs of MSS. I have collected these from most of the MSS. in public libraries in Europe, and in many private libraries. The very dry results are all tabulated. But there must be many MSS. or fragments belonging to private persons, which have not been examined. It is most important that any information they contain should be added to what is already collected. I beg you therefore, if any one has any such fragment or knows of the existence of any, to give me the opportunity of inspecting it. Even the smallest and apparently most insignificant fragment may be useful, when taken in conjunction with what is already collected. A short time ago Dr. Friedländer kindly lent me several fragments for examination. The most important consisted, I think, of only two leaves, much obliterated, but it gave me an obscure person's name for which I had looked in vain for years. In return I will gladly describe the contents of the documents, and send them back. One must be content to wade through many volumes if at the end one ascertains one name or rectifies one date. Only so will a continuous history be possible.

A. COWLEY.

THE DEMONOLOGY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

I.

Textual critics of the N. T. many,

Of late years the textual criticism of the New Testament has made much progress in this country, and especially in Oxford and Cambridge innumerable manuscripts have been collected and classified; the great lines along which the tradition has flowed are being ascertained, and even referred to the countries of their origin. The Diatessaron is restored to us, and little by little the external evidence of the Gospels is pushed back deep into the second century. That is one main result gained, and another equally notable is the recognition on all sides that however much inspired by God these writings may be, their transmission to us has at any rate been controlled by the same laws as govern the transmission of any other, and purely human, documents.

but critics of matter of N. T. few.

But the criticism of the contents of the New Testament has not made equal progress. Isolated thinkers indeed have made attempts to *humanize* the life and personality of Jesus, to show that there is really nothing about the history of the early Church which justifies us in lifting it out of general history and claiming for its documents a right to be tested by other tests of probability than those which we apply to secular narratives. But in the bosom of orthodox Christian sects such efforts have met with little or no response. To be an authority on the history of the sacred text is held to excuse

a scholar's reluctance to grapple with the ideas which are its content and underlie the narrative. Now I believe that we cannot understand these wonderful narratives except in so far as we can reconstruct the *mind* and intellectual habits of those who wrote them, and of those about whom they were written. We must try to breathe the atmosphere which they breathed, even though in working back to it we inhale more than we care to of the dust of ages. No other course is compatible with a real respect for the Christian religion, than to try to understand it as part and parcel of the great process in which man reveals himself to himself—as a great, perhaps, even as a culminating, manifestation of the human spirit. This is rationalism in its true sense. Let us then emulate St. Paul, who wrote thus: "I thank God, I speak with tongues more than you all; howbeit, in the Church I had rather speak five words with my understanding, that I might instruct others also, than ten thousand words in a tongue."

We honour Christianity but cheaply, when we draw a ring-fence around the person of its founder, and employ for the study of his character and actions, as related in the New Testament, methods and canons which we should repudiate in any other field of research.

In this century educated men have so generally abandoned the beliefs in a personal devil and in possession by evil spirits, that the Demonology of the New Testament is a most favourable subject-matter, the which to discuss from a newer and more critical standpoint. Jesus, his disciples, and all the New Testament writers had a profound and vigorous belief in the Devil and in evil spirits: and I venture to outline their opinion as follows.

Origin of demons in N. T.

The origin of evil spirits in a movement of rebellion against God on the part of certain of his angels is assumed in the New Testament as a matter of common knowledge. "I beheld Satan fall as lightning from heaven," says Jesus in Luke's Gospel[1],

[1] Luke x. 18.

addressing the seventy, when they returned to him with joy, because of their discovery that even the devils were subject to them through his name. We have fuller information from Jude, who knew of angels which kept not their first estate, but left their proper habitation [1]; from the author of 2 Peter, who says that God spared not the angels that sinned, but cast them down to hell [2]. This is all we can glean from the New Testament about their origin. About their present haunts, their activity in regard to mankind, and about the future that awaits them, the New Testament is more explicit. The author of 2 Peter and Jude believed that God reserves them for judgment, bound in dungeons of darkness [3]. The Lord reserves them in everlasting chains under darkness unto the judgment of the Great Day [4]. The demons, the ministers of Satan, themselves know what is in store for them, and this is why they cried, "What have we to do with thee, Jesus, thou Son of God? art thou come hither to torment us *before the time* [5]?" And from the same Gospel of Matthew we learn that for the Devil and his angels everlasting fire is prepared, into which the Son of Man at his glorious second coming will cast them along with the cursed among men [6].

Their activities.

For Satan, the Devil, the adversary, heads a counter-kingdom of evil opposed to the kingdom of God, and the lost angels are his messengers and instruments [7]. With an absoluteness, hardly less than that of Marcion, the apostles John and Paul insist on the entire subordination of this world to Satan. He is, according to the former, the prince or ruler of this world (ἄρχων τοῦ κόσμου τούτου) [8], in whose casting out the world itself is judged. And Paul calls him outright the *god of this world.* In the legend of the temptation of Jesus, all the kingdoms of the world and the glory of them are in Satan's gift.

They rule the world.

[1] Jude 6. [2] 2 Pet. ii. 4. [3] 2 Pet. ii. 4.
[4] Jude 6. [5] Matt. viii. 29. [6] Matt. xxv. 41.
[7] 2 Cor. xii. 7; Matt. ix. 34.
[8] John xii. 31; xiv. 30; and xvi. 11.

Since he was ruler and god of this world, it could hardly be otherwise.

Although, according to Peter and Jude, bound in darkness with everlasting chains, the devils and their leader, according to the New Testament writers, nevertheless possess great facilities for moving about. Thus, Paul held not only the Talmudic belief that Satan transforms himself into an angel of light[1], but also the Persian belief that he is prince of the power of the air[2]. "We wrestle not," he says, "against flesh and blood, but against principalities and powers . . . against the wicked spirits in the heavens." Not that they did not also haunt the earth; for Jesus believed that evil spirits prefer to walk through waterless places when they are seeking rest.

Their composition.

As to their composition, we may perhaps infer from St. Luke[3] that they could not be handled, nor had flesh and bones, yet that they appeared to the eye. So also Paul[4] expressly denies flesh and blood to the demon adversaries with whom he and his followers wrestled. But though they were thus immaterial, Paul believed that they could be warded off and their evil influences neutralized by so material a screen as the Chalebi or traditional headdress of the Jewish women. For this, as Dean Farrar (*Life of Christ*, Appendix VIII), admits, is the true meaning of Paul's rule, that women should veil themselves in church "because of the angels."

Terms for evil spirit.

The word δαιμόνιον is commonly used in the sense of evil spirits; δαίμων is less frequent. Πνεῦμα with the epithets "unclean," ἀκάθαρτον, or "evil," πονηρόν, is very frequent. Sometimes the expression πνεῦμα δαίμονος occurs, literally "the blowing of the Demon." For the

[1] 2 Cor. xi. 14. [2] Eph. ii. 2, and vi. 12.

[3] In Luke xxiv. 37 it is not said that the apostles thought the risen Christ to be an evil spirit, though they were "terrified and affrighted." Anyhow, it was as mere spirits, whether good or bad, that he could not be handled nor presumably eat. Πνεῦμα so used in the New Testament is, apart from moral qualities, the same sort of agency as δαιμόνιον.

[4] Eph. vi. 12; 1 Cor. xi. 10.

New Testament writers believed that the physical constitution of a spirit, whether holy or impure, was akin to moving vapour; and so, in John xx. 22, the risen Jesus communicates the Holy Ghost to the disciples by *blowing* on them. True it was the Holy Spirit so imparted, and not an unclean spirit; but it must be remarked that, apart from moral ends and considerations, the Holy Spirit gave rise in those whom it inspired just the same physical manifestations as did the unclean spirits.

Formal resemblance of evil spirits to Holy Ghost.

Let us examine a few passages illustrating this important point. We read in Luke how at the baptism in Jordan the Holy Spirit came down upon Jesus, in bodily form like a dove. Justin, quoting some early form of Gospel, says (*Dialog.* 315 D) that it flew and alighted on him (ἐπιπτῆναι ἐπ' αὐτόν). And in the Ebionite Gospel, as reported by Epiphanius (*Haer.* xxx. 13), the dove came down and entered actually *into* Jesus (περιστερᾶς κατελθούσης καὶ εἰσελθούσης εἰς αὐτόν). That in some early acts of martyrs (e. g. Polycarp's), a dove leaves the saint's body at death and flutters aloft, is proof of the antiquity of this belief that the spirit, in a dove's form, not merely alighted *on* Jesus, but passed *into* him. In precisely similar manner the evil spirits passed from the Gadarene demoniac's body into the bodies of the swine. And the conceptions of spiritual agency which underlie this well-authenticated story must be admitted to belong to a common circle of materialistic ideas with this Ebionite legend of the Holy Spirit. Again, the Holy Spirit *fell* bodily upon those that heard the word (ἐπέπεσε)[1]. The spirit of the Lord displayed the same faculty of material constraint, when it caught away (ἥρπασε) Philip[2] and, it would seem, transferred him in a miraculous and invisible fashion to Azotus. Similarly in a fragment of the Hebrew Gospel preserved by Jerome, Jesus avers that his mother, the Holy Spirit, caught him up by the hair of his head and lifted him (Comm. in Mich. c. 7, 5–7: in Ezech. xvi.

[1] Acts x. 44. [2] Acts viii. 39.

13). Perhaps such an opinion also underlies Mark i. 12, where it is related that straightway (after the baptism) the Spirit *drove* (ἐκβάλλει) Jesus forth into the wilderness. The same intrusion on the physical order of things constantly *marks the approach of evil spirits.* Thus the dumb spirit, wheresoever it took the man's son, it tare him down, so that he foamed again and gnashed with his teeth, and pined away[1]. And Luke relates of the same spirit that, "bruising" the child, it hardly departed from him.

Demons, like Holy Spirit, use voice of one possessed.

The Gadarene, similarly, would break his bonds and be driven of the Devil into the wilderness. And the same Gadarene devils drove the swine, in which they were allowed to take refuge, down a steep place into the sea.

Lastly, it is illustrative of the power of physical constraint ascribed to demons, that the vocal organs of one possessed were controlled by the demon which had overmastered him. It was not the man that spake, but the devil within him. "Hold thy peace, and come out of him," said Jesus to the unclean spirit in Mark i. 25; and when the sprit had torn him and *cried with a loud voice,* he came out of him. In the same context[2], and in Luke[3], we read that devils came out of many, crying out and saying, "Thou art Christ, the Son of God." But Jesus suffered not the devils *to speak,* because they knew him. In the later age of Clement of Alexandria the demons could not always make themselves understood, for he speaks of a special dialect or language spoken by possessed persons (δαιμονιζόμενοι, Clem. Al. lib. i. 338). In Acts xvi. 16 we read of a girl having a spirit of divination, whose soothsaying brought her masters much gain. Now the Holy Spirit within a man equally took possession of his voice; but whereas the demons spoke articulately, the Holy Spirit seems to have generally expressed itself in a stream of incoherent and unintelligible utterances. This is evidenced by more than one passage in Paul's Epistles. "If I pray in a tongue,"

[1] Mark ix. 18; Luke ix. 39. [2] Mark i. 34. [3] Luke iv. 34.

says Paul, "my spirit prayeth, but my understanding is unfruitful[1]." This gift accordingly was so little for the edification of others, that Paul made the rule, "that if there be no interpreter, then let him that hath this peculiar gift of the Holy Spirit keep silence in the church; and let him speak to himself and to God[2]." Not that the utterances of the spirit were ever thus unintelligible; for Jesus bade his disciples to take no thought how or what they should speak, when for his sake they should be brought before governors and kings[3]. "For it shall be given you in that same hour what ye shall speak. For it is not ye that speak, but the Spirit of the father which speaketh in you." Perhaps, however, it is to force language, if we should reckon this as a case of possession by the Holy Spirit, and so as similar to the phenomena dwelt upon by Paul.

Human sin due to devils.

With Satan and his demons lies the ultimate responsibility for human sin. Satan is the tempter, the evil one from whom Jesus taught his followers to pray to be delivered. He sows the tares[4] that choke the true seed's growth. He tempted even the Messiah, and he perpetually seeks to ensnare all men. He entered into Judas, and prompted him to betray his master[5]. The Jews who heard not Jesus, had for their father the Devil[6]. "The lusts of your father ye will do. He was a murderer from the beginning, and abode not in the truth. When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh his own: for he is a liar, the father of it." But though men thus have supernatural enemies who lead them into sin, they will none the less be cast into the furnace of fire, where shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth[7], as the penalty of having yielded to this domination. Human responsibility is thus assumed in the New Testament, though how it is to be reconciled with the forcible and *ab extra* character of the evil one's assaults upon man is not explained. In records so naïve we could

[1] 1 Cor. xiv. 14. [2] 1 Cor. xiv. 28. [3] Matt. x. 18, 20.
[4] Matt. xiii. 25. [5] John xiii. 2 and 27. [6] John viii. 44.
[7] Matt. xiii. 42.

not expect it to be. The same hierarchy of evil spirits is responsible also for death and disease. The inspirer of sin is indirectly the author of death[1], the last enemy whom the Messiah will destroy. And Satan's demons inflict on those of whose persons they take possession all forms of sickness, mental and bodily.

Let us enumerate the various categories of evil spirits.

Classification of Demons of Possession.

There were, firstly, the unclean spirits: such were the Gadarene devils which drove forth their victim to dwell in the tombs[2]. Their nature could be discerned from their favourite resorts. No pure spirit would frequent the neighbourhood of dead bodies. And to this day a Jewish priest may not view a corpse. Such unclean demons were held to be the restless souls of wicked men who had died; and this is why they were so often fierce and untameable; in such wise that the victims of their oppression required to be bound with chains. Others were devils of blindness, or of blindness and dumbness together[3]; others were simply dumb, or dumb and deaf together. In some cases the dumb spirit was also a violent one; e.g. in Mark[4] a parent appeals to Jesus, whose son had a dumb spirit. And wheresoever he led him he tore him; and the boy foamed, and gnashed with his teeth, and pined away. There were also fever demons, and Luke ascribes the "great fever[5]," from which Simon's wife's mother suffered, to a demon. For Jesus, he says, "stood over her, and *rebuked* the fever; and it left her." Other spirits were merely of weakness or infirmity. So in Luke[6], we hear of a woman "which had a spirit of infirmity (ἀσθενείας) for eighteen years, and was bowed together, and could in no wise lift herself up." And the seven evil spirits of Mary Magdalene were infirmities, or —more correctly—her several infirmities were demons. It is clear that to the mind of Luke the physician, if not in the opinion of Jesus also, fever and rheumatism were cases

[1] Rom. v. 14. [2] Mark v. 2. [3] Matt. xii. 22.
[4] Mark ix. 17; Luke ix. 39. [5] Luke iv. 38, 39. [6] Luke xiii. 11.

of possession. The two first synoptists, however, especially Matthew, tend to confine possession to madness. Indeed, Matthew[1] expressly identifies epilepsy or lunacy with possession. Σελημιάζεται καὶ κακῶς πάσχει, says the father kneeling before Jesus, who forthwith "rebuked the devil." Peter[2] believed that all those whom Jesus healed were "oppressed of the Devil."

Demons grouped in sevens.

There was no limit to the number of demons that could possess one and the same man. Thus the lunatic of Gadara had so many devils within him that they declared their name to be legion[3]; for devils had their own names, and Jesus was careful to ask what it was. It was of common occurrence for one person to be possessed by several devils at once; and so we read of the seven devils or evil spirits which Jesus cast out of Mary Magdalene[4]. And in this context we may note how common it was for devils to go about in sevens. The unclean spirit, when he is gone out of a man, goes back with seven others that he found walking in the waterless places. In Revelations the spirits of God are also seven in antithesis[5], and seven in number, as we shall see later on, were the characteristic spirits of Belial.

Paul identified ancient gods with demons.

Paul, the apostle of the Gentiles, believed in another and fresh mode of demoniac activity, never referred to in the Gospels. The gods of the heathen were devils, i. e. really supernatural beings exercising their powers and knowledge for sinister aims. "The things which the Gentiles sacrifice, they sacrifice to *devils*, and not to God," is his emphatic statement[6]. The tendency of this passage is unmistakable, and it is in connexion with it that we must explain the words which come earlier[7] in the same Epistle, that "an idol is nothing in the world." This refers to the wooden or stone images only. The gods and goddesses themselves,

[1] Matt. xvii. 15. [2] Acts x. 38. [3] Mark v. 9.
[4] Luke viii. 2; Mark xvi. 9. [5] Rev. i. 4; Testam. Rub.
[6] 1 Cor. x. 20. [7] 1 Cor. viii. 4.

which were worshipped through and in these images, were no other than malignant demons. In Revelations[1] we have the same opinion.

Paul's list of the functions of demons is not yet exhausted. For in his first Epistle to Timothy[2] we have recorded yet another mode of the sinister activity of the devils. "In the last times some shall fall away from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of *devils*, through the hypocrisy of men that speak lies." The demons then were responsible not only for sin and disease, but for false doctrine as well.

Demons inspire false teachings.

Let us now consider the relation of Jesus the Messiah to this kingdom of evil. Firstly, he was not alone or singular in his power of casting out devils. Prior to his advent the Jews were not without resources in combating the demons. In Acts[3] we hear of strolling Jews who were exorcists, but who had never heard of the name of Jesus. And in the Epistle to the Ephesians[4], where we get more than one peep into the demonological beliefs of St. Paul, we hear of "every name that is named," not only in this world, but in that also which is to come—the reference being, of course, to the use in exorcisms of names of angels and patriarchs. In the Gospels[5] also we have an attestation by Jesus himself of the fact that his Jewish contemporaries could, like himself, cast out devils. "If I by Beelzebul cast out devils, by whom do your sons (i. e. Jews in general) cast them out?" But the Messiah claimed to be no common exorcist, and the demons knew him at sight as their appointed destroyer[6]. He came and entered the house of the strong man Satan, and was stronger than he. He took from Satan all the armour in which he trusted; he bound him, and spoiled his house and his goods[7]. He suffered not the devils to speak, because they knew him. With authority

Jesus, vanquisher of demons.

[1] Rev. ix. 20. [2] 1 Tim. iv. 1. [3] Acts xix. 13.
[4] Eph. i. 21. [5] Luke xi. 19; Matt. xii. 27.
[6] Mark i. 24. [7] Matt. xii. 29; Luke xi. 21.

he commanded the unclean spirits, and they obeyed him[1]. The unclean spirits, when they saw him, fell down before him[2], and cried, saying, "Thou art the Son of God." That it was only by the good leave of Jesus that the Gadarene legion even entered the swine, is good evidence of the authority he wielded over their fraternity.

Procedure of Jesus.

As to the conditions under which and methods by which Jesus cast out devils, we learn the following details from the New Testament.

The Jews declared that he cast them out with the help of Beelzebul, the prince of the devils. Jesus, however, declared that it was with the finger[3] or by the spirit[4] of God that he did it, and argued that the kingdom of God was therefore come unto them. His procedure was usually to rebuke the spirit and peremptorily to order it to come out. "Thou dumb and deaf spirit, I charge thee, come out of him, and enter no more into him[5]." And this is the method referred to by Matthew in the verse: "He cast out the spirits *with a word*, and healed all who were sick."

He made no use, therefore, of magical herbs. Sometimes, however, physical contact with the victim was requisite; thus, he simply laid his hands on the woman whom Satan had bound together for eighteen years. The method of peremptory rebuke was not confined to what we should call mental cases, for Jesus rebuked the fever[6]. Yet he seems on the whole to have reserved it for violent demons, and Simon's wife's mother was probably delirious. "Be thou muzzled and depart," was often Jesus' form of rebuke.

Jesus delegated his power to disciples and believers.

This power over devils Jesus delegated to his disciples; and some of the apostles, e. g. Paul, could not only expel devils, but hand over people to the Devil for the destruction of their flesh[7]. Paul himself so delivered the heretics Hymenaeus and Alexander unto Satan[8], that they might learn not to blaspheme. The Devil or Demon was, it would

[1] Mark i. 27. [2] Mark iii. 11. [3] Luke xi. 20. [4] Matt. xii. 28.
[5] Mark ix. 25. [6] Luke iv. 39. [7] 1 Cor. v. 5. [8] 1 Tim. i. 20.

seem, inducted into the body of a person so handed to Satan. But there was still a chance for his spirit to be saved[1].

"Jesus," we read, "called unto him his twelve disciples, and gave them power over unclean spirits, to cast them out, and to heal all manner of sickness[2]." In spite of this, we read that they could not expel the violent dumb demon from a lunatic, because of their unbelief[3]. Belief then on the part of the exorcist, and even prayer and fasting, was needful in order to expel this particular kind of demon. According to Mark[4], belief on the part of the *father* of the lunatic was also a condition of the cure. "If thou canst believe," said Jesus to him, "all things are possible to him that believeth, and straightway the father of the child cried out, Lord, I believe." In the appendix of Mark we read that it was one of the signs which should follow them that believed, that they should cast out devils and speak with tongues[5]. The sick also were to recover when they laid hands on them.

In expelling devils Jesus himself does not seem to have invoked any name, not even his own, though he claimed to do it by the spirit or finger of God. But already during his lifetime we hear of unauthorized persons, who followed not with his disciples[6], casting out devils in the name of Jesus; and this not without his approval. At a later time, however, the sons of Sceva paid dearly for taking a similar liberty. "They took upon them to call over them which had evil spirit the name of the Lord Jesus, saying, We adjure you by Jesus whom Paul preacheth. And the evil spirit answered and said, Jesus I know, and Paul I know; but who are ye? And the man in whom the

[1] Lightfoot, *Horae Hebr.* (vol. I, p. 505), remarks: 'Traditio hominis Satanae gravissima omnium poena erat . . . Primo enim Corpus illud quod Spiritus Sancti habitaculum esse deberet, Satanae Spiritusque immundi habitatio fit: Secundo, hominis membra non aliter aguntur a Daemone, quam si eadem ipse animae instar animaret,' &c.

[2] Matt. x. 1. [3] Matt. xvii. 19, 20. [4] Mark ix. 23.

[5] Mark xvi. 17. [6] Mark ix. 38.

evil spirit was leaped on them, and overcame them[1]." The disciples themselves were to use the name of Jesus. "In my name shall they cast out devils." This power indeed was the first of the signs which were to accompany them that believed[2]. "Behold, I have given you authority over all the power of the enemy," we read in Luke, who, like the author of the appendix of Mark, ranks immunity from snake-bite along with the power over demons. "Lord, even the devils are subject unto us *in thy name*," say the seventy to Jesus, when they returned with joy. "In the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth, walk!" said Peter to the lame man[3]. "And he took him by the right hand, and raised him up: and immediately his feet and his ankle-bones received strength." And Peter, in the same context, explains the power: "By faith in the name (of Jesus) hath Jesus' name made this man strong."

Use of name of Jesus.

Let us now recapitulate the chief demonological ideas which underlie the New Testament.

Recapitulation.

(1) The world is full of evil demons presided over by Satan. Without flesh or bones, they hover in the air or haunt the earth, especially its waterless places and the neighbourhood of tombs.

(2) They cause in man all sin and disease and death. They are ever tempting man and plotting his ruin. They enter into his body, and there live as a second soul or spirit. They displace his mind and cause madness; or they affect his body and produce disease. To be sick is to have a devil inside one. . To be cured is to have it cast out. The exorcist is the physician, and the physician the exorcist. We hear of a fever-demon, of demons of deafness, dumbness, blindness, paralysis. They are, some of them, impure or unclean; some of them only wicked and lying spirits. Wind and waves also are demoniacal agencies[4].

[1] Acts xix. 14. [2] Mark xvi. 17. [3] Acts iii. 6.
[4] Mark iv. 39.

(3) They are, as a rule, invisible, but have their own names, and express themselves through the bodily actions and voice of their victims.

(4) They will pass from one person to another, and from human beings into animals. Such transitions are effected by them with great violence. They rend the person they leave, and drive their new hosts into frenzy and destruction.

(5) The chief mission of the Messiah was to rid mankind of these pests; to dethrone Satan, and overcome disease and death. When this triumph over the demons is effected, the kingdom of God will be established.

(6) The Messiah gave to his twelve disciples and to the seventy, the same authority to cast out demons and carry on the war with Satan which he himself possessed.

(7) Before the advent of the Messiah, the Jews knew names, at the naming of which over the possessed, the demons took to flight. But Jesus of Nazareth authorized his followers to use no name but his own.

(8) As a weapon against demons, the name of Jesus was immensely more effective than any other. So Paul[1] declared that God "highly exalted him, and gave unto him the name which is above every name: that in the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth."

(9) The demons were expelled by the mere word of mouth, by the peremptory command of Jesus. His followers, however, had to bid them depart "in or by the name of Jesus." For the preposition ἐν, "in," has the Hebrew sense in this phrase of "by means of" or "through."

(10) Faith on the part of the victim and bystanders in the power of Jesus to expel evil spirits was, as a rule, necessary to a cure, and Jesus himself was impeded by any want of such faith in himself. Nevertheless, even in his lifetime, some without believing in him used his name successfully against demons. Faith was therefore not in-

[1] Phil. ii. 10.

dispensable in the exorcist, though a power over demons went with, and was conferred by, faith.

(11) The gods of idolatrous Gentiles are no other than demons. They are real supernatural agencies, but evil ones.

(12) The demons inspire erroneous teachings within the circle of Christian believers.

(13) They haunt even the churches in which the faithful are met for worship, and in the synagogues possessed persons were to be met with.

(14) The demons were angels which rebelled and were cast out of heaven. Christ when he comes to judge the world will condemn them to torments in hell. This the demons knew, and accordingly dreaded the approach of Christ, whom they instantly recognized.

(15) The demons are often found in groups of seven.

(16) Any number of them at once may possess a man.

(17) Meats offered to idols are not to be touched, nor things strangled, the idea being that the blood being the life of the animal is the proper food for devils. Men by partaking of it would be feeding along with demons.

(18) The word "exorcist" already appears in the Acts of the Apostles, but in connexion with Jews only. There is, however, no reason to suppose that the disciples would have disclaimed the name. In Matthew[1] the verb ἐξορκίζω is used, but not in connexion with an evil spirit: "I adjure thee by the living God, to tell us if thou art the Christ, the Son of God." Exorcism of a demon was but a particular case of adjuration. We may say then that the term "exorcism" is already present in the New Testament in the sense in which later church writers use it, which sense is thus defined by Isidore: "Exorcismus est sermo increpationis contra immundum Spiritum in energuminis sive catechumenis factus, per quem ab illis diaboli nequissima virtus et inveterata malitia vel excursio violenta fugetur" (Isidore, *de Divin. Offic.* ii. 20).

[1] Matt. xxvi. 63.

Right interpretation of demonology of N. T.

Now the question arises, what is the right interpretation of this demonological strain so manifoldly inwoven not only in the historical but also in the epistolary and prophetic books of the New Testament?

(1) Shall we in the spirit of modern enlightenment deny the reality of evil spirits, and declare that the cases which Jesus healed were merely cases of cerebral and bodily disease? If this be admitted, it remains to ask:

(*a*) Was Jesus aware of the real nature of the evils he cured, and did he merely adopt the popular opinion in conversation and argument as a concession to the ignorance of the people he was among? or (*b*) was he immersed in the popular, but mistaken and somewhat barbarous, beliefs of his age and country?

(2) Or shall we take quite another view, and hold that there were really demons at work in the time of Jesus, true satanical beings arrayed as an army for the destruction of men's bodies and souls?

And on this other chief alternative position, if it be accepted, it follows to ask:

(*a*) Was this activity of demons limited to the period of Jesus' ministry? or (*b*) did it continue after his departure from among us, and does it still go on?

Views of modern divines.

Of the leaders of religious thought within the orthodox church of the present day, some accept the first of our two alternatives, others the second.

Among the former are Dean Milman and Dean Farrar.

Dean Farrar's views.

The latter writes as follows: "Among the most frequent of his (Jesus') cures were those of the distressing forms of mental and nervous malady which we ascribe to purely natural causes, but which the ancient Jews, like all Orientals, attributed to direct supernatural agency[1]." "The Jews, like most ancient nations,

[1] Farrar, *Life of Christ*, ch. 23.

attributed every result immediately to the action of demons[1]."

This being Farrar's view, it is a pity that he does not further instruct his readers as to whether or no Jesus was "like all Orientals," in being himself imbued with this primitive belief. But Dean Farrar scents the dilemma into which this view might lead him. If Jesus was "like all Orientals" in this respect, how was he the omniscient son of God? If he knew better and only simulated the common belief, what becomes of his honesty? Accordingly Dean Farrar leaves himself a loophole, and writes as follows: "If indeed we could be sure that Jesus directly encouraged or sanctioned in men's mind the belief that the swine were indeed driven wild by the unclean spirits which passed objectively from the body of the Gadarene into the bodies of these dumb beasts, then we could, without hesitation, believe as a literal truth, however incomprehensible, that so it was." "But this," he adds, "by no means follows indisputably from *what we know of the methods of the evangelists*" (Farrar, ch. 23).

But what is the fact? Three evangelists distinctly aver that Jesus did directly encourage and sanction in men's minds such a belief, and they aver it also in a perfectly naïve and straightforward narrative. Is it then the method of the evangelists "to say one thing and mean another?" According to Dean Farrar it is their method.

On the other hand, Canon Gore accepts the second alternative of the reality of demonological possession, both in the age of Jesus and in our own.

Canon Gore's view.

He is far from accepting Dean Farrar's position, that the question is one to which there attaches no vital importance. "The question," he writes, "of diabolic agency and temptation is one which really concerns the permanent religious struggle of mankind. . . . It is a matter of profoundly practical religious interest."

[1] Farrar, *Life of Christ*, ch. 17.

With admirable concision Mr. Gore says of Jesus that "he deals with demons with unmistakable seriousness, emphasis, and frequency. He sees Satan behind moral and physical evil." "Our Lord's language," he says, "reaches the level of positive teaching about good, and still more about bad, spirits." He goes on to declare it to be "impossible for Jesus as the incarnate Son of God, yet more as the spiritual teacher of mankind, to teach ignorantly on such a matter or to inculcate false impressions about it, or to connive in regard to it at popular belief and language."

There is yet the third view akin to Mr. Gore's, viz. that demons did exist during the ministry and age of Jesus, but not before or after. And Dean Farrar[1] in a note leaves a corner of his hospitable mind open for the reception, in case of necessity, of this half-view. "I am not prepared to deny that in the dark and desperate age which saw the Redeemer's advent there may have been forms of madness which owed their more immediate manifestation to evil powers." So the writer of the article on Demonology in the last edition of the *Dictionary of the Bible* broaches the view that in the age of Jesus demons really existed and manifested themselves, but only for the nonce, and in order that Jesus and his immediate followers might have them to cast out.

Instead of trying at once to decide between these rival views, it will be best to glance, first, at the subsequent history of demonological belief within the early Church itself; secondly, at the history of the belief outside the pale of Christianity. (1) Among the Jews before the age of Christ. (2) Among the Jews during and after that age. (3) Among the Greeks, the so-called pagans. (4) Among the ancient Assyrians and Persians. (5) Among primitive men and savages. Then we shall have oriented ourselves, and shall be in a position to pronounce upon the merits of the several views of Canon Gore, Dean Farrar, and others.

[1] *Life of Christ*, ch. 23.

Within the Christian Church.

Demons in the early Church.

The earliest extra canonical documents of the Church contain little that bears upon our inquiry. The teaching of the twelve apostles has no precepts concerning demons, neither has the first epistle of Clement. Barnabas[1] in the epistle which is ascribed to him, and which cannot have been written much later than 100 A. D., exhorts us to exert ourselves lest the "black one" (ὁ μέλας) should get a chance of creeping into us. Towards the close of his epistle[2], he says that the path of the "black one" is crooked and full of cursing. The heart full of idolatry, he says elsewhere[3], is the abode of demons; and he contrasts[4] with the light-bringing angels of God the angels of Satan, who is ruler of this present season of wickedness.

Barnabas.

Ignatius.

In Ignatius' epistles the references to Satan as the prince of this world are very frequent. His "ancient kingdom" was pulled down when God appeared in the likeness of man[5]. The martyr felt that "the envy of the devil, just because it was unseen by many, waged against him the fiercer war." Of actual possession we have no mention in his pages; but in Smyrneans[6] he says that the demons are bodiless (ἀσώματοι), and he quotes from a lost Gospel the words of the risen Jesus: "Lay hold and handle me, and see that I am not a demon without a body." "And straightway," he adds, "the apostles touched him, and they believed, being joined unto his flesh and blood."

In holding this belief Ignatius moved in the same circle of opinion as St. Luke; but in that he never refers to cases of possession he approximates to St. John, who, again in this respect as in others, is as it were a connecting-link between the Synoptic Gospels and the more philosophic

[1] Ep. iv. 9. [2] Ibid. xx. 1. [3] Ibid. xvi. 7.

[4] Ibid. xviii. 2.

[5] Ign. Eph. 17 and 19; Magn. 1; Trall. 4, Rom. 7; Philad. 6; Eph. 19; ibid. Trall. 4.

[6] Ibid. Smyrn. 2; ibid. 3.

Judaism of Alexandria, of which Philo is our sole surviving representative. Ignatius wrote before A.D. 120. Perhaps before that year, and certainly not more than ten years later, we have quite a philosophy of possession, not by demons only but by the Holy Spirit as well, in the Shepherd of Hermas.

As in the twelve testaments, so in this writer, even purely moral forms of evil are demons. Thus, evil speaking (*καταλαλιά*) is "a restless demon, never at peace[1]." So "quick-temper" (*ὀξυχολία*) is an evil spirit (*πονηρὸν πνεῦμα*). The *ὀξύχολος* or man who is quick-tempered is "filled with evil spirits; he is unstable in all his acts, and is dragged hither and thither by the evil spirits[2]." In Italy, where Hermas wrote, the passionate and vindictive temper of the inhabitants must have been a great obstacle to the progress of Christian love and charity. Elsewhere[3] Hermas speaks of the angels of wickedness going up into a man's heart, and contrasts the angel of justice, who is *τρυφερός* or soft and subtle—*tenerrimus*, as the old Latin version renders the word. The same epithet is often applied to the Holy Spirit of God. Another evil spirit is Sorrow. Sorrow (*λύπη*) is indeed said to be more evil than any other spirit. Another demon, called Lust (*ἐπιθυμία*), is daughter of the Devil[4]. Nor is Hermas, when he holds such language, impersonating abstract qualities in a merely rhetorical fashion. On the contrary, these passions are vaporous agencies, capable of physical and material action and reaction on each other and on the Holy Spirit, which in its composition resembles them. So it is that in several passages he represents the heart as a vessel (*ἀγγεῖον*), into which the Holy Spirit and the evil spirits may alike enter and dwell[5]. Not one but several evil spirits at once may remain in a man as in a single vessel. The vase in question cannot hold them all, but runs over. And then the Holy Spirit being *τρυφερόν* or very soft, since it is not accustomed to inhabit along

[1] Herm. Mand. ii. 2. [2] Ibid. v. 2, 7. [3] Ibid. v. 1, 3.
[4] Ibid. xii. 2, 2. [5] Ibid. v. 1, 2.

with an evil spirit, . . . departs out of such a man and seeks to live with Gentleness and Quiet. Elsewhere, he says, "the Demon of Sorrow squeezes out (ἐκτρίβει) the Holy Spirit[1]. But if a man be μακρόθυμος or long-suffering, the Holy Spirit, which dwells in him, remains pure, and is not dimmed and obscured by the presence along with it of an evil spirit[2];" but "dwelling in a broad space it will rejoice and be glad, as will also the vase (of the soul) within which it dwells. . . . But if quick-temper approach, then the Holy Spirit, being soft, is at once pressed for room, and not finding the place clean, seeks to get away out of it. For it is suffocated (πνίγεται) by the evil spirit, and has no room to pray and to worship (λειτουργῆσαι) the Lord, as it fain would do, for it is polluted by the companionship of quick-temper. Thus, both the spirits are dwelling in the same place; and that man in whom they are doing so, experiences great inconvenience and evil. It is," he goes on to explain, "just as if one poured wormwood upon honey. The Devil and arch-tempter[3] will, however, depart out of a man who is full of faith, because he finds no room to make his way in. Evil spirits[4] are earthly and vacuous; and the reason why a false prophet is dumb, when confronted with a congregation of people filled with the spirit of the deity, is that the earthly spirit which was in him takes to flight and runs away, leaving him dumb and shattered, unable to say anything."

To the use of the name in exorcism we find no express reference in the Shepherd; but he implies it when he says that "the great and glorious name[5] is the only refuge from the great dragon, and no one who does not bear it can enter the kingdom of God." There is no mention of the practice of exorcism. Yet we must not infer that the writer was any stranger to a rite, which it did not suit his literary purposes to refer to.

[1] Herm. Mand. x. 1, 2.
[2] Ibid. v. 1, 2.
[3] Ibid. xii. 5, 4.
[4] Ibid. xi. 17.
[5] Vis. iv. 2, 4; Sim. ix. 12, 1.

Justin Martyr.

The Demonology of Justin Martyr—who wrote nearly within a hundred years of the death of Jesus, and whose life may have overlapped that of St. John, is the same as that of the Gospels, only more fully thought out and elaborated. He in fact recites and explains at length conceptions and beliefs which the Gospels simply assume. The demons so-called are, he says[1], the offspring of the angels who yielded to the embraces of earthly women and begat children. They have enslaved men ever since by magic writings, by fears and threats of penalties, and by teaching them to sacrifice and offer incense and libations, of which they stood in need. But possession is due not only to these demons, but also to the souls of dead people, which, after death, still have consciousness (*αἴσθησις*), and take hold of men and throw them convulsively about[2]. (Here, then, we have an explanation of why the Gadarene demoniac was driven among the tombs.) The ruler[3] of the evil demons is called Serpent, Satan, and Devil. They appear to men, making epiphanies (*ἐπιφανείας*)[4], and they terrify them into believing that they are gods. Then men build temples and put up statues into which the devils enter to abide. The gods of the heathen accordingly are evil demons, and wield a real supernatural influence over mankind. The demons[5] assume what names they like among their votaries, and by their foul actions go far to justify the fables about themselves to which the heathen give credit. Nor is it only the myths of the heathen which are due to them; for they equally inspire heretical opinions among Christians[6], in particular those of Simon Magus and Menander[7]. They even try to prevent men from reading the Scriptures which contain the message of salvation. Their one aim in fine[8] is to lead away men from God the Creator and his firstborn son Christ.

And herein Justin discovers the true rationale of perse-

[1] Apol. ii. 44 B. [2] Ibid. i. 65 B. [3] Ibid. i. 71 A.
[4] Ibid. i. 55 E. [5] Ibid. ii. 44 C; Ibid. i. 67 D. [6] Ibid. i. 69 D.
[7] Ibid. 91 B. [8] Ibid. 61 A; ibid. 92 B.

cutions. For it is the demons who instigate rulers to persecute the faithful; driving the said rulers on with irrational passion as with a whip[1]. And this not in the present age alone. For it was they who long ago instigated the Greeks to kill Socrates[2], charging him falsely with introducing new gods, merely because he dissuaded men from the service of devils.

However in the end these unholy demons will be imprisoned and punished with eternal fire, as Jesus and the prophets have foretold. And even in the present age Christians[3] are not left without relief from the demons, since these are worsted by the name of Jesus Christ, which they, in common with all other principalities and powers[4], dread more than any other name of the dead. "We call him[5] (Jesus) our helper and redeemer, for at the power of his name even the demons tremble; and to-day when they are exorcised by the name of Jesus Christ, who was crucified under Pontius Pilate, . . . they cower, yield, and are subject; and so it is proved clearly to all that his father gave him so much power as that even the demons were subdued by his name and by the economy of his passion." So, elsewhere[6], after quoting the text, "I give unto you power to trample on serpents and scorpions and skolopenders and over all power of the enemy" (Luke x. 19), Justin adds: "And we now (καὶ νῦν), who believe in Jesus our Lord, crucified under Pontius Pilate, exorcise all the demons and evil spirits and have them in subjection to ourselves. Later in the same dialogue[7] Justin invites the unbelieving Jews to consider the results achieved under their very eyes by the faithful." "For," he declares, "by means of the name of this very Son of God and firstborn of all creation, who was born of a virgin and became passible man, and was under Pontius Pilate crucified and so died, but rose again from the dead and ascended into heaven, any and every demon is conquered and subdued."

[1] Apol. i. 55 D. [2] Ibid. 56 A; Ibid. ii. 48 D. [3] Ibid. ii. 46 D.
[4] Dial. 350 B. [5] Ibid. 247 C. [6] Ibid. 301 E. [7] Ibid. 311 B.

Here then we have the full formula of exorcism used by Christians in Justin's day, and we see that it was calculated to fully instruct the demons about the superior being in whose name they were challenged to quit the possessed.

To the Roman Senate, in his second Apology, Justin addresses a like appeal[1]. "Jesus," he says, "became man to save believers and overthrow the Demons." That in the belief of this apologist was the great aim and result of the Saviour's ministry. "And in the present time (*καὶ νῦν*)," he says, "you can learn from what is going on under your eyes. For many of our people, to wit of the Christians, have healed and still heal many possessed by demons both all over the world and in this your city, exorcising them by the name of Jesus Christ who was crucified under Pontius Pilate —and this after all *other* exorcists and charmers and medicine-men have failed to heal them. For we break the power of the demons that possess men and chase them out." And, in arguing with the Jews, Justin declares[2], that exorcise as they might by every name of kings or of just men or of patriarchs, yet no one of the demons was subject to them as to Christians. He admits, however, in the same context that the demons would probably submit to a Jew, who should exorcise them in the name of the God of Abraham, and God of Isaac, and God of Jacob. We see, then, that Justin still accords to the Jews the power to get rid of demons which Jesus in his days had acknowledged that they possessed.

Justin's conception of the mission of Jesus is thus very simple. He came among men to free them from the rule of demons, and his name is a more powerful weapon than any other to drive them off. For the rest the use of *the Name* among Christians is the same as in the practice of exorcism in general.

Irenaeus.

Justin represents Samaria and Ephesus in the first half of the second century. Turn we next to Irenaeus, who represents the Christianity of Asia Minor and Gaul in the latter half of the same century. He, like

[1] Apol. ii. 45 A.

[2] Dial. 311 C.

Justin, acknowledges the antiquity and effectiveness of exorcisms other than Christian. By the Invocation, he declares[1], of the most high and almighty God men were saved before the advent of our Lord from the most wicked spirits, from all demons and from general apostasy. This, not because the demons had *seen* God, but because, as St. James says, they knew that he existed. He testifies that in his day the Jews still routed demons by pronouncing the name of him who made all things (*hac ipsa affatione*). The same writer, in another very striking passage[2], bears witness to some very extraordinary facts, as follows :

"In his (viz. Jesus') name his true disciples, having received grace from him, fulfil works of benevolence unto the rest of mankind, according to the several gifts they have each from him received. For some drive out devils lastingly and truly, with the result that often the very persons who have been purged of the evil spirits believe and become members of the church. Others have actually a foreknowledge of the future, and visions and prophetic utterances. Others again heal the sick by the laying on of hands and restore them to health. And ere now, as we said, even the dead have been raised and have remained with us for many years." "All these works are in the church performed," this Father goes on to assure us, "by the free and unpurchased grace of God, and not by invocation of angels or incantations or other depraved methods of magic. It is alone needful for the faithful to send up a prayer cleanly, purely, and openly to the Lord, who made all things, and to invoke the name of our Lord Jesus Christ."

Demonology of earliest Fathers same as that of the N. T.

It is abundantly clear from these passages of Justin and Irenaeus that the same belief in demons and the same methods of exorcising them prevailed both among the Christians and among the Jews, throughout the second century, as were in vogue in the age of Jesus and his disciples. One by one the several

[1] Iren. ii. 4, 6 (Ed. Harvey i. p. 264).

[2] Ibid., Haer. ii. 49, 3 (Harvey i. p. 375).

characteristics of the New Testament Demonology may be identified and exemplified in the personal beliefs and experiences of Justin and Irenaeus; and whatever reality appertained to the demons expelled by Jesus must be acknowledged to equally belong to those which these Fathers saw driven out.

Acts of Pilate.

And here, perhaps, before I pass on to the views of the earliest Latin Father, Tertullian, it may not be out of place to quote the quaint recipe for driving away an evil spirit, which is preserved in the Acts of Pilate or so-called Gospel of Nicodemus. This is a very early document, relating the story of the trial and crucifixion; and was almost certainly in the hands of Tertullian, if not of Justin. Indeed it seems to belong to an age and circle in which the legend of the miraculous birth of Jesus had not as yet arisen. The very account of the first appearance of the risen Jesus to Joseph of Arimathea on the Saturday night must have been written before the four Gospels became canonical, for it is in flagrant contradiction with all of them. Joseph, as a follower of Jesus, had been imprisoned by the Jews late on the Friday night, on the day of the crucifixion. "And about the middle of the next night, after the full Sabbath was expired, I was standing up, he relates, and was praying, when the building in which you confined me was suspended by its four corners, and I saw as it were a flash of light before my eyes. And in terror I fell on the ground. And some one took hold of my hand, and removed me from the spot where I was fallen, and a spray of water was shed over me from head to feet and a smell of myrrh came unto my nostrils. And having wiped my face he kissed me and said to me, 'Fear not, Joseph, open thine eyes and see who it is that speaks to thee.' And I looked up and saw Jesus, and was afraid, for I thought it was a phantasm, and so began to repeat the commandments, and he repeated them along with me. And, as ye are well aware, a phantasm if it meet with any one and hear the commandments flees precipitately."

I believe that a ghost may still be routed by reciting to it the Lord's Prayer and Ten Commandments. Perhaps this passage of the Acts of Pilate is hardly pertinent to my theme, but I have thought it well to quote it. For it well illustrates the passage in the Gospels according to which the disciples saw Jesus walking on the sea and thought that it was an apparition. It equally well illustrates, while it contradicts, the various apparitions of the risen Christ related in the New Testament. Lastly, it is curiously like Mrs. Besant's account of the nocturnal appearance to her of an Indian Mahatma, who "like all Mahatmas smelt stongly of sandalwood and Eastern spices."

Tertullian.

Similar testimony to Justin's is afforded by Tertullian, who died soon after A. D. 220. "We sacrifice," he says[1], "for the good health of the Emperor, but we do so to our God and his, and in the way God enjoined upon us, to wit with pure prayer. For God, the founder of the Universe, wants no odour of blood of victims. For these are the food of demons (*daemoniorum pabula*). But we not only repudiate demons, but we also overcome and repel them, and day by day we expose them and drive them out of men, as every one well knows."

There is hardly any man who has not a demon in him, says elsewhere[2] the same writer, whose writings in a hundred other passages prove how thoroughly imbued the North African congregations were with the belief in demons, and what an everyday occurrence exorcism was among them.

Those who would realize how large a space of the mental horizon of a Christian of the late second century the belief in demons occupied, cannot do better than read the twenty-second and twenty-third chapters of Tertullian's Apology and parts of the tract of Minucius Felix. The one reflects the opinion of African, the other that of Roman Christians. "If Christ's divinity," declares Tertullian, "is true and real, because the knowledge of it reforms a man's character;

[1] Ad Scap. 69 c (ed. 1675).

[2] Ibid., De Anima, 305 D.

it follows that the divinity which lurks under names and statues of the dead, and gets itself believed divine by certain signs and miracles and oracles, is but a sham divinity. For we admit the existence of spiritual substances (*substantias spiritales*). Nor is the name a new one; since Socrates had a restraining demon within him from childhood, a demon," adds Tertullian, "which doubtless dissuaded him from what was right (*dehortatorium plane a bono*)." Mark here the hostility of the writer to an ancient whom even Justin and Apollonius of Rome felt constrained to reverence, and whom Justin in particular declared to have been inspired by the Word of God. "The poets," continues Tertullian, "knew of demons; and even the untaught vulgar often resorted to the use of the curse or malediction. Plato knew of angels, and the magi asserted the existence both of angels and of demons." We see how in the above Tertullian testifies that the belief in evil spirits was common to Christianity with the more ancient opinions and religions of the world. "In the Holy Scriptures," continues Tertullian, "you can read how out of certain angels corrupted by their own self-will, the still more corrupt race of demons sprang into being." (Here Tertullian refers to the book of Enoch, which he believed to have been really written before the Flood [1], and to be rightly accepted by Christians as a prophecy of Christ. "The Holy Spirit," he says elsewhere [2], "foretold all these things through the most ancient prophet Enoch.") "Now the entire activity of these demons is directed to the overthrow of mankind; and that is why they inflict on our body illness and physical calamities, and on our soul sudden and through their violence extraordinary fits of madness (*excessus*). Their peculiar subtilty and thinness (*subtilitas et tenuitas sua*) enables them to assail both body and mind of man; their spiritual powers enable them to do much, to operate mischief with energies unseen and unfelt, save

[1] De Cultu Fem. i. 3 (151 A).

[2] De Idol. xv (95 A).

in their baneful results; as when some hidden blight in the breeze, hurries forward fruit and grain in flower; then nips them in the bud or blasts them in their maturity; or as when they mysteriously contaminate the air we breathe, so that it spreads pestilence among us. With the same obscure contagion, the breath (*adspiratio*) of angels and demons vitiates the mind, and goads it into madness or cruel lusts along with diverse errors; the most prevalent of which is that by which they get the minds of men so enthralled and deluded to believe in your gods, a belief into which they bewitch us in order to obtain the diet which alone suits them (*pabula propria*) of reek and blood, of sacrifices slain in honour of their effigies and images, and (what is a more acceptable banquet to them) to turn mankind aside from reflecting on the true divinity by the deceptions of false divination." "Let me point out," continues Tertullian, "how they produce these results. Every spirit has wings. This is true of angels and demons alike. Therefore they are everywhere in a trice. The whole world is as one spot to them; and they can learn and announce to us with equal ease what is going on, no matter where." Hence the wonders of false divination. "Because we do not know their real nature, we take their quickness for a mark of divinity. Often the demons foretell evils, and themselves wish to seem the authors of the same; for they often have ill-tidings to announce, but never good. They stole the counsels of God from the prophets of old, and even to-day when we read the prophets in church they are eavesdropping. This is how they ape true divinity. And they ingeniously frame their oracles to suit either event, oracles fraught with woe to the Croesuses and Pyrrhuses of old."

Then[1] follows a passage which reveals to us how old are such superstitions as spirit-rapping and table-turning: "The magicians," he says, "call up ghosts (*phantasmata*), and dishonour the souls of those long dead; they smother

[1] Ibid. 23.

young boys to make them gasp out oracles; they play off marvels with the trickery of jugglers; they cause men to dream dreams, since they have to help them the power of the angels, whom they summon, and of the demons, through whose agency both goats and tables (*mensae*) are wont to guess secrets (*divinare*). . . . Since both angels and demons can work the same results as your gods, what," he asks, "becomes of the vaunted superiority of your gods? Are they more than demons, these gods of yours?"

We should note in the above two points, firstly, that Tertullian believed even the angels of God to be at the disposition of magicians. They had to come if properly invoked (*invitati*). Secondly, he believed goats and tables to be really inspired.

The conclusion which Tertullian urges is that there is no real godhead behind the beliefs of pagans, but only devils; and he points in proof thereof to the dominion and power over the ancient gods which Christians had by merely naming Christ, and enumerating to the demons the tortures which Christ the judge would in the end inflict on them. Dreading Christ in God and God in Christ, they render obedience to the servants of God and of Christ. "So it is," he declares, "that they flee from our *touch and our blowing on them* (*de contactu deque afflatu*), overwhelmed by the contemplation and representation of the fire in store for them. Yea, they quit men's bodies at our command before your eyes with bad grace and reluctantly, and blushing with shame of themselves because of your presence."

What a glimpse we have here of the practical Christianity of the second century. The exorcist standing or kneeling over the prostrate form of a demoniac, touching it, blowing on it, as Jesus blew on his disciples, reciting perhaps the while from the book of Enoch the judgments in store for evil spirits, when their hour shall come.

"But enough of words," exclaims Tertullian, "I can give you, if you will, an ocular demonstration that your gods are mere devils under another name. Let any one be

brought forward before your tribunals, who is admittedly driven on by a demon. Let any Christian you like command the evil spirit to speak, and it will at once own that it is really but a demon, though in other places it falsely pretends to be a god. In the same way let there be produced one of those whom you believe to be under the influence of a god (*de Deo pati*), one of those who, by inhaling the fumes of the altars, have conceived the godhead (*numen*), and who are bent double with belching as they pant out their prophecies. Choose your virgin Caelestis who promises rain, or Aesculapius himself. If these do not at once confess to being demons, because they do not dare to lie to a Christian, then cut the throat of that Christian on the spot for his insolence. What test," he asks, "could be more open and conclusive[1]: there would be no room left for suspicion." It would be nice to know whether a pagan judge ever accepted Tertullian's challenge; and if so, what was the result of so memorable a séance.

Minucius Felix.

In the apology of Minucius Felix, entitled Octavius, we have an account of the demons so akin to that of Tertullian, that critics are divided as to whether Felix had read Tertullian or Tertullian Felix. Just as the one reflects Carthaginian opinion in the second century, so the other, Felix, the scene of whose dialogue is laid at Ostia, reflects that of Rome. The origin of all error and depravity is, says Felix (ch. 26), to be traced to the activity of demons, impure spirits who roam around, exiled from heaven and from the strength which heaven gives, by the stains of earth and by their lusts. These spirits, immersed in vices, are borne downwards by the weight of their sins, and have lost the simpleness of their substance (*simplicitatem substantiae*). Ruined natures, they seek to solace themselves by ruining others and alienating men from God—as they themselves are alienated—by spreading among them false religions. These spirits the poets called demons. Socrates

[1] A hundred years later we find St. Athanasius (*de Incarn.* 48, § 15) renewing the challenge.

recognized their existence and had one dwelling within him, at whose beck and call he acted or declined to act. The magicians (*magi*) not only are familiar with demons, but by their means work all their miracles. Ostanes, leader and spokesman of these magicians (or *magi*), who taught truly about God and his angels, represented the demons as beings earthy, vagrant and inimical to mankind (*terrenos, vagos, humanitatis inimicos*). Plato, who esteemed it a difficult business to find God, tells us about angels and demons. In his *Symposium* he attempts to define the nature of demons. Their substance is halfway between mortal and immortal, between body and spirit, concreted of earthy heaviness and heavenly lightness. Of such a substance was Eros or love formed, so that he could glide into human breasts and stir the feelings. These impure spirits, as the magicians and philosophers have shown, lurk under cover of statues and images, and by their afflatus win the authority as it were of present godhead. At the same time they insinuate themselves into priests, as they hang about the fanes. They also at times animate the entrails of the slain victims so that the muscles twitch; they govern the flight of the birds, rule the lots, and fabricate oracles, in which they mix up a little truth with a great deal of falsehood. For they are themselves deceived and deceive others; for they either do not know the pure truth; or, if they do, will not confess it to their own destruction. Thus they weigh men down from heaven and call them away from God to material concerns. They disturb our life, and break up our sleep; and creeping into our bodies—secretly, for they are attenuated spirits—they produce diseases, scare our minds, and distort our limbs, all this in order to drive us to worship them, and to get the reputation of having cured us, when in fact they have only relaxed the limbs they had themselves cramped, because they are glutted with the reek of altars and blood of cattle. Then Felix relates how the demons owned to being demons, when the Christians drove them out of

men's bodies with torments recited and burnings invoked upon them (*tormentis verborum et orationis incendiis*). Saturn himself, and Serapis and Jupiter, and all the other demons worshipped, could be thus overcome by pain and made to declare their true nature. They never lied about their foulness, especially if their worshippers were present. "For when adjured by the only true God they give a shudder of misery in the bodies of the possessed; and either leap forth at once or disappear little by little (*exiliunt statim vel evanescunt gradatim*), according as the faith of the victim assists or as the grace of the healer is breathed upon him. So it is that the demons flee from Christians at close quarters, though when they are at a safe distance from their meetings, they assail them *through* the Pagans, into whose inexperienced minds they creep, and without showing themselves sow hatred of the Christians whom they dread. For this they seize upon men's minds and blockade their hearts; so that they begin to hate the Christians before ever they know them, or if they know them are prevented from imitating those whom yet they cannot condemn."

From such passages as these we can judge how firm a hold the older beliefs still had upon the Christians of the first three centuries. All the gods of the Greek and Roman mythology were supernatural and real, only malignant, beings. Still clearer is it that the practice of exorcising demons from the sick was as common in the Roman Church of 200 A. D. as it was in Judaea during the ministry of Jesus. The evil spirits still cried aloud and convulsed their victims, when they were cast out, just as they do in the New Testament. And just as they cried out to Jesus that they knew him for the Son of God, and besought him not to torment them, for their day was not yet come; so they avow to the contemporaries of Tertullian and Minucius Felix their real nature and their dread of the fiery torments in store for them. As St. James had put it in his general epistle: "The devils also believe and shudder" (James ii. 19).

F. C. CONYBEARE.

ELIJAH'S PRAYER.

(JEHUDA IBN GIAT.)

THE glory of the Lord I will declare
At eventide, when rose Elijah's prayer,
What time, the weak and sinful multitude
From day to day their evil works pursued,
And those who feared the Lord were sore distress'd,
Brought low, and by their enemies oppress'd.
Then while the people gazed, the priests of sin
Were gathered unto him, who sought to win
The erring crowd to hear his holy word,
Acceptable and pleasing to the Lord.

"Oh! may my prayer approach thy throne, Most High,
And be thine ear attentive to my cry,
When that the hour of Mincha draweth nigh."

Thus, unto all the people gathered round,
His words of gracious wisdom did resound,
Each unto each with understanding bound.

"Oh! foolish and unwise, who nothing know,
How long, unsure and halting, will ye go,
'Twixt two opinions, ever to and fro?

"Seek where the truth is found—if in the Lord
Or in another—be the truth adored."
And all the people answered not a word.

He cried aloud: "Nay, hearken once again.
I, only I, of all the many slain
A prophet of the Lord alone remain.

"The while the priests of Baal, who daily stand
Bending before the works of craftsmen's hand,
Four hundred count and fifty in the land.

"Choose ye a bullock then with fitting care,
And offer it upon your altar there.
I for myself will likewise mine prepare.

"Then this to all who fain the truth would see,
And follow after it a sign shall be—
Who answereth with fire, God is he."

And they, when these wise words to silence fell,
Seemed to repent, whose hearts did erst rebel,
For all made answer: It is spoken well!

"Be ye, the many, first," he said again,
"Prepare your altar, bring the bullock slain,
But let the fire unkindled yet remain."

They called in folly on an empty name,
"O Baal, answer us, thy power proclaim!"
But neither voice, nor sound for answer came.

Then mocked Elijah them and mocking said:
"Call with a loud voice, be ye not afraid,
Call, for he is a god—be undismayed."

Then leaped they on the altar they had built,
And cut and gashed themselves with knives, and spilt
Their blood with evil rites of shame and guilt.

Weary they grew and faint, as time sped by,
And their souls sank within them hopelessly,
Until the hour of Mincha had come nigh.

The man of God, the prophet, then ignored
For a brief period the holy word[1],
While he repaired the altar of the Lord.

For every tribe, as was their wont always,
He took a stone, as in the ancient days,
Wherewith the altar of the Lord to raise.

[1] In allusion to the law forbidding offerings elsewhere than in the temple.

He laid the offering, duly purified,
Upon the altar, and on every side
He dug a trench around it, deep and wide.

"Fill it with water till it overflows,"
He bade them next. Then at the long day's close,
Even at the Mincha hour, Elijah's prayer arose.

O Lord of all!
God of my fathers, hear me when I call.
Let it be known
For evermore that thou art Lord alone;
That I, even I,
Thy servant am, who still unceasingly
To serve thee run,
And at thy bidding all these things have done.
Hear, when I pray,
And make thy people know thy power this day,
And turn once more
Their hearts to thee, as in the days of yore!

Then fell there fire from heaven at his word,
And all the people cried with one accord,
"The Lord is God—He only—God and Lord!"

ALICE LUCAS.

A DIRGE FOR THE NINTH OF AB.

O THOU afflicted, drunken not with wine[1]!
Cast to the earth thy timbrel; strip thee bare;
Yea, make thee bald[2]; let not thy beauty shine;
Despoil of comeliness thy presence fair;
Lift up a wailing on the mountain height[3];
Turn thee to all thy borders; seek thy flight.

And cry before the Lord
For thresholds waste,
For thresholds waste;

[1] Isa. li. 21. [2] Mic. i. 16. [3] Jer. vii. 29.

Cry for thy little ones
Slain of the sword;
Lift up thine hands to him,
To him implored.

How hath to Zion come the foeman dread,
Into the royal city entrance found!
How do the reckless feet of strangers tread
With step irreverent on the hallowed ground!
Lo! when the spoilers stormed the sanctuary
They gazed on priests, the guards of sacred rite,
Watchmen who kept their charge, and fearlessly
Stood by, unflinching 'mid the deadly fight:
Until their blood was shed, profuse as when
Of yore the Nile was turned to bloody flow;
Within the curtain burst unholy men;
Yea, even where the High Priest feared to go.
They stript of gold thy walls' majestic heights[1],
And the fair windows of thy narrowed lights[2].

And cry before the Lord
For thresholds waste,
For thresholds waste;
Cry for thy little ones
Slain of the sword;
Lift up thine hands to him,
To him implored.

The voice of Zion's daughter sore doth moan,
She waileth from afar in anguish deep,
Uttereth the cry of Heshbon overthrown[3]
And with the weeping of Mephaath doth weep[4]:

[1] 1 Kings vi. 21.

[2] The Targum Jonathan ben Uzziel paraphrases this verse in accordance with Jewish tradition: "And they made for the house windows wide outwardly and narrow inwardly." The tradition was that while ordinary windows were constructed by cavities in the walls cut at an angle widening inwardly to admit the rays of light into the building, the windows of the Temple were cut in the opposite way to suggest that the Temple was the true source of light.

[3] Jer. xlviii. 34. [4] Jer. xlviii. 21.

Woe! I have drunk the cup, have drained it! Woe!
Lions with savage fangs have me undone,
Daughter of Babylon, that liest low[1]!
Daughter of Edom, O thou guilty one!
Wherefore, O Zion, art bewailing thee
O'er this thy doom? for lo! thy sin is known:
By the abundance of iniquity
Beholdest thou the exile of thine own;
For that thy watchman true thou didst forsake,
To hearken unto words false omens spake.

And cry before the Lord
For thresholds waste,
For thresholds waste;
Cry for thy little ones
Slain of the sword;
Lift up thine hands to him,
To him implored.

Rejoice not, O mine enemy, o'er my pain[2],
O'er the destruction that hath come to me,
For though I fall I shall arise again[2];
The Lord yet helpeth me; yea, even he
Who scattered, in his burning wrath, his flock,
Shall gather me once more within his fold;
He shall deliver me from thee; my Rock
Shall free his servant, to thy bondage sold.
Then unto thee shall pass the brimming bowl,
The cup whose bitterness hath filled my soul.

And cry before the Lord
For thresholds waste,
For thresholds waste;
Cry for thy little ones
Slain of the sword;
Lift up thine hands to him,
To him implored.

NINA DAVIS.

[1] Ps. cxxxvii. 8. [2] Mic. vii. 8.

THE TALMUDICAL LAW OF AGENCY.

THE present paper is an attempt to give an account of the Talmudical Law of Representation or Agency, together with a comparison, wherever such comparison seems applicable, of the Talmudical Law with the law on the same subject in the Roman and English systems. The paper must be considered to touch upon salient points rather than to give a Digest or a Code of the Talmudical Law of this important branch of Jurisprudence.

What do we mean by an Agent or Procurator, or שָׁלִיחַ (nuntius)? The Roman Law defines a Procurator as follows: "Procurator est qui aliena negotia mandatu domini administrat," and the Digest pithily puts the use of a Procurator thus: "Usus autem procuratoris *perquam* necessarius est, ut qui rebus suis ipsi superesse vel nolunt, vel non possunt, per alios possint vel agere, vel conveniri." Talmudical Law agrees exactly with other systems, in its definition of a שליח, and in allowing the appointment of a שליח it is actuated by the same need as allows such appointments in all systems of Law.

It may be necessary to notice by the way that a distinction is sometimes made between a "messenger" and an "agent." Sohm, in his *Institutes of Roman Law,* puts the distinction thus: "If I desire to conclude a juristic act on my own behalf, and am prevented by purely physical reasons, I may frequently avail myself of the services of a messenger. The messenger serves precisely the same purpose as a letter, the purpose, namely, of overcoming the physical obstacles of distance. He makes the journey instead of me, but it is I myself who conclude the juristic

act. Suppose, however, that in thus employing another, I have no intention of concluding the transaction myself, because I prefer not to determine all the details myself. It may be my purpose to let the negotiations, conducted with the person whom I have commissioned, decide the result, and be regarded in the same way as though they were carried on by myself in my own behalf. In that case the person whom I employ is not merely to save me the journey but is to conclude the juristic act for me. He is to weigh all the surrounding circumstances, and the decision, the exertion of the will by virtue of which the juristic act is concluded, is his, not mine. Such is the nature of representation. A messenger is merely a conduit pipe for conveying my will, a representative is a person who wills instead of me. Representation, then, is the conclusion of a juristic act by one person acting for another." Although jurists have sometimes made much of this distinction, I do not think it is a logical one. Careful consideration will show that the distinction depends upon the extent of the "mandatum" or the authority given to the "agent" by his "dominus" or "principal." The *authority* may be wide in its scope, or it may be very narrow. Talmudical Law knows nothing of the distinction. A man may say to his שליח, Go and enter into a marriage contract for me with a certain lady living at a certain place, or he may give his agent authority to enter into a marriage contract for him with a lady whom he (the agent) may think suitable for his principal. In any case the agent is called a שליח, a "nuntius," a messenger.

Let us see what the Talmud itself tells us about the שליח generally. Perhaps it is well to point out that there is no treatise on agency in the Talmud. The matter is only treated by the way while treating of another subject. The classical passage is to be found at the beginning of the second chapter of Kiddushin, and runs as follows: האיש מקדש בו ובשלוחו האשה מתקדשת בה ובשלוחה. A man may enter into a marriage contract either by himself directly or through

an agent; a woman may enter into a marriage contract either directly or through an agent. I think that in order to avoid misapprehension it is necessary to add that it is not recommended to enter into the marriage contract by means of a שליח. First, it is said, that men ought themselves to perform the מצוות or divine precepts, and marriage is such a precept; and, secondly, it is an איסור, a prohibition to marry a woman without having seen her. But the objections are ethical rather than legal.

It would be interesting, if space permitted, to go through the long logical argument by which the Talmud proves from the Scriptures the doctrine of agency. Talmudical Law was mainly concerned with the development of the Law of the Torah, and like other old systems hardly knew the meaning of *direct* legislation. Agency had become a necessity in the developed life of the community. It was important, therefore, to find the doctrine of agency in the Pentateuch. The argument may be stated shortly as follows:—Reference is made to the Biblical Law of Divorce ("and he shall send her away," Deut. xxiv. 1–4), and the word ושלחה is pressed. One might have expected instead of this verb וְגֵרְשָׁהּ, "and he shall drive her away," the more common verb for "to divorce." Since, however, ושלחה is used, we have a proof that the man who gives the גט or bill of divorcement may appoint an agent to give it, and since it is possible to read the same word ושלחה without a Mappiq in the ה, the admissibility of the woman appointing an agent to receive the גט is proved according to the exegesis of the Talmud. But the Talmud rightly objects that thus agency is proved only in the matter of Divorce, how can we extend agency beyond Divorce? After all Divorce is an exceptional matter, seeing that the third party to whom the שליח of the husband is sent is בְּעַל כָּרְחָהּ, that is to say, has no option to refuse, and thus Divorce is removed from ordinary juristic acts. The Talmud goes back to verse 2 of our chapter in Deuteronomy. In that verse the two verbs ויצאה והיתה will be found in juxtaposition,

and the argument runs as follows:—Since Divorce (ויצאה, "and she shall go out") can take place by means of an agent, so marriage (והיתה לאיש אחר, "and she shall be for another husband") can take place by means of an agent. But even now the doctrine of agency can only be applied to the two special cases of Divorce and Marriage. How can we make its application general? Will the fact that the תרומה, or heave-offering which the Levite gave to the Priest, could be separated by means of an agent (in accordance with the Talmudical exegesis of pressing the word גם in the phrase גם אתם (Num. xviii. 28)), help us in establishing the general rule. No, answers the Talmud, the separation of תרומה is different from other legal acts, since it can be separated במחשבה without any *actual act* of separation. Rabbi Joshua ben Korchah draws the general doctrine of agency and the permissibility to do an act which we find it either impossible or inconvenient to do ourselves from the verse in Exodus, which treats of the Paschal Lamb, ושחטו אותו כל קהל עדת ישראל, "And all the congregation of Israel shall slay it;" and he pertinently asks the question, וכי כל הקהל כולן שוחטין, Do the *whole* congregation kill the Paschal Lamb? But then the objection might be urged that the Paschal Lamb belonged to the category of קדשים, or sacrifices in which the principle of agency is perforce admitted, שכן רוב מעשיהם על ידי שליח. The outcome of the Talmud on the matter, and this too is the terse summing up of the celebrated Asheri, is that the doctrine of agency is extracted from the Paschal Lamb and Divorce combined. If the objection already referred to is urged against the former, then the fact of Divorce answers that objection. If the objection is urged against Divorce that agency is applicable there because the wife has no option but to receive the גט, then the Paschal Lamb disposes of that objection. To use Talmudical language, agency is extracted מבייניהו. The lawyer cannot help admiring the "elegance" with which the Talmudical lawyers arrive at their goal.

The relationship in Talmudical Law between the prin-

cipal and the agent is expressed in the maxim, שלוחו של אדם כמותו, "A man's agent is as himself," and the Talmud is prepared to carry this maxim to its full logical consequences. The agent may do all that his principal can do. Those who may be principals may be agents, and vice versa. Who, now, can be agents? According to Roman and English Law, few are excluded from being agents. According to Talmudical Law, the following rules are to be noted: A נכרי, an alien, can neither appoint an Israelite as an agent, nor can he be appointed by an Israelite as an agent, i. e. an alien can be neither principal nor agent to an Israelite. This might have been inferred from the fact that the doctrine of agency is derived from Marriage and Divorce, neither of which, according even to the Pentateuch, would apply as practical law between Israelites and aliens, or it might have been derived from the Bible verse referring to the Paschal Lamb, which of course cannot be applied to an alien, but the Talmud finds a special reason to emphasize the exclusion of the נכרי in the words גַּם אַתֶּם, "even ye," in the passage already referred to relating to the Terumah or heave-offering, words which, according to Talmudical exegesis, imply the necessity of equality, before the law, of principal and agent with respect to the covenant of Israel, and therefore the exclusion of the alien. A קטן, a child, and one of unsound mind cannot be principals and cannot be agents, because they are not בני דעת, i. e. have no legal knowledge. A woman, or a Hebrew slave, male or female, because, in their own sphere, the law is binding upon them, come within the law of agency. Again, those who cannot legally act for themselves cannot legally be principals. This would lead to practical difficulties, but the difficulty is overcome in Talmudical Law, as in other systems of Law, by what is called "tutelary representation." A guardian a tutor or Epitropos, which last term the Talmud borrowed from the Greek translation of the Roman term, was fully qualified to act on behalf of his ward, so long as he did not act to his ward's disadvan-

tage. Of course, what is disadvantage in this sense would give room for discussion. According to Maimonides (Hilchot Nachalot, XI) the Epitropos could neither bring nor defend an action on behalf of his ward. Abraham ben David of Posquières (ראב"ד), in his gloss on Maimonides, asserts that while the guardian may be the agent of his ward to prosecute a claim, he cannot be his agent to defend it.

The following case may be interesting as showing the extent to which the dictum that a קטן, a child or infant, who of course ceases to be an infant at a much earlier age than in Roman or English Law, cannot be an agent. A father sends his son with a bottle and a coin of the value of a florin to buy a shilling's worth of oil, and bring back the change. The shopkeeper measures the oil, gives it in the bottle to the boy and also gives him the change. The boy loses the change and breaks the bottle. Who is responsible for the loss? The answer is that the shopkeeper is responsible for the loss of the oil and the change, because he ought to have known that all for which the boy's father could have sent him was to order the oil, that he could not have been his father's agent to complete the purchase and bring the oil. The father of the boy has to bear the loss of the bottle because he wilfully ran the risk of the breaking of the bottle, when he gave it to the boy. In Rabbinical language, the bottle was אבידה מדעת at the very moment when the father gave it to the boy.

Perhaps one of the most interesting discussions in the Talmud, as to the nature of agency generally, is to be found in a short passage where the position of the כהן or priest is discussed. Is the priest the representative of the person who brings the sacrifice, or the representative of God who receives it? שלוחי דרחמנא or שלוחי דידן? Rab Huna settles the question in favour of the latter view, and does not incommode the question with any mystical theory, but simply remaining faithful to the first principles of agency, asks the question, "Can an agent do that for us which we

are unable legally to do ourselves": מי איכא מדי דאנן לא מצינן עבדינן ואינהו מצי עבדי? So the Halachic decision seems to be. Perhaps it might have been solved thus. According to Scripture, it was God who appointed the priests to bring the sacrifice, therefore they must be the agents of him who appointed them. The question might be asked what practical difference can result from the solution of the question as to the priest's principal. The practical difference the Talmud exemplifies thus: Reuben makes a vow that he will partake of no benefit which comes to him from Simeon or כהן. Can Reuben avail himself of Simeon's services to let him bring his sacrifice? The answer is in the affirmative, because the כהן stands in no legal relation to the בעל הקרבן, the bringer of the sacrifices. The question, however, is not simple, and the discussion on the same subject, in treatise Nedarim, should be taken into account where an attempt is made to distinguish between sacrifices which do and sacrifices which do not require the knowledge of the person on whose behalf they are brought, such as those which are brought after one has suffered a Levitical impurity, the sacrifices called in technical language מחוסרי כפרה.

That the Talmud had a sound idea of the nature of agency does not need further proof. We must now consider an interesting question. Did the Talmudical Law of agency advance beyond the Roman Law? The Roman Law, it should be stated, was far behind modern systems of law in its conception of agency. For what is the nature of true agency? I may quote from an excursus by Moyle in his excellent edition of the *Institutes of Justinian*. The test of true agency is this: To what extent is it possible for *B* to make a contract with *C* for *A*, so that assuming, of course, that *B* discloses the fact of his agency, and his principal's name, and does not exceed his instructions, *A* alone acquires rights against and can sue *C*. *C* acquires rights against and can sue *A* only, and *B* neither acquires rights nor incurs liabilities, under

the contract. Leaving out of the discussion the theory of Savigny, which is based upon a reading in a passage in Justinian's Digest, ascribed to the celebrated jurist Modestinus, the crucial reading in which is now held to be false, the Roman law of agency with respect to contract is very clumsy. Moyle puts the matter thus: "If *A* being at Rome wishes to buy a house belonging to *C* at Naples, he would give *B* at Naples a mandate to buy it for him. *B* does so, and then assigns his rights against *C* to *A*. *C*'s rights against *B*, e. g. his claim for the purchase-money, can be made available against *A* only by a novation (that is to say, a distinct stipulation from *A* that he will pay *C* for *B*); if this is not done, *C*, if necessary, must recover from *B* by *actio venditi*, and *B* from *A* by *actio mandati contraria*, an action to recover the money which *B* has laid out for him. Here none of the conditions above specified are realized, and it should be specially pointed out that *B* is in fact the principal and the true vendor throughout, and the only person who is entitled and bound in that capacity." It was different, it is true, when *res corporeales* were actually delivered. Then the agent could take possession for his principal, though according to the older Roman Law even this was not possible, for the maxim held good "per extraneam personam acquiri non potest." Now that the Talmudical Law went as far as the latest Roman Law, there can possibly be no doubt. The following passage from the well-known Code called the *Tur*, compiled by Jacob Asheri of Toledo, proves this to the hilt: "If Reuben says to Simeon, זבין לי מידי, Buy something for me, and Simeon buys מסתמא unconditionally, then in that case Reuben acquires possession (קנייה ראובן) from the very moment of delivery" (Choshen Hammishpat, 183).

Does Talmudical Law go farther than this, and admit agency in contract as distinguished from delivery of possession? I think I may safely say that it does, or at any rate, that it can. The Talmud never once loses hold of its great principle in agency שלוחו של אדם כמותו. The agent of

a man can do all that his principal can do. It is true, that according to the Talmudical Law of Sale, which was amended in the interest of the purchaser, there would be no complete sale of *mobilia* without some form of delivery הגבהה משיכה, that is to say, a mere contract of sale did not complete the sale; but the Talmud acknowledges that originally, according to the Torah itself, the giving of the purchase-money by the buyer completed the purchase; and we find in the Talmud, in the name of Rava, a decision according to which the actual delivery became a mere formality, e. g. it was sufficient for the purchaser to put a mark upon the things he bought, and the celebrated Rabbi Solomon ben Aderet of Barcelona is quoted in a gloss of Joseph Karo's Commentary on the code of Maimonides, to the effect that in all commercial matters the custom of the merchants in the province where the transaction takes place must be held to be binding. Certainly, in this manner, a contract of sale of mobilia which may take place according to English Law (I am leaving out of account, of course, the Statute of Frauds) without actual payment of money and without actual delivery, could take place in England according to Talmudical Law under the same conditions, and if we remain firm to our principle that an agent of man is as himself, it follows that if the principal may enter into such a contract, so may his agent for him. With regard to *immobilia*, a sale was complete in Talmudical Law when the שטר, or deed of sale, had been written and delivered and the money paid—in some cases even the last was not necessary. Here, clearly חזקה or actual delivery of the thing itself, though a possible form of completion, was not a necessary form, and clearly too a man could buy land through an agent, without the employment of the roundabout method needed by Roman Law. With regard to agency, then, the civil legislation of the Talmud would require no reform to bring it on a level with our modern systems.

We are, therefore, clear now as to the true nature of

agency in our Talmudical Law—are there cases in which a man cannot appoint an agent? I think the answer is afforded by our general principles. That which we cannot legally or morally do ourselves, we cannot appoint an agent to do. The Talmud expresses this in the maxim, אין שליח לדבר עבירה, "There is no agent to do a wrong." This also agrees with the general principle of the Roman Law. Ulpian lays down "Rei turpis nullum est mandatum." The Talmud shows here again its grip of logical consequences, and lays down further that a man cannot appoint an agent to do that which he could not do himself at the time of the appointment of the agent, although he might have been able to do it afterwards. To illustrate: *A* appoints *B* as agent to marry for him *C*, whom he believes to be divorced. *C* is not divorced at the time of the appointment of *B*, but is divorced at the time when *B* reaches her. *B* cannot marry *C* for *A*. The fact that *C* was a married woman at the time of *B*'s appointment invalidates his agency. The general maxim on this point is: לא משוי אינש שליח אלא במלתא דעביד השתא במלתא דלא מצי עביד ליה השתא לא משוי שליח (Nazir, 12 b). Wherein does the Talmud find its general rule, "There is no agent to do a wrong"? It gives a moral foundation for the rule in the maxim: דברי הרב ודברי התלמיד דברו מי שומעים, "If there be a contradiction between the words of a teacher and the words of his disciple, to whom should you give heed?" or, in other words, where there is a contradiction between a divine command, and a human command, heed must be given to the divine command. Therefore if a principal gives his agent commission to do a wrong, the divine command annuls the commission of his principal, and since there is no commission, there is no agent. But the Talmud also builds up this rule by pressing the demonstrative pronoun ההוא *that* in the verse in Leviticus xvii. 4: דם יחשב לאיש ההוא, "It shall be reckoned sin to *that* man only." The קרבן נתנאל, a commentary on Asheri's summing up of the Talmud, urges that if the agent were not aware of the wrongfulness of his agency, his

appointment as agent could not be declared void on the ground of the moral maxim. The writer therefore prefers to build up the rule on the verse in Leviticus to building it on the more general maxim.

There is one exception to the general rule that there is no agent to do a wrong, and that is in the case of מעילה or the inadvertent conversion of temple property to profane use, but this exception is not founded upon a legal principle, but upon the so-called גזרה שוה, a similarity of phrase in two verses, an exegesis, according to Talmudical theory, taught by tradition and not by logic (see the use of חטא in Lev. v. 15 and Num. xviii. 32).

The dictum that there is no agency in wrong doing, is not, however, universally admitted in the Talmud. Shammai, the contemporary of Hillel, did not accept it, and he grounds his dissent which is referred back to the prophet Haggai upon the fact that Nathan when accusing David of his sin against Uriah, said to him, אתו הרגת בחרב בני עמון, "Thou didst slay him with the sword of the children of Ammon" (2 Sam. xii. 9), although it was not David who had slain Uriah, but the Ammonites. But even Shammai would admit, says the Talmud, that if I said to a person, Go and eat forbidden food, that I could not be regarded as the principal and deserving of punishment, and the person who ate the food as the agent and free. Shammai would make this exception on the ground that there is no instance in the Law of a person being punished for a wrongful act, from which he had no enjoyment, זה נהנה וזה מתחייב לא אמרינן. It is very doubtful whether such a case is a case of agency at all. Gaius speaks as follows of a parallel case in Roman Law: "Cuius generis mandatum magis consilium est quam mandatum et ob id non est obligatorium, quia nemo ex consilio obligatus, etiam si non expediat ei cui dabatur quia liberum est cuique apud se explorare, an expediat sibi consilium" (XVII. i. 2, 6).

Excluding the dissent of Shammai then, the maxim אין שליח לדבר עבירה holds good in all cases except that

of מעילה already referred to, and the Talmud makes no distinction whatever between crimes and delicts or torts or civil wrongs which arise from the negligence or carelessness of an agent or servant in the performance of a duty. The idea of a crime as distinct from a tort is not clearly marked in the Talmudical system. In this it agrees with other ancient systems of law. The case where a man is held liable for injury done when he leaves an ox, or a pit, or a fire, or some other source of injury, in charge of a child or one of unsound mind, is no exception to the rule. These cannot be agents, and therefore the responsibility does not proceed from agency.

Let us see how the matter stands in other systems of law with respect to vicarious responsibility. The Roman Law does recognize it, at any rate in its later stages, with respect to what are called "quasi delicts," e. g. if anything is thrown out of a window in a house which I own or which I hire, to the injury of a passer-by, or if anything is stolen by the servants of the innkeeper, I and the innkeeper are liable. It is, however, acknowledged in the Digest that the Edict of the Praetor which admitted an action in this case, was founded upon expediency, nor was there any injustice in the rule, for it lay within the innkeeper's discretion whether he would accept the goods or not; besides it is his own fault if he employs careless servants (quod opera malorum hominum uteretur).

In English Law, the maxim "Respondeat superior" holds good in the case of torts, though not in the case of crimes. It is upon this doctrine that a Railway Company is responsible, civilly, for a so-called accident caused by the negligence of its servants, but it is very doubtful whether cases like these in English Law come at all under the category of principal and agent. It is clearly laid down that the contract of agency or service cannot impose any obligation on the agent or servant to commit or assist in the committing of fraud, or any other wrong. As between the agent or the servant and the principal or employer either is liable

for the whole damage, and when the plaintiff has made his choice which of the two to sue, he is concluded by it. Moreover, there is, generally speaking, no contribution between the so-called agent and his principal. If the agent has been sued alone, and compelled to pay the whole damage, he has no right to indemnity or contribution from his principal. The severity with which the Talmud applies its rule, "There can be no agency to do a wrong," is strictly logical, and Sir William Anson, in his well-known work on Contracts, regards the English rule, "Respondeat superior," as illogical. He says, "It would be interesting to inquire how far the doctrine of representation in such cases is of modern origin. It may be that the extreme form which Employer's Liability has assumed in English Law is an application to modern society of rules which are properly applicable when the master is served by slaves, and is liable for injuries done by them as being part of his property."

We have now, I think, touched upon some of the chief principles of the Law of Agency. We shall discuss now the relationship, not of the agent and principal to third parties, but of their relationship to each other. First, how is a שליח or agent appointed? Generally, according to Talmudical Law, no formalities at all are required. If, however, I wish to appoint an agent in a law-suit, or in any matter where there is not an acquiescent but an opposing third party, there must be an instrument in writing called a כתב הרשאה or deed giving permission. The reason for this is rightly stated to be, that without it my opponent might turn to my agent and say, "I have nothing to do with you; you are no party in the cause:" אין אתה בעל דיני. In the Roman Law, in its later stages, no special form was necessary in the appointment of procurators or agents to carry on law-suits.

Whether an agent can be appointed by me by conduct or sufferance without express words on my part, whether for instance I should, according to Talmudical Law, be bound

to the shopkeeper for what I have allowed my wife or my servant to buy habitually on credit, has not been decided so far as I know. It is worth while, however, pointing out that partnership is in English Law an illustration of agency by implication. It is well known that in Roman Law the contract of "societas" or partnership is but in an embryo state, and does not discuss aught beyond the distribution of the partnership goods. In the great code of Maimonides, agency and partnership are placed under one rubric. It is, therefore, probable that the Talmud would recognize "implied agency." Whether agency may be formed by subsequent ratification is also doubtful, although it is hard to see how the Talmud could have formulated its principle זכין לאדם שלא בפניו, that a contract may be entered into for a man without that man's authority, if there be a well-founded presumption that that man would consider such contract to be to his advantage, if agency by subsequent ratification were wholly unrecognized.

What are the duties of the agent? The Talmud distinguishes two kinds of agent: (1) the agent who performs his duties gratuitously; (2) the agent who renders his services for a reward—the so-called סרסר. The Roman Law considers the first to be the only true agent or *mandatarius*; the latter is moved from the contract of *mandatum* to that of *Locatio conductio*—Letting and Hiring. In this case I have not an agent, according to Roman Law, I have hired some one to perform a particular service for me.

The first duty of an agent is to perform what he has promised to perform, that is to say, to do his שליחות, to carry out his instructions. If he does not do this, the Talmud distinguishes between the שליח and the סרסר. In the first case, if, for instance, he buys barley when he is told to buy wheat, the whole business is בטל or void. If he is paid, then he is responsible, and is obliged to pay damages. I ought to add, that in both cases and always it is assumed that the שליח has disclosed the fact that he

is an agent. If he has not disclosed this fact, then, in both cases, the agent has purchased for himself. This is rational, because secret representation is no true representation. There is one case, however, in which even the agent who performs his work gratuitously must make good to his principal the deficient accomplishment of his agency. If a principal appoints an agent to buy land for him, and the agent buys for him without what is called אחריות, *cautio de evictione*, "security against eviction," then in such a case the agent is regarded as having purchased for his principal without such *cautio*, and he must sell to his principal with his own personal security.

Again, according to English and Roman Law, the agent must deliver up to his principal all benefits resulting from the execution of the agency. Both systems consider the whole contract of agency to be founded upon confidence. Speaking of the contract of *mandatum*, Paul says, "Originem ex officio atque amicitia trahit." English Law sternly prohibits anything which might tend to make the agent's interest clash with his duty. Talmudic Law does not go so far as this. If, for instance, the third party gave the agent a present in connexion with his agency, English Law would say that the present belonged to the principal: Talmudical Law lays down that the present is to be divided between the principal and the agent; not that it ought not, in strict law, to belong to the agent, but because the present was after all indirectly derived from the employment of the principal's money, the principal should have a share in it.

Owing to the same intention, the prevention of the agent's duty clashing with his interest, both English and Roman Law hold that if an agent is appointed to buy he must not himself sell, and if an agent is appointed to sell he must not himself buy. Talmudical Law has the same maxim, but deduces it by a most elegant piece of legal logic from the general principle שלוחו של אדם כמותו, "A man's agent is as himself." Sale, says the Tur, always comprises

the transfer of a thing from the רשות or ownership of one person to that of another. If, therefore, I appoint an agent to buy for me, he stands exactly in the same position as I do; he is, so far as his agency is concerned, my *alter ego*. If, therefore, my agent sells to me, instead of buying from another for me, it is as if I sold a thing to myself—which is, of course, an absurdity.

Again, the agent must not appoint a sub-agent. "Delegatus non potest delegare:" אין שליח עושה שליח. In all systems of law, the reason seems clear. I may have confidence that *A* may perform a certain business for me in accordance with my wishes: I may have no confidence that *B* appointed by *A* will perform the business equally to my satisfaction. The rule in Talmudical Law is founded upon the theory that "Agency" is a matter of confidence, but the point of view is rather different from what it is in other systems. In case of any dispute between principal and agent, the agent would be put upon his oath to swear that he was not guilty; and in Talmudical Law, as in Roman Law, the "jusjurandum in jure," the oath, was not merely administered to the witness as a warning that he should speak the truth,—it was of a "decisory" nature; it was, in fact, a sort of ordeal. In an analogous case mentioned in the treatise *Baba Kama* (11 b), it is laid down that a שומר or depositee, with whom I deposit an article, may not appoint another person to guard the thing. Not even a שומר חנם, a person who charges nothing to take care of the goods, may appoint a paid depositee or שומר שכר, because I might well turn round in case of damage, and say, "I am willing to believe you when you swear an oath; I am not willing to believe the man whom you may appoint."

There is one case in Talmudical Law in which an agent may appoint a sub-agent, that is in the case of taking a גט or bill of divorcement from the husband to the wife. The Talmud, following its exegetical method, founds this upon the fact that the verb שלח occurs three times in the

passage in Deuteronomy which treats of divorce. But the rule is rational. The שליח or agent, who takes a גט to a wife to be divorced, has really no third party to deal with, as, according to the letter of the Bible Law, the wife is obliged to receive the גט, even against her will בעל כרחה.

The amount of liability which falls upon an agent, if, e.g. the goods which he buys for his principal should be damaged while in his possession, varies, according to the Talmud, as he is unpaid or paid (פרסר). In the former case, it is the liability of a שומר חנם, of one who takes care of my goods free of charge. He is responsible for פשיעה, which is equivalent to the Latin "dolus aut culpa lata," actual wilful injury and gross negligence. If the agent is paid, his liability is that of the שומר שכר, one whom I pay to take care of my goods. He is responsible for loss, or breakage, or theft; for all cases, in fact, where there is no *vis maior*. Both Roman and English Law demand the greatest amount of care, "exacta diligentia," in all cases. The agent must use the care of a "bonus paterfamilias;" he must exercise the same amount of care, not as he may do in his own affairs, but as a prudent man of the world would do in his own affairs. There is, however, no complete unanimity on this point among the Roman lawyers. I might refer to a dictum of Modestinus in the *Collatio* (x. 2, 3).

How could שליחות come to an end, otherwise than by the performing of the agency? Of course, the principal could revoke. The agent can also renounce. In Roman Law, only, unless he were compelled by illness, &c., if he could do so in such time, that full power was left to the *mandator* or principal of doing the same business conveniently, either by himself or by another person. The *ius* must be *integrum*. According to Talmudical Law the gratuitous agent could always renounce.

Agency would also come to an end with the death of the agent or principal. In Roman Law a distinction is rightly made when the *mandatarius* did not know of the death

of the *mandator*. "Mandatum solvitur morte. Si tamen per ignorantiam impletum est, competere actionem utilitatis causa dicitur" (Paulus, *Digest.* xvii. 1. 26 pr.).

There is one special rule of evidence with regard to the Talmudical Law of Agency which is very interesting. There is a presumption of law that every agent performs his agency: חזקה ששליח עושה שליחותו. What would happen if I appoint an agent to marry a lady for me whom he considers suitable, and he dies without my knowing with whom he entered into the marriage contract on my behalf? The Talmud and the Commentaries point out some interesting complications.

I have attempted here to give some notes on the Talmudical Law of Agency. It is proved, I think, that the Talmud had a firm grip of legal principles, that it was masterly in its application of them, and that it would be perfectly capable of being developed on its civil side to meet the legal wants of men and women living under the complicated conditions of modern society.

L. M. SIMMONS.

JEHUDA BONSENYOR AND HIS COLLECTION OF APHORISMS.

My friend, A. Helfferich, who died recently, found, about forty years ago, in a Catalonian MS. in the National Library at Madrid, the *Dichos y Sentencias*, collected, by order of the king, by *Jafuda judio de Barcelona* from the writings of Arabian philosophers. He published some of these aphorisms in his work, entitled: *Raymund Lull und die Anfänge der Catalonischen Literatur*[1]. Several guesses were made as to the identity of this Jafuda. Some thought, with Helfferich, of the imitator of the Arabian manner, the poet Jehuda ben Solomon Al-Charisi, who flourished in the first half of the thirteenth century, and who had translated *Sentences of Philosophers* from the Arabic into the Hebrew[2]. Yet two years ago some considered the physician Jehuda b. Isaac b. Sabbatai of Barcelona to have been the same Jafuda, who compiled these aphorisms[3]. José Amador de los Rios, in his *Historia critica de la Litteratura española*, a much more thorough and better book than his *Historia de los Judios de España y Portugal*, was, as far as we know, the first to call Jafuda by his full name Jehuda ben Astruch. But who was Jehuda ben Astruch or Astruc? The greatest authority on Jewish literature in the present day confesses candidly "not to have met with, not to have come across, a Jehuda ben Astruc of Barcelona in Jewish documents[4]."

[1] Berlin, 1858.

[2] See Kayserling, *Sephardim*, p. 329.

[3] Neuzeit, 1893, p. 140.

[4] M. Steinschneider, *Hebr. Bibliographie*, XII, p. 60.

Nor was anything known of him in Spanish literature until quite recently. We owe it to the pains taken by D. Gabriel Llabrés y Quintana, the vice-president of the "Luliana" in Palma, on the island of Malorca, who first edited the whole of Jehuda's aphorisms and sentences in the Catalonian language [1], that Jehuda ben Astruc is no longer an unknown person.

He was the son of Astrug Bonsenyor of Barcelona, who is called Struch or Nastruch juen in the *Chronic. del Rey En Jaeme*, and to whom I directed attention in 1861 [2]. Like D. Solomon of Saragossa, and his brother Bahie, he was secretary of the King D. Jaime I of Aragon, to whom he was of considerable service as interpreter during his campaigns. We believe him to have already been in the service of the king in 1239. For, when after the conquest of Valencia, the Archbishop of Toledo, on the strength of an ancient right, claimed ecclesiastical authority over that town, in evidence of his right, he cited, among other Arabic books, also the work of Abubekr Mahomat Rasis, who had written the History of Moorish Spain by order of Miramamolin Dalharab. A Moor and a Jew were commissioned to study the Arabic works [3]. This Jew was probably no other than Astrug Bonsenyor of Barcelona. The king held Astrug in special favour [4]. The embassy sent by D. Jaime, at the siege of Murcia, to the besieged, consisted of several knights and Nastruch juen.

Astrug Bonsenyor died before 1280. His son Jehuda occupied the same office of interpreter with the kings Alfonso II and Jaime II as his father had filled with Jaime I, and, like the latter, was in favour with his royal

[1] Palma de Mallorca, J. Colomar y Salas, 1889.

[2] *Geschichte der Juden in Spanien*, I, 161.

[3] Florez, *España Sagrada* (Madrid, 1756), IV, 122 sq. . . "fecimus legi per unum Judaeum et alium Saracenum, et ipsi legentes in dictis libris, scil. in libro Rasis . . ."

[4] See also the documents in Jacobs, *Sources of Spanish-Jewish History*, nos. 159 and 369, where, instead of ben Bonseignor, Astrugo den Bonsenyor is to be read.

masters. In the same year in which Jehuda accompanied King Alfonso in his campaign to Minorca (1287) he received the exceptional permission, previously granted to his father, to construct doors and windows at a greater height than that of the wall, in his house situated in the Calle or Ghetto, adjoining the city wall, near the Plaço del Rey and the convent of S. Domingo[1].

Jaime II granted him exclusively the right of writing documents in the Arab language for merchants who came to Barcelona and only knew Arabic, and ordained that all Arabic documents composed, written, or legalized by Jehuda, in Barcelona and its dependent territories, should have full legal force[2].

In the year 1305 he received from the king a safe-conduct, first for a term of four months, and afterwards for another year. Of the aim and object of that journey nothing further is known. Did he undertake it in the interest of Jewish science, which was proscribed at that time? He undertook it at the request of some friends, who had also obtained the safe-conduct for him, just at the time when the struggle was at its fiercest[3]. It is possible that there was some connexion between his journey and the exemption from all taxes and communal burdens to which the Aljama, or Jewish congregation, of Barcelona was subjected, which was granted him as a token of royal grace and favour through the special intercession of the king's private physician Johann Amell. Neither himself nor his children should be molested on account of duties to be paid or in arrear, none of his

[1] Document of March 6, 1287, and April 4, 1334, *Arch. de la Corona de Aragon*, Reg. 486, fol. 64, in Llabrés, l. c., 130 sqq.

[2] Doc. of December, 1294, *Arch. de la Corona de Aragon*, Reg. 194, fol. 108 sq., in Llabrés, l. c., 123 sqq.

[3] Docs. of August 14 and December 11, 1305, *Arch. de la Corona de Aragon*, Reg. 203, ff. 44 and 83, in Llabrés, l. c., 125 sq. In both documents it is said: "Noueritis nos *ad maximam instanciam quorundam amicorum* Jahudani fili Astrugi den Bonsenyor Judei Barchinone . . . ."

property should be detained or pledged, nor should he be prevented from either entering or leaving the *Juderia*[1].

About this time Jehuda was also commissioned by D. Jaime II to compile, for the young Infants Jaime and Alfonso, the collection of aphorisms in the Catalonian language. This language alone was understood by the Infants, who were then ten and twelve years old.

After Jehuda had died in the year 1331, Bonsenyor, his son, who was, like his father, a physician, and private physician to the king, received the same privileges his father had enjoyed, in recognition of the many great services Jehuda had rendered as physician both to Jaime II and to the present king. Like his father he was exempt from all taxes and burdens, and he also was allowed to have windows and doors above the wall in the house which he had inherited from the former[2]. This is all we learn about Bonsenyor. Isaac Bonsenyor, who lived in Barcelona, and whom we suppose to have been his son, became in the year 1391 Maranne, and assumed the name of Ferrario Gracia de Gualbis[3].

As already mentioned, Jehuda Bonsenyor received from the "mighty lord Jaime II the honourable charge" to collect from Arabic books sentences of "Sages and Philosophers"; to arrange and translate them "en Romans" into Spanish, or rather into Catalonian[4]. This

[1] Doc. of November 4, 1310, *Arch. de la Corona de Aragon*, Reg. 207, fol. 166 sq., in Llabrés, l. c., 127, commencing: "*Ad supplicationem fidelis fisici (phisici) nostri magistri Johannis Amely:* Concedimus *de gratia especiali* Jahudano filio Astrugi den Bonsenyor Judei Barchinone . . . ."

[2] Doc. of July 5, 1331, *Arch. de la Corona de Aragon*, Reg. 483, fol. 229 sq.: "Cum magister Bonsenyor phisicus natus Jahude Bonsenyor judei et phisici Barchinone, et familiaris nostri, quondam, qui tam in arte phisica quam in pluribus aliis multa serenissimo domino patri nostro et nobis grata seruitia contulit . . ." Doc. of April 4, 1334.

[3] *Revue des Études Juives*, IV, 11.

[4] In Jehuda's preface to the aphorisms we read: "Haja manat a mi Jahuda, Jueu de Barselona, fill d En Estruch Bonsenyor sa enrera, que yo degues ajustar e ordonar paraules de sauis e de philosofs, e trer de libres arabichs e aquells tornar escriure en romans."

collection of aphorisms is extant in manuscript in the archives of the Aragonian crown in Barcelona, in the Escurial, in the National Library at Madrid, at Paris, and in the library of the Barons d'Escriche in Palma. It was translated into Castilian in the year 1402 by Jacob Cadique (Zadik) de Ucles under the title of *Libro de Dichos de Sabios é Philosophos*[1]. It was published by D. Joseph Balari y Jovany, professor of the Greek language and literature at Barcelona, in the *Revista Catalana*[2], and, in the same year, by the above-mentioned D. Gabriel Llabrés y Quintana as a separate book[3].

Jehuda's collection consists of sixty-seven chapters and 753 aphorisms, which he declares were drawn from Arabic books; but many, if not most, of them have grown on quite a different soil. According to D. G. Llabrés, who is of opinion that the aphorisms are patterns of pointed sayings, and that no author in any language had been able, "like Jehuda in these aphorisms," to express such great ideas in so few words, those sentences, which are particularly characterized by their pregnant brevity, must have been collected from the mouths of the people, and are still in use in Mallorca, and in Catalonia[4]. Thus: "Hiuas respondere fa errar," "Who answers quickly, errs easily" (284); "Qui mal escolta mal respon," "Who hears badly, answers badly" (294); "Qui ha riquesa ha gran noblea," "Wealth has great nobility" (471); "Qui compra so que no ha ops ven so que ha ops," "Who buys what he does not want, sells what he wants" (524); "Per molts mariners perex una nau," "By many sailors the ship is

[1] According to this, Steinschneider's statement in *Jewish Literature*, p. 103, has to be corrected: "The Libro de Dichos de Sabios e Philosophos, a compilation from the Old and New Testaments and ecclesiastical authors," also *Biblioteca española-portugueza-judaica*, p. 110.

[2] January, 1889. See also JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, IV, 11.

[3] Libre de paraules e dits de savis e filosofs . . . ara fets estampar complets per primera vegada ab un pròlech y documents, *Palma de Mallorca*, 1889.

[4] Llabrés, l. c., p. xxvii.

wrecked" (618), similar to the German proverb "Many cooks spoil the porridge." It cannot be denied that many sentences allude to the time when they arose, and to the conditions of the State. The following saying is characteristic: "A Moor was asked what he would do if he were king. He answered that he would take a thousand morabatins and flee."

On inquiring after the real sources of the collection, it becomes doubtful that Jehuda culled his aphorisms directly from the works of Arabic sages and philosophers. He rather made use of Hebrew compilations from Arabic epigrammatic poets, made by Spanish Jews, such as Abraham Ibn Chisdai and Joseph Ibn Abara, both of Barcelona. He particularly borrowed from Solomon Ibn Gabirol; in fact, *a great portion of the collection has been translated word for word from Gabirol's "Mibchar ha-Peninim."* This we shall show by some examples[1]:—

23. Dretura de rey es millor que larguesa de temps.

צדק המלך מועיל לעם יותר משובע הזמן (34)

48. Priuadesch de rey es axi com munt alt, on ha molts fruyts e bons, e hay males besties e serps.

חברת המלך . . . דומה להר גבוה שיש בו כל פרי טוב וכל חיות רעות. (34)

55. Trames a dir Aristotil a Alexandri: vulles esser senyor de la gent faentlos be, e hauras lur amor e hauras maior durada que si ho feyan per forsa; e sapies que no pots esser senyor de cors, e del cor sino faent be, que l poble com ha poder de dir, ha poder de fer; per so, tracta que no hagen a dir, e seras segur que no faran.

אריטוטלס כתב אל אלכסנדרוס מוקדון · משול בעם ורדה עליהם מהטבתך להם ותגע אל אהבתם · כי מושלך בעם בהטבתך להם · טוב משתמשול בהם בהברחתך · כי מה מועיל קנין הגופים? אך קנין הוא קנין הלבבות · כי כשתקנה הלבבות בהטבתך נוטים הגופים עמהם · ודע כי העם כשיוכלו לומר יעשו · השתדל שלא יאמרו · תנצל מאשר יעשו. (19)

[1] The figures refer to D. G. Llabrés' edition of the Jehuda Bonsenyor's collection, the figures in parentheses to the chapters in *Mibchar Hapeninim.*

54. Diu lo saui: rey e justicia son germans, no pot durar la i. menys del altre.

אמר (החכם) המלך והתורה שני אחים לא יעמוד אחד מבלתי השני. (34)

In the סוד הסודות, attributed to Aristotle, and extant in manuscript in Paris and Oxford, it says: ונמצא בקצת אבנים חקוק בלשון יון: המלך והצדק אחים אי אפשר האחד בלתי האחר.

89. Bon nodriment es ensenyament a que no fassas res en celat que n hages vergonya es si sabut.

מהו הצניעות? שלא תעשה בסתר מה שתתבייש ממנו בגלוי. (31)

90. El mestre de poquea es axi com qui fa escriptura cauada en pedra, e aquell de granea (granesa) axi com qui escriu en aygua[1].

בקשת החכמה בימי הזקנה כתיו על החול יובקשת החכמה בימי הנערות כפתוח על האבן. (1)

92. Els sauis son en terra axi com les esteles al cel.

דומים החכמים בארץ למאורות בשמים. (1)

93. Els reys son senyors de la gent, e los sauis senyors dels reys.

המלכים שופטי הארץ והחכמים שופטי המלכים (1)

111. No t placia que t honre la gent per hauer ni per senyoria, que si ho perts perdras lo honrament, mas vulles que t honren per saber e per bon nodriment.

אם בני אדם יכבדוך לעושר או לשררה · אל יערב לך · כי הכבוד ההוא יפנה בפנותם · אבל יערב לך אם יכבדוך בשביל החכמה או . . . בעבור מוסר. (1)

102. Qui s ergulex per son saber aclinel Deu per sa obra.

כל מי שרבו פניו תמעיט חכמתו (1)

108. Axi es lo saber qui no profita com tresaur qui no s despen.

כל חכמה שלא דובר בה כמטמון שאין מוציאין ממנו. (1)

[1] Instead of aygua (water) the MS. read, perhaps, arena (sand): Jehuda altered the sentence, preferring youth to old age.

122. Ben demanar es mig saber.

שאלת חכם חצי תשובה

129. Dix i fill de rey a un saui, fort som ansios de tu; dix lo saui, per que? dixli, per so que veig de ta gran pobresa: dix lo saui, si tu sabies que s pobresa, series affaenat de esser ancios de tu matex.

אמר אדם אחד לחכם כמה רישך גדול · אמר לו אלו היית יודע מהו הרש היית טורדת אותך החמלה על נפשך (מהתמלך עלי). (44)

142, 43[1]. Demanaren a un saui, quals son millors los sauis o els richs, e ell dix, que ls sauis. Item, dixerenli, perque van los sauis a les cazes dels richs, mes que ls richs a les cazes dels sauis; dix, per so com los sauis entenen e conexen la valor de la riquea, e els richs no conexen ne entenen la valor del saber.

שאלו לחכם מי הם יותר גדולים החכמים או העשירים? אמר החכמים · אמרו לו אם כן מפני מה החכמים בפתחי העשירים יותר מהעשירים בפתחי החכמים? אמר מפני שהחכמים מכירים מעלת העושר והעשירים אינם מכירים מעלת החכמה. (1)

149. Dix lo saui: mostre ton saber a qui es nesci, e apren de cell qui sab, e tu si fas asso, apendras (aprendas) so que no sabs, e membrarte e decorreras so que sabs.

אמר החכם למד חכמה למי שאינו יודע ולמוד ממי שיודע · וכאשר תעשה זה תדע מה שלא ידעת ותזכור את אשר ידעת. (1)

162. Amich ver d'hom es son seny, e son enamich oradura.

אוהב האדם שכלו ושונאו כסילותו. (54)

169. Qui no ha seny no es senyor de su ira.
456. Qui no es senyor de sa ira no es senyor de son bon nodriment[2].

מי שאינו מושל בכעסו אין שכלו שלם. (3)

289. Mes val callar que foll parlar.

השתיקה של אדם טובה מן הדבור בלא עתו. (32)

[1] Both these numbers form one aphorism and must not be separated.

[2] A similar sentence in מוסרי הפילוסופים (I, 5): מי שלא יכבוש שכלו לא יכבוש כעסו.

297. Cor d hom assanat es castell de secret.

סודך אסירך. (29)

299. Dix lo saui: so que tens celat de ton enamich no ha descobres a ton amich, per so com los cors se muden.

אמר החכם כל דבר שתסתיר אותו משנאך אל תגלהו לאוהבך. (29)

300. Cor de bon hom es fossa de secret.

האיך הסתרת הסוד? שמתי לבי קברו. (29)

321. Prometre de franch es donar, e donar de cobeu es prometre.

נדר הנדיב מתנה מהרה ונדר הבילי האחור והעלילה. (30)

333. Franch es qui esta apparellat de donar del çeu e que t lunys de l altruy.

איזהו נדיב? מי שהתנדב בעולמו לתקן אחריתו. (44)

359. Qui es auar de son argent de fer be a pobres, trametli Deu yra de senyor.

מי שקפץ ידו מהדלים ישליט האלהים המלכים בממונו. (43)

391. Demanaren a Aristotil que es amich, dix: un cor en dos cossos.

שאלו לחכם מהו האהבה? אמר נטות הלבבות והתחברם יחד. (25)

395. Si trobes ton amich comensel a saludar e feli loch e sonal (cridel) per lo millor nom que ell ha.

שלשה ישימו לך אהבת אהבך זכה שתתחילהו בשלום כשתפגעהו ותרחיב לו מושב ותקראהו בחביב מן הכנויים. (20)

396. Los amichs son de iii maneres: axi com a vianda que no pot hom estar menys d ella, e axi com medicina que la ha hom ops (nul temps), e axi com la malaltia que no la ha ops nul temps.

החברים שלש בחות · מהם כמזון שלא תוכל לעמוד מבלעדיו ומהם כרפואה אשר אתה צריך לעתים ומהם כמדוה אשר אין אתה צריך לעולם. (20)

402. Qui pren tota la gent en un grau, no ha amich.

מי שבני אדם שוים אצלו . . . (56)

405. Diu el saui: cell hom que poch he amat tots temps, es ceyl qui m diu mos vicis enfre mi e ell.

אמר (החכם) אני אוהב מי שיודיעני במומי ביני ובינו בלבד. (24)

408. Diu el saui: si vols conexer l hom, demana qui ha priuat.

אמר החכם כשתשאל על האדם שאל מי רעהו. (42)

413. Diu Plato: qui s vol venjar de son enamich, deu tractar de crexer sa valor.

שאלו לחכם במה יתנקם אדם משונאו? אמר שיוסיף מעלה יתרה בעצמו. (53)

464. Si vols esser segur que hages so que desiges, desige so que pots hauer.

בקש מה שאתה צריך לו ועזוב מה שאין אתה צריך לו כי בעזיבת מה שאין אתה צריך לו תשיג מה שאתה צריך לו. (44)

472. Dix un saui: yo som pus rich que negun rey. Demanaren al saui perque ho deya, dix: yo he poch e bastem, e ell ha molt e no li basta, e ell ha ansia de molts e yo no de negun.

אני עשיר ממך (מהמלך) אמר לו המלך: ואיך אתה עשיר ממני? אמר לו מפני שאני מסתפק במעט שבידי יותר ממה שאתה מסתפק ברוב שלך. (10)

481. Riquesa de cor val mes que riquesa d hauer.

עושר הנפש טוב מעושר הממון. (10)

545. Oradura es malaltia que no ha medicina.

השוטה אין לו רפואה והוא מדוה שאין לו תקנה. (42)

These examples sufficiently show that Jehuda Bonsenyor has made ample use of Solomon Ibn Gabirol's collection, besides the collections of others, like the one of Abraham Ibn Chasdai. The sentence 449: "Tota re comensa poch e puys crex, leuat dol qui comensa gran e puys minua" is to be found in so many words in *Prince and Dervise*, p. 83: כל דבר נולד קטן וילך הלוך וגדול זולתי היגון שנולד גדול וילך הלוך וחדול.

That he has also made use of sentences from the Talmud I will for the present only allude to. "Tot so que Deus fa, es bo" (18), is the same as Berachot, 60 b: כל דעביד רחמנא לטב עביד.

"Qui tot ho vol tot ho pert," or "Qui mucho quere, puerde toto" corresponds with the Talmudic sentence: תפשת מרובה לא תפשת; and so "Que basta de lum a un, basta a molts" is the Talmudic sentence, Sabbat, 122 a: נר לאחד נר למאה.

But to this, as also to his proverbs of Solomon, I shall refer on another occasion.

M. KAYSERLING.

THE DIETARY LAWS FROM A WOMAN'S POINT OF VIEW.

MR. CLAUDE MONTEFIORE has been good enough to express a wish that I should give my ideas about his article entitled "Dr. Wiener on the Dietary Laws," which appeared in the last number of this Review, although he is aware that my opinions on this subject are diametrically opposed to his own. Conscious as I am of my inability to do justice to my side of the case, it is only with extreme reluctance that I comply with his desire. And first of all I want to say that however much I disagree with his views, and however strongly I feel their danger, I am convinced, as every one else must be, that in every word he writes he is actuated by only one motive, that of eliminating from Judaism every element that seems to him to detract from its spiritual beauty and ethical effectiveness. Although some of us may dissent from the teaching, we must all reverence the teacher; but just because he is so widely known and respected as a good and earnest man, there is reason to dread the effect his doctrine may have on others when, as in this instance, it deals a blow at what seems to me to be a vital part of Judaism.

I do not propose to concern myself here with the hygienic value of the dietary laws. Mr. Montefiore quotes medical authority in support of his denial that they possess any sanitary value whatsoever; but I do not think there would be much difficulty in adducing overwhelming expert evidence on the other side. I leave this aspect of the

question for others who are more capable of dealing with it. And here I may, perhaps, be allowed to quote the following passage from my husband's book, *The Ideal in Judaism*:— "The motive for obeying them (the Mosaic Dietary Laws) should be a *religious* motive. There is a vast difference between the self-restraint which is dictated by mere prudential considerations, and that which is imposed by reverence for a lofty ideal . . . . . Every Jew who makes the distinction between the clean beast and the unclean should do so with the desire to maintain the separateness of Israel, and to maintain it through Israel's superior holiness [1]."

As to the influence of these laws in maintaining the separateness of Israel, a separateness which obviously must be maintained if Judaism is to survive, I think I cannot do better than again quote from the same work:—"The separateness of Israel must be assured—the Kingdom of Priests must be preserved among the congregation of humanity—by observances that differentiate it sharply from the rest of the world . . . . We would keep ourselves distinct, not because we have a contempt for our neighbours, or because we despise the world, but because such distinctiveness is the only means of ensuring the performance of our great mission. Far from contemning our fellow-men, it is the essential condition of the accomplishment of our Divinely-appointed task that we should love and respect them. Far from despising the world, we have to mingle with it in order to scatter the spiritual seed we have treasured up through the ages. Separatism is not necessarily isolation, and the Ghetto was not the Jew's handiwork . . . . If Judaism is to perform its errand it must live, and to live it must be Judaism, not vague Theism. How it is to be anything else without these distinctive laws I know not, nor do I believe any one can tell me [2]."

[1] *The Ideal in Judaism*, p. 54.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 57.

So far, then, as to the usefulness of these laws as a means of maintaining Jewish separateness. But there is a purpose more important still, and that is the promotion of Jewish holiness. It is to this point that I wish particularly to address myself. I think a woman is entitled to give her views on this aspect of the question, for it is in a woman's life, as Dr. Wiener points out, that these laws occupy so large a place. It is she who has to see that they are faithfully carried out, and indeed so much work does this duty entail upon her that Dr. Wiener declares, and Mr. Montefiore agrees with him, that one great reason why they should be given up is that they engross her thoughts to the exclusion of spiritual matters. This is the one plea that I wish most strenuously to combat. And I speak from experience, because during the first years of my married life I conscientiously carried out every detail of the Jewish dietary laws, Rabbinical as well as Mosaic. I had four sets of kitchen utensils, one set for meat, another for milk and butter, for ordinary use, and two sets for use during Passover. I made scrupulous preparation for the coming of the latter festival, in accordance with approved orthodox practice. I put the glass vessels into water for three days, and boiled all the silver plate. It now appears to me, as it will doubtless appear to most of my readers, that I was taking unnecessary trouble. About this I will not argue. All I want to point out is that my attention to all these *minutiae* did not, so far as I am aware at this moment, when I am looking back on the past from a somewhat different religious position, involve me in any spiritual loss. I firmly believe that a conscientious and self-sacrificing performance of duty makes for spirituality, whatever may be the conception that is formed of that duty. I know I shall be asked, as I have been over and over again, whether it was right to spend my time and energies merely in order to ensure that no crumb of leaven should be left in the house at Passover, or that no particle of butter should come near meat at any time. Was the

result worth all the labour that produced it? My answer is that if this were the only result achieved, it would have been far better had I spent my time in other ways. But all such efforts are but means to an end, and that end is holiness. The constant endeavour to obey laws which the Israelite considers sacred, and the self-sacrifice thus entailed, brace up his moral energies, and help him to make a more determined stand against temptation of every kind.

I submit, then, that the observance of these laws, even when carried to such excess, may do positive spiritual good rather than harm, when the motive is something higher than the mere superstitious fear which is too often the impelling force. But, so far as the *Rabbinical* ordinances are concerned, seeing that they lack the prescriptive sanctity of the Mosaic legislation, I hold that a firm conviction as to their necessity must be the condition precedent to obeying them. We Reformers, so it seems to me, have adopted the happy *via media* which Mr. Montefiore says is unknown in Germany, by teaching that the dietary laws must be obeyed as they are taught in the Pentateuch, unamplified by the dicta of the Rabbins. The adherents of those laws thus secure all the advantage of the regulation of sensual desire generally, without exposing themselves to the reproach of excessive scrupulosity. But if it should prove that in England, as Mr. Montefiore says is the case in Germany, "either people follow the entire Rabbinical code, or they eat hare as freely as they cook their chop in butter," then we should be giving a practical demonstration of the wisdom of the Rabbins in making "a fence for the Torah." But surely we ought to be strong enough to respect the Law, even when the fence is removed. And perhaps many persons who now disregard the dietary laws altogether, because they find it too difficult to obey them in the *orthodox* manner, might be willing to observe the Pentateuchal enactments if they could be made to see that those alone were binding on them. Obedience even to the

Pentateuchal precepts, which are simple when compared with the Rabbinical restrictions, still demands sustained self-sacrifice from us, and this self-sacrifice, borne cheerfully, is sufficiently great to exert a distinctly ennobling influence on our lives.

It is easy to scoff at these enactments, and to talk of a religion of pots and pans, to declare that "not that which entereth into the mouth defileth a man," and that "the kingdom of God is not eating and drinking, but righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Spirit," but I firmly believe that it is just this religion of pots and pans which has helped to make Jews temperate in all things, good husbands and fathers, peaceful and orderly citizens. That these are Jewish characteristics is a fact acknowledged even by our enemies, and if they are not attributable to the influence of the dietary laws, to what cause shall we ascribe them? Our theology, it will be said, is truer, simpler, nobler, than that of other religionists. Granted; but would the belief in the Unity of God have acted as an effectual check upon the lower impulses? Is the superior theology of the Jew a sufficient explanation of the fact that he is more temperate than his neighbour? Would the Russian or Roumanian Jew, in his uncivilized environment, have remained purer and more self-denying than his fellow-countrymen, if it had not been for the benign effect of these restrictions? Other religions teach these duties merely theoretically. Judaism teaches them not only theoretically but practically also. Every day I meet among the poor with instances of self-denial from religious motives that ought to give pause to those who would throw off the "Yoke of the Law," on account of its irksomeness. I know of starving men and women who will not eat at the tables of the rich because the food is not *Kosher;* of others who refuse the most tempting dainty because to partake of it would be an infringement of the enactments about butter and meat. "All very trivial and silly," Mr. Montefiore will say; but to me it means the suppression

of desire at the call of duty, and therefore something noble and beautiful. Is it too much to affirm that men and women who impose such restraints upon themselves are in an exceptionally favourable position for struggling successfully with sensual longings generally ?

I know it is sometimes urged that obedience to the dietary regulations, far from exerting this general disciplinary effect, is merely the result of a repugnance for forbidden food, fostered by early training. This may be its explanation in some cases, but it is undoubtedly true that in most instances it springs from a higher cause. Many persons feel a positive desire for certain kinds of forbidden food—a desire which they suppress entirely at the bidding of conscience.

And here I will quote a short passage from a forthcoming work on Modern Judaism by the author of *The Ideal in Judaism*. Having adduced certain considerations in support of his thesis that these dietary laws were really designed to impose a check upon sensual appetites, the writer goes on to say :—"They were to teach the Israelite self-control in all things by habituating him to self-denial in certain things. He was warned that self-indulgence could not be his rule of conduct, but that self-renunciation was the one and only basis on which it was possible to rear the fabric of the hallowed life, either for the nation or the individual. If this is to place upon these laws a higher interpretation than they will legitimately bear, I can only plead that I share my error with some of the most distinguished expounders of Judaism. The Rabbins, despite their formalism, could discern the lofty ethical purpose which linked these ritual enactments to the avowedly moral precepts of the Pentateuch. Their supreme aim was the discipline they were capable of imposing upon the Israelite's lower nature. 'The ideal Jew does not say, "I have no desire to eat swine's flesh, no desire to indulge my sensual cravings." "I desire it," he says; "but I will conquer this sinful yearning for my Heavenly Father's sake." For to

keep aloof is the true separateness, and only to such as painfully wrestle with temptation cometh the Kingdom of God![1]' A notable saying indeed, and one not the less notable because of its being ascribed to one of the older orders of Rabbins (Eleazar ben Azariah)."

I admit that there are hundreds who observe these laws and yet who are spiritually inert, and whose morality is far from being ideal. But what of that? No one can suppose that the avoidance of certain kinds of food can yield an entire ethical and religious equipment. Such was never their purpose, as conceived by the Mosaic lawgiver at any rate. "Obedience to the dietary regulations is never recommended as a substitute for righteousness and purity of heart, as every line of the Pentateuch testifies, nor as constituting sanctity in itself, but as a means of promoting holiness, personal, but racial more especially[2]." All I would maintain is that when looked at aright they are an aid, not a hindrance, to the uplifting of the soul Heavenwards. And surely we are helping to fulfil our mission of teaching holiness to the nations, we are "actively witnessing to God" when we show an example in this materialistic age of a people who cheerfully, day after day and year after year, perform acts of self-denial in obedience to the precepts of their Law. Can there be a more effectual way of keeping the torch burning that is to give light to the Gentiles, than by the sacrifice of a people's selfish longings at the behest of duty?

The social aspect of the question hardly seems to me to call for remark. Mr. Montefiore quotes Dr. Wiener's opinion that "Isolation and separation in matters of food and drink are especially calculated to make the Jews disliked and misunderstood." I cannot concur in this

[1] Siphra on Levit. xx. 26. A passage which proves the groundlessness of Mr. Montefiore's belief that the conception of these laws as "ascetic exercises, disciplinary rules in self-control" is "unknown to the Talmud."

[2] *The Ideal in Judaism*, p. 52.

view. I have always found that those Jews are sure of Christian respect who conform conscientiously to the precepts of their religion, no matter what may be the precise label, whether orthodox or reform, by which they may happen to be designated. Every man whose opinion is worth having will do homage to conscientiousness. But apart from this, how worthless is the argument that would persuade any one to disobey a single precept he considered binding, for the sake of mere social advantage! The argument pushed to its logical conclusion would really amount to this, that Jews ought to abjure their cardinal dogma and avow a belief in the divinity of Christ in order to promote a "closer and more sympathetic union with their fellow-citizens of other creeds," for surely their rejection of his divine claim is a stronger reason for their being "disliked and misunderstood" than their refusal to eat certain kinds of food.

It seems to me, as I have already said, that the question is to be argued with reference exclusively to the power of these laws to maintain Israel's separateness and holiness. For it is obvious that the promotion of the first purpose only is not a sufficient justification for the survival of any institution. There are many Jewish quasi-religious observances which place undesirable barriers between the Jew and his neighbour. It is possible to imagine a Jewish separateness rooted in a blind and ignorant adherence to superstitious ideas. No; holiness is the supreme object, and these dietary laws, I urge, are calculated to promote it. Jewish morality would be less stable and vigorous without them. There are a few favoured individuals—Mr. Montefiore among them—who feel the need of no such help. But mankind is made up for the most part of weak, faulty creatures, whose moral nature requires all the support it can obtain. The time will come, we all believe, when the world will be filled with the knowledge of God, when mankind will have made great strides towards perfection, and Judaism, having fulfilled her mission, need be a separate

religion no longer. But that time is still far distant, and in the meantime we must each try so to order his life as to make it lend the highest possible argument to the lives of others. We have to make "Judaism as true and pure and serviceable as we can," not certainly "by the propagation and maintenance of error," but by upholding those institutions whose gracious effect has been so abundantly illustrated in the history of our race. Only thus can we expect "God to preserve Judaism," for never does he work save through human agents.

FRANCES A. JOSEPH.

CRITICAL NOTICES.

THE STEINSCHNEIDER "FESTSCHRIFT."

Festschrift zum achtzigsten Geburtstage Moritz Steinschneider's (Congratulatory-volume for the eightieth birthday of Prof. Dr. M. Steinschneider). Otto Harvassowitz, Leipzig, 1896.

THE Nestor of Hebrew bibliography reached his eightieth year on the 30th of March (second day of *Pesah*) in full working order, and it occurred to many of his pupils and friends to congratulate him by a volume which contained essays on various subjects of Hebrew and Rabbinic literature, viz. Bible criticism, mediaeval Biblical commentaries, Hebrew Grammar, Historical subjects, Theology and Philosophy, Documents and Letters, Poetry, Folklore, Mathematics, and Bibliography, altogether twenty-nine essays, written (entirely, or at least prefaced) in Hebrew, English, French, German, and Italian, by authors living in England, America, France, Germany, Russia, Italy, and Denmark. Thus we may say that the desire to honour Hebrew literature in the person of our octogenarian is universal, except in Germany as we shall see. It is by no means a criticism of the many essays that I am going to give; it would be presumptuous on my part to embrace such a variety of subjects, all I can do is to give a short abstract of each essay according to subjects.—The most useful and most extended essay is the Bibliography of the writings of our learned octogenarian, by G. A. Kohut, son of the lamented Rabbi A. Kohut of New York, author of the *Arukh completum*. This essay fills thirty-five pages of small print, in a methodical form, viz. 1. Separate works (from 1841 to 1896); 2. Contributions to the works of others (1838 to 1892); 3. Essays and Reviews contributed to various periodicals, encyclopaedias and similar collections (1839 to 1896). Dr. Steinschneider's writings are in Hebrew, Latin, German, French, and Italian. He has just issued the second edition of the catalogue of the Hebrew MSS. in the Royal Library of Munich, and is now finishing the אוצר הספרים of Benjacob according to the authors, which will be very extensive. Kohut's bibliography will be indispensable for those who deal with Rabbinic literature. Another bibliographical essay is written by Dr. Simonsen, Rabbi of Copenhagen, on the first issue of the *Mahazor*

according to the German rite, Cracow, 1571. Dr. S. Poznański, of Warsaw, who paid a visit last summer to the British Museum and the Bodleian Library, gives an extended description, more than bibliographical, of al-Qirqisani's works in MSS. in the British Museum (see Dr. Bacher's essay on this author in *J. Q. R.*, VII, 687). I should mention that Dr. Harkavy brought this Qaraitic author to the fore by publishing his chapter on the various sects amongst the Jews (*J. Q. R.*, VII, 355).—Biblical researches are represented by Prof. D. H. Müller of Vienna, Amos 1–2, according to his theory of strophes and hypothesis of chorus in the Prophets. This is an addition to his great and original book in German, entitled *Die Propheten in ihrer ursprünglichen Form*, which appeared some months ago in two volumes. We hope that a specialist in Biblical criticism will make it known to the readers of this QUARTERLY. Lector M. Friedmann of Vienna busies himself with the division of some prophecies of Isaiah; his essay is in Hebrew and will scarcely be read by Christian Bible critics. It is only a first part, which I hope will be continued, for there are many points which are original, though perhaps not concise. Dr. S. Krauss of Budapest has given some interesting notes on Aquila's Greek translation of the Bible, which we recommend to the critics. He shows that our knowledge of his translation is by no means complete.—Talmudical literature is represented by Mr. I. Abrahams' edition of an ethical treatise, entitled "The Fear of Sin" (מ' יראת חטא), published from MSS. in the Bodleian Library, which is identical with מ' דרך ארץ זוטא, according to Professor Bacher. We shall mention out of chronological order the essay of Dr. H. Adler, the chief rabbi, on Jacob of London's עין חיים, with an extensive specimen from his book. The last two essays are written in English. Herr A. Epstein adduces evidence that the commentaries on parts of the Babylonian Talmud attributed to R. Gershom, called the "light of the captivity," are not by him but by an anonymous writer of Mayence. The essay is full of information concerning the Rabbis in the Rhine provinces and in Lorraine in the eleventh and twelfth centuries.—The Midrashic part is taken by Prof. Blau of Budapest, who makes some contributions to the understanding of the Mekhilta and the Sifre. Dr. Ph. Bloch of Posen gives samples of a translation of the three chapters איכה, שמעו, דברי of the Pesikta, attributed to R. Kahna, with interesting notes. Both are written in German. Herr S. Buber of Lemberg explains the object of the introductions (פתיחות) to the Midrash of Lamentations. This is written in Hebrew. —There is one essay on Hebrew Grammar, by M. Lambert of Paris, with the title of "Quelques remarques sur l'adjectif en arabe et en hébreu," of course written in French.—As to Rabbinical commentaries,

it happens that Dr. Friedländer, of the Jewish College, London, and Mr. H. J. Mathews, of Brighton, have both hit upon commentaries on Canticles, the first in Hebrew and Arabic, probably coming from Yemen, incomplete and philosophico-mystic in character; the editor's preface is written in Hebrew. Mr. Mathews publishes another, of a rather rationalizing character, by an anonymous French Rabbi of the twelfth century. Mr. Mathews' preface is written in English.—Philosophy: Dr. Hirschfeld, of Montefiore College, Ramsgate, publishes from a MS. of the College Library, the Hebrew translation of Isaac Israeli's Arabic book of definitions, translated by Nissim ben Solomon. The Arabic original is lost, and the Latin translation (Lyons, 1515) is according to Dr. Steinschneider a compilation. Dr. Hirschfeld's introduction is written in German.—Theology: Prof. Bacher of Budapest publishes in Arabic a second composition of S^{e}adyah Gaon's book of Creeds, the chapter on the resurrection (seventh chapter), from a St. Petersburg MS. In the learned preface he states that our text is in accordance with Tabbon's translation, and that it is probable that the seventh chapter was current as a separate treatise, perhaps in S^{e}adyah's lifetime. Prof. Gottheil of New York gives an extended notice of an unknown and unique theological treatise in Arabic, with the title of "Garden of Intelligence," by R. Nathanel ben Fayyumi. Dr. Gottheil is right in identifying Nathanel with the father of Jacob, to whom Maimonides addressed his epistle of Yemen. Prof. Gottheil says: "Of Jewish authors I find only S^{e}adyah Gaon, B^{e}hai ben Joseph, Solomon Haḳḳātān, and Jehudah Hallēwi. Nathanel speaks of the last two as living in his time (בי הדה אלזמאן). This would fix his date about the middle of the twelfth century." It seems to us that Nathanel could not be a contemporary of Solomon הקטן (Gabirol) who lived in the eleventh century, and of Judah Halevi who lived in the twelfth century.—Poetry is represented by pieces from a Yemen Diwan in Arabic with Hebrew characters, in the possession of the publisher, Baron David de Günzburg of St. Petersburg. His preface is written in Hebrew. Dr. Heinrich Brody of Berlin produces ten poems of the famous Moses ben Ezra from a Bodleian Manuscript. The editor is well known by his edition of other poetical texts. His preface is written in Hebrew.—Mathematics is dealt with in an Italian translation of an Arabic mathematical treatise by Gustavo Sacerdote of Rome. The full title is "Il trattato del pentagono e del decagono di Abu Kámil Shogia' ben Aslam ben Muhammed." The translator gives also the technical terms in Hebrew according to a Munich manuscript.—Documents and letters: Prof. Goldziher of Budapest gives in German an abstract of S'ad ben Manṣûr ibn Kammûna's Arabic treatise on the eternity of the soul. Dr. Stein-

schneider was the first to point out the relation of Ibn Kammûna's treatise to Jewish religion. Prof. Kaufmann of Budapest publishes the Hebrew text of Moses Rimos (perhaps Remos) of Majorca, addressed to Benjamin, son of Mordecai, at Rome. The preface is written in German. The Rev. W. D. Macray contributes a letter from Isaac Abendana, 1673, which is a slight addition to the history of the Jews in England. Herr S. J. Halberstam of Bielitz (Austria) contributes letters in Hebrew concerning Azariah de Rossi, and one from him. —Historical matter: Prof. Büchler of Vienna has made new studies concerning the behaviour of Caesar to the Jews. The English of the German title is as follows: "The priestly tithes and the Roman taxes in the edicts of Caesar." He comes to the conclusion that Caesar wished not only to reward the Jews but to win them for the future. The writer of these lines has completed the non-Jewish chronicle by Abraham Zakkuth from a newly-acquired MS. in the Bodleian Library. The preface is written in English.—Folk-lore: Dr. Güdemann contributes a German essay on the superstitious signification of the proper names in pre-mosaic Israel, saying that the names had a real signification amongst the early Jews and later on. M. Israél Lévi publishes the legend of Alexander the Great, according to the Hebrew MS. in the Library of Modena, which is identical with that bought by Dr. Harkavy some years ago in Damascus. M. Lévi thinks that the text comes from Southern Italy, composed in the eleventh century. M. Lévi's preface is written in French. Finally Dr. Harkavy publishes an essay on R. Nissim (of Kairowan) and some legends in the Talmud, of which he discovered a great part of the original Arabic text. The bibliography of the subject is exhaustive.

It will be seen that nearly all branches of Jewish learning are represented in our volume, with the exception of mysticism and Kabbala. It is possible that the learned Jews in Germany took up that difficult part of the literature, and could not get their essays ready in time. Thus one mystery may explain another.

A. N.

PROPER NAMES IN HEBREW.

Die Eigennamen des alten Testaments in ihrer Bedeutung für die Kenntniss des hebräischen Volksglaubens, von M. GRUNWALD. (The proper names of the Old Testament in their significance for the knowledge of the Hebrew popular creed.) Breslau (Koebner), 1895.

AFTER the first attempts by Pott and Ewald to explain the sig-

nificance of the proper names of the Old Testament for ethnology, language, and more especially for religion, these interesting researches were continued by eminent Semitic scholars like Nestle in his book with the title *Die israelitischen Eigennamen nach ihrer religionsgeschichtlichen Bedeutung* (Harlem, 1876). The progress in the epigraphical department reveals, we may say daily, some new facts and new etymologies, more especially for the names of the deity applied to proper names of men, women, and localities. Epigraphical documents have the advantage of authenticity, whilst written documents are often corrupted by scribes, which is often the case in the Old Testament. We mention only the corruption generally admitted by scholars, of הר המשחית (2 Kings xxiii. 13), mount of corruption (R. V. *or* destruction), for הר המשחה (mount of anointing) (see Felix Perles, *Analekten zur Textkritik des alten Testaments*, p. 31). Our author has made a harvest in comparing the written materials with those in inscriptions; compare, for instance, his note on בעל (pp. 10 and 11). But he had to compress much into the notes, in such a way that his monograph consists mostly of the notes. Compare, for instance, note 4 on p. 4 on בד in Phenician = עבד. And what is inconvenient is that there is not a ghost even of an index. But with all inconveniences (perhaps the publisher's fault) Herr Grunwald's monograph is instructive. After the Introduction follow chapters (not even numbered) which treat—(1) of general religious historical matter; (2) the beginning of the Semitic divine service. This chapter is very instructive, but sometimes rather wild. Our author takes the proper name בלהן (Gen. xxxvi. 27: not 20) as בלחן, and compares it with the Phenician בעלחנא, but why not do the same with the name of בדד (Gen. v. 35) as בן הדד, and for בלדד = בעל דד, analogous to אלדד (Num. xi. 26, 27; see *Studia Biblica*, I, p. 226), more especially as, according to our author's supposition, we should have בן בן הדד? Chapter III treats of demonism among the Hebrews, and here the harvest is not very rich, if we except post-Biblical items. Demons are derived more from the Persians. The next chapter treats of the cult of nature. The composition of טל (אביטל), of גשם (rain), שמש (sun), לבנה (moon), which is also found in the name לבנון, analogous to the name of the town ירחו (Jericho). Next our author treats of fetishism among the Hebrews. The composition of proper names with צור (rock), and the worship of stones is known, also of mountains in הר אלהים, mountain of God, and גבעת אלהים. Chapter VI treats of the cult of ancestors. This is evident in the names composed with אב, e.g. אביאב, אליאב, בנימן, also in נפש, stone of memory, רפאים and תרפים (perhaps = תרפאים, the image of the dead). The words

frequently composed with אח, and עם (which is perhaps the abridged name of עמון ?). The next chapter, which has for subject totemism, is well treated by Mr. Jacobs in his book, *Studies in Biblical Archaeology* (1894). iv. Chapter VIII has for object the representation of the Godhead by fire, by dreams, by clouds, in the compounds of חזה, מלאך, פנים, פסל, and סמל (Semele ?). The next chapter treats of the usages of the cult. This is implied, according to our author, in words like עמרי from עמר, חגי, שבתי, חרמה; these derivations are very weak. The last two chapters, which treat of the patriarchs and of the cults of the separate tribes, are rather weak, and seem too hurriedly done, the author seeming tired of his subject In general, the monograph is very dry and indigestible even for specialists. Indeed, how could the religion of the Semites be properly treated in seventy-five pages ? We hope that our author will take his time for a second edition, and above all be kind enough to give an index for the thousand or more names of various kinds treated in it.

We may mention that Mr. G. Buchanan Gray, M.A., of Mansfield College, Oxford, has in the press a similar work of some 300 pages, entitled *Studies in Hebrew Proper Names*, which we hope will add materially to the knowledge of the subject.

A. N.

ABRAHAM IBN EZRA'S ARITHMETIC.

Sefer ha-mispar. Das Buch der Zahl des R. Abraham ibn Ezra, herausgegeben, ins Deutsche übersetzt u. erläutert von Dr. M. SILBERBERG. (Frankfurt a. M.: S. Kaufmann. 1895.)

MATHEMATICS formed a favourite study of Ibn Ezra; wherever opportunity is given in his writings he introduces Geometry, Arithmetic or Astronomy. In the curriculum of studies which he recommends to his pupil in his *Yesod Mora* or "Foundation of the Fear of the Lord," the mathematical sciences occupy a prominent place. The numbers seem to have frequently engaged his attention, and three pamphlets were written by him on numbers, from three different aspects. *Yesod ha-mispar*, "Foundation of the numerals," is a treatise on the grammatical peculiarities of the numerals; whilst, in the *Sefer ha-eḥad*, "The Book on the Unit," the author discusses the theory of the numbers. The *Sefer ha-mispar* was probably intended to be a guide in Elementary Arithmetic. The dedicatory lines which in some

MSS. and in the present edition precede the *Sefer ha-mispar*, are out of place here. The author says, Behold here is a book faithfully copied; in it you find of every number its properties; it is written by Meir's son for Meir, who is young in years but great in understanding. It is in the book *Sefer ha-eḥad* that the properties of each number are described, and not in the *Sefer ha-mispar*. The editor wrongly translates here *mispar* by "problem or sum," and *t'chunah*, by "solution," and is, like some copyists, misled to connect these lines with the *Sefer ha-mispar*. It is also possible that *Sefer ha-mispar* is not at all the original title of this book.

Who is this Meir to whom these lines are addressed? Mr. Halberstamm, in *Sefer ha-ïbbur*, believes that he is the same Meir whom Maimonides mentions in his letter to Rabbi Samuel Ibn Tibbon as a pupil of Ibn Ezra. The book opens with a parallelism between the Universe and the numbers; there we have nine spheres and a being that is the beginning and source of all the spheres, and at the same time separate and different from the spheres. Similarly there are nine numbers, and a unit that is the foundation of all numbers but is itself no number. There are only nine spheres, and only nine numbers; ten is again one in the second series, and so hundred in the third and so on. The nine numbers are represented by the first nine letters of the Hebrew alphabet, and their absence whether it be in the units, or tens, &c. is indicated, as in the ordinary systems, by a circle. Ibn Ezra retains also the usual order, and counts from right to left, the first place being assigned to the units, the next to the tens, &c., e.g. אה = 15; כ = 20; כאא = 3021. By means of writing the nine figures symmetrically in a circular form he shows a certain peculiarity of the multiples of nine, viz. that each multiple from two to five consists of two opposite figures, the one giving the units the other the tens, and from six to nine, the multiples contain the same figures in reversed order as regards the units and tens, e.g. $2 \times 9 = 18$ and $9 \times 9 = 81$. The same remark, in the same context, is found in Ibn Ezra's Comm. on Ex. iii. 14, and in other writings of Ibn Ezra. He seems to see in this peculiarity a proof that nine figures suffice for all purposes, since they suffice to express all multiples of nine, which is the greatest number. The four species are not arranged in the same order as we have them in our Arithmetic books. Multiplication and division precede here addition and subtraction. This is certainly unmethodical, because multiplication is not completed without addition, nor is division worked out without subtraction. Ibn Ezra no doubt followed in this respect the arrangement generally adopted in Arithmetic books of his time. It may be that the reason for this strange arrangement is to be found in the fact that the arithmetical problems

which are foremost in practical life, are multiplication and division. Numerous problems are solved by the author in illustration of the method taught by him. It is worth noticing that whilst modern Arithmetic books are rich in problems about interest, the Arithmetic written by a Jew for Jews does not contain one single sum dealing with interest. His method of multiplication and division is the same as our method. The difference exists only in the way in which the successive steps of the operation are written down; the author following the custom of his contemporaries. The two Tables *a* and *b* may illustrate the method adopted.

a. Multiplication.

ז ב א	127		127
ה ה ג	355		355
ה ג ג ב ג	32335	or	35
ה א א	115		35
א ו	61		21
ה ס	55		10
ה	45085		10
			6
ה ח ס ה ד			355
			45085

Ibn Ezra tests the correctness or at least the probable correctness of the result in the following way: consider each figure in the two factors and the product, or in the dividendus, divisor, quotient, and remainder, as units, find the sum of the figures in each quantity and divide the sums by nine; the remainder is called "balance" (Hebr. *moz'ne*); multiply the balances of the two factors, in case of multiplication, and divide by nine, if the balance is equal to that of the product, the result is assumed to be correct. In case of division, add to the product of the balances of divisor and quotient, the balance of the remainder, and divide the sum by nine, if the balance is equal to that of the dividendus the result is probably correct.

E. g. the test for the above multiplication sum: $1+2+7=10$ leaves the balance 1, $3+5+5$ leaves the balance 4, and $1\times 4=4$; the balance of the product is likewise $4+5+8+5=22=2\times 9+4$. The test for the division sum: divisor $9+9+9+9=36$ leaves 0; dividendus $9\times 7=63$ leaves 0; quotient $7+7+7+8+5=34$ leaves 6; the remainder $5+5+6+2=18$ leaves 0; $0\times 6+0=0$ and equal to the balance of the dividendus.

b. Division.

							ס		
						ס	א		
					א	ה	ה		
				ס	ח	ו	ו		
				א	ט	ג	ס		
				ז	ה	ה	ה	ה	
			ס	ח	ח	ו	ו	ו	
			א	ד	ט	ב	ג	ס	
			ז	ז	ה	ה	ה	ו	
		ס	ח	ח	ח	א	ב	ס	
		א	ד	ד	ד	ד	ד	ה	ב
Divid.		ז	ז	ז	ז	ז	ז	ז	ז
Quotient					ז	ז	ז	ח	ה
Divisor						ט	ט	ט	ט
Remainder (the top figure of each column).						ה	ה	ו	ב

9999)777777777(77785
63
14
63
84
63
784
63
7784
63
14
63
85
63
791
63
7854
63
15
63
92
63
861
63
8554
72
13
72
63
72
562
72
5555
45
10
45
60
45
560
45
5562

The fifth chapter is devoted to fractions. The denominator (Hebr. *ha-moreh*) is best expressed by the product of simple numbers between two and nine, e.g. $\frac{1}{24}=\frac{1}{2}$ of $\frac{1}{3}$ of $\frac{1}{4}$; $\frac{1}{60}=\frac{1}{2}$ of $\frac{1}{2}$ of $\frac{1}{3}$ of $\frac{1}{5}$. A denominator that cannot be reduced to such simple, small factors, as e.g. all prime-numbers from 11 upwards, or numbers including such prime-numbers as factors, is called by Ibn Ezra "a number whose factors cannot be expressed by simple figures" (Hebr. שאין לו חלקים שיוכל האדם לבטא בהם[1]).

It is remarkable that Ibn Ezra finds also a common denominator for the multiplication of fractions; in the division of fractions it is intelligible; because through turning the fractions with different denominators into fractions with a common denominator, the problem is reduced to a division of whole numbers. Perhaps for the sake of uniformity the same is done in the case of multiplication. Another kind of fractions is mentioned by Ibn Ezra, as occurring in Astronomic calculations. They are similar to decimal fractions, with this difference, that instead of the different powers of 10 the denominators are formed by the different powers of 60. The following instance of multiplication may serve as an illustration:—

			ג	ד	ט	ב
			אא	דד	חא	ג
			בב	חח	וג	ו
		טט	וטג	בוא	זב	
	דד	וא	בז	בא		
גג	בגא	דה	ט			
גג	וא	טבג	טטד	בוב	גו	ו
		ב	ה	ח	ד	א
גג	וה	אג	דב	ס	ז	ז

					$3'''$	$4''$ $9'$ $2°$
					11	44 18 3
					22	88 36 6
				99	396	162 27
			44	176	72	12
		33	132	54	9	
		33	176	329	499	212 63 6
				2	5	8 4 1
		33	56	31	24	30 7 7

The last two chapters deal with proportions and square roots. Numerous problems are solved in illustration of the rules given. Some of the methods he marks as his own by introducing them by the word מצאתי "I have found"; e.g. the sum of the numbers from

[1] בהם refers to אחרים mentioned before or it is a slip for באחרים.

1 to n equals half the sum of n^2+n; the square of a number is equal to ten times the square of its third minus the square of its third.

$$a^2=(\frac{a}{3})^2 \cdot 10-(\frac{a}{3})^2 \cdot$$

The editor has done everything in his power to produce a correct text. Five different MSS. were consulted and collated and their differences duly and conscientiously registered. The notes likewise contain valuable information on the subject; but I do not see the editor's object in adding a literal German Translation. A short *résumé* of the book in terms intelligible to all familiar with modern Arithmetic would fully suffice. I am sure that the ordinary German reader will meet with far greater difficulty in his attempt to understand the German translation than the ordinary Hebrew reader will meet with when trying to master the original. Does any one understand: "Multiply minutes with minutes, and you obtain seconds as the product." The Hebrew is correct and intelligible: "Multiply two fractions whose denominator is 60 (ראשונים); the product is a fraction, with the denominator 60^2 (שניים)." The book without the translation is an excellent work.

M. FRIEDLÄNDER.

THE HAGGADAH ACCORDING TO THE RITE OF YEMEN.

The Haggadah according to the rite of Yemen, together with the Arabic-Hebrew Commentary, by WILLIAM H. GREENBURG. (London: David Nutt. 1896.)

DR. GREENBURG has rendered a service to Semitic philology and to Jewish Literature by editing the Yemen Haggadah together with the Arabic-Hebrew Commentary. The work is done carefully and conscientiously. A good many MSS. have been consulted and collated, and the variae lectiones are duly registered in the first set of footnotes. A second set of footnotes contains valuable philological remarks and references to Talmud and Midrash. The text of the Haggadah is on the whole the same as in the ordinary editions, with some interesting variations, of which the following are a few examples:—The first paragraph of our Haggadah begins הא לחמא עניא; in the Yemen MSS. it is preceded by the words בבהילו יצאנו ממצרים

"We left Egypt in haste." This addition has probably its origin in the Talmudic direction to hurry over the first part of the Seder, lest the little ones fall asleep before the unleavened bread and the bitter herbs are taken. This was indicated by the word בבהילו "in haste." The "haste" was then explained to represent the haste of the Israelites in leaving Egypt. Subsequently the phrase mentioned became part of the text.—In the question of the wise child we have אשר צוה אתנו instead of אשר צוה אתכם. The five paragraphs from רבי יוסי אומר to עונותינו על כל are introduced by the words "Some add," and are thus marked as a later interpolation. Remarkable is the division of Hallel into very small verses like those in the Peshito; from the beginning of Ps. cxiii to צדיקים יבואו בו (Ps. cxviii. 20) 122 verses are counted; the number of the chapters is not given; the remaining verses of Ps. cxviii are not numbered.—The great Hallel (Ps. cxxxvi) and the consequent cup of wine with the usual blessings conclude the Service.—In the rhymed Order of the Service the last term is נרצה, which is probably used in the sense of Conclusion, and refers to the concluding prayer חסל סדור וגו׳. This prayer is not found in the Yemen Rite, and it is therefore evident that the rhymed Order, which precedes the Haggadah in the Yemen MSS. has been added by a thoughtless copyist who misunderstood the term נרצה, or did not notice the absence of the concluding prayer. Dr. Greenburg added also an English translation of the Haggadah and of the explanatory notes which are in Arabic. I apply to the translation the same remark as made by me in my notice on Ibn Ezra's *Sefer ha-mispar*. When translators desire to be very literal and in their zeal overcharge the translation with various renderings in parenthesis, they frequently lose sight of the most important elements in a translation, viz. accuracy and intelligibility. A free translation or even a mere abstract would prove far more useful. Of the numerous but short explanatory notes I give a few as characteristic of the school from which they emanated. Why, asks the Commentator, are only those called upon to eat who are hungry, every one of the company being bound to partake of the unleavened bread, whether hungry or not? The answer is, that the words referred to contain an invitation to non-Jews or proselytes present, who are not commanded to eat unleavened bread. In the text the word אלוים, which the editor rightly marks as corrupt, must be corrected into אלגוים or אלגרים. The latter is more probable, as the next sentence, "he who must partake of the Paschal Lamb, come and do so," is distinctly applied by the Commentator to proselytes, with the additional remark, "as we explained with regard to the unleavened bread." The *five* cups of wine are explained as

corresponding (1) to the brain as the seat of the intellect (*Kiddush*); (2) to the heart as the seat of wisdom (*haggadah*); (3) the liver as the seat of animal life (*Grace*); (4) the body as a whole (*hallel*); and (5) the Knowledge of God, which gives us true redemption, namely from the tyranny of the body (*hallel haggadol*).

The difficult word אפיקמון is explained as composed of the initial letters of the following seven words:—אֲגוֹדִים nuts, פֵּירוֹת fruit, יַיִן wine, קְלִיוֹת parched corn, מַיִם water, וּבְשָׂר meat, and נְרְדִים nard. —The directions and dinim are based on Maimonides' Mishneh-torah.—Besides the above-mentioned emendation, there are other passages which seem to be corrupt, of which I will only mention the last two lines on p. 17. From the context we gather that the author means to say "hurry over the first part of the service lest the little ones fall asleep before having eaten of the unleavened bread, or the grown up become sleepy and eat, what is their duty to eat, without proper intention (כונה)"; the right text is therefore: אם והגדולים האריכו בסיפור קודם הסעודה שמא יישנו ואח"כ יאכלו אותה שלא בכונה. Dr. Greenburg has shown perseverance and ability in dealing with this branch of Jewish literature; may he find leisure successfully to continue these interesting studies.

M. FRIEDLÄNDER.

THE TARGUM OF ONKELOS TO GENESIS.

The Targum of Onkelos to Genesis. A critical inquiry into the value of the text exhibited by Yemen MSS., by Dr. HENRY BARNSTEIN. (London: David Nutt. 1896.)

THE Targum has always enjoyed great privileges: its importance was greatly enhanced by the fact that it accompanied the public reading of the law in the synagogue, and by the rule laid down in the Talmud that every one should read the weekly sedra twice in the original and once in the Targum. It was a favourite study with the late chief rabbi, who embodied the result of his research in the well-known commentary *Nethinah la-ger*.

Dr. A. Berliner has since edited the Targum and discussed the several problems connected with this version. Dr. Barnstein selected the Targum of the Yemen MSS. for his special attention. This Targum has several peculiarities; first among these is the form of the vowels,

which are superlinear. As the number of vowels is smaller in the superlinear system than in the ordinary one, it is but natural that the vocalization of the text should show many differences. But there are besides other important differences which are independent of the character of the vowels and betray a different recension. Dr. Barnstein has made a careful study of the several MSS. of the Targum to Genesis, conscientiously collected all the various readings whether important or unimportant, and classified them in a practical manner. Thus we have differences in vocalization, variations in orthography, grammatical variations, other variations, i.e. additions, omissions and contractions, and exegetical variations. Of the latter class we will cite a few examples: וְלָקַחַת, Gen. xxx. 15, is either infinitive or second person feminine past. The Targumim seem to be divided on the question, but the opinion of Onkelos on this and similar questions cannot so easily or so decidedly be selected from the variations as the author believes. There is no harm in finding that, in spite of the attempts of scholars to solve riddles and to clear up what is still dark for us, there still remain a good many things doubtful. Another example of this kind is תִּוָּרֵשׁ, Gen. xlv. 11, which admits of two explanations: lest thou become poor, and lest thou be destroyed; there are accordingly two versions in the Targum תתמסכן and תשתיצי, both equally correspond to the original. It is not necessary to assume that literal translation is more original than paraphrase. The object of the Targumist was to make the Torah intelligible to the people, and where he thought a literal rendering would not be understood, or at least not understood in the manner he wished, he naturally paraphrased, and such paraphrase has as much claim to originality as the literal rendering. It is, therefore, not so evident as Dr. Barnstein thinks, that on account of its literality the Targum of Yemen MSS. embodies an earlier and more original recension of the Targum of Onkelos than the various editions and European MSS., the source of which can be traced to Babylon. But much may be said in favour of the theory at which he arrived after painstaking and careful study, that Targum Onkelos has Palestine for its birthplace, that it travelled thence to Babylon, that the Yemen Targum came thither from Jerusalem, and that the form in which the Yemen MSS. preserved the Targum is that of the earlier, the Palestine, recension. A well-known saying is המתחיל במצוה אומרים לו גמור. I apply it to the author of this dissertation. It is the beginning of his literary career; it is a successful beginning, and we expect more of him about the Targum of Onkelos in the course of time.

M. Friedländer.

PRIESTS AND WORSHIP IN THE LAST DECADE OF THE TEMPLE AT JERUSALEM.

PROFESSOR Adolf Büchler of Vienna has written a highly estimable work on the Priests and Worship in the last decade of the Temple in Jerusalem[1], which, by reason of its wealth of new ideas and importance, is in many respects subject to criticism. As far as I know, two scientific reviews, both entering into details, have thus far appeared; one by Herr A. Epstein[2], and another by Prof. L. Blau[3]. In the following remarks I do not intend to discuss Prof. Büchler's work, but to produce some data referring to this subject, which I hope will serve to throw light upon the last decade of the Temple of Jerusalem in its many phases.

It has already been pointed out by Herr Epstein, that Prof. Büchler's investigations are especially instructive in reference to the schools in Jabne and Lydda. Among other things Prof. Büchler mentions certain Tannaites, whose name is introduced by the word אבא. Prof. Büchler considers this title to be quite obscure (p. 92). This title is, however, so frequently met with that it does not sound at all unfamiliar. The point may be characterized as a sort of *bon mot*, not rare among Talmudists; namely, a question which is only put because the questioner has a good answer *in petto*. Prof. Büchler asks the question only because he thinks he has a good answer to give; namely, he is of opinion that such Doctors of the Law had stood "in relations" to the sanctuary in Jerusalem. Prof. Büchler quotes even Matthew xxiii. 9[4], where this title also occurs in Greek (πάτερ); consequently, the meaning is at least not obscure. It would also be appropriate to cite the Greek word πάπας, about which we read in Sophocles (*Greek Lexicon of the Roman and Byzantine Periods*, p. 839): "PAPA, *father*, a title given to bishops in general, and to those of Alexandria and Rome in particular." The Roman "Pope" (Italian *papa*, French *pape*) has retained his title up to the present day. This sort of designation certainly came from Judaism into Christianity. This circumstance might have been made use of by Prof. Büchler to show, that those priests, or, as he expresses himself, those men are called "father" who stood in some relation to the sanctuary.

But in truth neither from this, nor from the proofs adduced by

[1] *II Jahresbericht der israelitisch-theologischen Lehranstalt in Wien*, 1894, 1895.

[2] *Monatsschrift für Geschichte & Wissenschaft des Judenthums*, XL, 138-144.

[3] *Revue des Études Juives*, XXXI, 143-154.

[4] The citation of verse 10 is probably only a *lapsus*, for nothing can be found there referring to this subject.

Prof. Büchler, can this inference be drawn. It is so very natural to address a beloved and revered person as father, that there is really no necessity to look for a reason. We have the example of Elisha, who calls the prophet Elijah his father (2 Kings ii. 12). Besides, it appears to me, that this custom still obtains at the present day in Eastern countries[1]. It may of course be asked why the title of אבא was given to certain persons only, and not to the great multitude of Doctors of the Law. This I consider to be an idle question, because there is no suitable answer to it. For my friend Prof. Büchler is mistaken when he thinks that the persons named by him bore the title all through from the beginning to the end. Thus, for instance, it is not true that Jose b. Dosithai[2] had no other title but that of אבא, for in Genesis Rabba, c. 78, 4, he is called ר׳ יוסי; this passage, like some other, proves moreover that the sayings of Abba Jose do not always bear reference to the sanctuary[3]. In Deuteron. Rabba, c. 4, 8, and Levit. Rabba, c. 5, 4, a certain אבא יודן is mentioned, who neither was a teacher of the Law nor did he live during the time of the temple. Compare also אבא אנטולי, Jer. Demai, 24 a. In the name אבא אריכא, and also in other cases, אבא is a proper noun[4]. We also find ר׳ אבא הכהן (Tanchuma, בהעלותן, § 20, ed. Buber), where the priestly office is clearly not designated by אבא.

Consequently I venture to maintain that Prof. Büchler's inferences drawn by him from the title of אבא are as untenable as those which he makes from another idiomatical phenomenon; namely, that Doctors of the Law are mentioned only as בן, followed by the name of the father. The latter conclusions have been completely refuted by Prof. Blau[5]. But even the distinction made by Prof. Blau, that

[1] In a recent work of Deismann, *Bibelstudien* (Marburg, 1895), p. 273, a papyrus is published, where a certain Lycarion called a revered person *πάτερ*.

[2] It would be more correct to write *Dōsthai*, for דוסתאי is always written without *Yod;* in the Greek *Δοσίθεος* the accent is, by reason of *Syncope*, moved to the first syllable. I will here remark, that a Jew *Δοσίθεος* is already mentioned in the epilogue of the Septuagint to the book of Esther.

[3] Vid. Bacher, *Agada der Tanaiten*, II, 388. He quotes there from Midrash Samuel, c. 32, אני לא שמעתה מפומיה דאבא, which also shows that אבא was merely an expression of veneration.

[4] Vid. Aruch, s. v. אבא.

[5] *Revue*, l. c.—Why does not Blau quote the name of *Bar-Kappara?* The name בן זכאי is also found in Semachoth, VIII; בן הנפח in Jer. Sanhedrin, 18 c.

in ordinary cases the name of the father only is mentioned, and the name of the scholar himself only then added when it is preceded by the honouring title of "Rabbi"—even this distinction cannot be upheld. For according to my belief people are in ordinary cases called by their own names only, to which subsequently the name of the father may be added. This is usually the case in Greek and Latin, from which languages the existence of the same custom can be proved in reference to persons of the Jewish race. But this is so natural that it requires no proof. It is known that under primitive conditions of culture the descent from the mother's line was principally considered, and then the child most likely added the name of the mother. Why should the Jews, more than others, have suppressed their own names? Why should they have deviated from a custom that was prevalent in the Bible? As a matter of fact they never relinquished that custom; even at the present day in Synagogal rites, they use their own name and that of their father. The fact therefore remains that names like עקביא אלישע בן אבויה, יוסי בן יועזר בן מהלאל, were customary, and that such as בן עזאי, בן זומא, &c., were exceptional. The causes for such appellations can be recognized in some cases, but are in the majority of cases unknown.

Valuable informations about the sanctuary of Jerusalem have come down to us from scholars who lived in Sepphoris. Prof. Büchler attempts to prove that many distinguished families of priests had fled from the warlike Jerusalem to Sepphoris. He chiefly relies on the genealogy (מגלת יוחסין) which had been found in Jerusalem (Jer. Taanith, 68 a; Genesis Rabba, c. 98, 8), in which we also find בן יהודה מן צפרין. The whole argument is based upon this notice. Herr Epstein[1] had already pointed out that this passage is corrupt. Unfortunately, neither Herr Epstein nor Prof. Büchler has noticed that this passage of מגלת יוחסין occurs also in Mishna Arachin, II, 4, and Tosifta Arachin, I, 15[2]. In the Tosifta we read בית צפרייא מימאים[3], which means, "The house *Sippor* is from Emmaus[4]." It is known that Emmaus lay in the province of Judaea[5]; thus the passage means

[1] *Monatsschrift*, l. c., p. 141.

[2] Epstein quotes Strashun ad loc. (חדושי הרש"ש in ed. Wilna, 1884), without noticing that Strashun had already the correct notion that the notice in מגלת יוחסין had to be combined with Mishna and Tosifta Arachin.

[3] מימאום (in the ordinary editions of the Mishna מעימאום) is, of course, a corruption of אמאום, v. Rappoport, ערך מלין, p. 112. Prof. Büchler disregarded Rappoport's discussion; the passage from the Mishna he quotes p. 181, n. 2.

[4] The Aramaic צפרייא corresponds with the Hebrew צפרין.

[5] Vid. Graetz, *Monatsschrift*, 1853, p 112, who rightly distinguishes Emmaus

to say that "the house of *Sippor* is from Judaea." The passage in Jerushalmi will therefore have to be inverted; instead of בן יהודה מן צפורין read בן צפור מן יהודה[1], and in Genesis Rabba, instead of דבית יהוא מן ציפורין read דבית צפורין מן יהודה[2]. This notice would thus be fully borne out by those of the Mishna and Tosifta. This would also raise a difficulty mentioned by Herr Epstein; namely, that in a genealogy the names of ancestors must be expected rather than those of the places where the people lived. According to our assumption, the passage really says, that the house of *Sippor* was descended from the tribe of Judah, and is thus in conformity with the other portions of the genealogy.

Prof. Büchler further asserts that there was a Synagogue in Sepphoris which was called the Babylonian Synagogue (כנישתא דבבל דצפורין). I may as well mention first that besides the passages quoted by Prof. Büchler, Jer. Megillah, 75 b, must be cited. Based on this, Prof. Büchler would prefer to read in Jer. Taanith, 64 a, and Jer. Nazir, 56 c, כנישתא דבבלאי instead of כנישתא דבולי[3]. I cannot accept this opinion. I consider בולי as a proper noun, the Greek *Βουλή*, a town in the south of Judaea. I rely on the passage in Jer. Aboda Zara, 43 b: צלמא דבולי, where only a town can be meant. In connexion with this I mention that there were in the south of Judaea twenty-four such towns, which had a Greek form of government, and were for this reason called *Βουλαί*, Jer. Nedarim, 38 a, and Jer. Shebnoth, 34 d, כ"ד בוליות היו בדרים[4]. It is said that they were destroyed—it seems in the war of Hadrian against Bar-Cochba—on account of the careless oaths of their inhabitants. The sin of indifference in the matter of oaths is also mentioned in other sources; thus, in Tanchuma, old edition, ויקרא § 7; Tanchuma, ed. Buber, ויקרא § 16, and מטות § 1; Numeri Rabba, c. 22, 1; only in these passages a thousand cities[5] are mentioned, which were said to have lain in "the mountain of the King" (הר המלך). We know also from

in the South of Judaea from Emmaus near Tiberias. The place is now called *Amwâs*. Vid. Boettcher, *Lexicon zu Josephus Flavius*, p. 111.

[1] Or בית צפורין מן יהודה.

[2] It is known that יהודא was also written for יהודה.

[3] Strashun, in מתחיה to Genesis Rabba, c. 52, 4, quotes the reading כנישתא דבבלאי דצפורין instead of כנישתא דצפרין.

[4] For this we read in Pesikta Rabbathi, c. 22, p. 41 a, ed. Friedmann אלות; cf. *Aboth di R. Nathan*, version I, c. 20, p. 72, ed. Schechter.

[5] Always עירות. The number may have its origin in an erroneous transcription of ברבוא, out of כר, and then 20,000 cities were spoken of; vid. Threni Rabba, II, 2.

other sources that the war of Hadrian had raged particularly in "the mountain of the King"; there is, therefore, an historical substratum in this narrative. It is, however, nowhere said that the destruction originated with the Romans; the matter seems rather to have been brought about in this way, that those cities, for reason of their Greek customs, were rather disliked by the warriors for the national cause, and that the first work of the Bar-Cochba revolt had been to punish them. Similar frictions between the Jewish and Hellenistic population of Palestine are also otherwise historically attested. The crime committed by these cities was perhaps not the taking of an unnecessary oath, but a criminal breach of faith [1].

Prof. Büchler further deals with the question as to the language spoken by the priests of Jerusalem during the last decennium of its existence [2]. In reference to this much ventilated question, Prof. Büchler comes to the conclusion that before 63 [3] the official language of the priests had been Aramaic, in accordance with the conditions of the time, but that after 63 it had been Hebrew, under the influence of the Pharisees. Here also Prof. Büchler's arguments are not of sufficient force. He relies on the account as to the divine voice heard by the High Priest Simon in the sanctuary speaking *in the Aramaic language* (ובלשון ארמי שמען). Prof. Büchler lays particular stress on these words, but it escaped him that the same words are also used, on an occasion where there is no question either of sanctuary or of priests [4]. The reason of the Aramaic being used in the narrative does not lie in the circumstance that the priests spoke that language, but in the fact that such was the historical style of the time [5]. As a further proof I will only mention that we have an *Aramaic* account about the High Priest Simon referring to quite an ordinary event (Pesikta Rabbathi, c. 14, p. 65 a, ed. Friedmann, and parallel passages). Prof. Büchler thinks everywhere of priests; thus he could also have applied in proof of his proposition the passage in Joma, 18 a, where we are told in *Aramaic* that Martha, the daughter of Boethus, had

[1] The בולאות שביהודה are reproached for their great pride in Gittin, 37 a. That בולאות should mean *rich people* is a misunderstanding (W. Bacher, *Agada der Tanaiten*, I, 57, note 3). The most unmistakable passage occurs in Semachoth, c. 8, פסקו בולאות שביהודה, followed immediately by the word קורקסאות (circus).

[2] Pages 60–67.

[3] The year 63 B.C. is according to Prof. Büchler a turning-point in the history of the Temple Worship.

[4] Semachoth, c. 8 ובלשון ארמית אמרן; I consider these words to be authentic, although they are absent in Sanhedrin, 11 a; cf. Jer. Sanhedrin, 18 c.

[5] Vid. my observation in *Revue des Études Juives*, XXX, 217.

sent the king Jannaeus two *Kab* of Denars, because he had appointed Josuah ben Gamla High Priest. (Vid. Tosafoth, ibid.; cf. Tosifta Joma, I, 14, and Threni Rabba, c. 9, 16.) Prof. Büchler thinks that this account is *Aramaic,* because it speaks about a priest. But I am of opinion that we have here a fragment from a lost historical work. We must remember that the Scroll of the Fasts (מגלת תעניות) was also composed in Aramaic. The insufficiency of Prof. Büchler's argumentation is characterized by the circumstance that he draws important inferences from the single word ברקאי in Mishna Joma, III, 1, and Tamid, II, 2, a word, the meaning of which is by no means certain.

Prof. Büchler's attention is directed to everything which bears even the slightest reference to priests. Thus he attempts to prove, that priests married usually only girls of priestly descent[1]. I consider this statement to be fully proved. Prof. Büchler cites himself (p. 16) the Talmudical account, according to which eighty pairs of priestly brothers married in one night eighty pairs of sisters descended from priests. It is all the more remarkable that Prof. Büchler does not utilize the passage in proof of his proposition[2]. I myself might adduce an additional strong proof for the statement. Namely, in Levit. Rabba, c. 20, 10, we find that the children of the high priests were particularly careful in the choice of their wives (ר' לוי אמר ... מה היו אומרים ... אבינן כהן גדול ואנו שני סגני כהונה אי זו אשה הוגנת לנו, cf. Tanchuma, אחרי, § 6, p. 156 b, ed. Buber, Pesikta, 172 b, ed. Buber, Midrash Psalm lxxviii. 18)[3]. There are, however, also examples of Israelite (non-priestly) maidens being married to priests (in the above-cited Mishna Arachin, II, 4)[4]. Here it ought to have been mentioned that this fact was not generally recognized, for R. Chanina b. Antigonos says differently. It can, however, be pointed out, that, according to Tosifta, Aboda Zara, III, 10, Rabban Gamliel I gave his daughter to the priest Simon ben Nethanel for a wife[5].

Prof. Büchler conjectures that with the expression עדה קדושה

[1] It is true Prof. Büchler speaks only of high priests, but the proposition can also be extended to common priests.

[2] The legendary character of the narrative does not prevent Prof. Büchler from utilizing it on another occasion.

[3] The references given by Herr Epstein, l. c., p. 142, note 1, must be supplemented by these passages.

[4] Not priests of high standing, as Prof. Büchler thinks, but priests generally are named here.

[5] Prof. Büchler cites the passage himself, p. 14, note 2.

a community of priests is meant. Prof. Büchler's expositions are, in respect to this, very happy, and throw a correct light upon a number of data. Blau has strengthened Prof. Büchler's opinion with numerous fresh data[1]. I may be allowed here to make myself an observation: In Mishna Eduyoth, VII, 8 (cf. M. Kelim, V, 5), מנחם בן סגנאי is mentioned (Tosifta Eduyoth, III, 1, סוגנאי, Var פיבגי). He seems to be the same as מנחם בן סימאי, in Pesachim, 104 a, who is surnamed בנן של קדושים, "the son of holy ones[2]." The surname, the reason for which is given in so peculiar a manner[3], seems to me to have been derived from the father's name; סגנאי is the Greek proper noun Ἅγνος[4], equal to the adjective *ἁγνός*, *holy*. The form סגנאי was taken for a plural, and thus בן סגנאי became בן קדושים. Menahem, to judge from his decisions, was a priest, and it is probably owing to this circumstance that popular etymology took hold of his name and made a saint of him. For the present I give this with all reserve, although I think this is on the right track. Further I observe, that Blau's assertion, that the expression חסיד does not apply to the priestly character, is evident from the following passages: Sanhedrin, 11 a (several times הי חסיד); Sabbath, 127 b, מעשה בחסיד אחד.

I now turn to one of the boldest assertions of Prof. Büchler's, namely, that the so-called Woes in the Gospel of Matthew (c. xxiii) are directed against the priests, although in the chapter in question no priests, but Pharisees and Doctors of the Law, are mentioned. Herr Epstein rightly rejects this impossible assertion, and refutes it with undeniable proofs. Another proof against this statement, and, in my opinion, not less undeniable, lies in the words *πλατύνουσιν γὰρ τὰ φυλακτήρια αὐτῶν*, "they enlarge the phylacteries" (verse 5). We know from the whole Talmudical literature that the wearing of the *Tefillin* is a characteristic Pharisaical institution[5]. The same is also evident in Jerome's works[6]. It might be asserted *a priori*, that the priests, who more inclined towards Sadducism, did not wear the phylacteries. But we have even information about it *expressis verbis*. The Talmud says it expressly of the תפלין של יד, of the Tefillin to be worn on the arm: והני כהנים הואיל וליתנהו במצוה דיד, Arachin, 3 b; but the

[1] *Revue*, l. c., p. 150.

[2] Vid. Braunschweiger, *Lehrer der Mischna*, p. 178, note 1.

[3] R. Samuel b. Meir was not aware of the reason.

[4] Fick, *Griechische Personennamen*, p. 5, mentions Ἅγνος, Ἁγνιάς, Ἁγνώ, Ἅγνων; all from *ἁγνός*, *holy*.

[5] Prof. Büchler does not touch upon this point; but I cannot suppose that he would divide the chapter, which evidently forms one whole.

[6] Vid. my essay in this REVIEW, VII, 238.

priests did not wear them on the head either, because they were covered by the ציץ, or מצנפת. If the matter is treated critically, it appears from the discussion of the Talmud, that the priests did not wear any phylacteries at all; it seems that the Mishna first obliged them to do so. But תפלין and ציצית have the same fate, and presuppose the same data; consequently, we can maintain, that the priests did not wear the fringes either. For this reason alone Matthew, xxiii, cannot refer to the priests.

Prof. Büchler makes a very minute and valuable investigation about the officials of the temple. Among these the אמרכל is frequently mentioned. For the purpose of fixing the character of that dignity, Prof. Büchler quotes Targum Jonathan to Isaiah xxii. 23, where we find: ואמנניה אמרכל מהימן ואתן מפתח בית מקדשא ושולטן בית דויד בידיה. Prof. Büchler observes to this: . . . . "which says, that the key of the sanctuary was in the hands of a dignitary who was called *Amarkol*" (p. 94). But I see that the Targum says more than this, for the words: "The dominion of the house of David in his hand" (in the text only על שכמו), cannot possibly mean a simple temple official, like the Amarkol. But Prof. Büchler takes no notice of these words of the Targum, although these very words carry us back to the source of the Targum. For in Leviticus Rabba, c. 5, 5, the same verse of scripture is the subject of a controversy. R. Eleazar holds that Shebna had been a high priest, but R. Jehudah maintains that he had been an *Amarkol*. Now, as it is frequently the case[1], both opinions are blended together in Targum Jonathan: מפתח &c. refers to the Amarkol, שולטן &c. refers to the high priest. In view of this freedom of treatment, the Targum cannot justly be called sufficient evidence. The passage in the Midrash shows, however, that the Amarkol took part in the affairs of the sanctuary, but not in the offering up of the sacrifices[2]; consequently, he was not a priest, but an Israelite (layman). For all these reasons I cannot admit Prof. Büchler's concluding words that he had correctly discerned the position and signification of the Amarkol, although I am unable to substitute another theory of my own. Prof. Büchler himself remarks, that the Targum of the Prophets renders the word יוצר = treasurer, in Zech. xi. 13, with Amarkol, although we should have expected גזבר; but we cannot urge closely paraphrastic interpretations. I am surprised that Prof. Büchler does not think it worth while to prove, in respect to the word גזבר, that it

[1] Prof. Büchler, on another occasion, also speaks of a double translation (p. 100).

[2] Difference between הקרשות and קרבנות.

denoted a priestly office. Taanith, 29 a, proves nothing, for there גזברין is to be taken metaphorically, and not literally, as Prof. Büchler himself admits.

Nor can I agree that it was proved that the ראש המעמד was a priestly person; the "plain and evident result"[1] is rather that the first man of the division was a layman. This is not contradicted either by Sifre, Numbers, § 9, or by Sifra, Lev. xiv. 11. For in the former passage it is not said that the priest was assigned to render the service; but only, that the action be performed under the supervision of the priest; and, according to this, the other passage must be explained in the same way[2].

The opinion that בעל הפיל (Tosifta, Kelim, Baba Kama, I, 6, p. 569, ed. Zuckermandel) denoted a dignitary in the temple, I consider to be altogether erroneous. Prof. Büchler does not examine the word itself[3]; moreover, he omits to show a connexion between the word and its meaning as adopted by him. In my opinion, בעל הפול is probably nothing else but "the man of the bean (*faba*)"; i. e. the ancestor of the house of *Fabius* (פיאבי or פאבי), vid. Perles, *Beiträge zur rabbinischen Sprach- und Sagenkunde*, p. 6. Some proof for this assumption may lie in the circumstance that in Mishna Taharoth, VII, 9, some books read בן פיאבי instead of רבי אליעזר בן פילא.

I observe besides that important and detailed notices on the composition of the משמר are found in Jer. Taanith, 68 a, which have not been made use of by Prof. Büchler. Among other things, it is said there that the Chiefs of the Order (משמר) were sometimes degraded to Chiefs of Families (ועמדו ראשי משמרות ועשו עצמן בתי אבות).

A leading idea of Prof. Büchler's, which goes through the whole work, is this, that the Pharisees were suspicious of the priests, and therefore superintended the latter. Thus he writes: "Unequivocal and fully reliable traditions, which we are soon going to consider, put it beyond doubt, that the presence of non-priestly elders at the sacerdotal performances was not an ancient custom and settled usage, but has to be counted among the rights obtained by the Pharisaical side during the last decennium of the existence of the Temple." This idea may be correct in itself; but I think, it also ought to have been mentioned, that the presence of non-priestly elders was not a right obtained by the Pharisees, but the assist-

[1] Prof. Büchler's own words, p. 92.

[2] Prof. Büchler gives a good instance of this also, cf. his remark on Mishna Zebachim, IX, 3 (p. 70, note 4).

[3] Page 98, where the subject is dealt with in an off-hand manner.

ance rendered by the teachers of the Law, versed in the Halacha, to priests who lacked such training. This idea is quite plainly expressed in traditional literature [1], and the sources display evidence of a calm treatment of the subject, and that they give no indication whatever that any struggle had taken place.

Prof. Büchler then speaks of the connexion between priests and Levites. At the very commencement he meets with a difficulty (p. 119); namely, the letter of Antiochus the Great, communicated by Josephus, mentions the teachers of the law of the temple (*καὶ γραμματεῖς τοῦ ἱεροῦ*) [2], who, according to the context, could only have been Levites. Prof. Büchler sees a difficulty in this, that nothing similar is to be found in the literature of the Talmud and Midrash. Against this I draw attention to the frequently expressed view, according to which the teachers were of the tribe of Levi [3]; and more especially to the remarkable circumstance, that Moses, the chief of the Levites, is, in two places, very emphatically called Israel's teacher of the law (ספרא רבא דישראל, Sotah, 13 b) [4].

Prof. Büchler collects on this occasion several data, which prove that the singing in the temple was done by the priests; but Prof. Büchler cannot acquiesce in this, and vindicates, in spite of this, the singing in the temple by the Levites. This opinion, which is meant to agree with the Halacha, is really opposed to it; for according to the latter, priests, Levites, and Israelites had to participate in the singing *without fail*. (Jer. Taanith, 67 d: תני ר"ש הכהנים והלוים וישראל ושיר מעכבין את הקרבן, where the word שיר refers to all three categories, as the discussion there proves [5]. This of course would not mean to say that there was not any singing which was reserved exclusively for the Levites.

Prof. Büchler does not mention with a single word [6] that the Levites were also divided into orders (משמרות), and yet this is evident from the words of R. Jose b. Chanina in Jer. Megillah, 73 b: מיכן

[1] Numeri Rabba, c. 11, 3: תלמידי חכמים המלמדים את הכהנים הלכות שחיטה וקבלה וזריקה וקמיצה כוי; ibid. שהיו מלמדין לכהנים היאך יעשו עבודה; ibid. היו מוהירין אותו, &c. The same also Canticum Rabba, III, 6. I do not want to examine the historical value of these notices; but so much is certain that the co-operation of the "Pharisees" appears here in quite a different light. Cf. also the important passage in Sifre, Numbers, § 116: הרי זו אוהרה, &c.

[2] Büchler translates "scribes," but it means "teachers of the law."

[3] In connexion with Genesis xlix. 7.

[4] Prof. Bacher pointed out to me that these words are also found in Targum Onkelos to Deuteronomy xxxiii. 21.

[5] See Prof. Büchler, p. 127, on the singing by laymen.

[6] Cf. Blau, l. c., p. 151.

למשמרות כהונה ולויה שיהו בטילין, further, Numeri Rabbi and Canticum Rabba, l. c.: כ"ד משמרות כהונה וכ"ד משמרות לויה [1], and Ezra vii. 9 [2].

Prof. Büchler further discusses the place where the Levites stood. He considers as such the frequently-mentioned "raised place" דוכן, in opposition to Graetz, who says that this was the place where the priests stood [3]. On this point, I think I must agree with Prof. Büchler. For there is, in the ordinary prayer-books, a רבון העולמים after the פרשת הקרבנות, in which, among other things, is mentioned כהנים בעבודתם ולוים בדוכנם וישראל במעמדם; and a little later we read: ולא לוי בדוכנו. This is enough to place Prof. Büchler's opinion beyond doubt. I attribute some authority to this prayer [4], because a prayer of this class is based, as a rule, upon some Rabbinical source, and it may be that the above words are taken from the Talmud. But, speaking of the prayer-book, I will only add that the words ולוים בשירם ובזמרם, in the Musaph-prayer of the three principal festivals, also seem to indicate what I said before, namely, that the Levites participated in two sorts of singing.

I may now be allowed to make a few observations on the particular way in which the so-called twenty-four orders (כ"ד משמרות) were constituted; and I should say at once that Blau does not properly call the order consisting of Israelites (laymen) "Mishmar [5]," for the Talmud, in the passage quoted by Blau, always used the expression *Ammud* עמוד, and the term for this is always only מעמד, *Maamad*. The difference between the two expressions is this, that מעמד always means the order of Israelites only (Jer. Taanit, 67 d, המעמדות מתכנסין בעריהן, and further on always only ישראל), whilst עמוד was the order consisting of Cohanim, Levites, and Israelites. An order of the latter kind was always present in Jerusalem during the service (ibidem: ועל כל משמר ומשמר היה עמוד בירושלים של כהנים של לוים ושל ישראלים). Then follows immediately: "It has been taught: twenty-four thousand [6]," i. e. the just-mentioned order consisted of a body of priests, Levites, and Israelites, to the number of 24,000 men. The members of this order were convened from the whole of Palestine. The Baraitha continues: עמוד מירושלים וחצי עמוד מיריחו, "from Jerusalem only a whole Ammud (24,000) could be drafted." This means that Jerusalem always contained such a population of priests, Levites,

[1] Cf. Threni Rabba, Introduction, No. 23, משמרות כהונה ולניה.

[2] Quoted by Prof. Büchler, p. 137. [3] Page 126.

[4] In the edition of Salomon (Zalmon) London, Vienna, 1857, this prayer is printed on p. 20.

[5] *Revue*, l. c., p. 151. [6] תני עשרים וארבעה אלף.

and Israelites, that an Ammud could always be formed from them, and Jericho also contained so many people as to suffice for half an Ammud. This may really have been so. Then a small exaggeration follows. "Jericho could also have furnished a complete Ammud, but it sent only half an Ammud, in order to preserve Jerusalem's prerogative." The words following next form the natural complement: "The priests for the service, the Levites for the Duchan[1]; the Israelites, on the other hand, prove *per se* that they were the deputies from the whole of Israel." This means that it was not necessary to bring up to Jerusalem, from the whole of Palestine, the Israelite portion of the Ammud—besides, this would have been an impossibility, for, in that case, it would have been just as necessary to summon deputies from Egypt and Babylonia and from the Jews of other countries—but the mere fact that there were also Israelites in the Ammud, gives it the character of a representation of the whole of Israel. This I believe gives a clear meaning to the whole passage, and it is unnecessary to amend it in any way, as Blau has, not very happily, attempted to do.

In further laying stress upon the difference between Mishmar and Ammud, I am unable to accept Blau's opinion that the Baraitha contained in Bab. Taanit, 27 a, was only another edition of the above-mentioned Baraitha, and was to be modified accordingly. The Baraitha, as contained in the Babylonian Talmud, exhibits, to my mind, no difficulties, although Epstein[2] does not see his way clear about it. We give a translation: "There are twenty-four Mishmars in Jerusalem, twelve of which were in Jericho[3]; when the turn of a Mishmar came round to go up [to Jerusalem], the one half of a Mishmar went up from Palestine to Jerusalem[4], and the other half of a Mishmar went up from Jericho, and for the reason, to enable them to provide drink and food to their brethren in Jerusalem." Namely, there was in Jericho a large colony of priests, who occupied themselves with agriculture; therefore it was ordained, that of the Mishmars of the country—with the exclusion of Jericho—always one half,—and of the Mishmar of Jericho likewise one half went up to Jerusalem. Accordingly, the rest of Palestine, as well as Jericho, sent

[1] This passage also proves that the Levites used to stand upon the דוכן.

[2] *Monatsschrift*, l. c., p. 144.

[3] As if it were written ומהם שתים עשרה ביריחו, as the Talmud correctly explains.

[4] The words מארץ ישראל לירושלים, which would be superfluous, plainly say that always one half of a Mishmar, scattered over all Palestine, went up.

twenty-four times a year one half of a Mishmar to Jerusalem. I do not see why such an arrangement could not have been made, by means of which it was even possible to distribute systematically every Mishmar over the whole country and over Jericho, and which would thus cause no difficulty. Prof. Büchler has been able to understand this Baraitha, and also the one in Jerusalem in which he proposes a small alteration only. I think even this to be unnecessary; much more so the alterations of Epstein and Blau.

In conclusion, I observe that the Baraitha discussed by Blau, which treats of the four families of priests, is also found in Jer. Taanit, 68 a.

I made these observations, partly when I first read Prof. Büchler's work, and partly on reading the said reviews. I have not treated the matter systematically, and this may be my excuse, that I publish here only stray notes, and not a finished essay.

SAMUEL KRAUSS.

ZADOC KAHN'S SERMONS.

Sermons et Allocutions adressés à la jeunesse israélite, par ZADOC KAHN, Grand-Rabbin de France. (Paris: Durlacher, 1896.)

M. ZADOC KAHN'S reputation as a preacher deservedly stands high among his own countrymen, and several of his sermons which have found their way across the channel have attracted attention here.

The volume under consideration is a new edition of a work which originally appeared in 1877. It consists of a collection of sermons and addresses delivered to children, or to adults on topics connected with childhood. But it is more than a mere reprint, for it contains some addresses which do not figure in the earlier edition, and which are now printed for the first time. The volume might have been conveniently divided into two parts, Part I (pp. 1–162) comprising nine sermons, Part II (pp. 163–293) containing fifteen addresses on special occasions.

The author states what he regards as the ideal method to be adopted by the preacher to children. In the course of an excellent sermon, entitled "Be Young," he feels for a moment that he is talking above the heads of his young auditors, and exclaims: "However, I must not lose sight of the fact that after all you are children, and that it behoves me to speak to you in a language adapted to your

intelligence. The first duty of the sacred orator in the presence of such a congregation is simplicity and clearness. He must be able to make himself a child in order the better to be understood by children" (p. 147). The book, as might be expected, contains many eloquent passages. One of the most striking is the introduction to the sermon on "The Love of God" (p. 55), a paragraph which brings to mind Jellinek's famous sermons on the Shema.

"There is a chapter in Holy Writ which every Israelite should recite at least twice a day, with which we commence and finish our daily work, and thus awake and retire under the guard of religion. It is a chapter which we inscribe on the doorposts of our houses, and which we bear on our forehead during prayer, a chapter which is not a prayer, but which we consider as the most important of prayers, which is not an exposition of doctrine, but which we consider as the very expression of our faith, a chapter which seems to be the foundation of our religion . . . . , a chapter which is piously repeated by generation after generation, which even the most ignorant know by heart, and recognize or divine the sense, and which every mother teaches to her child as soon as it begins to lisp its first words, a chapter which for centuries has consoled the suffering and sweetened the last hours of the dying; a chapter, in short, so rich in its simplicity, so expressive in its conciseness, that it sums up our principal duties and awakens in us a crowd of memories and thoughts, in making shine before our eyes, as in a rapid vision, all the glories of our past, and all the hopes of our future."

Among other subjects included for treatment occur—"The signification of the name of Israel" (p. 13), "Honour your parents" (p. 35), "Progress" (p. 73), "The Ceremony of Religious Initiation" (p. 91), "Divine Providence" (p. 107), "The Schemang" (p. 125), "The Existence and the Unity of God" (p. 193), "Woman's work" (p. 251), "Instruction and Work" (p. 265), and "Patience and Perseverance" (p. 289).

The passages cited from the Agada are admirably chosen and beautifully rendered. The death-bed scene of Jacob, described on p. 125, and based on Genesis R. § 98, is a splendid example of the author's facility and felicity in making the Midrash appeal to the heart and the mind of the listener or the reader. References are given for all quotations, a feature which greatly enhances the value and the usefulness of the work.

The volume before us will be found to be what it aspires to be, a wise and suggestive initiation into religious thought for Jewish youth. There is a skilful combination of the "simplicity and clearness," aimed at by the author, with fullness and depth of meaning.

All this preacher's peculiar charm of style is apparent, and displays a tenderness of feeling inspired by perfect sympathy with the thoughts and ambitions of childhood. There is an originality in many of the thoughts which goes far to recommend the work. The volume in short contains excellent specimens of what children's sermons should be—plain, direct, practical, pervaded by the true spirit of Judaism, and holding up lofty aims in a manner adapted to the intelligence of the young.

S. LEVY.

MISCELLANEA.

KARAITE MISCELLANIES.

I. *From Daniel al-Qumisi's* ספר המצות.

DANIEL B. MOSES AL-QUMISI, or al-Damagâni, flourished at the end of the ninth or at the beginning of the tenth century. He seems to have been at first an admirer of Anan, whom he afterwards held in low esteem. He composed a ספר המצות in the Hebrew language, and, as is evident from Qirqisâni, also some other writings of which we do not know even the names[1]. Pinsker (*Lickute Kadmonioth*, Notes,

[1] We obtain some data about this Karaite in the first section of Qirqisâni's *Kitâb al-'Anwâr* (see Prof. Bacher in this Review, VII, 687–710), edited by Harkavy. We deduce his age from the fact that Qirqisâni, in the work here mentioned (written 937), considers him as the last sectarian. Qirqisâni mentions also other writings of Daniel, thus (ed. Harkavy), p. 316: ודלך מרן פי גיר מוצע מן כתבה; on the other hand, p. 285, ודן כתאבא; on p. 280, again, the singular as well as the plural occurs. From the name al-Damagâni it may be conjectured that Daniel was a native of the country Qumis in Tabaristan, and that he must therefore have been called al-Qumisi (Harkavy, l. c., p. 271, note 8). A David al-Qumisi, otherwise unknown, is mentioned by Mas'ûdi in his *Kitâb al-tanbîh*, ed. De Goeje, p. 113. He is said to have lived at Jerusalem, and to have died 945–946. That he was a Karaite, as Harkavy conjectures (לוח אחיאסף, II, 281), is to be proved from the following passage from a Karaite commentary in Arabic to Lev. iii. 9 (MS. Bodleian, Hebr. d. 44, f. 60 b): חלבו האליה תמימה אחת אנ אבו סלימאן אלקומסי בקולה חלבו האליה פקאל אן אלאליה סמי חלב קאל ואלדליל עלי דלך הו אן כל כלמה יכון פי אכרהא ו משאר ואלכלמה אלתי בעדהא יכון עלי ראסה הי גיר אצלי יגב אן תכון אלכלמה אלתאניה וצף ללכלמה אלאולה ולא תכון גירהא וקאל אליס תרי בנו הבכור ידו החוקה ורועו הנטויה אלך. (See Hadassi, *Eshkol Hakkofer*, alphabet 233, letter ת; Aron b. Elia, *Gan Eden*, f. 96 c, and *Keter Tora* on this passage.) Subsequently I found this Karaite cited also in Jefeth's Comm. on Lev. xxiii. 5 (second recension? Brit. Mus. MS. Or. 2518, f. 72 a). Various opinions are here given for the circumstance, that the 15th of Nissân falls on a Sabbath. We read there, among others: ואלמדהב אלה' מדהב אבי סלימאן אלקומסי רחמה אללה ענדה אן אלפסח יעמל לילה אלסבת שנצא ואחדא ען אלאמה באכרהא ולא יאכל בל יחרק.

pp. 188–189) cites from his code a long passage quoted by Jefeth b. Ṣagîr. Dr. Harkavy published (*Magazin für d. Wissensch. d. Judent.* XX, 227–228) three more passages from Petersburg manuscripts. Since Daniel's book is one of the oldest Karaite codes extant, and moreover, as it is written in the Hebrew language, it rouses special interest. It may therefore not be unwelcome if I now publish a further extract from the same book. The British Museum MS. Or. 2494, from which I take this extract, contains, ff. 31–80, a fragment of a Karaite commentary, in Arabic, on Lev. xi. 37–43. This commentary, composed 1050 E.C., is a compilation chiefly from Qirqisâni, 'Abu 'Ali (i. e. Jefeth b. 'Ali), 'Abu Saïd (i. e. Levi b. Jefeth, v. Pinsker, l. c., p. קי״ט), 'Abu-l Sari (i. e. Sahl b. Mazliach), Al-Raïs, and other authors. In addition to these, other Karaite authors are cited, such as 'Anan, Daniel and 'Abu Jaqûb, i. e. Josef al-Baṣîr[1].

The passage that follows is indeed not described as taken from the ספר המצות, nevertheless I believe this to be the fact on the evidence of its contents. As a convincing argument I may point out that, in the quotation in question Daniel deals with Lev. vii. 24, where it is said, that the fat of a beast that died by itself and that of an animal torn with beasts may be used for any other purpose except to be eaten. The Talmudists conclude from this, that the fat does not cause any uncleanness (v. Sifrâ to this passage). The Karaites, however, do not admit this conclusion, and accordingly they find the passage not free from difficulties. Daniel explains it by saying that if the body of the beast which died by itself, or was torn, is used in a manufacture, it is no more unclean. This opinion is cited by Jehuda Hadassi, *Eshkol Hakkofer*, alphabet 287, letter ג (f. 108 c):

״דברו שאמר וחלב נבלה וחלב טרפה יעשה לכל מלאכה וגו׳ הוא למלאכת הטמאים עוד . . . . . ״גלה ושפט מזה דניאל בן משה משכילי נ״ע כי נבלת בהמה טהורה אחר שנעשתה לפעולות אינה מטמאה לאדם בנגיעתה להזהרה שנא׳ וחלב נבלה וחלב טרפה יעשה לכל מלאכה יען כי יצא מקדושתו ואמר לא תאכלוהו אזהרה וכו׳.

The view quoted by Daniel, according to which by the term נבלה is here to be understood a sick beast which has been slain, was originally that of the Samaritans, with which, as it would seem, some Karaites concurred. By both sects the use of such

[1] See my description of Qirqisâni-MSS. in the British Museum in the *Steinschneider-Festschrift* (Leipzig, 1896), p. 215.

a beast was prohibited[1]. Compare further Geiger in *Hechaluẓ*, VI, 18–25, and *Jüdische Zeitschrift*, II, 21, 22.

The passage to which I have been referring runs as follows:

[f. 60 b] קול דניאל אלקומסי קאל ובהמה טהורה לא כתוב בהם טמאים הם לכם אחרי מותם למען כי אחרי אשר תעשה למלאכה לא תטמא כאשר לא כתוב בכלים בגד ועור ושק טמאים הם לכם למען כי גבול טמאתם עד הערב ורחיצה כן לא כתוב לבהמה טהורה טמאים הם לכם למען כי גבול טומאתה עד אשר תעשה למלאכה על כן כתוב וחלב נבלה וחלב טרפה יעשה לכל מלאכה[2] ועל כן כתוב וגם את המת יחצון[3]. וכתוב בה וכי ימות[4] כי לא כלם ימותו להודיע כי הנשחט לא מטמא. ויש שיאמר כי הכתיב וכי ימות היא הבהמה הנשחטת בחליה[5] [61 a] ולא כן הוא. וגם יאמרו וחלב נבלה היא הנשחטת בחליה ולא כן הוא כי אין בכל המקרא שם הנזבח נקרא נבלה וגם אם[6] נזבח לגלולים וכתוב וזבחו לאלהיהם[7] לבעלים יזבחו[8] זבח רשעים תועבה[9] קרא בשם זבח ולא בשם נבלה. והנזבח בחליו אם אסור לאכול ואסור לנגוע הלא הוא במשפט המת כאחד ובמה להפריד בינו ובין המת ואם מותר לאכול

[1] The following etymology of the word נבלה, which Hadassi quotes a few lines before (letter כ, f. 108 b), in the name of the Philosophers (חכמי הדעת, comp. Bacher in the *Monatsschr. f. Gesch. und Wissensch. d. Judent.* XL, 26, note 4), is interesting: "כי חכמי הדעת אפילו השחוט בכושר נבילה קוראים אותו יען [כך] אמתת המלה · כי אמתת מלת נבלה היא שנפלה מחיותה ונבלה · מגזרת ועליהו לא יבול כנבול עלה מגפן וכנובלת מתאנתך · "יושר המלה אמנם כזאת היא · אבל האלהים מן הנבולים ונופלים מחיותם התיר לנו · השחוט בכושר ביד בשר ההיה החיא · ושאר הנבולים אסרם לנו שנא' לא תאכלו כל נבלה וכו'.

[2] Lev. vii. 24. [3] Exod. xxi. 35. [4] Lev. xi. 39.

[5] The representative of this opinion is ʿAnân, see the passage communicated by Harkavy from the former's ספר המצות (*Magazin*, l. c., p. 225; Graetz's *Geschichte*, V³, p. 424; לקורות הכתות בישראל, p. 13): וכי ימות מן הבהמה ראי שחיט לה לבהמה בעידן דקריבה למות כנבלה היא וכו'. ʿAnân's opinion is also refuted by Qirqisâni in his *Kitâb al-ʾAnwâr*, ch. x, § 24 (Brit. Mus. MS. Or. 2580, f. 31 a). His words, for a copy of which I am indebted to the courtesy of the Rev. G. Margoliouth, Assistant Librarian of the British Museum, run as follows: ··· הדא איצא ממא קד דכרנא כטא ענן ענה אד געל קולה וכי ימות ליס הו מותא טביעיא ואנמא הו דביחה אלבהימה אלמריצה והדא מא לם יוגד פי אלכתאב אן שיא מן אלבהאים אלטאהרה אד דבח סמי מיתא ותאכיד דלך במא קאל בעדה וכל הנוגע בנבלתה והדא איצא ממא יבטל קולה אד כאן אלמדבוח מן אלבהאים לא יקע עליה אסם נבלה.

[6] MS. אין. [7] Exod. xxxiv. 15, MS. לאלהיהן.

[8] Hos. xi. 12. [9] Prov. xxi. 27.

ומותר לנגוע הלא הוא כמשפט החי מֵתֹם הנוף ולמה קרא אותו נבלה ובמה תפריד בינו ובין החי מֵתֹם הנוף. ואם מותר לאכול [ואסור לנגוע] ושכן כתוב הנוגע בנבלתה[1] למה אסור לנגוע. ואם תאמר הוא האוכל בשגגה או לאונס ולמה גם כן לא יגיע שגגה ואונס גם על הבהמה המתה ולא נפלא זה מן הכתוב ונבשל את בני ונאכלהו[2]. בזאת תדע כי הנוגע בבהמה טהורה המתה אחרי אשר נעשה למלאכה לא יטמא והנוגע בבהמה וחיה טמאה ושרץ טמא אם נשחט למלאכה יטמא על כן כתוב או בנבלת חיה טמאה או בנבלת שרץ טמא[3] ולא הזכיר הנה בהמה טהורה.

II. *Saadja and Salmon b. Jerucham.*

Sahl b. Maẓliach in his תוכחת מגולה, as his controversial tract against Jacob b. Samuel, the disciple of Saadja, is styled, gives a list of those Karaite authors who opposed Saadja's views. Of these, Ben-Mashiach and Salmon b. Jerucham must have written against the Gaon even during his lifetime; others again, such as 'Abul-Tajjib al-Jebeli, 'Ali b. Ḥasan, 'Abu 'Ali Ḥasan al-Baṣri (i. e. Jefeth b. 'Ali), Sahl himself, and several more, did not attack him till after his death[4]. It is not known whether all the Karaites here mentioned wrote whole treatises against Saadja, or whether, as is more probable, they only occasionally controverted his opinions. We only know with certainty that Salmon and Jefeth belong to the first class. The latter mentions his polemic against Saadja in his commentary to Exod. xxxv. 3[5]; this treatise, however, has not yet been discovered, and we do not know whether Jefeth wrote it in Arabic, like most of his works, or in Hebrew, the language he selected for his controversy with Jacob b. Samuel. Salmon's book, however, is extant in MS. in some libraries[6].

[1] Lev. xi. 39, MS. בנבלתם.

[2] 2 Kings vi. 29. The sense is, if it can even happen that men should eat human flesh, how much more possible is it that they should consume that of an animal that had died of itself.

[3] Lev. v. 2.

[4] See Steinschneider, *Catal. Lugd.*, p. 403; Pinsker, *Lickute Kadmonioth*, Notes, p. 37.

[5] וזלך כמא רדדת בה (אי באלפיומי) עלי מדעייה פי אלכתאב אלדי אלפת לה (Pinsker, l. c., p. 20).

[6] This appears in the Univ. Bibl. at Leyden, Cod. Warner 41, ff. 277b–288a, and in the Beth Ha-Midrash in Vienna (Pinsker's Collection), Cod. 27, ff. 26-38. My quotation follows the Leyden MS.

This treatise, entitled by the later Karaites מלחמות י"י[1], is written in Hebrew. The author also intended to translate it into Arabic[2], but it is not known whether he carried out his intention or not. Sahl distinctly says that Salmon entered the lists against Saadja with a Hebrew treatise. The book, which is written in a wretched rhymed-prose, has a scarcely intelligible introduction, which is only partly preserved, and has no connexion with the real contents of the work. The work contains, further, nineteen chapters, which are alternately written with the acrostic אבג"ד and תשר"ק; with the exception of chapters 11 and 19, in which the acrostic is סלמון בן ירוחם. The fragment of the introduction, which has been preserved, and the first two chapters are published in the *Litteraturblatt d. Orients*, VII, 23, 163, 211. Pinsker, pp. 16–19, gives a summary of the contents of the whole book, but he accounts only for thirteen chapters; in his copy chaps. 3, 4, 16–19 were lacking[3]. I will therefore supplement his account by giving the contents of these six chapters.

Chapter 3 is connected with the first two, and endeavours to refute the arguments for the inspiration and necessity of the oral law. Saadja's seven arguments for the necessity of tradition, as given in his Commentary to Genesis, are here specially cited and refuted[4].

Salmon's arguments against the alterations in the date of the Passover לא בד"ו פסח are given in chap. 4. He quotes in evidence Ezra vii. 9 and viii. 31–33, and maintains that at that time the Passover festival must necessarily have begun on one of the days which Rabbinical tradition excludes. This argument is also to be found in Qirqisâni, with whom probably it had its origin[5]. Hadassi

[1] This name is first mentioned by the author of the ארח צדיקים (ed. Vienna, f. 24 a), see Geiger, in אוצר נחמד, IV, 13, comp. also *Litteratbl. d. Orients*, VII, 17.

[2] See Pinsker, p. 15. [3] See ib., p. 133, note 1.

[4] Saadja's arguments, without the refutations of Salmon, are given by Geiger, *Wissenschaft. Zeitschr. für jüdische Theologie*, V, 133. These seven arguments are also quoted and refuted in a fragment of a Karaite work in the British Museum, MS. Or. 2580, f. 46, entitled אלבאב אלכאמס עשר. This fragment belongs (see *Steinschneider-Festschrift*, p. 209) to the second section (אלמקאלה אלתאניה) of Qirqisâni's *Kitâb al-'Anwâr*. Among other things there we find it stated: ואמא מא ד̇כרה מן אלסבעה אלאצול מן אלשרע אלכברי אלתי זעם אנהא תצטרנא אלי אלרגוע אלי אלנקל ומא ד̇כרה מן כיפיה אלציציח ואלסכה ומא אשבהמא פאן אלתי קאל אצחאבה פי אלסכה [הו] בכלאף מא אכברתה אלכתאב ומא שרח מן ד̇לך פי קצה עוראּ עליה אלכלאם אלך.

[5] Qirqisâni composed his work 937 (see ed. Harkavy, p. 247, and

also, in his *Eshkol Hakkofer*, alphabet 185 (comp. also *Gan Eden*, ענין קדוש החדש, § 5), quotes this argument, and I cannot say which of these two earlier Karaites was his authority.

In chapters 16–18 nearly the whole of the שעור קומה is paraphrased[1].

In the 19th and last chapter, Salmon expresses the hope that the temple will be erected again, and the truth established. He writes against Saadja also in this chapter.

The tone of this book is outrageously personal. He insults the Rabbanites in general, and Saadja in particular, in the rudest manner; in this respect he is scarcely surpassed by Jehuda Hadassi. It seems as if he himself felt that he had considerably overstepped the bounds of courtesy, for he urges the excuse that he was piqued and irritated by Saadja's attack on the Karaites[2]. His phraseology is awkward in the extreme, and makes everybody sensible of the deficiency of the book as regards a lofty ideal. At all events the work is worthy of notice as it is unique in its kind, and of so early a period.

We will now try to fix the time when this book was composed. We have in Sahl's statement a *terminus ad quem*, that Salmon wrote against Saadja during the Gaon's life. And indeed the whole tone of

Neubauer, *Mediaeval Jewish Chronicles*, II, 249). whilst Salmon wrote his polemic, if my conjecture be correct, not before 940. I have found the passage in a compendium (מלתצר) of Qirqisâni (British Museum MS. Or. 2525, see *Steinschneider-Festschrift*, p. 211). The chapter referred to is headed : פי אלשהור (אי צאחב אלאנואר) פצל פימא קאלה ; and is also taken from the seventh section of the *Kitâb al-'Anwâr*. I give this passage in extenso : ומן דלך [f. 46 b] מא קאלה פי עורא פי באחד לחדש הראשון הוא יסד המעלה מבבל (Ezra vii. 9) פאכבר מן צעודהם יום כאן פיה ולא יגוז אן יכון דלך פי יום אלסבת תם קאל ובאחד לחדש החמישי בא [אל] ירושלם (ib.) ולא יגוז אן יכון דלך איצא יום אלסבת ואנא כאן ראם שהר אב לם יכן אלסבת ולם יכן ניסן אלאחד ודלך אן ניסן ענדהם אברא תאמא פאנא כאן אלאחד יכון ראם אייר ואייר אברא כט יומא פאנא כאן ראסה אלג יכון ראם סיון אלה וסיון תאמא פיכון אול תמוז יום אלגמעה ותמוז אברא כט יומא פיכון אול אב אלסבת פעלם מן הנא אלפסוק [47 a] אן ניסן לם יכן פי תלך אלסנה לא אלסבת ולא אלאחד תם קאל ונסעה מנהר אהוא בשנים עשר לחדש הראשון (ib. viii. 31) ולא יגוז אן יכון דלך יום אלסבת ואנא כאן כדלך לם יכן ראסה אלג פתחת מן הדין אלפסוקין אן ניסן פי תלך אלסנה לם יכן אלסבת ולא אלאחד ולא אלג תם קיל פי אכר אלקצה ונבוא ירושלם ונשב שם ימים שלשה וביום הרביעי נשקל הכסף והזהב (ib. 32, 33) ולא יגוז אן יכון דלך יום אלסבת ואנא כאן דלך כדלך פלא יכון ראסה אלה ואנא כאן ראם אב לא יכון אלה לא יכון ראם ניסן אנה פתחת מן הנה אלקצה אן ניסן פי תלך אלסנה לם יכן לא אלסבת ולא אלאחד ולא אלג ולא אלה ובקי אן יכון יום אלג ויום אלה או יום אלו בלאף לא בדו.

[1] See Graetz, *Monatsschr.*, 1859, p. 67 ff.

[2] See Chapter II, letter צ (*Litteratbl. d. Orients*, l. c., 213).

the attack would suggest, that it was directed against a person who was still living. Note for instance the challenge thrown out to Saadja to be consistent with himself, and either to concur with the opinions of the Rabbanites, or to adopt the view of the Karaites[1]: to openly oppose him (Salmon) and to reply to his objections[2]; mark also the observation, that whatever Saadja might have to say would only be weak and inconclusive[3]. Where, however, can we place the *terminus a quo?* I think I shall be able to fix it from a passage taken from this polemical treatise itself. In the second chapter, Salmon cites one of Saadja's arguments for the necessity of committing the oral law to writing. The passage runs as follows (*Litteratbl. d. Orients*, l. c., 215):

"טפש מחלב אמרו וניבו · אשר חקר במגילה בכתבו ·

. . . . . .

"חקוק חקק כי ששה סדרים תורת משה · ולמען זה חקקוה למען לא תנשה

In other words, Saadja maintains, in one of his works, that the Mishnah was written down because it was feared it might otherwise be forgotten. Now Saadja gives this reason for writing the Mishnah in his ספר הגלוי, or rather in the Arabic commentary to it, as is distinctly mentioned in a fragment of a Karaite polemic against its author[4]. This will explain the term מגלה which Salmon uses. Saadja's opponents named this work thus, because of its being divided into verses and accented like a book of the Bible, and they reproached him by sneeringly asking whether he would pass for a prophet[5]. Consequently no other treatise of Saadja's could be meant, although this argument anent the compilation of the Mishnah may perhaps be mentioned elsewhere[6]. As therefore the ספר הגלוי

[1] Chapter VI, letter ב: "בחר לך אחת משני פנים וכו' (quoted by Pinsker, p. 16).

[2] Chapter VII, letter ג: "נשה אלי התיצבה · ואכפי עליך אל תעצבה · עת המערכה לקרבה · למה בחרר תשבה · "דבר אנה צוה שוכן מעונה · לשמור תולדות הלבנה וכו'.

[3] Chapter XIX, letter ו: "וסעדיה הפיתומי אם יכהוב בזה תשובות · יודע תשובות המתועבות (כי תשובותיו מהועבות ?) · ואם העתיקו ממנו תשובות משולבות · ידע כי הכל יושר ידיו וכי שגגותיו מרובות (כושר ?).

[4] See Harkavy, *Studien und Mittheilungen*, V, 195.

[5] See *ibid.* 229: ויכתב מגלה להדמות בנביאים כאחר נביאי השקר.

[6] Jefeth also cites this fact in his Commentary to Exodus xxi. 33 (British Museum MS. Or. 2468, f. 7 a); the same argument is literally copied from a work of Saadja (חרף בחרף), it is possibly from the Arabic Commentary to his ספר הגלוי, but it may be from some other of his writings. Among other things it is said there: . . . פלמא גלת אלגלוה אלאולי הכוף אלעלמא אן תנסי הדא אלא אר אלתי כאן גמע אלשמל יהפמנוהא פעמד עליהא פכסוהא כלאמא ואתבתוה

was composed in 934[1], Salmon's work must have been written between the years 934–42. I would be inclined to fix the later years of this interval as the date of Salmon's attack, because most of Salmon's Bible Commentaries were written in the sixth decade of the tenth century. The Commentary to the Psalms he composed, according to his own statement, in 955[2], the Commentary to Lamentations in 956[3], the Commentary to the Song of Solomon is mentioned as contemplated in the former work, in the latter, however, it is already quoted, consequently this also was composed between 955–956[4]. But the remaining Commentaries, with the exception of that to Daniel, were probably written after this time[5]. We may therefore suppose, with a certain amount of probability, that Salmon composed his work about 940.

If my conjectures in this respect be correct, we can also obtain an inkling as to the year of Salmon's birth. According to his own

וסמוהא [משנה] פכל מן סבק מנהם אלי אלתרביר בשי אתבתה (l. באסמה ליהתו אתבתוהא אלתלאמיד עלי אלהפט ובקי שעבא מא רנו חפטהא או קד אתבתו אצולהא פלמא גלת אלאמה אלגלוה אלתאניה כאף אלתלאמיד עלי אלפרוע אלבאקיה אן חנסא פכסוהא כלאמא ואתבתוהא איצא וסמוהא תלמוד.

[1] See Harkavy, *ibid.*, 142. If this date only refers to the first recension of the ספר הגלוי, and not to the other which Saadja provided with an Arabic commentary, and in which the origin as well as the committal to writing of the oral tradition was laid down, then it becomes all the more certain that Salmon composed his polemic much later than 934.

[2] In Commentary to Psalm cii. he gives the year 887 after the destruction of the second temple as the date. This is not 4717 of the era *anno mundi*, as Pinsker (p. 130) wrongly states, but 4715 (=955 C.E.), for according to Jewish reckoning the destruction occurred in the year 68 C.E., not 70.

[3] In Pinsker, p. 132, we read תחצה; likewise in the Paris MS. 295, where we find: תמאן מאיה נמסה ותמאנין סנה, viz. 953. But this is impossible, because the Commentary to Psalms is already cited here. The British Museum MS. Or. 2516, f. 113a, has the right date, viz. תחצה = 956, MS. Or. 2513, f. 129a, has even תחצה.

[4] Of this Commentary I have found eight pages in the British Museum MS. Or. 2520, ff. 68–75, for the most part illegible. To Song of Songs ii. 11 there is a long excursus, in which Saadja's calculation of the year of redemption derived from Daniel is quoted and attacked. He then cites the eighth section of Saadja's *Emunoth Vedeoth* (פי כתיב אמאנ[א]תה פי אלמקאלה אלח). Salmon writes on the same theme in his Commentary to Psalm cii. 15. See Pinsker, p. 81.

[5] This is inferred from the fact that only the Commentary to Daniel is quoted in that to Echa, see Pinsker, p. 132.

statement, he was at the time he wrote his polemic a young man[1]. Supposing he was between twenty and twenty-five years old, it will be evident that he was born about 915 or 920. At all events he was considerably younger than Saadja, and the fable invented by the later Karaites that the Gaon was his disciple, is chronologically impossible, besides being incredible for many other reasons[2]. It is further evident from this, that the pretended *Muqaddima* of Salmon (Pinsker, Notes, p. 61), according to which he would have been born 1196 aer. contr. = 885 C. E., is a clumsy falsification, also the statement that he came from Egypt, a statement which was probably only invented (by Firkowitsch ?), to make it possible that Saadja was the disciple of Salmon in that country[3].

Besides this polemic, Salmon attacks Saadja in his Commentary to the Psalms[4]. He attacks him likewise in his Commentary to the Song of Solomon[5]. On the other hand, Salmon does not mention the name of Saadja in his Commentary to Echa and Koheleth. Neither does he attack him anonymously, so far as I can judge from a superficial reading of these works. It is quite possible that he quotes now and then Saadja's translation or explanation anonymously and rejects it, but at all events this is done without any animosity[6].

But did Saadja write a reply to Salmon's attacks? I scarcely think that he did. Four anti-Karaite works of Saadja are known[7]: (1) כתאב אלרד עלי ענן, A Refutation of Anan, written 915. (2) כתאב אלתמייז, Book of Distinction, written 926. Both these are out of the question owing to the date of their composition[8], apart from the

[1] Chapter II, letter צ: צעיר אנכי לימים ואהם מימני קדומים.

[2] See Pinsker, p. 135; Weiss, דור דור ודורשיו, IV, 95, 139; compare also the Epigraph of Elia b. Baruch in Bardach's מזכיר יבני רשף, p. 37.

[3] It follows from his Commentary to Psalm cxl. 6 (by Pinsker, p. 14), וגהת בה אלי אלעראק, that he did not live at Babylon, which is also evident from his polemic, Chapter I, letter ג (*Litteratbl. d. Orients*, l. c., 163), גר הייתי בארץ נכריה וגו', yet this does not prove that his home was Egypt, as Pinsker maintains. Probably he lived at Jerusalem.

[4] Compare p. 3, note 10 and the preceding note; also Neubauer, *Aus d. Petersb. Bibliothek*, p. 12.

[5] See p. 3, note 10.

[6] I have examined the Commentary to Echa, in the two MSS. of the British Museum (see above p. 3, note 11), that to Qoheleth after the MS. Or. 2517 in the same collection.

[7] Compare Dukes, *Beiträge z. Geschich. d. aeltesten Auslegungen und Sprachererklärung d. A. T.*, II, 32-33; Steinschneider, *Cat. Bodleian.*, col. 2165-68.

[8] With this also falls Graetz's hypothesis (*Geschichte*, V, note 20, 3rd ed., p. 460), that this work was directed against Salmon. Graetz relied upon

fact that the former is distinctly directed against Anan. (3) כתאב אלרד עלי בן סאקויה, Confutation of Ibn Saqûje. This Karaite is not mentioned anywhere else. Geiger[1] therefore conjectures, that it is the Arabic name of our Salmon, but this is a mere hypothesis which is destitute of probability. In the same manner it seems very unlikely that this work is, as Geiger conjectures, identical with (4) The (?) כתאב אלרד עלי מתחמל היום, Refutation of the Bold Opponent[2], cited by Nissim b. Jacob, and to understand by this "bold opponent" Salmon, i. e. Ibn Saqûje. Saadja's work against Ibn Saqûje deals mainly with the fixing of the Spring, מציאת האביב, by the intercalation of a month[3]. The work mentioned by Nissim, however, chiefly aims at defending the Anthropomorphic Agada, and is doubtless identical with that work of Saadja, from which Jehuda b. Barzilai, in his Commentary to *Sefer Jeẓira* (ed. Halberstam, pp. 20, 34), quotes two passages. From the contents of these we can clearly see the aim of the whole work[4]. Salmon has of course in his polemical treatise devoted a large space to the Anthropomorphic Agada (see above, p. 3), but it is difficult to comprehend why Saadja in a work directed against Salmon, should have singled out only this one point[5]. On the other hand if our supposition be correct, that Salmon composed his polemical work not much before 940, it is extremely doubtful whether Saadja could have seen it, or if he saw it, whether he found it necessary to write a reply to a young Karaite author, who wrote in so conceited a tone.

We may remark, in passing, that Saadja composed the last-men-

the above-mentioned *Muqaddima* as accurate. Steinschneider (l. c., 2165) suggests that Salmon specially attacked this work of Saadja's, but this is also improbable, for he merely cites it as he does other works of Saadja, as his סדר הגלוי, his Commentary to Genesis, and Esther (see Dukes, l. c., p. 100).

[1] נטעי נעמנים, German part, p. 46. Pinsker's assumption (p. מג) that this Karaite was named Samuel, depends on a mistranslation of a passage in Josef al-Baṣîr's כתאב אלאסתבצאר (see Harkavy, *Studien und Mittheilungen*, III, 45). This Samuel is no other than the Gaon Samuel ben Hofni.

[2] נטעי נעמנים, Hebrew part, f. 16 b.

[3] See Pinsker, l. c. But this question was not exclusively the object of this work of Saadja, as we shall soon have occasion to prove.

[4] P. 20: ומצינו בספר אחד מספרי רבינו סעדיה ז"ל שחיבר על טענות מין אהד שם רשע יקב שאמר אותו הרשע על רו"ל חלילה וחלילה שהם היו נוהגים דמות ותמונה לבורא העולמים .... וחבר עליו ר"ס ז"ל סדר בהשובות נכונות וכו'.

[5] In his edition of Qirqisâni, p. 248, Harkavy supposes that Saadja is here attacking this Karaite, but he does not prove this supposition. Perhaps he relies upon some materials in MS. which are in his possession.

tioned anti-Karaite work after 933. For he cites in it his ספר היחוד, by which he doubtless meant the second section of his religio-philosophic work, as the following parallels show.

Jehuda b. Barzilai, ed. Halberstam, p. 20.

ואלו היה חוזר אל לבו ומעיין בתורה וקורא אותה לא היה תמה על זה לפי שהיה מוצא בתורה כי המקום הראה למשה אחרית כבודו כי לא היה יכול לראות ראשיתו . . . והיה מוצא בה כי משה ואהרן ונדב ואביהוא ושבעים מזקני ישראל אמרה התורה עליהם ויראו את אלהי ישראל ופירוש הכתוב כי ראו אור גדול . . . והוא האור הברוי תחלת כל הבריאות והנוצרות . . . וכן כל נביא וחוזה שראה זה האור הבהיר אומר ראיתי את ה' . . . כמו שפרשתי כל זה פירוש רחב בספר היחוד וכו'

Emunoth, ed. Slucki, p. 55 (ed. Landauer, p. 106).

. . . וכבר בלבל דעת קצת בני אדם ענין משה רבינו איך שאל מאלהיו הראני נא את כבודך . . . ונכפל בלבולם באמרו וראית את אחורי ופני לא יראו ואומר בגלות כל זה כי יש לבורא אור בראהו והראהו לנביאים . . . וכאשר יראה אותו אחד מהם אומר ראיתי את ה' על דרך ההסתר וכבר ידעת כי משה אהרן ונדב ואביהוא ושבעים מזקני ישראל אמר עליהם בתחלה ויראו את אלהי ישראל ופרשו אחר כך ומראה כבוד ה' כאש אוכלת בראש ההר וכו'

Now as Saadja composed his *Emunoth* in the year 933, this polemical work of the Gaon must have been written after that date[1]. Otherwise we must suppose that the reference to the ספר היחוד is a later interpolation[2].

III. *From Jefeth's Commentary to Genesis* xv. 3.

The Commentary of Jefeth to this verse is interesting in so far as it brings before us some Karaite opinions concerning the law of inheritance[3]. First of all, he says, some ask how could Abraham

[1] Luzzatto (הליכות קדם, ed. Pollak, p. 70) suggested that by the title ספר היחוד is probably to be understood the second section of the *Emunoth*. He merely says briefly: אולי הכוונה על המאמר השני מס' האמונות והדעות.

[2] Compare Kaufmann, *Gesch. d. Attributenlehre*, p. 87, note 146.

[3] There exist differences between Rabbanites and Karaites concerning the right of inheritance which would be out of place to give fully here; I will therefore note only one point, viz. that concerning the

utter the complaint: "Behold, I am childless," when God had twice promised him that he would bestow the land upon his descendants? (see xii. 7 and xiii. 15). To this Jefeth replies, that as the promise was not accompanied by oath or bond, Abraham was afraid that it might perhaps be dependent on certain conditions, and that its fulfilment might be uncertain. He was therefore anxious to assure himself[1]. The second question is, if Abraham had even remained childless how could Eliezer have become his heir? What became of his nearest relations, such as brothers and sisters, nephew, &c.[2]? To this Jefeth gives the following five answers. According to one supposition, as long as a man lives he can dispose of his fortune in accordance with his own pleasure, only after his death the heirs may step in to claim their right. Now as Eliezer was an excellent and obedient slave Abraham could present him with all his fortune during his lifetime. Others again maintain, that before the revelation of the Law a slave born in the house (יליד בית) was the privileged heir next to the children of the possessor, and had consequently the preference before the other relations. The supporters of this view rely upon the verse in question, Genesis xv. 3. On the other hand others suppose that the right of inheritance did not suffer any change through the revelation[3]. The sisters

daughter's share in the inheritance. One ר' יוסף הפקח, otherwise unknown, was of the opinion, that a daughter's share of the inheritance is equal to that of a son. The following words of this Karaite, which are given in his name by Aaron b. Elia (*Gan Eden*, f. 165 d; compare Bashiatchi, *Adereth*, f. 119 c), are worthy of notice: "I thought at first that I am alone in my opinion, but I found afterwards that David b. Boaz and many others also adopted this view," still he does not mention their names. But Aaron unveils this secret by quoting the passage of the Talmud, Baba Bathra, 115 b: כל האומר תירש בת עם בת הבן (עם הבן by Aaron) אפי' נשיא שבישראל אין שומעין לו שאינן אלא מעשה צדוקין וכו'. Accordingly we see here the close connexion between Sadducees and Karaites, and a further evidence for the well-known hypothesis of Geiger, according to which the later sect would be the spiritual successors of the former. The view of Daniel al-Qumisi, according to which one-third part of the heritage belongs to the daughter, is further to be noticed. This law is similar to that of the Qoran, see the quotation from the ספר העשר to Num. xxvii. by Pinsker, 85: ודניאל קומסי יתן לבת שלישית נחלה ויקח זה מן הערכים, also *Gan Eden*, f. 169 d.

[1] Compare Nachmanides (*ad loc.*), where this question is raised, and answered somewhat differently.

[2] In the Arabic original the passage runs אב ואבוה ואבן אף, "Father, sister and brother's son." But the word אב must be a slip, for Terah was already dead.

[3] The question whether at the revelation several divine ordinances were

and brothers of Abraham, however, cannot be taken into account because of their being disbelievers, and as such they were not allowed to become the heirs of a believer[1]. Lot, again, voluntarily departed from Abraham and assimilated with the inhabitants of Sodom. Therefore Abraham would rather bequeath his goods to a slave than to him. A fourth view is that the word יורש does not mean here "inherit" but "govern." Abraham complains then that he must, for want of a son, let his fortunes be governed by a slave. Lastly, many explain the text in the following way: Abraham had complained before God, that his fortune must necessarily fall into the hands of Eliezer because Lot had separated from him and he was at that time childless, nor could he appoint his relations of Haran as his heirs (because they were too remote from him?). So Eliezer thought: the fortune of my lord must needs come into my possession.

Of all these explanations Jefeth chose the second, and decided accordingly. His words run as follow[2]:—

. . . . וקד יסל אלנאס האהנא מסלתין אחדהמא יקאל אלים קד תקדם אליה קול אללה דפעתין באנה יכון לה זרע ירת אלבלד בקו׳ לזרעך אתן וקאל לך אתננה ולזרעך פכיף קאל ואנכי הלך ערירי והנה בן ביתי יורש אתי אלגואב פי דלך הו אן קול אללה לזרעך אתן ינזו אנה באסתתני בעד מא לם יצמנה אללה בשבועה וברית כמא סנשרח דלך שרח שאפי פי והאלהים נסה את אברהם פנזו אברהם עאלם אן יכון קול אללה לזרעך אתן לה אסתתני מא פקאל הן לי לא נתתה [זרע] ליעלם מא ענד אללה הל הו קול באסתתני אם הו חתם לא בד מן כונה

modified was hotly discussed and variously answered by Karaites. Thus with regard to the Levirate marriage, which the Karaites mostly hold must be fulfilled not by the brother-in-law but by a more distant relative. But Genesis xxxviii. 8 proves that the brother-in-law was involved in the Levirate union. Karaites who deny that any change in the divine laws occurred at the Revelation, remove this difficulty by artificial assumptions.

[1] This law, also known to Islâm, was accepted by Rabbanites as well as Karaites. Thus Natronai ordered that a Jewish renegade was not to inherit his father's property (compare שערי צדק IV, iii. 25; *Resp. Geonim*, ed. Lyck, 24; *Resp. Geone Mizrach*, &c., ed. Müller, 11, where it is added: כי בדת ישמעאל דאינון לא מורתין למשומר נכסי אביו סמיכי רבנן למימניה מירושת אביו; *Pardes*, ed. Constant. f. 26 a, and Weiss, דור דור ודורשיו, IV, 117). Similarly with the Karaites, cf. e. g. *Adereth*, f. 120 d: והנה יפי זה הכפרן לא יירש למאמין.

[2] The passage from Jefeth I cite in accordance with the MS. Berlin or. qu. 828 a.

פלדלך קאל הדא אלקול ענד מא קאל לה שכרך הרבה מאד ואלמסלה אלב
קיל אלים כאן לאברם פי הדא אלוקת אב (?) ואכוה ואבן אך פכיף
קאל והנה בן ביתי ולם ירדּ אלמיראת אלי קראבתה אלגואב פי דלך
אוגה עלי חסב אכתלאף אלנאס פי באב אלמיראת פקאל בעצהם אן
אלמאל לצאחבה ויעטיה למן ישא פי חיותה פלמא כאן אקרבא אברם
בעידין מנה וכאן אליעזר עבד צאלח מאיע לה גאז לאברם יעטיה מאלה
בחיותה לאנה מאלך למאלה בעד אן לם תפות רוחה ואנמא יגב אלמיראת
ללקראבה דון אלעבד בעד אן ימות ואלמאל עלי גמלתה וקאל בעצהם אן
פי קדים אלזמאן קבל נזול אלתוריה כאן ילידי בית אחק באלמיראת מן
גירה בעד אלולד והדא שרט אלעבד אלטאיע ועלו עלי דלך עלי קול אברם
פקאלו אן למא ראינא לה קראבאת וקאל הן לי לא נתתה זרע ותמאמה
עלמנא אן כאן הדא שרט פי קדים אלזמאן אלי נזול אלתוריה כאן ילידי
בית אחק באלמיראת מן גירה בעד אלולד וקאל בעצהם אן פרץ אלמיראת
לם יכתלף קט ואנמא קול אבר(ה)ם הנה בן ביתי יורש אותי עלי וגה והו
אן לם יגז לאברם יורת אבוה (?) ואכוה לאנהם כפרה ואלכאפר לא ירת
מאל אלמומן ואמא לוט פקד רצי לנפסה יכרג מן גמלה עמה ומע דלך
פקד כאלט אהל סדום וצאהרהם פלם יר אברם אן יורת מאלה ללוט מן
הדה אלגהה בל יורת עבדה אלדי עלם אנה אחק מן לוט לאנה הו
תחת טאעתה וכאן טאיע ללה בלא מחאלה וקאל בעצהם אן ליס קולה
יורש אתי יריד בה אנה ירת מאלה בעד אלמות ואנמא יריד בה אן מאלי
תחת ידה פי חיותי ולו כאן לי ולד כאן הו אלאחק בה וקאל אכרון אנה
אראד בקולה יורש אתי אנה למא בעד לוט ענה ולם יכן ללוט ולד
פי אלוקת ולם יגז אן ירת מאל אברם אהל ביתה בחראן קאל אליעזר אן
מאל מולאי ירגע אלי פכאן הדא יתן בה אליעזר מן טאהר אלקצה פקאל
יא יוי הודא בן ביתי יומן אנה יכון וארת מאלי ואלדי נדהב אליה מן
גמלה אלאקאויל הו קול אצחאב קדם אלפרץ עלי מא משינאה:

IV. *The Karaite view of Leviticus* x. 19.

The second half of this verse is usually translated thus: "If I had eaten the sin-offering to day, would it have been acceptable in the sight of God?" This is its meaning according to the Talmud (Zebahim, 101 a), and almost all commentators agree with it. The verb ואכלתי would then have the force of an imperfect, and the ה in הייטב would be a sign of interrogation. Thus both words are irregular.

The first has the accent upon the penultimate syllable, and the ה has a patach with a dagesh following. The last circumstance especially forces itself upon the observation of Jewish grammarians, comp. e.g. Abulwalîd, *Kitâb al-luma'*, p. 357, l. 24: קיל הייטב בעיני ה׳ פחרכוא אלהא באלפתח ושדדוא אליא בעדהא וכאן אלונה אן יכון אלהא בשבא ופתח ואן יכון מא בעדה מכפפא. An analogous instance is found in Amos v. 25, where the ה with a patach is followed by ז with a dagesh. See Ibn Ezra on this passage: יראה בדרך הפשט כי הא הזבחים · הזבחים התימה והנה הטעם שלא הגישו.

In order to avoid these two irregularities, there are some grammarians who consider ואכלתי as the perfect tense, and the ה of הייטב as an article. They explain the passage in the following manner: "Behold my sons have offered to-day their burnt-offerings and sin-offerings, and now this misfortune has happened to me. I ate therefore of the sin-offering (only so much) that was acceptable to God, that is I ate only a trifle in order to fulfil my duty, the remainder however was burnt." Ibn Ezra, commenting on this passage, cites this explanation in the name of some grammarians, יש מדקדקים שאמרו, but he adds, that in any case it remains an irregularity, as the ה in the sense of an article cannot be placed before an imperfect tense. From another passage we now gather that the grammarians here referred to were Karaites, see *Zahoth*, 18 a: והנה מלת הייטב בעיני ה׳ זרה על כן אמרו מכחישי תורתנו שהיא על פה כי טעמו בהא הדעת כמו אשר ייטב בעיני ה׳ וכל זה בעבור הדגשות וכו׳[1].

I will now give a longer passage from the Commentary to Leviticus mentioned above, p. 681, note 1, in which the Karaite view is quoted, as also is the opposed or rabbinical interpretation, the latter, however, is refuted. The passage runs:

[62 a] . . . פאלאקרב אן יפסר ואכלתי חטאת היום אלדי יחסן בעיני י״י יעני ואן כאן פי יום אלמציבה מא כאן ירידו אן יאכלו אלקראבין עלי אלרסם פמא בד להם מן אן ידוקו מנה לאדא אלפרץ ולו אלא לקמה ואחדה ומן כאלפנא פי הדא אלבאב יקול אן מא כאן ידוקו מן אלחטאת פי יום אלמציבה שי פקלנא להם אדא כאן משה עארף אן אלאכל מנה לא יגוז וחרקה ואגב וקד סאל עז כבר הדא אלחטאת וקיל לה אנה אחרק פלאיש ויקצוף

[1] Compare *Safa Berura*, ed. Lippmann, f. 45 a: ויש מלה זרה והיא הייטב בעיני ה׳ ודעת קדמונינו ז״ל שהוא הא לתימה ודעת המורים שהוא הא הדעת. Cf. Bacher, *Abr. Ibn Esra als Grammatiker*, p. 42, note 9. David b. Abraham Alfâsi also considers the ה as article, see Neubauer, *Notice sur la lexicogr. hébr.*, p. 49.

על אלעזר ועל איתמר פנאובונא וקאלו אראד אן יגרבהם פזגר בהם כמא אלאסתאד יציח עלי גלאמה חתי יסתפהם מנה פאראד אן יסתפהם מנהם אן אלדי לם יאכלו מנה כאן בעלם אם כאן בנזאף וקאלו אן למא כאן נדב ואביהוא גלטו והלכו אראד משה אן יסכט עלי האולי ליסתפהם עלי אי וגה לם יאכלו פקלנא להם אלחכים לא יסכט עלי מתל הדה אלאשיא אלא עלי צבי [62 b] או עלי אנסאן אכלה יסתפהם דלך[1] ואמא אהרן ובניו פלים מחלהם הדא אלמחל ואדא כאן אלאמר כדלך פצחה[2] תפסרתי ואכלתי אקרב מן גירה:

. . . "The best explanation is as follows, and I ate to-day of the sin-offering, which is pleasing to God. That is, although they would not on this day, the day of his calamity[3], eat the sin-offering in the usual manner, yet they were bound at least to taste something of it. For according to the law, even a morsel is sufficient. Our antagonists interpret this passage as meaning that they did not eat any portion of the sin-offering on the day of their calamity. To which we reply: If Moses knew that the sin-offering ought to be burnt, and not eaten, why was he so angry with Eliezer and Ithamar, when on his asking as to what had become of the sin-offering, he was told that it had been burnt? They on their part contend that Moses wished to try them, and therefore he blamed them as a teacher declaims against his disciple, till he ascertains from him just what he would like to know. Moreover Moses was anxious to find out whether they had refrained from eating the sin-offering because they knew that it was prohibited, or whether their action was the result of an accident, more especially as Nadab and Abihu had already met with death through their ignorance. He was therefore angry with the other two in order to know why they did not eat it. In reply, we observe further: A wise man would not be angry about such a thing except with a child, or with a man, who has eaten without cognizance of the law (?). Aaron and his sons, however, do not belong to this class. If this should be true, it follows that my interpretation of the meaning is the better, and that the word ואכלתי is a perfect tense."

Still the fact remains, that not all Rabbanite grammarians support the view of the Talmud, nor are the Karaites unanimous on the other side. Of the former, a certain grammarian at the beginning of the twelfth century, is astonished at Abu-l-Fahm (Levi) Ibn at-Tabân for

[1] Probably the reading should be או עלי אנסאן אכלה, or לא עלי אנסאן אלך ולם יסתפהם וילך.

[2] MS. פצחר.

[3] I. e. on the day of אנינות.

maintaining that the ה in הייטב and in הזבחים is a sign of interrogation[1]. He seems to have been of the opposite view. Among the Karaites, Aaron b. Josef was the first to interpret the verse in the sense of the Rabbanites, and he refutes the common Karaite view with the same arguments as Ibn Ezra uses. But even Tobia b. Mose, as early as the second half of the eleventh century, says in his אוצר נחמד (Cod. Bodleian, Opp. fol. MS. 26) on this passage, that the interpretation of ואכלתי as a perfect is grammatically impossible, although in the end he inclined to the usual Karaite interpretation. His words run:

[149 b] ודע כי אשר פתר ואכלתי חטאת וכבר אכלתי חטאת שגה מדרך הלשון כי אכלתי לשון עבר ובא עם אות ו״ו והעתיק המלה מן העבר אל העתיד כמו עשיתי שהוא עבר ועשיתי עתיד ולו היה כאשר אמר היה יתכן להיות ואכלתי חטאת כי הוא עבר במע׳ וכבר אכלתי חטאת היה יהיה ואכלתי[2] וכאשר אינו כן בטל להיות פתרונו כבר אכלתי חטאת ואצל בעלי הדקדוק כי זה הפותר שגה[3] כאשר שגה[4] ולו אכלתי חטאת הייטב בעיני ה׳ במע׳ עתיד כי לו אכלתי חטאת היה יכשר לפני ה׳ ויהיה הטוב שיפתר אותו ואכלתי חטאת וכבר אכלתי חטאת היום כמדת אשר ראוי[5] מפני כי אכלתי למען כי הקדים הטעם בו נהיה מעשה עבר ואם יתאחר הטעם יהיה עתיד כמו ודברתי על הנביאים[6] ודברתי על לבם[7] · ודע כי ההא אשר הוא במקום אשר יבוא על המעשה מודגש אשר אחריו כמו שבא הא הייטב כמו השמה מעקי ים[8] השבה עם נעמי[9] אשר אלה ב׳ ההין יהיו במקום אשר למען

[1] ועלבני מן אבן אלפהם בן אלחבאן רחמה אללה אוֹ קאל ואלהא אלתי פי הובחים ומנחה הי הא אלאסתפהאם ואן כאן מא בערהא משדרא ומתלה הייטב בעיני ה׳ הוֹא נץ קולה (cited by Kokowzow in his work on Ibn Barun, Russian part, p. 7, note 9). Derenbourg gives larger extracts from this Grammar in *Opuscules et traités d'Aboulwalid*, pp. xx–xxi, from a Petersburg MS. Another passage is quoted in my work, *Mose b. Samuel Hakkohen Ibn Chiquitilla*, &c. (Leipzig, 1895), pp. 135, 136. Since he mentions Ibn at-Tabân as deceased, it is clear that the author must have lived at the beginning of the twelfth century at the earliest, and cannot therefore possibly be identified with the כתאב אלתצאריף of Isaak b. Jashush, as Neubauer supposed. Compare further my above-mentioned work, p. 54.

[2] The meaning of these words is not perfectly clear to me.

[3] The reading should possibly be לא שגה.

[4] Here the word הפותר is probably missing.

[5] MS. ראו, i.e. "I ate as much as was necessary," see Ibn Ezra on the passage: רק אכלתי ממנה (מן החטאה) מה שייטב בעיני ה׳ והטעם מה שיוציאני לידי הובה.

[6] Hos. xii. 11. [7] Ibid. ii. 16. [8] Isa. li. 10. [9] Ruth ii. 6.

כי הם ב׳ מעשים לשון עבר על הנקבה לביאת הטעם בתחלתם ולא יכשר[1] על זה היותם בהם במע׳ הי המיודע ויכשר היות ההא במלת הייטב במקום אשר [מפני כי] הוא דגש ולא יהיה תופס[2] בזה היות הייטב לשון עתיד והיות השמה לשון עבר · וזה הפתרון יתר ועדוף מן הראשון לאשר זכר מדרך הלשון זולת מאשר יחזיק אותו גם מדרך המעני כמו שאמר בפסוק וזבחת מבקרך [150 a] ומצאנך אשר נתן י״י לך כאשר ציויתיך[3] אשר השיב מקצתם הצווי אל [האכילה] לא אל הזביחה ויהיה היתר והעדוף להשיבו אל הזביחה למען כי הוא . . .[4] במלת לך יע׳ כי הוא סמוך בו ולו היה מוכרת ממנו כאשר אמר הפותר . . . אותו אל האכילה היה יבא לך הלא תראה אל אשר אמר הלא שלח שלחתי לקרא לך[5] הוא מוכרת מאשר אמר אחריו למה לא הלכת אלי[5] ואל אשר אמר וקרא לך[6] שהוא מחובר באשר אחריו ואכלת מזבחו[6] וזולתו מאשר ידמה לזה · זה הדבר הוא אשר נגלה לנו מדרך הלשון והדקדוק כאשר בארנו והוא הטוב מב׳ הדרכים.

V. *Some hitherto unknown Karaites.*

1. *Said Shirân.* The manuscript of the British Museum, Or. 2523, ff. 47–88, contains a fragment of a Karaite polemic in Arabic, in which special prominence is given to the question of the consideration of the ripening of the wheat (אביב) as a means of fixing the intercalary month[7]. The book is especially directed against a Rabbanite author whose name I could not gather from the fragment that has been preserved. In fol. 58 a the author says:

ואמא אללגה פליסת לך בל אלכתאב פיהא כאן לסעיד שיראן רחמה אללה אלדי סעיד שיראן כאן תלמיד פיהא לאבי יעקוב יוסף בן בכתוי מעלם אלנאליה רצי אללה ענה.

"Now concerning the science of language[8], it is not thy province[9].

[1] The reading perhaps should be ויכשר. [2] MS. מופס. [3] Deut. xii. 21.

[4] There is a lacuna here in the MS. The next words deal with the passage Exod. xxxiv. 15.

[5] Num. xxii. 15. [6] Exod. xxxiv. 15.

[7] The first half of this MS., ff. 1–46, contains a polemic in the Arabic language by a Samaritan on the "chosen place" המקום אשר יבחר, which, however, is of no interest.

[8] Shortly before the following subjects are dealt with אלתלוחיר ואקיאם ואללגה ואלאביב, i. e. the problems of the divine unity, the application of analogy to interpretation, the science of language, and the question of the ripening of the wheat harvest.

[9] For this reason it is improbable that this book is directed against Saadja.

However, Said Shirân (may God have mercy upon him) composed a book on this subject. He was in this science a pupil of 'Abu Ja'qûb Jûsuf Ibn Bachtawi, the teacher of the Diaspora (may God be gracious to him)."

This Said is otherwise quite unknown, nor do I know any other instance in which the name of Shirân occurs either in Jewish or Arabic writers. Perhaps it should be סעיד שירואני, which means Said of Shirwan in Buchara, or שירני of Shirin near Qarmisin in Media[1], though it is hard to suppose that the name has been twice corrupted. Ibn Bachtawi is known through citations by David b. Abraham Alfâsi and Jefeth b. 'Ali[2]; here, however, we are informed that he was chiefly known as a grammarian, as he is also styled המדקדק in the pretended *Muqaddima* of Salmon b. Jerucham (Pinsker, Notes, p. 62). But whether he is therefore to be identified with Abu Jaqûb Jûsuf b. Nuḥ, cited by the author of the Mushtamil as the writer of an אלדקדוק, as Prof. Bacher supposes[3], is yet to be decided. There is preserved at St. Petersburg a commentary to the Pentateuch by the latter[4], and he is doubtless identical with that Josef b. Noah, who is mentioned by Hadassi (*Eshkol Hakkofer*, alphabet 168, letter ה) as having rejected the use of the analogy (היקש קיאס): דרך בזו הדרך גם יוסף בן נח נ"ע ואמר כי לא יקיש בתורה

Our manuscript contains a further passage concerning Ibn Bachtawi, which I will also quote in this connexion[5]. It runs (f. 65 b): וסמעתך יום תצע מן אלמעלם אבו (l. אבי) יעקוב יוסף בן בכתוי רצי אללה ענה ותקול אנה באן רגל מפסר (l. מפסד) וענד אלנאס אנה באן סראג מניר ופר אללה נציבה פלקד כשף אלאבצאר ומא כאן לא גסור ולא מגזף.

"I heard that thou hast been endeavouring to disparage the learned Abu Jaqûb Jûsuf b. Bachtawi (may God be gracious to him), and hast said of him that he is a dangerous man; by the people, however, he is esteemed as a brilliant luminary, may God increase his lot. He opened men's eyes, was neither presumptuous nor an unmeasured talker (?)."

2. *Abu Ḥatim al-Rahabi* (?) and 3. *'Isra'il b. Danial al-Ramli.*

[1] See Sujjûti, *De nominibus relativis*, ed. Veth, p. 159. The Pseudo Messias שירני (see Graetz, *Gesch.*, Bd. V, note 14) was probably a native of Shirin.

[2] See Pinsker, p. קי, compare also Geiger, *Jüd. Zeitschr.*, V, 177.

[3] *Revue des Études Juives*, XXX, 251.

[4] See Harkavy in Stade's *Zeitschr. f. Alttest. Wissensch.*, I, 156.

[5] For a copy of these two passages I am again indebted to the kindness of the Rev. G. Margoliouth.

The Bodleian MS., Hebr. f. 18, ff. 1–33 a, contains a small anti-Karaite work in the Arabic language. Its conclusion runs as follows: נגמר הספר הזה בעזרת שדי יום אחד בירח אלול שנת ארבעת אלפים ושמונה מאות ושתים ושבעים שנה ליצירה לכבוד יקר הדר מרנ׳ ורבנ׳ יוסף בן כבוד ג״ק מ׳ ור׳ רביעה הכהן ס״ט האלהים ישימהו עליו סימן טוב לחזות בנים ובני בנים לנגדו הוגים בתורת ה׳ ובכל המצות לקיים עליו וראה בנים לבניך שלום על ישראל אמן ואמן סלה.

It was therefore composed in the year 1112.

It seems that two leaves at the beginning are missing[1], as is also page 8. On the first page, as the MS. now stands, we meet with this sentence:

פקד וחלנא פי קום אקלّ עדדא ואשدّ לדדא ואפחש תאוילא ואשנע נהלא ואקבח אעתזאלא לאנהם יתעלקון בזעמהם במא יגמע כלמתהם עלי תורה אחת ומשפט אחד וידפעון לכל כתאב מכתת (? מכתוב l.) עלי תאויל אלסنّה גיר אלתורה אלמכתوبة ואלא הם יצנעון כתבא שתא ותאוילאת מכתלפة ותפאסיר מתנאקצה מן ענן אלי בנימין אלי מאלך אלי ואחד בעד ואחד אלי אבי חאתם אלרהבי אלי אסראיל בן דניאל הלא אלרמלי.

"We have quarrelled with people who are smaller in number than we, but more powerful in disputation, who are detestable in their interpretation, repellent through ignorance, abominable in their schismatic attitude. They assert that all their words harmonize with one doctrine and one law and therefore reject every work which is based on the interpretation of tradition, and not on the written Torah. They themselves, however, have the most varied writings, and interpretations which differ from one another, and explanations which contradict one another. [This continues with them] from Anan to Benjamin [Nahavendi], to Malik [al-Ramli], and so in the course of time to Abu Ḥatim al-Rahabi to this Israil b. Danial al-Ramli."

The two Karaites last mentioned have also been hitherto unknown. The name of Abu Ḥatim is not mentioned, to my knowledge, by any previous Jewish writer. What is signified by אלרהבי I do not know, perhaps it ought to be אלדהבי. The expression הלא used by Israil b. Danial may perhaps indicate that he was a contemporary of the author. This Karaite is probably also referred

[1] Every sheet has ten leaves, leaf 9 forms the beginning of the second sheet, therefore not only leaf 8 is wanting but two other leaves besides.

to in a second passage of this work (f. 26), I do not however clearly apprehend the connexion of this latter passage. The text runs as follows: פקד וגב לנא אן נתעגב מן תכלפך עז מפארקתנא איאהם ולא סימא אלא אנך תכאף מן שמאתה אלרבאניך פי חמלך דלך עלי סתר עיוב תפסיר אלרמלי ואלצבר עלי דעאויה אלכארבה ונסבה אלחכמה אלי נפסה ותרכת קול שלמה ענה כסיל כאולתו פן יהיה חכם בעיניו אלך. A certain Israil ha-Dajjan b. Daniel Iskenderi is known, who might be identical with our Israil if Firkowitch's statement be correct, that he wrote a ספר המצות in the year 1062[1], and it may be supposed that he emigrated from Alexandria to Ramle, or vice versa, but, as is well known, we dare not rely upon Firkowitsch's statements unless they are otherwise confirmed.

4. *Nathan b. Jehuda.* Another MS. of the Bodleian, Heb. f. 12, contains *inter alia* in ff. 9 b–44 b some chapters in the Hebrew language by the well-known Karaite religious philosopher of the eleventh century, viz. Josef al-Baṣîr, which are possibly translated from his כתאב אלאסתבצאר, Heb. ספר המאור[2]; fol. 9 b begins thus: הדבור בראיית הירח לזקן יוסף בן אברהם הרואה ז"ל · שאלה אמר יחי מאורות הוא דיבור למלאכים ואם היה כן מה המצוה אשר תתחייב עלינו מדבורו עליהם? תשובה · אמר הזקן נ"ע יוסף בן אברהם נ"ע כי דבורו ויאמר אלהים יהי מאורות אין הוא עם המלאכים בלבד כי אם עמם ועם זולתם וכו'[3]. This chapter concludes, fol. 12 a, with the words: זה מדברי יוסף בן אברהם נ"ע וזה המעט מאשר דברו החכמים בעבורו. Further on the MS. continues: בחדש סיון השמ"ד מצאתי בספר ישן ענין האביב של החכם

[1] See Pinsker, pp. 94, 174; Harkavy, *Studien und Mittheilungen*, III, 35, 46.

[2] See Harkavy, *ibid.*, 44–46.

[3] The sense of these words is as follows: The verb אמר can only be applied if there is a person present who is addressed; before the creation of man, however, there was none to whom this word could be directed. For this reason Saadja translates ויאמר in Gen. i. to ver. 26 always by ושא "and he willed," others again are of opinion that the divine word was spoken to the angels (for a full examination of this question see my work, *Mose Ibn Chiquitilla*, p. 124), the view last mentioned is also shared by al-Baṣîr. Now the Karaites cite Gen. i. 14 as a proof that the beginning of the month must be fixed by observation of the moon and not by computing the calendar (see e. g. *Gan Eden* ענין קידוש החדש, § 1). Therefore al-Baṣîr asks if this passage be directed to the angels how can a command for man be deduced from it? The obvious reply would be that the passage is directed to angels and to others besides.

רבי׳ יוסף ב״א ובו דבוק לענין זה ולא יש מקום לכתבו פה וכתבתיהו בסוף הספר הזה ושם תמצאנו. Fol. 12 b begins: מדבור הזקן יוסף בן אברהם נ״נ • דע כל האמה יאמרו כי יום הנפת העומר הוא משבעת ימי המצה וכו׳. Fol. 15 a: הדבור במחרת השבת, here he attacks Saadja. Fol. 21 a begins: הפרקים אשר מדבור הזקן יוסף בן אברהם נ״נ בעניני השבת מספרם י״ז, and these chapters conclude fol. 44 b.

Before the beginning of these chapters on fol. 9 a, the following occurs: זה הלשון מצאתיו בספר ישן בתחלת הספר הכתוב בדף הבא • הדבור לזקן יוסף בן אברהם הסומא • שאלה לבעלי החשבון אמר יהי מאורות דבור למלאכים ואם [בן] מה המצוה אשר תתחייב עלינו מדבורו עליהם? תשובה יאמר כמו[1] אלפיומי כי הראשונים היו יעשו על החשבון במאמ׳ מימות עזרא ואילך לא מצאנו אלול מעובר[2] בעבור כי הוא דבר יחיד והוא ר׳ חנניה ופיומי אמר לא יזכרו מאמר ביחיד אלא להבטלתו ואיך יעשה הוא דבר היחיד ראיה • ומאמרם אדר הסמוך לניסן לעולם חסר זה אמר אותו אחר עשיתם החשבון הלא תראה אם יאמר כי החשבון הוא מזמן אדם אמרו לא היה אדר לעולם מעובר ועל זה איך יהיה לו ראיה בו • ועוד אמר פיומי כי אמרו והיו לאותות ולמועדים לא יסמוך אל המאורות כי אם אל היום ואל הלילה[3] והוא אמר בו זה הפתרון הוציאו מנפשו וזה לא יצא משני דברים האחד אם ישיב והיו לאותות על המאורות הוא מאמרינו ומאמר הראשונים ואם יהיה הוא לבדו המעתיק די לו זה ואמר הכתוב כי הירח עשה אותו למועדים שנ׳ עשה ירח למועדים והירח הוא אחד מן המאורות ועל זה היה

[1] The answer seems to have fallen out. Perhaps the reading should be: יאמר כמו שכתוב למעלה ואמר אלפיומי וכו׳.

[2] Here, too, some words seem to be missing. The sense is, Saadja had assumed that the Calendar is very ancient (*Responsa Geonim*, ed. Lyck, 1), and used as an argument the Talmudical phrases (*Rosh Hashana*, 19): אמר ר׳ אדר הסמוך לניסן לעולם חסר and הנינא מימות עזרא ואילך לא מצאנו אלול מעובר. If, then, general rules can be subsequently formulated, the Calendar was obviously fixed. To this al-Baṣîr replies: The remark of R. Chanina is a דעת יחיד and therefore is indecisive; while the second passage dates from the time when the Calendar was already fixed. Compare *Gan Eden*, l. c., § iv, where the same controversy is reported.

[3] Cf. *Gan Eden*, § i: ולא תשמע לדברי חולם הלום להיות מלת והיו חוזר אל היום והלילה הסמוכים וכו׳. Saadja is mentioned in Jeshua ben Jehuda's בראשית רבא (MS. Leyden, Cod. Warner, 41, f. 88 a): ואין אופן לאשר אמר אוהו הציתומי מן חיוב השיב והיו לאותות אל היום ואל הלילה ואלצמיר (l. ואלצמיר) אנמא יעוד אל הקרוב לבד מן הרחוק אם יהיה הדבר מודבק בו וכו׳.

מאמרו והיו לאותות ישוב אל המאורות[1] ודבר גלוי מאד כי הזמן לא יהיה מבדיל לזמן ולא סימן לו וזה הטעם כתבתיו אני נתן בספרי אשר עשיתי תשובה על פיומי ויוצרי ידע כי לא עיינתיו (? שמעתיו) עד עתה [? מפי] רבי וכראותי זה לצורי וגואלי שבחתי שנתן לי דעת להכיר מכתביו.

The whole of this passage is copied from an old book, and the superscription referring it to Josef al-Baṣîr is unquestionable, as is clearly proved from parallel passages. Even the words beginning with וזה הטעם כתבתיו the copyist must have found in the old book referred to, and they cannot possibly have emanated from him himself, as is indeed evident from the two following reasons. First, it is very unlikely that a Karaite should, as late as the sixteenth century, still feel induced to write a polemic against Saadja. It is true indeed, that even the later Karaites controverted Saadja in their writings, as for instance, Aaron the second and Elia Bashiatchi, but this happens only occasionally, and the polemical passages are for the most part borrowed from their predecessors[2]. Secondly, after the end of the chapters by Josef al-Baṣîr, a further passage by one Nathan b. Jehuda is found, also headed העתקתיו מספר ישן, and no doubt attaches to the identity of these two Nathans. This passage (f. 45 a) runs thus: אני נתן בן יהודה נשאלתי שאלה זאת מן אלופי הקראים אשר הם יושבים בעיר אדום כי מאין לנו מן התורה שני ימים כסוי הירח השיבותי להם מן ספר בראשית ישנאמר יהי מאורות ברקיע השמים וגו' וביום ששי ברא אלהים את האדם ומעת ברוא אדם על פני האדמה התחילו ימינו וחדשינו ושנותינו שנאמר ויהי אדם כן ויולד את קין והגיד הסדר הזה כי ראש חדש לא יהיה אלא בראשית השנה ולא נוכל לומר כי ראשית חדשיו ביום רביעי וראשית שנותיו ויומו ביום ששי כי הדעת והכרעת תורתו יהדוף זה ועוד לא נוכל לומר כי מיום רביעי היה רואה ומושל הירח ולא נחשבו לו אלא ביום שלישי שלו עשה האדם ראש החדש אלא כי מכוסה היה וכסויו אינו חשוב מראשיתו ובזה מנהגים של ימים האלה מגיד בסויו שאין כל חדש תחת השמש · ואמרו לי והנה היום כסוי הירח מן הישן ואם כדבריכם כסוי הירח מן החדש · אמרתי לא אלא גם אז כסויו מן הישן נחשב ונפלו שני הימים מן תחלת ימינו חדשינו ושנותינו כמו שנפלו שלשת הימים הראשונים מן חשבונינו כי כסוי הירח ידמה לולד אשר במעי אמו.

[1] Compare Ibn Ezra to Gen. i. 14 (first recension, ed. Friedländer, p. 29), and *Gan Eden*, l. c.

[2] *Gan Eden*, ff. 4 c, 5 b, 6 d, 7 b, 9 d, 15 b, 16 d, 53 a, 89 b, 96 b, 97 a; *Adereth*, ff. 8 a, 31 c, 67 c.

This Nathan is also unknown so far as I am aware. Perhaps the learned Librarian in Petersburg, Dr. A. Harkavy, who has at his command such rich Karaite treasures, might be able to communicate some further particulars as to the four Karaite authors here mentioned.

SAMUEL POZNAŃSKI.

LEAVES FROM THE "GOLDEN BOUGH."

ISAIAH lxvi. 17, אחר אחד בתוך. These words are an old puzzle. Canon Cheyne (*Prophecies of Isaiah*) observes, "Early Jewish critics felt that some reference was required to the deity in whose honour the mysteries were celebrated. . . . Their general view seems confirmed by the common use of 'after' in technical religious phrases." He then refers the rites here described to the worship of Tammuz or Adonis. "But why should Adonis be called 'One'?" And again, in a footnote, discussing a conjecture of Lagarde, he says, "But no such name of a deity as *'ekhādh* has yet been found." A passage in Mr. Frazer's work, *Aureus et foliis et lento vimine ramus*, may perhaps supply the desideratum. It will be well, however, to prefix another extract from the same source, vol. I, p. 319: "So closely did the rites of Osiris resemble those of Adonis at Byblus, that some of the people of Byblus themselves maintained that it was Osiris and not Adonis whose death was mourned by them (Lucian, *De dea Syria*, 7). Such a view could certainly not have been held if the rituals of the two gods had not been so alike as to be almost indistinguishable."

It is impossible, by any process of abridgment, to do justice to the sustained force, the *lentum vimen*, firm yet pliant, of Mr. Frazer's argument. The whole section on Osiris (*Ibid.* 301 et seq.) should be read. It must suffice to quote the following: "His character as a tree-spirit was represented very graphically in a ceremony described by Firmicus Maternus. A pine-tree was cut down, the centre was hollowed out, and with the wood thus excavated an image of Osiris was made, which was then 'buried' in the hollow of the tree. Here, again, it is hard to imagine how the conception of a tree as tenanted by a personal being could be more plainly expressed. . . . As to the pine-tree in particular, at Denderah the tree of Osiris is a conifer, and the coffer containing the body of Osiris is here represented as

enclosed within the tree. A pine-cone is often represented on the monuments as offered to Osiris, and a MS. of the Louvre speaks of the cedar as sprung from Osiris. The sycamore and the tamarisk are also his trees. In inscriptions he is spoken of as residing in them; and his mother Nut is frequently represented in a sycamore. . . . In inscriptions Osiris is referred to as 'the one in the tree,' 'the solitary one in the acacia,' &c." (Lefébure, *Le mythe Osirien*, p. 191). Here then we have the solution. *The one in the tree* = אחד בתוך העץ, and the A. V., "one *tree* in the midst," is not so far wrong after all. But bearing in mind the words immediately preceding, from which it appears that the object of worship was placed in a garden, perhaps we should rather understand אחר בתוך הגן, and in this connexion it is difficult to avoid thinking of that other mysterious tree whose position "in the midst of the garden" is insisted on with an emphasis probably significant (see especially Gen. ii. 9 and iii. 3). Was the tree of life also a tree of Osiris or Adonis?

If the passage under discussion is to be understood as a polemic against the worship of Osiris, it is not surprising that the clause in question has no exact equivalent in the version of the Seventy. It would be highly offensive to the natives and the rulers of Egypt, while to Jewish piety it might appear to contravene the command in Exod. xxiii. 13.

I cannot now enter on the complicated questions connected with the criticism of Isa. lxv, lxvi. But provisionally it may be observed that if we could suppose even a partial reference in these chapters to the "family of Egypt" (Zech. xiv. 18), we might then interpret the opening words of ch. lxv in accordance with xix. 18–25. The word "thence" in lxv. 20 would no longer present a difficulty, and the expression of ver. 11, "ye that forsake the LORD, that forget my holy mountain," would gain fresh point. Finally, is it possible that in ch. lxvi, "vv. 1–3 are directed against certain Jews who wished to build a temple to Yahwè in" *Egypt*, as was ultimately done by Onias? Cf. xix. 19. I do not venture to affirm that this is the real explanation of these chapters. The true hypothesis is that which fits *all* the data, and the points mentioned may admit a different interpretation. The title, "One in the midst" [of the tree, or garden], may have been applied to the Syrian as well as to the Egyptian deity. But no one, I think, who compares what Mr. Frazer has written on the rites and myths of both, with what Cheyne and Robertson Smith have said on the passage before us, will doubt that the title of Osiris may legitimately be cited in explanation of these words. It is possible that variants may have existed, בתוך העץ and בתוך הגן, and that uncertainty of text may have led, firstly, to a blank being left in

the MS. for revision never accomplished, and secondly, to the total omission of the last word; or בְּתוֹךְ (abs.) might be understood in either sense.

ZECH. v. 5–11. The strange vision here related, with its striking, but at first sight unbiblical, personification of abstract qualities—Iniquity, ἀδικία, עון in ver. 6, and Wickedness in ver. 8—receives a vivid illustration from a passage of the same work dealing with "human scapegoats," vol. II, pp. 195, 196. "At Onisha, on the Quorra River, two human beings are annually sacrificed to take away the sins of the land.... The sacrifice of one of these victims was witnessed by the Rev. J. C. Taylor on February 27, 1858. The sufferer was a woman, about nineteen or twenty years of age. She was dragged alive along the ground, face downwards, from the king's house to the river, a distance of two miles. The crowds who accompanied her cried, 'Wickedness! wickedness!' The intention was 'to take away the iniquities of the land. The body was dragged along in a merciless manner, as if the weight of all their wickedness was thus carried away.' In Siam it was formerly the custom on one day of the year to single out a woman broken down by debauchery, and carry her on a litter through all the streets to the music of drums and hautboys. The mob insulted her, and pelted her with dirt; and after having carried her through the whole city, they threw her on a dunghill or a hedge of thorns outside the ramparts, forbidding her ever to enter the walls again. They believed that the woman thus drew upon herself all the malign influences of the air and of evil spirits."

Here, too, the whole section should be read in order to appreciate the full meaning of these observances. Apparently, from its association with the ephah and the talent, the wickedness referred to by Zechariah is the commercial dishonesty denounced in Micah vi. 10, 11, and elsewhere.

THE RELATIVE ש IN GENESIS.

vi. 3. For the unsatisfactory בשגם הוא בשר may we not read simply בשר גם הוא, *he also is flesh*? It is only necessary to suppose that a ר has fallen out of the text, that the word בשר has been noted in the margin by way of correction, and that it has been subsequently incorporated at the end of the clause of which it is properly the first word.

xlix. 10. עַד כִּי יָבֹא שִׁלֹה, ἕως ἂν ἔλθῃ τὰ ἀποκείμενα αὐτῷ, *until his fate shall come upon him.* May not the whole clause be a qualification added to the text at a time when the sceptre had already passed away from Judah? Mr. Fripp treats these words as an interpolation, although upon other grounds. Cf. Micah iv. 8, where, if I am not mistaken, an analogous threat of judgment has been interpreted and expanded in the sense of a Messianic promise. Compare also such passages as Isa. xlvii. 9 (*bis*), 11, Ezek. vii. 5, 6, of the "coming" of evil—*Venit summa dies et ineluctabile tempus*—expressions pregnant with the significance not only of disaster but of destiny.

These are, I think, the only instances of the relative שׁ in Genesis. The first may be explained as a corruption, the second as an interpolation.

SUGGESTIONS FOR A SIMPLER MODE OF POINTING.

It seems not unlikely that the recently awakened interest in the critical study of the Old Testament may lead to a considerable increase in the number of Hebrew students. But even in the classical languages, which offer fewer difficulties to the beginner, and form the mainstay of our higher education, the necessity for economizing time and directing labour to the best advantage, for combining, as far as possible, simplicity of method with accuracy of result, has been felt for many years past. Such books as Abbott and Mansfield's *Primer of Greek Accidence*, or President Harper's *Elements of Hebrew*, are efforts in the same direction. That a further step might be taken with profit is sufficiently suggested by the dry remark of Professor A. R. Davidson: "Probably only those who have already solved all the other problems of the universe, and find still a little time upon their hands, think of studying the Hebrew Accents" (*Expositor*, 4th ser., VI, 320).

The text of the Hebrew Scriptures is commonly presented to the reader in one of two forms: either accompanied by such an apparatus of points and accents as bewilders the attention and fatigues the sight, or else unpointed, and affording indeed a grateful relief to the eye, but a veritable quicksand to the learner, and causing difficulty and uncertainty even to more advanced students. Would a method intermediate between these two extremes be practicable and legitimate, at least as an aid to study?

Starting from the basis of the consonantal text, I would propose:—

(1) To introduce a simple system of punctuation, by means of point and comma, founded upon the traditional accentuation, although not slavishly conforming to it.

(2) To mark the tone in every case, and the secondary tone where present, by an acute accent placed above the initial letter of the accented syllable. Where, however, the accent preceding a pause occasions vowel-change, a circumflex might be used. No other signs, except the points of שׁ and שׂ, should be allowed above the letters, nor any other accents employed.

(3) To indicate all the vowels by subscript signs, permitting no other signs in this position. A vertical stroke, the symbol of Silluq and Metheg, no longer needed for that purpose, might serve to represent long I. Long U might be symbolized by a miniature ν; long O by a miniature Omega (Ω); short O by a small circle, which could, of course, be combined with the usual sign for the half-vowel; while I would venture to abolish altogether the useless and misleading silent Shewa. In the case of initial וֹ, the vowel sign should be placed beneath the vowel letter; in all other cases beneath the preceding consonant. The points of וֹ and וּ would disappear.

(4) To print the breathings א and ה, and the semi-vowels ו and י, *when not employed as consonants* (that is, whether used as vowels or as etymological symbols), with hollow or linear type. Mappiq would thus be rendered superfluous.

Such a scheme as the above, while retaining the grammatical and critical value of the transmitted consonantal text, would afford a complete and uniform system of phonetic signs, in which the several elements of the pronunciation, consonants, vowels, and accents, while clearly distinguished from each other, would be simultaneously presented to the eye in consecutive and parallel series. The consequent gain to the reader in facility would, I believe, be very great. Now a gain in facility means potentially a gain in accuracy. If you reduce and classify the objects which claim and divide the attention, you reduce at the same time the likelihood of oversight. Moreover, no text can be profitably studied unless to the patient examination of the details we can add the rapid and repeated survey of the whole. After all, the interest of most of us in the Bible is not purely a matter of Philology. Finally, although long practice will diminish, it does not altogether remove, the fatigue of eye and brain by a difficult and complex character. A very distinguished *savant*, long resident in England and past master of our language, is said to have found, upon revisiting the Continent, that he could lecture for an hour and a half in his native tongue without more fatigue than was caused by an hour's lecturing in English.

So even the accustomed exertion tells, and no scholar can afford to neglect the economy of eyesight. Why should not Hebrew be made as legible as Greek?

GREY HUBERT SKIPWITH.

SPANISH JEWISH HISTORY.

DR. KAYSERLING has done me a certain amount of injustice in his criticism of my book on the Jews in Spain by neglecting to observe the conditions under which my entries have been printed. The following passage from the prefatory letter to my list of documents, for it claims to be nothing more, will explain what I mean.

"Nor could I check or control in any way the entries of the archivists, which I have left in exactly the same form as regards spelling and punctuation as that in which I found them. This will account for the various ways in which proper names are spelt; these I have left as I found them, merely collecting together the various forms in the indexes at the end. To have attempted to check them by the documents at the time would have reduced my spoil to one-tenth of its present extent, to have checked them by correspondence afterwards was beyond my power."

Again, in the introductory note to the *Index Nominum*, p. 250, I have further pointed out the necessity of inserting necessarily uncertain orthography of the proper names contained in my lists.

"The actual forms of the names in this list must be used with caution, since they are no less than four stages off the originals, being printed versions of my transcripts of the archivists' abstracts of the official copies in the Registros of the original documents, which were probably not distinguished by any rigid orthography of proper names."

Everybody who has to do with mediaeval documents, especially those relating to Jews, must be familiar with the terrible hash that the Christian scribes made with the unfamiliar Jewish names. I have made some of the same obvious corrections in the *Index Nominum*, and some of these Dr. Kayserling has repeated after me. But his unrivalled knowledge of Spanish Jewish history has enabled him to add considerably to these emendations which have made his criticism so valuable, but in justice to myself I would venture to emphasize the fact that in the majority of instances he is correcting the scribes and not my transcripts of their entries. Though on the other hand

some of his strictures apply to my own mistakes in my transcripts of the annual entries, I have little doubt but it would have been impossible for me to remedy this without a further journey to Spain.

With regard to Dr. Kayserling's statement that I have included items not relating to Jews, I would point out that each of the three cases which he refers to in that connexion, Jayme de Monjuich, Jayme de Call, and Mose de Peralta had all been previously queried by myself (see Nos. 165, 565, 600). In the case of the last, if my transcripts are correct, I found him once referred to as "Judio," 532. The entries relating to the two others are exactly of the same kind as those given about undoubted Jews.

Dr. Kayserling draws attention to the fact that in several instances I have repeated in my calendar documents printed or referred to elsewhere, but he surely would not have desired that I should omit them for that reason; all calendars of documents only include any that have been previously utilized, as it might easily occur that they might be wanted again. My entries would have been even more incomplete than they are if I had not included these items, which after all do not take up more than three or four pages of my calendar.

With regard to the omissions which Dr. Kayserling points out, especially in the Barcelona Records, after the first forty Registros I have explained their causes in the Introduction, page xv. I have observed that the addenda given by him on pp. 491–2 mostly begin with the letter A. I had time to copy out the entries, s. v. "Judios," only in the second set of indexes, which are arranged alphabetically. I trust that Dr. Kayserling has copied out the Jewish entries for the remainder of the alphabet, and will print somewhere those ranging from B to Z. As regards the Inquisition Records at Simancas, I drew attention to the huge mass of these in my Introduction, pp. xliv-vi.

I was interested to learn that such an authority as Dr. Kayserling dissents from the generally accepted identifications of Nachmanides with Bonastruc de Porta. I observe that he considers that he has conclusively proved the contrary so far back as 1865. To this I would remark that as recently as 1887 M. M. Isidore Loeb still remained unconvinced. At that date he then stated in the *Revue des Études Juives*, XV, 17 . . . "Tout le monde est d'accord que ce Bonastruc de Porta, *maître*, est notre Moïse Nahmani, et que la controverse dont il a fait la relation est celle de 1263." I am content to err with "tout le monde."

JOSEPH JACOBS.

A CURIOUS IBN EZRA MANUSCRIPT.

THE object of the following lines is to call the attention of lovers of the commentaries of Ibn Ezra to a MS. which probably is not known to them.

In the printed catalogue of the "Proprietary and Cottonian Library" at Plymouth, the second entry reads: "Abenezræ comment. super Gen. & Exodum."

The MS. itself is labelled thus:

"Ab. Abenezræ super Genesim & Exodum latine versus per Methrydatem, Gaonis Commentum super ultimam prophetiam Danielis;—in a good hand of the sixteenth century, folio," &c.

The size of the MS. is half-folio.

A more recent hand than that of the MS. has written on the first page:

Oeilampadii Commenta de Genesi.
180 fol. init. Sæc. XVI.

Since the MS. itself frequently gives the names of the authors as "Aben Azra" and Ben Caspi, the question is not only who is this Oeilampadius (rather Oleilamp.?), but also how did this writer come to ascribe it to a bearer of this name, a name very befitting an author or student ("man of the oil-lamp").

The Rev. J. Polack suggests to me that Ben Caspi's super-commentary, which is partly contained in this MS., may have borne in Hebrew a name such as שמן למאור, which was mistaken for the name of the author. But Dr. Friedländer, in his "Ibn Ezra Literature" (Society of Heb. Lit. IV), remarks of Caspi that this author had the habit of naming his works with an allusion to כסף in reference to his own name[1].

The MS. is in Latin throughout. It contains—firstly, a very brief abstract of Ibn Ezra's Introduction to his *Commentary on the Pentateuch*; then Ibn Ezra on Gen. i–iv. 8, with many omissions.

This part ends with the words: et mille ligna & mille lapides aderant ad interficiendum eum.

After which follows:

Finis Abenazræ. Seq. Additio Bencaspi sup ipsius [?] comment [?] Abrāe.

[1] On the other hand, a super-commentary by Caspi on Ibn Ezra is described simply as פ' הסודות של א"ע (Renan-Neubauer, *Les Ecrivains Juifs français du XIVe Siècle*, p. 138).

This part of the super-commentary of Caspi (or is it more correct to call him with this writer Ibn Caspi ?) deals with several points contained in the preceding part of Ibn Ezra's commentary.

After this, on a fresh page (p. 19), begins the Latin translation of the commentary of Ibn Ezra on the whole book of Exodus, with the omission (as also stated in the heading by the writer of it) of grammatical matters. Still, a cursory glance already reveals the fact that it sometimes differs from the text usually found in print, although that is the version it represents. Not alone are there omissions and abbreviations, but expansions are also to be found, as will be seen by comparing several quotations from the MS. given below, with the printed text.

Into this Commentary of Ibn Ezra, the notes on it by Caspi, are almost to the end interwoven, as will be seen by the specimens adduced immediately; towards the end of the book, however, they are not incorporated in the text, but as above, on Gen. i-iv, follow separately.

The superscription, evidently by the hand of the writer of the MS., runs thus :

cum additionibus ben Caspi

Abrami Avenzari [here follows an illegible word, perhaps versus] p. Methrydatem ex hebraico c̄m dimissione s. q. ad grammaticam p. tinerent.

Then follows :

"Et hæc sunt nomina filiorum isr̄l. Superaddit et [ו] pro continuatione sermonis preteriti," &c.

The following specimens, which are somewhat hastily extracted, may contain some unavoidable mistakes in spelling, but they will nevertheless give a sufficiently clear idea of the character of the MS.

[Ibn Ezra on Ex. i. 10 towards the end, א"ר מרינוס] Dixit marenos egredietur pro egrediemur, i.e. expellemur de terra [words illegible] egredietur ad evitandum augurī quo summo p̄e Aegyptii utebantur & cavebant int. loquendū. [The latter words are not in the usual text.]

[Ib. ver. 16, after the translation of משני עבריהם] & hoc indicat cp. [sancta ?] Scriptura qua utimur hebræ. [Then in red ink] Prima additio Ben caspi [again in black] p. p. duos transitus i. duabus viis [word illegible] hebreus uno modo ab heber, [עבר] q. Latina int. pr. atur transitus, qua transivit opinionē. omnium gentiū mundi de unitate dei, et vera fide, alio mō[do] p. p. transitum fluvii euphratis. Nam in Mesopotamia hā[bi]tabat heber, & insula ē[st] int'duos

fluvios Tygrin & euphratem nec poterant [ea]m̄ exire nisi fluvium transissent. Idō dur [=Ideo dicuntur] hebrei [עברים] 1. transeuntes & t. [tum] hoc ē[st] quod dx deus p. Josuen in transitu fluvii hītarunt prēs uri ab initio. [Then in red ink :]

Secunda Additio eiusdem. [On Ibn Ezra, ib. וזה לאות. Then in black] et hoc indicat scriptura qua utimur hebrea ost.[endare ?] hoc ideo dicit, qua quidem invidentes nobis, opinati sunt linguam n̄rām [nostram ?] et hebraicam caracteres tū[m] caldaicos sive assyrios ut negent nos et priores ceteris, idō postillator [?] hoc excludens, dit [dicit] caracteres quos hēmus [habemus] e. [esse] hebraicos, cum punctata lrā [litera] Tau legitur Tau pro nomine illius lrē [literæ] quod deriva[ta] a xobo [verbo ?] ituita [התוית Ez. ix. 4]. Quod ē signare . et īn dx [inde dixit ?] Tau 1. signum quare et nomen illius lrē et caracter ē idem tam legendo q̄. scribendo et icidem [?] ē de ceteris lr̄s chaldaicis neq. aliarum linguar̄. Ex quo lingua & caracteres hebraicos nos habere patet.

Abram. Et faciebant mares [matres ? ib. ver. 17, ותחיין] Intelligitur ipsas conatas fuisse ultra vires suos pueros conservare.

In this way, this MS. intersperses the notes of Caspi among the explanations of Ibn Ezra. Generally the words: Abram, & Additio Ben Caspi, or Ben Chaspi, are in red ink.

Here is one more specimen: Ibn Ezra on Ex. xii. 7, towards the end (והתוית תו): et notabulum bathim equoñ ē ad domus, et ad mēsuram cuius singulare ē bath.

Additio Benchaspi. Prout in fragmentis et fractionibus [is this the title of an arithmetical book ?] indicat, cp. [quod ?] Aegypti solent commede re quosdam cibos ex similagine semicocta, et fragmenta, supposito oleo instare minha quam d. jussit israelitis capii [cassi ?] et frangi. Dem[um] super ponēr [superponitur ?] oleum & sacrificar ut levitico. Bathim quando org. domū. ponitur cames [קמץ] subtra beth qu. org. mensuram illam ponitur patha subra beth, in pronunciatione tamen uno modo proferuntur.

[ver. 8] Abram. Et comedent eum sup. azimis, &c.

Towards the end of Exodus, the notes of Caspi do not intrude into the commentary of Ibn Ezra, but are collected and subjoined at the end: on p. 167, after "noctis," the last word of Ibn Ezra's commentary, we find these words:

Et sic finis Rabi Abram. in 60 tribus cōmtibus. [paragraphs or notes ?].

On p. 168. Additio Bencaspi sup. am̄ [com ?] pen. ultimo Abram. sup. exodum.

The occasional variations, noticeable in this translation, from the

version in the commonly printed text, which version it yet mainly follows[1], and still more the fact of its being interspersed with the notes of Caspi, make it probable if not certain, that it is translated from a Hebrew MS., which slightly differed from our text.

At the conclusion of the commentary and super-commentary on Exodus occur a few blank pages, then the MS. finishes with the commentaries, in a Latin version, and one after another, of R. Saadya Gaon and of Ibn Ezra on Daniel x-xii, thus forming with the previous matter a curious conglomeration.

The translator "Methrydates" is no doubt identical with the Flavius Mithridates who towards the close of the fifteenth century rendered many Hebrew works into Latin[2]. It is, however, a new point, I fancy, to find him among the translators of Ibn Ezra.

M. Berlin.

SYMPATHY WITH THE BRUTE CREATION.

As the Holy One, blessed be he, hath compassion upon man, so hath he compassion upon the beasts of the field. As it is said in the text:

"When a bullock or a sheep or a goat is brought forth, then it shall be seven days under the dam; and from the eighth day and thenceforth it shall be accepted for the oblation of an offering made by fire unto the Lord[3]."

Furthermore it is said:

"And whether it be cow or ewe, ye shall not kill it and her young both in one day[4]."

And as the Holy One, blessed be he, hath compassion upon the beasts of the field, so is he filled with mercy for the birds of the air. For it is written: "If a bird's nest chance to be before thee in the way[5]." *Midrash Rabbi Deut.*, VI, 1.

[1] For information on the two Recensions of Ibn Ezra's Commentary, see Dr. M. Friedländer, *Essays on the Writings of Ibn Ezra*, IV, p. 148 ff. (cp. p. 151, מרינוס ר', and beginning of our first quotation above); and on the super-commentary of Caspi, ibid., p. 231 ff.

[2] On this Mithridates see Steinschneider, *Die hebräischen Uebersetzungen des Mittelalters*, pp. 492, 922, 930, and esp. 985 and the references there given. Cf. *Hamazkir*, XXI, 111, where a list of Mithridates' translations is given.

[3] Lev. xxii. 27. [4] Idem, 28. [5] Deut. xxii. 6.

"And whether it be cow or ewe, ye shall not kill it and her young both in one day[1]."

Since the necessities of man require the slaying of animals, the Torah has minimized the pain to be inflicted upon them, and it has prohibited any act of unkindness in the mode of procedure. The prohibition, "And whether it be cow or ewe, &c.," is explained by tradition to forbid the cruelty of killing the young in the sight of the mother; for the principle of "sympathy with the brute creation" is here involved in no small degree, in that the love and compassion of the mother for her young is implanted in the feelings of the dumb nature as in the human heart.

Maimonides, Guide to the Perplexed, Part III, Chap. XLVIII.

Saith Rabbi in the name of Rab, "It is forbidden to man that he should taste of aught until he hath given food unto his beast; as it is said: 'And I will give grass in thy fields for thy cattle.' And afterwards it is written: 'And thou shalt eat and be satisfied[2].'"

Talmud Babli, Gittin, LXII, A; *Idem, Berachoth*, XL, A.

"Now Moses was keeping the flock of Jethro his father-in-law[3]." God tried him as a shepherd as he tried David, of whom it is said: "And took him from the sheepfolds[4]."

David kept back the sheep from the lambs, leading forth the lambs to the pasture first, in order that they might eat the tender grass.

Then he brought out the sheep, that they might eat of that grass which was neither fine nor coarse.

Then made he the strong amongst the sheep to eat the coarse grass. Then said the Holy One, blessed be he: "He that knoweth to tend the sheep, each one according to its need, let him go forth and tend my people[5]." And Moses was tried in this wise. Our Rabbis say: "When Moses was keeping the flock of Jethro his father-in-law, in the wilderness, a kid fled from him, and he pursued it. As he followed he chanced upon a stream of water, to which the kid had run to drink. When Moses had overtaken it, he said: 'I knew not that thou did'st thirst after the brook. Behold, now thou art weary.' And he lifted it upon his shoulder and so went his way.

"Then said the Holy One, blessed be he: 'Great is thy tender kindness for the sheep; as thou livest, shalt thou tend Israel my flock.'"

Midrash Rabba Exodus, II, 2.

[1] Lev. xxii. 27.
[2] Deut. xi. 15.
[3] Exod. iii. 1.
[4] Ps. xxviii. 70.
[5] Ps. lxxviii. 71.

HUMAN SYMPATHY.

"If thou at all take thy neighbour's garment to pledge, thou shalt restore it unto him by that the sun goeth down[1]."

"And if he be a poor man, thou shalt not sleep with his pledge; thou shalt surely restore to him the pledge when the sun goeth down[2]."

One text saith: "By that the sun goeth down;" and the other text saith: "When the sun riseth." From these expressions thou shalt know that as thou art bound to restore the pledge wherein he sleepeth "By that the sun goeth down;" so if the pledge be his ploughshare, shalt thou rise early and return it unto him at sunrise.

"In his day thou shalt give him his hire[3]." This text hath a two-fold meaning; in this wise canst thou explain it:—The labourer goeth by the way followed by his ass, and one selleth unto him a sheaf of corn which he placeth upon his shoulder, and the ass followeth him with longing eyes upon the sheaf. When he cometh home he putteth the ass into the stable, and the sheaf he tieth above his reach.

Then would one say unto him, "Thou wicked one! All the way hath he followed thee, longing for the sheaf, and now thou givest it not unto him." So is it with an hireling who laboureth all the day and looketh forward for his wage, "and setteth his heart upon it[4]."

And thus is it written: "I will hear, for I am gracious[5]."

"If thou draw out thy soul to the hungry[6]." If thou hast naught to give unto him, comfort him with words. Say unto him, "I am grieved in my soul for thee, that I have naught that I can give thee." So shalt thou "draw out thy soul to the hungry, and satisfy the afflicted soul[7]." *Midrash Rabba Levit.*, XXXIV, 15.

There are eight degrees in charity, ascending step by step.

The highest degree—for than this can there be none higher—is that thou takest by the hand thy brother who is poor and bestowest a gift upon him, or lendest unto him, or findest work for him to do, that he may be independent, and neither want nor be compelled to ask aught of his fellow-creatures.

This is the meaning of "Thou shalt uphold him[8]."

[1] Exod. xxii. 26. [2] Deut. xxiv. 12. [3] Deut. xxiv. 15.
[4] Idem. [5] Exod. xxii. 27. [6] Isa. lviii. 10.
[7] Idem. [8] Lev. xxv. 35.

The next degree is that thou givest unto the poor, but knowest not unto whom thou givest, and the poor man knoweth not whence cometh the gift.

Akin to this form of charity is adding to the congregational charity store, but it is only fitting that thou shouldest do this when thou knowest that the almoner is faithful and wise in the apportioning thereof.

The next degree is when thou knowest unto whom thou givest, but the poor man knoweth not from whom he taketh. (The wise men of old went in secret and threw their money into the doorways of the deserving poor.) And this is a virtuous act, if peradventure the public almoner apportioneth without discretion.

The next degree is when the poor man knoweth from whom he receiveth, but the giver knoweth not unto whom he giveth; according to the way of the wise men of old, who tied money into bundles, and as they went threw it behind them that the poor might come and take and have no shame.

The next degree is that thou givest unto the poor man less than he asketh of thee, with a smile upon thy face.

The next degree is that thou givest, but givest with a pang.

Shulchan Aruch Yoreh Deah, Chap. 149.

If a poor man and woman beg of thee, thou shalt first give unto the woman and then unto the man. *Idem*, Chap. 251.

Let man ever hold himself aloof from receiving charity, and rather suffer distress than depend upon his fellow-creatures. And this have the wise men commanded: "Be as frugal on thy Sabbath as on other days, if indulging in the delights of the Sabbath should make thee dependent upon thy fellow-creatures."

Even if a man be learned and distinguished but poor, he should learn a trade however humble, that he may not be dependent upon others. *Idem*, Chap. 253.

A slave that hath fled to the land of Israel from another land, he shall not be brought back to servitude; about him the text saith: "Thou shalt not deliver unto his master a servant which is escaped [1]."

But they shall ask of his master to write for him a release, and the value of his freedom, and when the hand of the slave shall attain thereto he shall pay it unto him. And if the master be not willing to set him free, then shall the Sanhedrin proclaim his freedom and he shall go forth. *Idem*, 268.

An old man, or one who is sick, or one in trouble, who hardeneth his heart and will not accept charity, behold such an one is guilty of

[1] Deut. xxiii. 15.

shedding his own blood, and his trouble is naught but iniquity and sin.

Yet one who is forced to seek charity, but fretteth himself and deferreth the evil hour, and passeth through the ordeal in order that he may not trouble the congregation, verily he shall not die, but live to provide for the need of others.

Of him the text saith: "Blessed is the man that trusteth in the Lord[1]." *Idem*, 255.

[1] Jer. xvii. 7.

ELSIE DAVIS.

END OF VOL. VIII.