The Jewish Quarterly Review

EDITED BY

I. ABRAHAMS AND C. G. MONTEFIORE

VOLUME IX

London
MACMILLAN AND CO., LTD.
NEW YORK: THE MACMILLAN CO.
1897

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

OXFORD
HORACE HART, PRINTER TO THE UNIVERSITY

THE JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW

VOL. IX



CONTENTS

PAGE

ABRAHAM BAR HILLEL, THE EGYPTIAN HISTORIAN AND POET. By Prof. D. KAUFMANN 168

ABRAHAM BEN SCHEMAJA AND ISAAC BEN SAMUEL. By Prof. W. BACHER 359

"AMEN." NOTES ON ITS SIGNIFICANCE AND USE IN BIBLICAL AND POST-BIBLICAL TIMES. By the REV. H. W. HOGG 1

ARABIC LITERATURE OF THE JEWS, AN INTRODUCTION TO. By Prof. M. STEINSCHNEIDER 224, 604

ART IN THE SYNAGOGUE. By Prof. D. KAUFMANN ... 254

CHALFAN, ELIA MENACHEM, ON JEWS TEACHING HEBREW TO NON-JEWS. By Prof. D. KAUFMANN 500

CORRIGENDA 358, 359, 758

CRITICAL NOTICES:

ABRAHAM BEN ELIJAH WILNA'S "RAV POELIM" ... 164

AMERICA, HEBREW WRITINGS IN 741

D. W. AMRAM'S "THE JEWISH LAW OF DIVORCE" 531

BACHER'S "DIE BIBELEXEGESE MOSES MAIMÛNI'S" 740

S. BUBER'S "AGADATH ESTHER" 743

FLUEGEL'S "MESSIAH-IDEAL" 155

W. FRANKENBERG'S "DIE DATIERUNG DER PSALMEN SALOMOS" 540

FRIEDMANN'S "ONKELOS AND AKYLAS" ... 165, 727

GROSS'S "GALLIA JUDAICA" 743

M. GRÜNBAUM'S "JUDEO-SPANISH CHRESTOMATHY" 536

HARKAVY'S PUBLICATIONS 163

HESSELING'S "NEO-GREEK PENTATEUCH" 742

JESSOPP AND JAMES' "LIFE AND MIRACLES OF ST. WILLIAM OF NORWICH" 748

JEVONS'S "INTRODUCTION TO THE HISTORY OF RELIGION" 724

I. LÉVI'S "LES DIX-HUIT BÉNÉDICTIONS ET LES PSAUMES DE SALOMON" 541

A. LÉVY'S "LES DOCTRINES D'ISRAËL" 537

PAGE

CRITICAL NOTICES (*continued*).

H. Malter's "Abû Hâmid Al-Gazzâlî's Antworten auf Fragen" 533
Minor Literature 745
Moulton's "The Modern Reader's Bible" ... 352
Moulton's "Literary Study of the Bible" ... 350
Ratner's "Seder Olam Rabbah" 740
Schechter and Singer's "Talmudic Fragments in the Bodleian Library" 145
S. Schechter's "Studies in Judaism" 522
E. Schürer's "Review of Frankenberg" (see above) 539
M. Steinschneider's "Medical Bibliography" 166
Strack's "Grammatik des Biblischen Aramäisch" 755
Wendland's "Die Therapeuten" 151
Wendland and Kern's "Beiträge zur Geschichte der Griechischen Philosophie und Religion" 151
G. Wertheim's "Die Arithmetik des Elia Misrachi" 528
Wertheimer's "Treasures of Jerusalem" ... 161
Wiener's "Bibliotheca Friedlandiana" ... 157
Wijnkoop's "Hebrew Syntax" 745

DEMONOLOGY, CHRISTIAN. By F. C. Conybeare 59, 444, 581

DIETARY LAWS, ANOTHER WORD ON THE. By the Rev. M. Hyamson 294

EAST INDIA COMPANY, A JEW IN THE SERVICE OF, IN 1601. By B. L. Abrahams 173

EBJATHAR HAKKOHEN. By Prof. W. Bacher 358

ECCLESIASTICUS, THE HEBREW TEXT OF. By Prof. W. Bacher, A. Cowley, Dr. A. Neubauer, the Rev. Prof. Driver, and the Rev. G. Buchanan Gray ... 543

EDUCATION, JEWISH RELIGIOUS. By the Rev. Morris Joseph 631

EGYPTIAN FRAGMENTS. By Dr. A. Neubauer 24

EGYPTIAN SUTTA-MEGILLA. By Prof. D. Kaufmann ... 170

IBN AL-HĪTĪ'S ARABIC CHRONICLE OF KARAITE DOCTORS. By the Rev. G. Margoliouth 429

JEHUDA HA-NAGID, DEDICATORY POEM TO. By Prof. D. Kaufmann 360

PAGE

JOB, THE TEXT OF. By the Rev. Prof. T. K. CHEYNE ... 573

JOSEPHUS, THE SOURCES OF, FOR THE HISTORY OF SYRIA. By Prof. A. BÜCHLER 311

LEVI, DAVID. By Miss HELEN ZIMMERN 363

LEWIS-GIBSON HEBREW COLLECTION. By S. SCHECHTER 115

MACCABEES, THE THIRD BOOK OF. By I. ABRAHAMS 39

MARINUS, A JEWISH PHILOSOPHER OF ANTIQUITY. By Dr. SAMUEL KRAUSS 518

MASSORETIC STUDIES. By Prof. L. BLAU ... 122, 471

MEGILLATH ZUTTA HARASHA. By Dr. A. NEUBAUER ... 721

MINIM, IMPRECATION AGAINST, IN THE SYNAGOGUE. By Dr. SAMUEL KRAUSS 515

MISSION OF JUDAISM, THE. *Recapitulation:* by OSWALD J. SIMON. *Opinions:*—(1) The Rev. Dr. ADLER, Chief Rabbi; (2) Miss SYLVIE D'AVIGDOR; (3) The Rev. J. ESTLIN CARPENTER; (4) Mrs. NATHANIEL COHEN; (5) FRED. C. CONYBEARE; (6) The Rev. Dr. DRUMMOND; (7, 8) The EDITORS; (9) The Rev. S. FRIEDEBERG; (10) Colonel A. E. GOLDSMID; (11) The Rev. MORRIS JOSEPH; (12) H. S. LEWIS; (13) Lady MAGNUS; (14) The Rev. Prof. D. W. MARKS; (15) The Rev. Dr. JAMES MARTINEAU; (16) The Rev. L. M. SIMMONS; (17) The Rev. S. SINGER; (18) Miss ANNA SWANWICK; (19) The Rev. CHARLES VOYSEY; (20) LUCIEN WOLF; (21) I. ZANGWILL 177

MISSION OF JUDAISM, THE. A REPLY. By OSWALD J. SIMON 403

MOSES MAIMÛNI, THE TREATISE ON ETERNAL BLISS ATTRIBUTED TO. By Prof. W. BACHER 270

NAGID, INSTALLATION OF THE EGYPTIAN. By E. N. ADLER... 717

PASSOVER HAGADAH, FRAGMENT OF, IN SHORTHAND. By Dr. M. FRIEDLÄNDER... 520

PRINCESS AS HEBRAIST, A. By OBERRABBINER Dr. M. KAYSERLING... 509

ROSSI, DAVID DI, A LETTER OF, FROM PALESTINE, DATED 1535. By Prof. D. KAUFMANN 491

ΣABBAΘION. By I. ABRAHAMS 175

SEPHER HA-ITTIM OF JUDAH BEN BARZILAI. By ELKAN N. ADLER 669

TIMNAH IN GENESIS XXXVI. 12. By Prof. W. BACHER... 359

PAGE

TRANSLATIONS OF HEBREW POEMS. By Miss NINA DAVIS:
"LOVED OF MY SOUL" (attributed to Jehudah Halevi and Israel Nagara) 290
"THE PROPHET JEREMIAH AND THE PERSONIFICATION OF ISRAEL" (attributed to Kalir) . 291
AMITTAI'S "HYMN OF WEEPING" 722
TROYT, AN ANGLO-JEWISH NAME. By M. D. DAVIS ... 361
UNITARIANISM AND JUDAISM IN THEIR RELATIONS TO EACH OTHER. By C. G. MONTEFIORE 240
UNITY OF GOD. By CYRUS L. SULZBERGER 723

CONTRIBUTORS TO VOLUME IX

ABRAHAMS, B. L., 173.
ABRAHAMS, I., 39, 175, 195, 539.
ADLER, E. N., 669, 717.
ADLER, H., 184.
D'AVIGDOR, SYLVIE, 187.
BACHER, W., 145, 270, 358, 543.
BARNSTEIN, H., 754.
BLAU, L., 122, 471, 727.
BÜCHLER, A., 311.
CARPENTER, J. ESTLIN, 189.
CHEYNE, T. K., 573.
COHEN, JULIA M., 191.
CONYBEARE, F. C., 59, 151, 192, 444, 581.
COWLEY, A., 563.
DAVIS, M. D., 361.
DAVIS, NINA, 290, 291, 722.
DRIVER, S. R., 563.
DRUMMOND, J., 194.
FRIEDEBERG, S., 200.
FRIEDLÄNDER, M., 520, 528, 745.
GOLDSMID, A. E., 202.
GRAY, G. BUCHANAN, 567.
HALBERSTAM, S. J., 161, 358.
HARKAVY, A., 358.
HOGG, H. W., 1.
HYAMSON, M., 294.
JACOBS, J., 724, 748.
JOSEPH, M., 203, 631.
KAUFMANN, D., 168, 254, 360, 491, 500.
KAYSERLING, M., 509, 536.
KRAUSS, S., 515, 518.
LEVY, S., 537.
LEWIS, H. S., 206.
MACALISTER, A., 522.
MAGNUS, KATIE, 208.
MARGOLIOUTH, G., 429.
MARKS, D. W., 210.
MARTINEAU, J., 211.
MONTEFIORE, C. G., 197, 240.
NEUBAUER, A., 24, 155, 163, 563, 721, 741.
OORT, H., 350.
POZNAŃSKI, S., 157.
SCHECHTER, S., 115.
SIMMONS, L. M., 212, 531, 533.
SIMON, O. J., 177, 403.
SINGER, S., 214.
STEINSCHNEIDER, M., 224, 604.
SULZBERGER, C. L., 723.
SWANWICK, ANNA, 217.
VOYSEY, C., 217.
WOLF, L., 219.
ZANGWILL, I., 221.
ZIMMERN, HELEN, 363.

in this article have a certain additional interest from their bearing on other wider and more important subjects [1].

1. *The word "Amen."*—The fundamental idea of the root אמן, in the north and south Semitic languages alike [2], is "stability, steadfastness, reliability." "Amen" represents in form an old Semitic *amin*, which, according to analogy, should be an intransitive adjective [3]. It has retained this power, however, only in the somewhat rare Arabic *Amin*^{un}, "safe, secure," while in Hebrew "Amen" has become an indeclinable particle. As contrasted with other particles from the same root, it seems to involve the will as well as, perhaps we should say rather than, the judgment [4]. This is best seen on an examination of the instances of its occurrence in the Old Testament.

2. *Usage of "Amen" in the Old Testament.* (1) *Modes of Use.*—The first thing that strikes one about the use of "Amen" in the Old Testament is that it is practically

[1] Some (especially statistical) details have been retained merely for the sake of giving them a permanent record somewhere, for reference if they should ever be wanted.

[2] Cf. e.g. Assyrian *temenū*, "foundation," and Syriac, "*daily* bread," in the Paternoster (Curetonian and Sinaitic Palimpsest MSS.) on the one hand; and Aethiopic *amena*, "trust," and also "confess" (hardly "verum esse," as Dillmann says, quoting Luke i. 1), on the other.

[3] Barth, indeed, regards it (*Die Nominalbildung*, &c., 5 c and 7 b) as an abstract noun. Nor is it an answer to say that the feminine form *amint* or *amant* (אמת) is abstract; for in Hebrew, at least in the first letters of the Dictionary, when words exist in both forms, it is rather the rule than the exception that they should agree in this respect. Moreover, on the other hand, the majority of nouns of the form *amin* are concrete, and there is, as a matter of fact, a difference between *amin* and *amint* (see next note).

[4] For אמת, see especially Isa. xliii. 9, where E. V. is right, as against the LXX and Peshitta, in rendering אמת as *oratio recta*, "Truth!" Cf. also the quasi-adverbial use of אמת at the *end* of a sentence in Ps. cxxxii. 11 and Jer. x. 10 (see also 1 Kings xvii. 24, Pesh.). The three particles referred to above are connected with the parallel stem *amuna*. אָמְנָה (JE) introduces a solemn confession (Gen. xx. 12, Josh. vii. 20); אָמְנָם (8 times, 6 in Job) seems to be used by preference to introduce hypothetical or ironical sentences; while אֲמְנָם (5 times) always introduces a question (Ps. lviii. 2, reading אַלָּם with most, is sarcastic).

confined to the literature that modern criticism regards as Exilic or Post-Exilic. What makes this still more noteworthy is that the three cases of which this cannot be said form a class by themselves—they are cases of what we may call the *Initial Amen.* Benaiah, after receiving instructions about the coronation of Solomon, replies: "Amen! Yahwè the God of my lord the king say so too!" (1 Kings i. 36). So Jeremiah says to Hananiah: "Amen! Yahwè do so!" &c. (Jer. xxviii. 6). In the third passage it is God that is addressed; Jeremiah replies to the "word" that came to him from Yahwè in the phrase: "Amen; Yahwè!" In these cases "Amen" is a kind of conversational particle, and stands by itself, prefixed to an exclamatory sentence, expressing a wish, "So be it!"

In the later literature the "Amen" tends to become more and more liturgical. The Deuteronomist makes "all the people" say "Amen" to each of the twelve[1] curses (Deut. xxvii. 15–26); Nehemiah tells us that the "congregation" pledged itself in the matter of the poor brethren by a solemn "Amen" (Neh. v. 13); when Tobias and Sarah were left alone he prayed, and at the end of his prayer "she said with him, Amen" (Tobit viii. 8)[2]; and, according to the Vulgate, when Gabael prayed and blessed Tobias, all who were present said, "Amen" (Tobit ix. 12). In this group the sentence introduced by the "Amen" is left to be understood from the situation. We might call this the *Detached Amen.*

This liturgical "Amen" tended to become double. "Amen, Amen" is the formula assigned by the Priestly writer to the suspected wife in the oath of purgation (Num. v. 22[3]); as it is also the formula with which the people solemnly accepted the Priestly Law (Neh. viii. 6[4] = 1 Esdras

[1] So in MSS. A and F of the LXX. B and Luc. have thirteen, having *two* curses in ver. 22 or ver. 23.

[2] The Vulgate text differs at this point, and has no "Amen." Syr. and Aeth. follow LXX.

[3] It is single in the Targums.

[4] The "Amen" is single in LXX (BNA Luc.).

ix. 47[1]), and, according to the romance, the words of Ozias (Judith xiii. 26 [20][2])[3]. This formula becomes "Amen *and* Amen[4]" when following a doxology at the end of each of the first three divisions of the Psalter, although in the fourth division (Ps. cvi. 48[5]), and the equivalent 1 Chron. xvi. 36, there is for some reason only one "Amen," and so at the end of 3 and 4 Macc. We have thus what we may call a *Final Amen*, and the Vulgate provides us with two cases where a speaker says "Amen" to his own prayer, viz. 2 Esdras (i.e. Neh.) xiii. 31, and Tobit xiii. 18, while the same thing occurs in Pr. of Manasses, ver. 23[6]. A pure *Subscriptional Amen* appears in the Old Testament only at the end of Tobit[7]. It also is single. There remain to be considered only four passages where our authorities disagree as to what we should read, "Amen" or something else, and so we must examine the usage of the Versions.

(2) *Treatment of "Amen" in the Versions.* The practice of the LXX confirms the view just propounded as to the history of the word "Amen," while it illustrates the necessity of considering the various parts of the LXX apart. In the Pentateuch the LXX regularly translates אמן into Greek[8], and the same practice is continued throughout the Prophets,

[1] So in B, Syr., and Aeth.; but Vulg., A, and Luc. have only one ἀμήν.

[2] Only one "Amen" in A.

[3] Ecclus. l. 29 ends in E. V. and some Greek MSS. with a doxology and double "Amen," but the best MSS. and edd. and Vulg. omit the whole clause. The Syriac text differs at this point.

[4] The LXX [BℵART] has no "and."

[5] MSS. AR^{a}T of the LXX have two "Amens," but ℵ follows the M. T. with one.

[6] It is to be noted that we have only Latin authority for what has since become so common, an "Amen" said to one's own prayer (for Prayer of Manasses, ver. 23, might fairly be regarded as of subscriptional origin), and, as we shall see, the usage can hardly be said to be found in the New Testament.

[7] So in BA; in ℵ it may be almost said to be preceded by a doxology.

[8] The LXX translates "Amen" by γένοιτο eight times, by ἀληθῶς once (Jer. xxxv. 6 [BℵAQ] = M. T. xxviii. 6). For the other Greek versions, see farther on.

Former and Latter, and even the Psalter. But when we come to the work of the Chronicler, we find אמן simply transliterated *ἀμήν*, even in 1 Chron. xvi. 36 (though = Ps. cvi. 48). This practice, once begun, is continued right through the Apocryphal books[1]. Aquila admitted *ἀμήν* to 1 Kings i. 36, but uses *πεπιστωθήτω* in Jer. xxxv. [xxviii.] 6, and elsewhere (probably always) *πεπιστωμένως*. Theodotion uses *ἀμήν* in the one place (Deut. xxvii. 15) where we can trace him (see, however, below on Isa. xxv. 1), and Symmachus appears to have carried this practice through consistently (we can test it in six cases). The same is true of the Aramaic (Targum and Peshitta) and Latin Versions, except that naturally the Vulgate Psalter has *fiat*=*γένοιτο*. The English Version carried the general rule of the Vulgate right through the Psalter also, but for some unaccountable reason followed the LXX in Jer. xi. 5. The Revised Version has of course restored "Amen" there.

The phenomena of the Versions appear thus to confirm the impression given us by the M. T.: whether "Amen" was common or not, originally, as a conversational particle, it became more and more common as a liturgical formula, and the more it became stereotyped in this way the less did it suggest any definite idea to the mind that needed to be translated into other languages, and the more natural did it become to transliterate it as *ἀμήν*, *amen*. Whether the tendency can be traced even farther than this already in the LXX is not so certain. The LXX has, no doubt, discovered three "amens" in the Old Testament not to be found in the M. T.; but then it renders them *γένοιτο*, not *ἀμήν*, and they do not seem to be cases of ingenuity, such as we shall find later in Rabbinical literature, but rather of a faulty MS. or careless reading. Thus in Jer. xv. 11 אמר has been read אמן, while in Jer. iii. 19 "Amen" must have been known as a living word in the language rather than as merely a liturgical formula, when אֵיךְ was read as א׳ י׳ ך׳,

[1] Except Judith xiii. 20 (*γένοιτο, γένοιτο*), where, however, Aeth. and Pesh. have "Amen, Amen."

i.e. אמן יהוה כי, and translated Γένοιτο, Κύριε· ὅτι. Still it is, of course, quite as possible that it was some earlier Hebrew copyist that made this mistake. In Isa. xxv. 1, the LXX, followed by Theodotion, read *γένοιτο*, i.e. אָמֵן, where the M. T. has אֱמֶת[1]. There can be little doubt that the M.T. is right in these three passages. The case is somewhat different in Isa. lxv. 15. Here it is the Massoretes (followed by Symmachus and Vulgate, and supported by Aquila's *πεπιστωμένως*) that have found אָמֵן, where the LXX render *ἀληθινόν* and Targ. אֱלָהָא קַיָמָא. Symmachus actually understands this אמן in the liturgical sense, and, as we shall see, it was probably so interpreted in the Apostolic age. But as, on the one hand, the liturgical "Amen" is peculiar to men in *reply* to God, and on the other hand, Barth's theory that אָמֵן is an abstract noun has hardly been substantiated, it is most probable that "Amen" is not the original form of the word in this place. It is natural to think of אֱמוּנָה (cf. אֵל אֱמוּנָה, Deut. xxxii. 4)[2], especially as this is translated *ἀληθινόν* in Isa. xxv. 1. Still simpler would be the almost equivalent אֱמֶת following it in the same verse—a suggestion, in favour of which might be urged the fact that the LXX itself has actually converted this latter אֱמֶת into אָמֵן, which, as usual, it translates by *γένοιτο*.

3. *Result.*—Our examination of the use of the word "Amen" in the Old Testament has given us twelve certain cases in the Hebrew text, and six to ten in the Apocrypha, and seems to lead to the following conclusions as to Old Testament usage. (1) The original use of "Amen" was to introduce an answer to a previous speaker (1 Kings i. 36, Jer. xxviii. 6, xi. 5). (2) Then the words of the answer were suppressed, and "Amen" stood alone (Deut. xxvii. 15 ff., Neh. v. 13, 1 Chron. xvi. 36 = Ps. cvi. 48, Tobit viii. 8,

[1] Aq. has *πεπιστωμένως*, i.e. probably "Amen," and Sym. *πίστει*, i.e. probably *not* "Amen."

[2] Cf. Ps. xxxi. 6 אֵל אֱמֶת; 2 Chr. xv. 3 אֱלֹהֵי אֱמֶת; Jer. x. 10 אֱלֹהִים אֱמֶת; in which last case, indeed, Theod. has *Θεὸς ἀληθινός*, as the LXX has here.

ix. 12 [Vulg.]), this liturgical "Amen" tending to become double (Num. v. 22, Neh. viii. 6 [M. T.] = 1 Esdras ix. 47 [B, Syr., Aeth.], Judith xiii. 26). (3) The next stage is where there is no indication of a change of speaker, so that "Amen" actually appears to be the *last* word of the sole speaker, instead of the first (or only) word of the response. This usage is exemplified in two ways: (*a*) in the formal subscriptions appended, in conformity with Eastern custom, to a completed MS. Such "Amens" standing absolutely after a doxology are found in the Old Testament ("Amen *and* Amen") at the end of the first three (four) divisions of the Psalter (Pss. xli, lxxii, lxxxix), and then, at a very much later date, in 3 and 4 Maccabees; (*b*) in the "Amen" said by the speaker to his own prayer, found twice in the Vulgate (2 Esdras [i.e. Neh.] xiii. 31 and Tobit xiii. 18), and also in Prayer of Manasses, ver. 23. (4) Already in our oldest MS. of Tobit we have what is almost a fourth stage, a simple subscriptional "Amen," without doxology. We have thus in the Old Testament four usages: (i) Introductory, (ii) Detached, (iii) Final, (iv) Subscriptional.

4. *New Testament.*—The growing liturgical use of "Amen" in the later books of the Old Testament, and the phenomena of the LXX, prepare us for what we find in the New Testament, the Textus Receptus of which contains the word in some 119 places, of which the Revised Version retains 100[1]. Strange to say, each of the four usages we have just found in the Old Testament is represented in the New Testament also. Usage i. (*Introductory*), which we have seen reason to regard as the original, is represented naturally enough by the "Amens" in the non-Epistolary part of the Apocalypse (vii. 12[2], xix. 4, xxii. 20) prefixed to a doxology, and referring back to words of another

[1] "Amen" is retained in the Vulgate throughout; and in the English versions outside of the Gospels. In the Gospels, when it introduces a sentence, it is translated "Verily," and at first, in the Old English versions, it seems to have been regularly rendered "soðlice."

[2] Westcott and Hort have here also a final "Amen" in square brackets.

speaker. Usage ii. (*Detached*) is found in the remaining "Amen" of this part of the Apocalypse (v. 14), and is testified to by Paul in 1 Cor. xiv. 16. Corresponding to usage iii. (*Final*) we have the usage of the New Testament Epistles (including the first part of the Apocalypse). If we exclude Apoc. i. 7[1], where a liturgical "Amen" is added to *ναι* at the end of a solemn statement, the thirty-four "Amens" of the Epistles [T. R.] fall into two groups, fifteen following doxologies, and nineteen following blessings. The fifteen doxology "Amens" are all well attested (except 2 Pet. iii. 18)[2], but of the nineteen benediction "Amens" only two (Rom. xv. 33, Gal. vi. 18) are retained by Westcott and Hort, although they admit two others (1 Thess. iii. 13, a prayer, and Heb. xiii. 25) to their margin, and the Revised Version even admits the last mentioned, and Apoc. xxii. 21 to its text, as also, though doubtfully, Philem. 25. Of usage iv. (*Subscriptional*) there is no instance in the best texts of the New Testament; but there is a marked tendency to it in later MSS.[3]

As the book of Acts does not contain "Amen," all that remains to be examined is the Gospels. It is remarkable that these documents, whose literary history forms so intricate a problem, contain far more "Amens" than all the rest of the books of the Old and New Testaments together; and yet their usage does not exactly correspond to any one of the four stages we have distinguished. These "Amens" are all of one kind—for the five final "Amens"[4] are wanting in the best texts—and form a very peculiar class, unparalleled in Hebrew literature[5]. They are initial

[1] Apoc. i. 18, 1 John v. 21, 2 John 13, which somewhat resemble it, are excluded in R. V.

[2] Retained in R. V., but omitted by Westcott and Hort. The other fourteen are Rom. i. 25, ix. 5, xi. 36, xvi. 27, Gal. i. 5, Eph. iii. 21, Phil. iv. 20, 1 Tim. i. 17, vi. 16, 2 Tim. iv. 18, Heb. xiii. 21, 1 Pet. iv. 11, v. 11, Jude 25.

[3] Aethiopic MSS. often have a triple "Amen," corresponding to the אמן אמן אמן of post-Biblical Hebrew.

[4] Matt. vi. 13, and at the close of each Gospel.

[5] Delitzsch in *Zeitsch. für Luth. Theol.*, 1856, p. 422, and Dalman, *Gram. des Jüd.-Pal. Aramäisch*, p. 193, note.

"Amens" like group i. (pre-exilic and Apocalypse), but seem to lack the indispensable backward reference. This is the more striking as they are all in sayings of Jesus, and very frequently occur in a sort of dialogue [1]. An examination of these passages, however—and they number about fifty-two in the Synoptics and twenty-five in John—will generally show that there is some trace, after all, of a reference either to some preceding words, or to the sentiment underlying them [2].

In Luke "Amen" occurs only six times [3], three of the cases being common to the Synoptics, and three in verses peculiar to Luke. In three other places Luke has *ἀληθῶς* where the parallel passages in the Synoptics have *ἀμήν* [4], and once (Luke xi. 51) *ναί* corresponds to an *ἀμήν* in Matthew. In Luke iv. 25, a verse peculiar to Luke, *ἐπ' ἀληθείας may* represent an original *ἀμήν*, but in view of the *ἀμήν* in the preceding verse this is perhaps hardly likely [5]. In five (six [6]) passages peculiar to Matthew and Luke, the latter simply omits *ἀμήν*. The avoidance not only of the form *ἀμήν*, but even sometimes of any equivalent particle, is therefore characteristic of the third Gospel.

Mark has four passages where *ἀμήν* is peculiar to him, although Matthew has a parallel passage; while Matthew has only two lacking in Mark. The frequency of *ἀμήν* in Matthew is due to nineteen passages not in Mark, viz.

[1] They are invariably followed by *λέγω ὑμῖν*, except where this naturally becomes *λέγω σοι*, viz. in the solemn sayings to Peter (John xiii. 38= Mark xiv. 30, John xxi. 18), to the thief on the cross (Luke xxiii. 43), and to Nicodemus (John iii. 3, 5, 11); and this form is used rhetorically once in the Sermon on the Mount (Matt. v. 26).

[2] e.g. Matt. vi. 2: "The hypocrites [pray] in the synagogues . . . that they may have glory of men. Amen, I say unto you, They have received their reward."

[3] For xiii. 35, where it is wanting in the parallel Matt. xxiii. 39, does not have it in the best texts.

[4] Luke ix. 27, xii. 44 (where, however, D has *ἀμήν*), and xxi. 3.

[5] *ἐπ' ἀληθείας* in LXX oftenest represents אֱמֶת: also יַצִּיב and קְשׁוֹט.

[6] In Luke xv. 7 the *οὕτως* in a sense represents the *ἀμήν* of Matt.

nine[1] peculiar to Matthew and ten where the parallel in Luke either omits (*a*) simply the ἀμήν (five or six times[2]), or (*b*) the whole formula[3], or else changes it into something else[4]. Of the Synoptics, therefore, it is Mark that seems never to avoid the word.

A well-known peculiarity of the fourth Gospel is that it invariably (twenty-five times) has ἀμὴν ἀμήν, as against the just as invariable single ἀμήν of the Synoptics (about fifty-two times); and this phenomenon occurs even in one and the same saying, e.g. John xiii. 38=Mark xiv. 30=Matt. xxvi. 34=Luke xxii. 34, where Luke, as already explained, omits the ἀμήν altogether[5]. Delitzsch[6] explained this peculiarity of the fourth Gospel as being due to a corruption of the Aramaic vernacular *amen amêna* (=*amen amer-'na*=ἀμὴν λέγω), which sounded like ἀμὴν ἀμήν, but Dalman (*loc. cit.*) contests this explanation[7].

Two New Testament passages alone remain, and in these ἀμήν is treated as a noun[8]. In Apoc. iii. 14, where it is masculine, it is immediately explained as a designation of Christ as "the faithful and true witness." The key to this usage is doubtless the traditional Massoretic pointing of Isa. lxv. 16, which as we have seen is at least as old as Symmachus, with possibly a reminiscence of the practice of Jesus and of 2 Cor. i. 20. This latter passage is less clear; but τὸ ἀμήν has probably about the same meaning as in 1 Cor. xiv. 16.

5. *Liturgical Use of Amen.*—We have already observed the increasingly liturgical character of the "Amens" in post-exilic literature. (1) Our positive knowledge of the

[1] A tenth (Matt. xviii. 19) has ἀμήν in square brackets in Westcott and Hort, but none in R. V.

[2] Matt. v. 26, viii. 10, x. 15, xi. 11, xiii. 17 (xviii. 13).

[3] Ibid. v. 18, xvii. 20. [4] Ibid. xxiii. 36, xxiv. 47.

[5] The other twenty-four passages are peculiar to John. [6] *loc. cit.*

[7] Apparently on the ground that the alleged pronunciation is a characteristic of the Babylonian not the Palestinian Talmud. See, however, pp. 71 and 77 of the same work.

[8] The third passage (1 Cor. xiv. 16) calls for no remark.

details of the temple ritual of this period is very limited indeed. From 1 Chron. xvi. 7–36 it would appear that in the time of the chronicler it was the custom that when the Levitical choir sang selections (one or more) from the Psalter, the people answered, saying "Amen," and praised Yahwè[1]. It is at least plausible to hold that the usage[2] was one which, being well known, did not need to be constantly indicated in the MSS. of the Psalter, and that so, from motives of economy of space, the doxology was omitted except at the end of the great divisions of the Psalter (so Grätz)[3]. If this be so, we should find a parallel case in the English Church Prayer-book, where the Amen-doxology used after every selection from the Psalter is not printed. On the other hand, the comment of Shelomo b. Melech on Ps. xli. 14 suggests an equally plausible explanation of the presence of these doxologies: דברי המשרר נותן הודאה לאל בבלותו הספר כמנהג הסופרים; and, when Grätz urges in support of the other view that in 1 Chron. xvi the Amen-doxology is added to selections from Pss. cv and xcvi which want it, he seems to fail to take account of Ps. cvi. 47 which is also included.

(2) Even for the Herodian temple ritual our witnesses are not contemporary, and such as they are they are not only meagre, but so unsystematic and fragmentary, not to say conflicting, that it is precarious to try to construct a systematic account, especially as the practice may have varied. We can hardly do more here than mention some of the points.

The chief occasions when one would look for Amen-responses in the ordinary temple ritual are these: (*a*) When the priests came out on to the steps and pronounced the

[1] It is likely enough that some such practice was in existence even if with Reuss, and after him Stade (and Cornill?), we regard this passage as a later insertion into the work of the Chronicler, which originally passed directly from ver. 7 to ver. 37.

[2] Cf. Ps. lxviii. 35 [36] and 1 Chron. xxix. 20.

[3] *Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judenthums*, 1872, p. 486.

blessing on the people (Tamid. vii. 2), and the latter, at a signal, prostrated themselves and worshipped. In this ritual, however, the blessing was not, as in the synagogues, pronounced in three parts with an "Amen" after each, but in one (ibid.); and a longer response was used (see further below). (*b*) When, after attending to the other offerings, the priest stooped to pour out the drink-offering, and at a signal the Levitic choir chanted the selection from the Psalter; for, at the trumpet blast that marked every pause, the people bowed and worshipped (Tamid. vii. 3). But we are not *told* of any "Amen" at this point. (*c*) In response to the concluding doxology with which the Levites may have ended their chant. If we assume that doxologies were really said after each Psalm, then it is at least possible to assume also that the forms used in the Herodian temple have been preserved for us in Taan. 16 b, where we are told that to each of the special doxologies on fast days for rain, which ended with the words, "Blessed be Yahwè, the God of Israel, from age to age" (ברוך ה׳ אלהי ישראל מן העולם ועד העולם), the people replied, "Blessed be the name of the glory of his kingdom for ever and ever" (ברוך שם כבוד מלכותו לעולם ועד). But the argument that a rarer ceremony (prayer for rain) borrowed its ritual from some more common one, needs to be used with caution; and more precarious still is the assumption (Grätz) that the more common one was precisely the daily Psalm ritual. Still this is as likely as not to have been so, and with this proviso we may accept the hypothesis[1].

All this, however, gives us no certain "Amen." And there is a well known and often repeated statement in the Talmud, that "Amen" was in fact not said in the temple, but only in the synagogues (בגבולין). In the temple the form used was the response quoted above (ברוך שם וגו׳). The explana-

[1] See some interesting discussions and conjectures in Ludwig Blau's article, "Origine et Histoire de la Lecture du Schema" (*Revue des Études Juives*, XXXI, 179-201), including the subject of the practice in the Synagogue of Jericho.

tion follows (Taan. Bab. 16 b): ומניין שאין עונין אמן במקדש שנאמר קומו ברכו את ה' אלהיכם מן העולם עד העולם ויברכו שם כבודך[1]. Judah Calats (יהודה כלץ), however, is probably nearer the truth when he points us (*Sefer ha Musar*, Pereq 4, ed. Mantua, p. 42) to those passages in the Talmud that tell us that in the temple the divine name in the priestly benediction was uttered as spelled (בכתבו), instead of, as usual, בכנויו, i.e. by the substitution of a less awful name, and that accordingly the "Amen" said in the synagogues after each of the three parts of the benediction was omitted in the temple. It would appear, therefore, that when the Tetragrammaton was pronounced, the longer blessing ברוך שם וגו' was used. The meaning of this obviously is, as Grätz clearly saw, not that people were not allowed to say "Amen" in the temple, but that there the special solemnity of the service demanded, and the postponement of the response to the end of the whole act allowed, the use of a more extended and impressive formula than a single "Amen;" just as in the English Church "Amen" alone is sung after hymns or short prayers, but after each Psalm a complete doxology.

If now we venture to apply these results to the Psalm ritual, we find that the Amen-doxology has disappeared. What then of the five doxologies in Pss. xli, lxxii, lxxxix, cvi, and 1 Chron. xvi? Can it be that they are really not temple doxologies at all, but synagogue doxologies? This was Grätz's view; and he accordingly maintained that they made their way into the Psalter only after the destruction of the temple. Their presence in the LXX, however, and especially in the translated form *γένοιτο* (see above), seems against this view. Grätz himself could not see how the Amen-doxology could have made its way into 1 Chron. xvi so late as this. Can we indeed be sure that "Amen" was not really said after all, only appended at the end of the longer formula, as it is in the English ritual just referred to?

(3) In the synagogue the response to the Shema seems

[1] i.e. Neh. ix. 5.

to have been the long one (ברוך שם וגו׳: Grätz, *loc. cit.*, p. 493), although usage varied; but the response to the priestly blessing, which was closely associated with the prayer, was "Amen," and the leader (העובר לפני התיבה) was directed not to join in the "Amen" lest his mind should be disturbed (מפני הטרוף, Ber. V, 4)[1].

(4) Outside the synagogue, too, "Amen" was used in response to the father's blessing before and after food, though (notwithstanding Tobit viii. 8) not in private prayer (Lightf., *Hor. Heb.*, 302), and it frequently occurs, as already remarked, at the end of MSS. and treatises[2], as also on epitaphs (e.g. נשמתה תהי צרורה בגן עדן אא״א סלה). Other formulae in use are: אכ״יר, i.e. אמן כן יהיה רצון; בהנ״וא, i.e. בעזרת השם נתחיל ונגמר אמן, as an introductory formula like the Mohammedan, *bi'smi 'llāhi 'rraḥmāni 'rraḥīm*; יז״יא, i.e. יראה זרע יאריך ימים אמן, or שלי״טא, i.e. שיחיה לימים טובים אמן, after a man's name; and תנ״בעא, i.e. תהי נפשו בגן עדן אמן, after the mention of one who is deceased, like the Arabic, *sallā 'allāhu 'alaihi wa sallam*.

6. *Jewish doctrine of "Amen."*—The theoretical prescriptions concerning the use of "Amen" were many. The following specimens will be sufficient to illustrate the style. The bread must not be broken at meals till "Amen" was quite finished (אין הבוצע רשאי לבצוע עד שיכלה אמן מפי העונים, Ber., f. 47 a), except in the case of one or two delaying inordinately (אבל אם כלה מפי רוב העונין אפילו אם עדיין מיעוט שמאריכין בו אין צריך להמתין להם כיון שמאריכין בו יותר מדאי, Judah Calats, *loc. cit.*, f. 42 a, ll. 14–16). "Amen" could be freely said to a benediction uttered by a Jew; but in the case of a Gentile (Samaritan) great caution must be used (עונין אמן אחר ישראל המברך ואין עונין אמן אחר הכותי המברך עד שישמע כל הברכה, Ber. VIII, 8)[3]. A man must not pro-

[1] For the practice at a later date, see Maimonides, *Mishneh Torah Hilchoth Tephillah*, § 9.

[2] e.g. א״ס״ו, i.e. אמן נצח סלה ועד. בי״לאו, i.e. ברוך יהוה לעולם אמן ואמן.

[3] Contrast Bartholomaeus Gavantus, *Thesaurus Sacrorum Rituum* (Rome, 1736), tom. I, pars iv, tit. ix, p. 1085, "Ad monitionem pro Judaeis, non respondetur, *Amen*."

nounce "Amen" hurriedly, or incompletely, or inattentively (lit. orphan[1]), or disconnectedly (אין עונין לא אמן חטופה ולא אמן קטופה ולא אמן יתומה ולא יזרוק ברכה מפיו, Ber., f. 47 a). "Hurriedly" was explained by some to mean "cutting short the first vowel," by others, "before the last word of the benediction was completely uttered" (פירו' כאלו הא"לף נקוד' בחטף ויש מפרשי' שלא יחטף אותו שלא ימהר לענותו קודם שיסיי' המברך, *Orach Chajim* (בית יוסף, אורח חיים), ed. Venice, 1550, I, f. 84 b). "Incompletely" was explained as "cutting short the last letter" (דהיינו שמחסר קריאת ה"נון שאינו מוציאה בפה שתהא נכרת, *Orach Chajim*, f. 85 b, l. 20 f.), or cutting the word into two parts (ibid.). "Inattentively" was applied to "Amen" uttered by one who had not heard the words of the blessing (אמן יתומה דהיינו שהוא חייב בברכה אחת ושליח צבור מברך אותה וזה אינו שומעה ואע"פי שיודע איזו ברכה מברך השליח צבור מאחר שלא שמעה לא יענה אחריו אמן דהיא אמן יתומה, *Orach Chajim*, cap. 74, § 8, quoted in Vitringa, *De Synagoga*, p. 1100); or, according to another tradition, to "Amen" said at an interval after the blessing (אמן יתומה שלאחר זמן מרובה שסיים הברכה ענה אמן על דעת אותה ברכה, *Orach Chajim*, 85 b, l. 24 f.). "Disconnectedly" is explained as hurriedly and without attention (Judah Calats [יהודה כלץ], *op. cit.*, f. 42 a, l. 11). Moreover, Ben Azzai urges home the lesson by the assurance that as one deals with his "Amens" so shall he himself or his children be dealt with (בן עזאי אומר כל העונה אמן יתומה יהיו בניו יתומים · חטופה יתחטפו ימיו · קטופה יתקטפו ימיו ·, Ber. 47 a), holding out the inducement that whosoever prolongs his "Amens" in so doing prolongs his days also (וכל המאריך באמן מאריכין לו ימיו ושנותיו, ibid.). The exact degree of prolongation of "Amen" must have been difficult to hit, however, for it must not be prolonged too much (כל העונה אמן יותר מדאי אינו אלא טועה, Ber. 47 a), lest it drown the voice of the reader (לפי שאין קריאת התיבה נשמעת כשמאריך יותר מדאי, *Orach Chajim*, f. 85 b, l. 35). Nor must it be said too loud (העונה אמן לא יגביה קולו יותר מהמברך, *Orach Chajim*, cap. 78, § 8, quoted in

[1] So a Psalm is called "orphan" when nothing is said of author or occasion of composition (מזמורא יתומא, Ab. Zar., 24 b, line 7 from foot).

Vitr., *loc. cit.*). The right speed is defined by the time it would take to say "God, faithful king" (ארוכה קצת כדי שיוכל לומ׳ א״ל מ״לך נ״אמן, ibid.); while in the large synagogues the right moment was indicated by waving a scarf. Thus we read of the synagogue in Alexandria: ובימה של עץ באמצעיתה וחזן הכנסת עומד עליה והסודרין בידו וכיון שהגיע לענות אמן הלה מניף בסודר וכל העם עונין אמן (Succah, 51 b).

An almost superstitious reverence for the word appears again in the following doctrines. He that saith "Amen" is greater than he that uttereth the benediction (גדול העונה אמן יותר מן המברך, Judah Calats, *loc. cit.*, l. 19), because it is the former that secures the answer (כי הוא פותח המקור מראשיתו להשמיע הברכה אל מקום המדה הצריכה למתפלל וכוונת המברך נאצלת ממקו׳ ברכת העונה אמן כי העונה אמן אינו קונע מחשבתו לפני המלך פנים בפנים, ibid.). Rabbi Jonah tells of the special merit of saying "Amen" to each benediction (העונה אמן אחר כל ברכה הרי הוא כמתפלל שני פעמים, *Orach Chajim*, f. 84 b, foot). Rabbi Judah says, "Whosoever saith 'Amen' in this age is worthy to say it in the next age also; and so King David saith, 'Blessed is Yahwè, the God of Israel, from this age and to that age, Amen and Amen,' i.e. once 'Amen' in this age and again 'Amen' in the coming age" (Tanchuma, cited in Buxtorf, *De Synag. judaica*, in Ugolini, *Thesaurus*, IV, col. 1376). And so we read, "Whosoever saith 'Amen religiose et cum summa attentione,' speedeth on our deliverance" (ibid.). Rabbi Shim'on, we are told, said, "Whoever shall say 'Amen' with all his strength (i.e. with firm purpose), to him the gates of Paradise shall be opened (אמר רבי שמעון כל העונה אמן בכל כחו [פירוש בכל כונתו] פותחין לו שערי גן עדן), for it is said, 'Open the gates that the righteous nation which keepeth truth may enter in[1]'" (*Orach Chajim*, 85 b, ll. 8 ff.), the exegesis of which verse is thus given: "Say not *shomer emūnim*, 'which keepeth truth,' but *she omer Amen*[2], 'which saith Amen'" (אל תקרי שומר אמונים אלא שאומר אמן, Sanhed. 110 b–111 a).

[1] Isa. xxvi. 2.

[2] The saying is often quoted with *Amenim* (pl.) for *Amen*.

Nor is this semi-magic power of "Amen" confined to this life. In *Seder R. Amram* (ed. Warsaw, f. 13 b, foot) we read of the righteous answering "Amen" to David's song of praise to God, whereupon "the sinners of Israel answer 'Amen' from Gehenna." When God graciously inquires about them he is told "though they are in great straits, they force themselves, and say before thee, 'Amen.'" God saith to the angels, "Open for them the gates of the garden of Eden, that they may enter and praise before me," for it is said, Open ye, &c. (Isa. xxvi. 2)[1]. A similar story, going into much more detail, may be seen in J. P. Stehelin, *Rabbinic Literature*, II, 68 f.

On the other hand, we find elsewhere importance attached to the mental attitude of the worshipper in the following explanation of אמונים נוצר י"י (Ps. xxxi. 24 [23]), where the merit lies in faith undaunted by perplexities and delays: אלו שאומרי' אמן באמונה אומר ש"צ ברוך מחיה המתי' והם עונין אמן ועדיין לא ראו תחיית המתים ומאמינין בהק"בה שמחיה המתים אומר ש"צ ברוך גאל ישראל והם עונין אמן ועדיין לא נגאלו ואם תאמר נגאלו הרי חזרו ונשתעבדו ומאמינין שעתיד הקדוש ברוך הוא לגאלם אומר ש"צ ברוך בונה ירושלם ועדיין היא בחורבנה ומאמינין בהק"בה שעתיד לבנותה ועונין אמן הוי אמוני' נוצר ה' (*Orach Chajim*, 85 a).

Again, Rabbi Jose tells us that "Amen" has three powers: it is an adjuration (Num. v. 22)[2], an acceptance of a form of words (Deut. xxvii. 26), or an acquiescence in another's saying (Jer. xxviii. 6) (אמר רבי יוסי ברבי חנינא אמן · · · בו שבועה · דכתיב ואמרה האשה אמן אמן · בו קבלת דברי' דכתי' ארור אש' לא יקים את דברי התורה הזאת לעשות אותם ואמר כל

[1] ואומר דוד שירה לפני הקב"ה · ועונין אחריו הצדיקים אמן יהא שמיה רבא מברך לעלם ולעלמי עלמיא יתברך מתוך גן עדן · ופושעי ישראל עונין אמן מתוך גיהנם · (fol. 14) מיד אומר הקב"ה למלאכים מי הם אלו שעונין אמן מתוך גיהנם · אומר לפניו רבונו של עולם הלוּ פושעי ישראל שאעפ"י שהם בצרה גדולה מתחזקים ואומרים לפניך אמן · מיד אומר הקב"ה למלאכים פתחו להן שערי גן עדן ויבואו ויזמרו לפני שנאמר פתחו שערים ויבא גוי צדיק שומר אמונים · אל תקרא שומר אמונים אלא שאומר אמנים.

[2] Sh^{e}muel says: כל העוכה אמן אחר שבועה כמוציא שבועה בפיו (Surenhusius, *Mishna*, III, 211 b). On Rabbinic explanations of the double "Amen" in Num. v. 22, see *Sota*, II, 5 (e. g. אמן על האלה · אמן על השבועה).

העם אמן · בו האמנת דברים דכתיב ויאמר ירמיהו אל חנניהו אמן כי יעשה ה׳ יקם ה׳ את דברך, Shebu. 36 a).

Finally, to the question, "What is the secret of 'Amen'?" Rabbi Hanina answers, "God, faithful king" (מאי אמן אמר רבי חנינא אל מלך נאמן, Sanh. 111 a).

These illustrations must suffice as an indication of the nature of the Rabbinical treatment of the subject. Further details may be found e.g. in *Orach Chajim*, ff. 84 b–85 b, *Sefer ha Musar*, 42 a, b, and in the *Sefer Chassidim*, § 18[1].

7. *Christian Practice.*—If "Amen" was in common use outside of the temple, and especially in the synagogues, it would naturally be retained by the early Christians. At all events, 1 Cor. xiv. 16 shows that it was in liturgical use in the days of the Apostles as a well-known formal response of the whole congregation. The absence of the Amen-doxology from the Paternoster in the oldest text does not necessarily mean that some such doxology was not in very early use. The doxology occurs in a slightly different form in the *Didachè*, both in the Paternoster (ch. viii), and in two other prayers (chs. ix and x). As Dr. C. Taylor has pointed out, the form of the doxology seems to be modified by the context, and the absence of the "Amen" may indicate simply that it was felt, as an invariable response, not to belong to any particular form of prayer (cf. Grätz's theory of the doxologies in the Psalter). In one place in the *Didachè* "Amen" does occur (ch. x), immediately preceded by *Maranatha*. This naturally calls to mind the "Amen: come Lord" of Rev. xxii. 20, and it is even possible to suppose some connexion between this formula and the Jewish hymn

[1] וחייב לענות אמן על כל ברכה וברכה שנאמר פתחו שערים ויבא גוי צדיק שומר אמונים שאומרים אמן וגדול העונה אמן יותר מן המברך שהוא מודה לברכות המברך והמברך אינו מזכיר אלא שם אחד והעונה אמן מזכיר ב׳ שמות כי אמן עולה בגימ׳ בשם יו״ד ה״י ושם אל״ף דל״ת שיכוון אדם לבו לשמים בשעת עניות אמן שהוא אל מלך נאמן (*Sefer Chassidim*, § 18). This idea may be the origin of the custom in some Jewish rites for the Reader himself to say "Amen" before the congregation makes the response. Cf. p. 16 above and p. 22 below.

אין כאלהינו, "There is none like our God," occurring in all the Jewish liturgies[1], the first letters of the lines of which read אמן בא. The combination, which has been defended by Dr. C. Taylor (*The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*, pp. 77–79), is very attractive; but, not to speak of the uncertain age of the hymn, there are two difficulties in the way of our accepting it with any confidence. In the first place, although it can hardly be doubted that the present acrostic arrangement of the lines is intentional, for the hymn would gain much in force by an alteration of the lines say to 2 1 5 3 4, it is not at all clear that the hymn was *originally* meant to be acrostic. As a matter of fact, indeed, other orders are found. Thus in *Seder R. Amram* (ed. Warsaw, 1865), f. 14 a, ll. 6 ff., we find the order 2 1 4 3 5, and in MS. Add. 434, of the Cambridge University Library, p. 107 b, the order 2 1 3 4 5 (cf. also Jellinek, *Beth ha Midrash*, II, p. 47, ll. 16–18, at the end of מסכת היכלות). The question is whether the acrostic form or the logical order is to be regarded as the more original. But in the second place, even if we could be sure that the acrostic order were the original, the reading of the acrostic title אמן בא as two words "Amen: Come!" is, of course, a mere conjecture: it might just as well be read "Amen; blessed art thou!" (ברוך אתה), and Mr. Schechter (JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, 1892, p. 253, note) may be right in preferring the latter rendering[2].

[1] e.g. *Authorized Daily Prayerbook of the British Empire*, ed. S. Singer (1891), p. 167. The hymn runs as follows:—

1 אין כאלהינו · אין כאדונינו · אין כמלכנו · אין כמושיענו
2 מי כאלהינו · מי כאדונינו · מי כמלכנו · מי כמושיענו
3 נודה לאלהינו · נודה לאדונינו · נודה למלכנו · נודה למושיענו
4 ברוך אלהינו · ברוך אדונינו · ברוך מלכנו · ברוך מושיענו
5 אתה הוא אלהינו · אתה הוא אדונינו · אתה הוא מלכנו · אתה הוא מושיענו.

[2] The hymn is actually referred to twice under the title אמן בא in a MS. Machzor (German ritual) of Dr. Taylor's (cf. שבלי הלקט, Venice, 1546, fol. 2 a, col. 2). On the second occurrence it is unpointed, but on the first it is pointed *amen ba*, which, while it naturally decides nothing as to the view even of the writer of the MS., at least does not favour that of Dr. Taylor. See further, Mr. Schechter's article cited above.

The use of "Amen" after prayers and the Eucharist in the second century is described by Justin Martyr in oft-quoted words[1]; while Jerome's description of the heartiness of the response is almost too well known to bear repetition[2]. The communicant said "Amen" on receiving the elements, and Ambrose explains "non otiose [quum accipis] dicis tu *Amen!*" (*De Sacramentis*, lib. IV, cap. 5)[3]. This practice is supposed to have fallen into disuse about the sixth century in the western churches (Riddle, *Manual of Christian Antiquities*, 1843, p. 379), though it continued to be observed "in the eastern churches, and in the Ambrosian (Milanese) and Mozarabic (Spanish) liturgies" (ibid.). The Scottish Liturgy (1637), however, preserved the form. In the Communion ritual we read, "*Here the person receiving shall say 'Amen,'*" and the form was recommended by Bishop Andrewes, Cosin, &c., while the practice is said to be still common among devout persons in the English church (Blunt, *Theol. Dict.*, p. 17)[4]. It also became somewhat common, though at a later date, to insert "Amen" after the name of each of the persons of the Trinity in the formula of Baptism; the people replying at the end "Amen"—a usage still to be found in Russia (Coleman, *Christian Antiquities*, p. 218). Moreover, a responsive "Amen" was sometimes said by the congregation after the reading of the Lesson (Bartholomaeus Gavantus, *Thesaurus Sacrorum Rituum*, Rome, 1736, tom. I, pars i, p. 208 [Tit. x. 6 f.]).

Christians followed in the footsteps of the Jews in

[1] Apolog., I, §§ 65, 67: Οὗ συντελέσαντος τὰς εὐχὰς καὶ τὴν εὐχαριστίαν, πᾶς ὁ παρὼν λαὸς ἐπευφημεῖ λέγων· Ἀμήν.

[2] "Ubi sic ad similitudinem coelestis tonitrui *amen* reboat, et vacua idolorum quatiuntur?" (*Comm. in epist. ad Gal.*, proem. ad lib. II, p. 428.)

[3] Cf. August., *Contra Faustum*, lib. XII, c. 10: "Habet enim magnam vocem Christi sanguis in terra, cum eo accepto ab omnibus gentibus respondetur *Amen*."

[4] For a discussion how ecclesiastical practice required "Amen" to be said (by the priest or by the people) after the Consecration of the Elements, see Benedict XIV, *De Sacrosancto Missae Sacrificio*, Lib. II, c. 23, nos. 9–11.

enumerating the blemishes that would render the Amen-response ineffective. It might be "Amen pupillum," i.e. יתומה "cum quis precatione tenetur nec intelligit quod respondet;" or "Amen surreptitium," i.e. חטופה "cum surripit et dicit Amen, antequam absolvatur precatio;" or "Amen sectile," i.e. קטופה "cum secat in duas partes, nempe oscitanter audiens, et alias res agens" (Angelus Caninius, *Disquisitiones in locos aliquot Novi Test. obscuriores* [Francofurti, 1602], p. 55).

The English Church, moreover, in addition to distinguishing between "Amen" as a response after prayer with the meaning "So be it!", and "Amen" as said after a Creed with the meaning "So it is!", recognizes certain distinctions in the relation of the "Amen" to the form that precedes it. (1) In some cases the "Amen" is a response of the congregation, ratifying and accepting what the minister has said (e.g. Absolutions, Benedictions, Consecration of Elements, Commination). (2) In others it is (perhaps somewhat artificially) regarded as a part of the formulary, and is said by all who have recited the formulary, i.e. minister as well as people (e.g. Lord's Prayer, Doxologies, Creeds, Prayer at end of Commination). (3) In certain cases it is the speaker alone that says "Amen," solemnly ratifying what he has said (e.g. formula of Baptism, reception of the baptized into fellowship of the Church, Confirmation, Marriage, Ordination, the Paternoster at the beginning of the Communion service, and one place in the Commination service). These distinctions are indicated in the Prayerbook by "Amen" being printed in italics in (1), but in Roman type in (2) and (3)[1]. Different from any of these cases, and quite peculiar, is the formula of the oath of supremacy administered to bishops, "In the name of God, Amen. I . . . do profess, &c." Somewhat similar is the formula pronounced by the preacher in some churches.

[1] Cf. *The Annotated Book of Common Prayer*, ed. by J. H. Blunt, 1884, *passim*.

The churches that employ a liturgy have thus to a considerable extent preserved the ancient and natural responsive use of "Amen." In the other religious bodies the practice varies. Where great individual freedom prevails, "Amens" are freely uttered by members of the congregation in response to any saying that impresses them deeply. Where there is less flexibility, as e.g. amongst Presbyterians, the third of our four classes of "Amen" has become the rule, and, except where sung, the "Amen" is uttered by the officiating minister alone [1].

8. *The modern Synagogue.* — In the synagogue also "Amen" is used in two ways; sometimes with the formula "and let *us* say Amen" (ונאמר אמן)[2]; sometimes with the formula "and say *ye* Amen [3]." Just before the recital of the Shema, the worshipper is directed, when prayers are not said with the congregation, to add, אל מלך נאמן, "God, faithful king."

9. *Mohammedan usage.*—Mohammedan worship is much more of a private exercise, though usually performed in public. Still, "Amen" has been naturalized, and it is commonly said at the end of the first Sura of the Koran when uttered in prayer, its assonance with the irregular lines of the Arabic favouring the practice. Mohammedan scholars wander about in their attempt to explain the word. One says it means "Answer thou me;" another, "It is strangely asserted by some of the learned that after the *Fatiḥa* it is a prayer which implies all that is prayed for in detail in the *Fatiḥa*." Some solemnly assure us it is one of the names of God; while another declares that some say incorrectly that it means "O God," the word "answer!" being understood.

10. *Secondary Applications.*—German kings and emperors early began to append "Amen" to the introductory and concluding formulae of state documents, and this

[1] On this anomaly, see *Catholic Presbyterian Mag.*, IX, 108 ff.

[2] *Authorized Daily Prayer-book of the British Empire* (1891), p. 69.

[3] Ibid., p. 54.

practice appears to have been quite general till the time of Charles V. From that time, however, it began to be given up (Höck in Ersch und Gruber, *Allgemeine Encyclopädie*, III, 346, who refers to Ch. G. Hoffmann, *De usu particulae Amen in diplomatibus regum et impp. Germaniae*, Tübing., 1773).

In Syriac literature, "Amen" came to be used as a common noun meaning consent or approval, in such phrases as, "With the 'Amen' of the whole of Christendom," and in modern English the same usage exists[1]. By a rather strange fate, however, this word, which, as we have seen, originally invariably stood at the head of a sentence, is now also frequently used in the sense of the very last of any matter in hand.

H. W. Hogg.

[1] For examples, see *A New English Dictionary* (Oxford), *sub voc.*

EGYPTIAN FRAGMENTS. II[1].

A.

THIS fragment, containing the last twenty verses, had altogether seventy-six verses, as we see at the end. It is a kind of holy מגלה, provided with vowel-points and accents in red, analogous to the scroll of the Hasmoneans (see Harkavy, in his זכרון לראשונים, Part V, p. 207, and *J. Q. R.* IV, 493).

It seems that the first sixty-one contained the religious preamble without historical data. Verses 62–70 relate the following historical fact: "And it was in the days of the king, who is called our master, *Hadan b^e Omer-El*, who ruled over the land of Egypt, and in all the corners of the earth, west and east, north and south. His kingdom was exalted and strengthened, and his throne was higher than the throne of his fathers and forefathers. Thirteen years old was he when he began to reign, and he carried on his government with largeness of heart and a good understanding, and needed neither minister nor counsellor. Many plots were made against him, and many enemies rose up against him, but God made them to fall under the soles of his feet: because he loved righteousness and hated iniquity, and set up judges in the land and commanded them to judge and decide in equity and truth. He took away the violent men and removed the foolish: he rejected them that pervert their way and are corrupt in their doings. But he loved men of understanding, and to establish judgment and the way of goodness." The sense of the subsequent lines is not clear. Perhaps it means that Hakim created

[1] See THE JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, vol. VIII, p. 541.

prisons and workhouses, and that he had the Nile regulated by dams.

[1]נוה שני עד נחתם חזון ונביא כאשר העתיקו הנביאים הראשונים: יהיו עם אלהים נעתקים ממלכות למלכות מבבל למדי וממדי ליון אל עוצים ואל הַגְּרִים: ובכל אלה הימים הגיעו לעם זו צרות רבות ויאפפום רעות ותלאות על זנחם מוסר עץ חיים: ובכל דור ודור בְּסָרָם ובשובם אל יי אלהי א[בות]יהם יקים ל[הם] מושיעים ויפליא להם פלאים גדולים וינוססה רוב נסים ויתן להם רחמים בעיני כל מלך ומלך: למען ברית אבותם ולמען תורתו אשר היא הגיונם ולבלתי הכרית שאריתם:

ויהי בימי המלך הנקרא אדונינו הַדָּן בְּאוֹמֶר־אֵל המולך בארץ מצרים והמושל בפנות הארץ במערב ומזרח בצפון ובים ותגבה מלכותו ותחזק [2]ותאמץ וירם כסאו מכסא אבותיו ואבות אבותיו: בן שלוש עשרה שנה היה במלכו וינהג את כל הממלכה ברוחב לב ובטוב שכל ולא נצרך למשנה ולא ליועץ: כמה קושרים קשרו עליו וכמה קמים קמו עליו ויפילם אלהים תחת כפות רגליו: למען כי אהב צדק וישנא רשע ויעמד שופטים בארץ ויצום לדון דין צדק ולשפוט משפט אמת: וירחיק את אנשי חמס ויסר את מתי און ויתעב את מסלפי דרך וננויי מפעל: ויאהב את מתי שכל ואת יְצוּב המשפט ואת דרך הטוב: ויהי מרוב אהבתו לצדק ויצב עדים נאמנים לגרדון ולפלילות ולמשוטטי לילה אשר לא עלה על לב כל מלך ולא קדמו בזה כל שלטון: ויודע לכל כי א[ין] [3]מעליהם רום גליו ומשבריו: גם כְּהוֹדַיַת אנושי מחל אשר ימלט משחיתותם אף כהודית אסירי עני וברזל אשר יגדע בריחי ברזלם: ועתה אחינו כל בית ישראל שובו נא אל יי אלהי אבותינו ושימו לבבכם על דרכיכם הכנעו ושברו לב הוסרו וקחו מוסר: זכרי זאת ושימוה נגד עיניכם וספרוה לבניכם ובניכם לבניהם לבניהם לדור אחר: שובו [ו]השיבו הזהרו והזהירו הזכו הדכו הסירו רוע המעלל [ו]הטיבו דרכיכם ומעלליכם ואל תשתכחו כל תגמולי [כל] אשר גמלנו ברחמיו וכרוב חסדיו: כי כאשר ייסר איש את בנו יי אלהינו יסר אותנו ויושיענו למען שמו ולמען ברית אבות ולמען ברית ראשונים ולמען הבטחת ואף גם זאת בלי עשות כלה: יהי שם יי אלהינו מבורך ומשובח מעת ועד עולם לדור דורים ולעולמי עולמים ולנצח נצחים אשר [נפ]לאותיו ומחשבותיו אלינו נגידה ונדברה עצמו [4]מספר: הללוהו שבחוהו רוממוהו כי גבר עלינו חסדו ואמת יי לעולם הללויה: ס

סכום פסוקיה עוֹ פסוק

[1] Fol. 1, recto. [2] Fol. 1, verso. [3] Fol. 2, recto. [4] Fol. 4, verso.

There can be no doubt that Hadan b^{e} Omer-El is identical with the King of Egypt, named Al-Hakim bi-Omr-Allah, who reigned from A.D. 996 to 1021. This is the opinion of my friends Profs. De Goeje (Leiden), Brünnow (emeritus Heidelberg), and D. S. Margoliouth (Oxford). The last had hit the right point in saying that הדן is a Hebrew translation of Al-Hakim. Ibn Al-Athir says that Al-Hakim came to the throne at the age of eleven years and five months, the Hebrew document says thirteen years. I suppose the Hebrew date, as by a contemporary, is here more reliable than the Arabic historians. The Arabic documents do not mention that Hakim was at one time favourable to the Jews, possibly this favour did not last long. Hakim, indeed, it is said, treated the Jews badly.

B.

The following document[1] contains a letter by R. Nissim, sent by R. Menahem ben Eliyahu, and is written in the form of a roll on both sides, damaged in some places, which we have marked with . . . . It seems to refer to the first crusade in which the Germans acted a special rôle (p. 27, l. 16), as well as the French (p. 27, l. 20), who went to Salonica (p. 27, l. 26) and Constantinople (p. 27, l. 21). Tobiah (p. 28, l. 2) is probably Tobiah ben Eliezer, author of the מדרש לקח טוב, a Midrash on the Pentateuch and the scrolls, who lived at the time[2]. Michal Yenimts (p. 28, l. 4); Ben Ahron (p. 28, l. 5); R. Nissim (p. 28, l. 6); Ebjatar, chief of the school of Tripoli (p. 28, l. 9), who speaks of some miracles in Salonica, are unknown to me. R. Eliezer hag-Gadol (p. 27, l. 29) is perhaps identical with his namesake at Mayence, and Tobiah of Thebes (p. 28, l. 28) perhaps not identical with R. Tobiah (p. 27, l. 31; p. 28, ll. 2, 11). We see from this letter that there were Jewish congregations in Roumania

[1] MS. in the Bodleian Library.

[2] See Buber's preface to his edition of the *Lekach-Tob* (on Genesis and Exodus), Wilna, 1880.

(Roumelia, p. 28, l. 26), one of which was at Salonica. The Black Mountains (p. 28, l. 12) and the land of the Khozars (p. 27, l. 19) are mentioned. Possibly one of our readers will find the clue to this mysterious oracle. The vertical lines mark the end of the lines in the MS.

. . . . . אלהים לציון כדבר אל . . . . . | . . . ם רבים האומרים תחנף ותחז בציון עינינו : | והם לא ידעו מחשבות יי : וג׳ ועדאיין לא נתמלא | הגורן אבל דעו אחינו ברוכי יי שבזו השנה נתקיים | דבר אלהינו ובאו׳ האשכנזים לאין מספר לרוב · | אלפי אלפים הם עם נשיהם ובניהם ועם כל ממונם | ויקבצם אלהינו לגורן · ושואלים מהם הגויים והיהו[דים] | ואומרים להם למה הינחתם בתיכם ומקומכם | ויצאתם ועונים ואומרים כך החשובים והגדולים | שבהם הרי חושך קרובים לנו ועתה נתגלו באור | גדול וראינו אומה ואוהלים עד אין מספר ואין | אנו מכירים לשונם ואיש אחד יצא מתוכם | ואמר לנו לכו לדרככם והנה אנחנו באים | . . . . . ועל זה אנחנו נרדפים ובאים ואנו׳ | [או]מרים בוודיי קיים אלהינו דברו ולאשר | בחושך היגלו׳ אילו׳ השבטים האחֵרים ובשעה | שיֵלכו׳ האשכנזים כולם בארץ ישראל ויתמלֵא | הגורן אז יאמר אלהינו קומי ודושִי בת ציון וג׳ | וכל הקהילות נזדעזעו׳ ושבו׳ אל יי · בתעניות | ובצדקות בין (?) ממקום אלכזרייה והלכו כשאמרו׳ | שבעה עשר קהילות אל מדבר העמים ואין אנו׳ | יודעים אם נתוועדו׳ עם השבטים אם לא[1] וגם | מארץ פרנגיאַן ששיגרו׳[2] שלִיחַ עם כתבים | באלאסקוסטנייה ועדאין לא נתבררנו׳ משכתוב | נכתוב אליכם וגם באלקוסטנטיניה במקום אַוידֶן | [ש]קרוב לאלקוסטנטיניה קהילות קטנות קמו׳ | כדברי דניאל איש חמודות בני פריצי יי[2] | תכלמו באן[3] אליהו נגלה עלינו כדכתֹ ובני פָּריצֵי | עמך ינשׂ וג׳ ולא קיבלנום לא אָנו׳ ולא קהל | קוסטנטינייה אלא החרמנום · וגזרנום · | אבל נגיד לפני כבודכם מה שנהיה בשלוניקייה | בקהל הקדוש שבאו אכסניים יהודים וערלים | ושלטונים וסיפרו שנגלה אליהו זצ״ל בגלוי ולא בחלום | על אנשים מיוחסים והרבה אותות ומופתים | חָזו׳ שם שמגידים הערלים *[4]והיהודים ונגלה על ר׳ אליעזר בנו של ר׳ | יהודה בן ר׳ אליעזר הגדול וכאשר יאמרו | האכסניים נתן לו מטה אבל בבירור | המופתים שנהיו בשלוניקייה העידו הערלים | לפי תומם ונתבטלו היהודים מכל מלאכה | וגם רבינו טובייה שיגֵר[5] תלמיד אחד | ובידו

[1] MS. ליו.
[2] So MS.
[3] So MS. ובאו?
[4] Verso, in margin ; headed מעות.
[5] Text ששיגר ; the end of note headed מעות.

אינרת פתוחה אל אלקוסטנטינייה לבשׂרם | והיה שם יהודי ממקומינו והיה בו ריח תורה | וראה הכתב ששיגר רבינו טוביה וכתוב בו | אותות ומופתים היו במקומינו וגם אליהו נגלה | אלינו וכך העיד זה היהודי (two words crossed out) | שמו מיכאל יינימטש שראה בכתב רבינו טוביה | בעינו שלזה מיכאל ביר אהרן החבר שהיה בשלוניקייה | שהיה עיוור בשני עיניו ונתפקח וראה בעיניו | וגם ר׳ ניסים יודע אותו וזה מיכאל עשה בשגגה | ולא לקח פתשגן הכתב שאם היה מביא לנו היינו | משגרים אליכם שתאמינו בדבר ועוד נתברר | לנו בבירור כי שיגר ראש ישיבה רב אביתר הכהן | כתב מפורש מן טראבלם אלי קהל קוסטנטינייה | והיו לשם ד׳ אנשים וראו הכתב שהיה ביד לוזו | הערל וגם אילו לא חששו שיביאו לנו פתשגן כי | כי הם בורים והשעה אנו מקווים שנקבל כתבים | מן ר׳ טוביה ומן הקהילות הקדושות שאנו תומהים | על הנס הגדול שהיה בשלוניקייה שהיו שונאים | הערלים את היהודים עד לאין חקר כאשר יודע | אותם ר׳ נסים שאם לא היה נס ומופת גדול ונשמע | למלך לא היה נשתייר משונאי יי שריד ופליט | והשעה הם יושבים בבטח גדול בלא גולגולת | וענשים ויושבים בטליתות ומלאכה אינם | עושים ואין אנחנו יודעים מה הם מקווים | ואנו מתפחדים שלא ייגלה הדבר בגויים וימיתונו | אבל בשעה השלטון עצמו והאגמון הגדול | אומרים כולם אי יהודים למה תשבו בשלוניקייה | מברו את בתיכם ונכסיכם והמלך קיסר | עוזר להם ולא יוכל אדם ליגע להם ואתם עדיין | אין אתם הולכים כי בבירור למדנו כי יצא המשיח | שלכם ושבח לאל אין אנו מתפחדים ושבח | לאל גם אנחנו שבנו אל יי בתשובה בתעניות ובצדקות | והרבה צומים בכל יום ואחרים שיני וחמישי | ולוקים מלקות ומתוודים הודייה בעוונותיהם וקודם | ששמענו השמועה שלשלוניקייה היו רואים | חלומות יהודים וגם הערלים ולא היינו יודעים | על שלוניקייה כלום ולא היינו מאמינים לדבריהם | אלא היינו גוערים בהם עד שראה אחד יהודי כהן | בחלומו קודם שלא נשמע כי כל קהילות רומנייה | יתקבצו בשלוניקייה ומשם ייצאו ונערנו בו | ואמרנו כי הם שונאי יי ואיך עד שבא טובייה | מן תיבם והביא כתב בידו שנהיו אותות ומופתים | בשלוניקייה ואחרות קהילות מתקבצים שם והנה | יבוא טובייה לשם ויגיד לכם הכל מה ששמע וראה | ויצא החלום שראה היהודי הכהן ועתה אחינו אם | ייטיבכם האל אם יש עמכם שמועה ובשורה חדשה | שאנחנו יודעים מה ששמע ויודע אדונינו ראש | הישיבה גם אתם שמעתם ויודעים ואם תעשו עמנו | גמילות חסדות כתבו לנו מה אתם יודעים ושמעתם

(verso) ואל תפחדו כלום כי אפילו המלך שמע אותו | ואין אנו מתפחדים ואם יבוא כתב מאצל כבודכם | יתחזקו כל קהלינו בתשובה והאל ישלם לכם | שׂכר טוב ותזכו לחזות בנועם יי ולבקר בהיכלו | ורציתי אני מנחם שאבוא לשאם בזו השנה | וראיתי החיילות האשכנזים כי יעברו לרוב | ואיני יודיע אנה יפשטו והאל יגן בעדכם | ובעדינו אמן

זו הכתב מאצל הרב המובהק[1] מוֹ ורבּ ניסין | סּ טּ[2]

(verso, in margin) זו הכתב ששיגר רבינו הרב מנחם סּטּ בן | רבי אליהו נּעּ

C.

The following document was copied by my learned friend, Mr. Schechter, from a MS. in roll form, preserved in the University Library of Cambridge. It contains data concerning the Nagid Meborakh (*J. Q. R.* VIII, 555) who was greatly favoured by Al-Afdal[3], King of Egypt (p. 35, l. 12 from below), who lived in the years A. D. 1096–1121. The MS. is much damaged, and it is doubtful whether the order of the document is rightly given by us. The missive is full of poetical pieces and biblical verses, so that the real document is short. But we see by this the style of such documents coming from Egypt. It will perhaps show the political relation between Egypt and Constantinople, which was represented by a Patriarch (p. 35, l. 2 from below).

Recto.

. . . . . אפודים יחידים . . . . . .
פּצּעּ פרים צבים כנרים ברתות
רחקּ רצף חצף נופין בבריתות
מקּב ידם מדם קרם בחרם השתות
וברכות ערוכות ארוכות לא פחותות
ונחמות נעימות משכימות . . . . .
במור ואהלות וקציעות נפותות
והוד וכבוד לזבוד מאד לצמיתות

[1] MS. המוהבק. [2] Crossed out in the MS.

[3] According to Arabic sources, Afdal had the principal management of the kingdom under Abu-l-Kasim Ahmad.

כהציג מקלות צרה (?) . . . בשקתות
וקדושות והגשות בקומץ סלתות
ופתח יי על מזוזות ועל חלונות
וישועות . . . . . נוחרות (?)
בחוזק ידועות . . . .
במסות במופתים ובאותות
לתת חופש ונופש לכל נפש ושביתות
בחגים ובחדשים ובשבתות
ובחול לנחול בלי בחול ולמחול . . . עויתות
להנחילך עלם שבולו מנוחות
שלש מאות ועשרה עולמות . . .
כאומר להנחיל לאוהבי יש עמיתות (?)
לשרוק ולפרוק . . . כהות כתותות
. . . בבור שוחת שחות שחותות
ביד קצוצי פאות מתפ . . . כסתות
וביד פולחי דמותות עובדי תבניתות
אשר שמו אותתם אותות
הצובו משחית על דרך ורשתות
יפלו ולא יקומו אמות ממותות
ילכו ולא יגיעו כתות חתותות (?)
יעופו אל ארובותיהם יונות פותות
להכשיר ולהעשיר עניה ענתות
להתים לאתים חרבות וחניתות
לעת צאת השואבות לדלתות הפותות
מים בששון ממעיני הישועה שותות
לזכור אהב כלולות מופתות
למשכם בחבלי אדם בעבותות
כאמור בחבלי אדם אמשכם
בעבותות אהבה

אל קהלות הקודש אשר מצורם אמורים
אמורים מסיני זכים חפים ברים
ברים מהם מסולפים ומיושר בוערים
בוערים כלפידים ומחשך לא גרים

גרים יאכלו טוב הצפון כי לקח גומרים
גומרים להידבק בצורם והצלו דוברים
דוברים אמונים לדת אל בטרם הרים
הרים ירוע למו כי פתי ממכתו הערים
הערים קהל (?) ופני שונאיהם מפילים ומשחרים
ומשחרים פניהם לשלם אלים ופרים
ופרים ורבים לאין מספר . . . בם זרים (?)
זרים ירעבו והם ישבעו ויהיו זומרים (?)
זומרים אויבים ויהיו אז בני חורים
חורים וכפים ממעיני הישועה חושרים
חושרים בשורות טובות כי מראש טורים
טורים מאורם דבריהם גלוייה טהורים
טהורים ירוקים אשורים לקישים עם יורים
יורים חיצים לאשר במסתר יחרים
יחרים לפי חרב ושרידים בחן כומרים
כומרים ממשטן תשובות לשפוך כרים
כרים נרחבים ירעו כר שערים לחומרים
לחומרים בלי להקל ואין צוחה להגרים
להגרים בשחיטה בודקים במעש מקטרים
מקטרים בנינים (?) יחזו וכל פה אותם מכתרים
מכטרים לחוות אהבת נעורים
נעורים צוררים על ידי משורש נוצרים
נוצרים קלופים למנחה והקרבת שעירים
שעירים ובני החורי בצלמות ולא סדרים
סדרים ששה יגרסו ואם הם עתה עדרים
עדרים מצאן ובקר ושבע נשמות ערים
ערים שונאים וחוקיהם יהיו פגרים
פגרים יקמו יום רגבים פושרים
פושרים קושיות יתהללו לפאר צפרים
צפרים מעירים וגרסתם בציונים צרים
צרים בלחם העצבים ואוכלים פת קברים
קברים יפתחו וירננו כמים על נפש קרים
קרים תלאות להטעים כחלמות רירים

רירים זבים בודקים בציוני שערים
שערים ימצאו כי פנים תוארים
תוארים הגביל מסובלרם בלי היות תגרים
כאמ אלופנו מסובלים וג׳

המה הקהלות הקדושות · בני בית קדש הרוס · הדרים בארץ אדום · בבצרה עיר המלוכה הנקראת קוצטנדינא אשר נפוצו שם ברוב חובה (?) עושים מאהבה · לשמור למו הטובה · יהיו לאלפים ולרבבה · ורחבה ונסבה · משכרתם מי יוכל להניבח · להסר האיבה · ולגלות החיבה · היתה כתלאובה · מהיום מתעבבה · בצמחים מתרטבה · בחדוש שם לנקבה · לקדמותה להשיבה · להשבית מדהבה · מדם עקובה · ותתאמץ החטובה · חכמת נפש משיבה · בתבונות מתרחבה · השאלה והתשובה · כמסיני נקשבה · החמורות להרביבה · והקלות להשכיבה · וההוראה לשגבה · תימנה ונגבה · ומזרח ומערבה · לרפאת משובה · באהב נדבה · ולקבל תשובה · ומלאו תחת נגיבה (?) · פני תבלתעבה · להקים זבח ומצבה · ומנחת יהודה לערבה · כאומ׳ וערבה ליי׳

מנחת יהודה וג׳ ·

שלומות כטפי מיות . וברכות כערימות
ממגד תהומות . לדרוך על במות
להשיב השוממות . ביסודות ראמות
וחזיונות סתומות . יגלו בה דומות
ויחור חמות . להפיל חומות
ויופיע בנקמות . ויתחדשו הקדומות
והטובות והנחמות . לבנות האולמות
ומקום האשמות . בשיר עלמות
ויתקיימו קונמות . ויובלו לרקמות
תופפות עולמות . בנבהות קומות
והצולעה לנעימות . והנהלאה לתעצומות

לקיים אומ׳ ושמתי את הצולעה וג׳
וישב עמי בנוה שלום ובמש׳ וג׳

השבעתי אתכם רואי מעשה יי עוברי מים רבים · מקום נהרים יאורים רחבי ידים מי שחו בצבאות מעלה · ומטה · העושים צביון צובם השם בהם אות להודע עבור לפסוח עליהם · שמעו חכמים מלנו (?) לערכם במאתים וח (?) כבעפר נופח · שלא תשכח מפיכם אמרתי חנוני חנוני אתם

ריעי כי מפנקי שבקי ומנדשקי שוקקי הן בחליי לא ביקרני · ובמותי לא
קברני · צר לי מאוד כי יצאה בי יד יי · קרא עלי מועד להפיל שרי וגבורי
להסיר ממני משען ומשענה כל משען לחם וכל משען מים · בטלו האשכולות
ותשב היד כבוצר על סלסלות · דודי ירד לגנו לערוגת הבשם לרעות בגנים
וללקוט שושנים · כל מבצרי בכורים ותאנים · נפלו על פי אכל · כי הרבתי
תאונים · יתר הגזם אכל הארבה · והנה למעט אשר זרעתי הרבה · כי
טוב קויתי ויבא רע ואיחלה אור והנה אופל נזרע · בי אדני מה אומר
אחרי אשר הפך יש׳ עורף לפני אוביו · המאם מאסתה את יהודה אם בציון
געלה נפשיך מדוע הכיתנו ואין לנו מרפא · ועל מי נטשת מעט הצאן אשר
קוניהן יהרגון ולא יאשמו היו לבז ואין מציל משסה ואין אומר השב · כי
מרעה אל רעה יצאו צריהם להצר להם ויאמרו לא נאשם · אשתוללו אבירי
לב נמו שנתם · ולא מצאו ידיהם אנשי חיל כי הקיפה הזעקה כל בית גדול

Verso.

[ ] אמר יי עשוקים בני ישראל ובני יהודה יחדיו וכל וג׳
גואלם חזק יי צבאות שמו ריב יריב את ריבם למען וג׳
עשה צדקות יי ומשפטים לכל עשוקים
עשה משפט לעשוקים וג׳
לאמר לאסורים צאו לאשר בחשך הגלו על דרכים וג׳
רוח יי אלהים עלי יען כי משח יי אותי לבשר ענוים שלחני
ושבתי אני ואראה את כל העשוקים אשר נעשים תחת וג׳
לחבוש לנשברי לב לקרא לשבויים
דרור ולאסורים פקח קוח
לקרוא שנת רצון ליי וג׳
אלהים מושיב יחידים ביתה מוציא אסורים בכושרות
לפקוח עינים עורות להוציא ממסגר אסיר מבית כלא
יושבי חשך וצלמות אסירי עני וג׳
גם את בדם בריתך שלחתי אסיריך מבור מים אין בו ·
שובי לביצרון אסירי התקוה גם היום מגיד משנה אשיב לך
כי דרכתי לי יהודה קשת מלאתי אפרים ועוררתי בניך וג׳
וחתו גיבוריך תימן למען וג׳
מחמס אחיך יעקב וג׳
כי פדה יי . . . יעקב וג׳ יאמרו גאולי יי אשר וג׳

[ ] אקבצם מא׳ וג׳ עורי צפון ובואי תימן וג׳
אומר לצפון תני ולתי׳ וג׳ אם יהיה נדחך בקצה וג׳
והביאך יי׳ אלהיך וג׳ ומל יי׳ את לבבך וג׳
ונתן יי׳ אלהיך את כל וג׳ גואלינו יי׳ צבאות שמו וג׳
אשריך ישראל מי כמוך וג׳
אשרי העם שככה לו וג׳
אשרי שומרי משפט עושי וג׳
אשריכם זורעי על
כל מים ׃
אשרי העם יודעי תרועה וג׳ ׃ אשר באהליהם קול רנה וישועה
ומתפללים לצורם בתחנה ושועה ׃ ווכרים ייחודו בכל עת ושעה
ונלחמים עם מדברי תועה ׃ לא יבושו בעת רעה
כי לא תמצא בהם לעולם רעה ׃ והם מבקשים חכמה ודיעה
ועושים חסדים בטוב שמועה ׃ יגאלם נוטה שמים כיריעה
ויחיש בימיהם גאולה וישועה ׃ וישמרם מסער סועה ׃
לא תאונה אליהם רעה וג׳
כי מלאכיו יצוה להם לש׳ וג׳
ואתם חזקו אל ירפו ידיכם
כי יש שכר לפעולתכם
חזקו ויאמץ לבבכם כל המיחלים
לי׳
שמעו שמוע מלתי ואחותי באזניכם
לא אליכם כל עוברי דרך הביטו וראו וג׳
שמעו רבותי ׃ ובינו מלותי ׃ כי פקד צורי עלי חטאתי ׃
והפליא מכותי ׃ והרבה אנחותי ׃ והרחיק מעלי בני ובנותי ׃
ושבר עצמותי ׃ ופלח כליותי ׃ והדמים שירותיי ׃
והרבה קינותי ׃ וגדר אורחותי ׃ ועוה ותיבותי ׃
והשמים טירותי ׃ וסתם תפילותיי ׃ ועצמו יגונותי ׃
ושבתו נגינותי ׃ וחרבו מסבותי ׃ וערבו שמחותי ׃
ונעדרו בינותי ׃ ודממו אמרותי ׃ וחשכו נרותי ׃
ונסגרו דלתותי ׃ כי אל אלהי ישועתי
ממרום שלח אש בעצמותי
מי יקום לי עם מרעים מי יתיצב וג׳

לולי יי עזרתה לי וג׳
ויהי יי משגב בדך וג׳

משגב לעיתותי · עזרה לצרותי · מחסה בצוקותי ·
ירפא משובותי · וירצה תשובותי · וימחה דמעותי ·
וישמע שועתי · ויחיש ישועותי · וריב ריבותי ·
וינקום נקמותי · וישיב את שבותי · ויפתח את שפתי ·
לספר סודותיו · ולדבר הודותיו ·
להרבות תודותיו · ולשלם נדבותיו
כדבר האמור
אבוא ביתך בעולות אשלם לך
נדרי
אשר פצו שפתי ודבר פי בצר לי
לך אזבח זבח תודה ובשם
יי אקרא
נדרי ליי אשלם נגדה נא וג׳
בחצרות בית יי וג׳

אליכם אישים אקרא · ואדבר בשפה ברורה
מלטוני מצוקה וצרה · בעזרת האל הנורא
אשר עמו עוז וגבורה · יהי עליכם סתרה

ואגיד לכם כי הייתי משרת למלך מצרים האדון הגדול הנכבד הקרוי אל אפדל יאריך שדי ימותיו בטוב וימחץ קמיו ויתן בלבו לעשות טובה עם עמיו · ונתן אותי על אוצרותיו ושדותיו ועריו וגנזכיו ומאכליו ומשקיו ומלבושיו · והייתי לפניו נרצה ועון בי לא מצא · ויקנאו בי עבדיו ויעזרני אלהי בחסדיו . ועלי הטה חסד לפניו · והיו המלשינים והאויבים ידברו עלי כזבים כמה פעמים ולא היה ישמע מהם · עד אשר באו ימי הפקודה · ויביאוני בעונש גדול · ומכרתי מקומותיי ודירותיי כספי וזהבי ועבדי ואמהותי וכל קינייני · ונתתי כל ממוני ונשארתי ערום ועריה ואומר ערום יצאתי מבטן אמי וערום אשוב שמה את כל זה נתתי כופר נפשי למען שלא אפול ביום אויבי · ויתעללו בי ובכל זאת לא גרשני המלך מלפניו והשארני בשירותו כי הוא מלך חסד רודף צדק · ושונא חמס · ואחרי הדברים האלה גדל המלך הזה איש ערל והנא אחי נוּפַּטְרִיאַרְכִי אשר הלך ממצרים אל קוסטנדינא בשנה שעברה עם שליח המלך וישם את ידו מעל השרים ועבדי

המלך · וייטב בעיני האיש הערל הזה להרחיק את כל היהודים ולהפילם מיד המלכות · והיה לנו לפני המלך הגדול הזה איש עברי צדיק וחסיד ורופא וחכם ויועץ למלך היה מנעוריו ושמו מבורך נֹעַ וישם שמו שר השרים ונתנהו שר על בני ישראל אשר במלכותו והיה יאהבהו עד למאוד והיה על ישראל כחומה בצורה דורש טוב לעמו ודובר שלום לכל זרעו · וברוב עונותינו נאסף למנוחתו אל עמיו · כי היה זקן ושבע ימים ובמותו גלה כבוד מישראל · ונתקיים בנו והיה ביום ההוא ידל כבוד מישראל ולא נשאר במלכות כמוהו ·

וילֶקט מדורי כל נחשק ונחמד
כל צדק וישר גוע ונשמד
וארבץ תחת עולי · כעגל לא למד
טבעתי ביון מצולה
ואין מעמד

וכאשר מת השר הלזה נֹעַ ותשמחנה בנות פלשתים ותעלוזנה בנות הערלים ויתחזקו האובים על ישראל וישאו ראשם ויערימו עליהם סוד ויתיעצו להשמידם ולאבדם · אמרו לכו ונכחידם מגוי וגו׳ וידל ישראל עד למאד ביום ההוא · ותכבד יד הערלים עליהם ונתקיים בהם ויחר אף ה׳ בעמו וגו׳ ויתנם ביד גוים וילחצום אויביהם ויכנעו תחת ידם · ואחרי כן קמו ארבעה אנשים מבחורי ישראל ומהם איש אחד חשוב וגדול ליהודים היה וגם הוא חכם ויבא רע ויתיעצו ארבעתם להיעזר על האיש הערל ופחים טמנו ללכדהו ולא עזרם אלהים עליו ברוב אשמותינו כי לא קראוהו באמת · וימצאו כתב כתוב מפי הערל הזה כתבו בידו ולא יש בו רעה ושמו כי הוא כתבהו אל האפרנין אשר בארץ כנען ובירושלים *בעבור מלך מצרים אשר בדברים רעים[1] · ונתנו אותו על יד שליח כסיל ילך בו וישליכהו בבית איש שופט בעיר אִישְׁטוֹטַמְיאַתִי היא כפתור הסמוכה למצרים וילך האיש וישליך את הכתב בבית השופט וכאשר ראה השופט הכתב חרד חרדה גדולה ויחפש על האיש . . . . . .

D.

A fragment of a letter against Ben Meir, perhaps from Sᵉadyah Gaon (see JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, VI, p. 493), beginning missing. The author heard at Aleppo that Ben

[1] These words are crossed through in the MS.

Meir thought of proclaiming defective the months Marheshwan and Kislew. The writer of the letter warns Ben Meir not to proclaim his opinion, for he has made the calculation that the two months are complete, which he intends to prove. The author continues as follows: I returned to Bagdad in the belief that Ben Meir had accepted my calculation, but it was not so. The writer of the letter sent out letters to many congregations with the consent of the two heads of the schools (Sura and Pumbaditha), as well as the chief of the captivity. Otherwise Israel would eat leavened bread on Passover, and eat, drink, and work on the day of Atonement. The text of the letter is preserved in the Bodleian Library, not yet classed.

ובלכתי מהמון אל האמון · ובשובי מחיל אל חיל · בזכרי טַפַּי ועוללי
לנגדי בן זכרכם תלמידי · לא נגזר בניב ולא נגרז מנגד עינ יומן ייי אלהי
עזר אשאלה להראותני פניהם ופניכם בקרוב ברוב שמחותי ועל דברת
השמועה הנשמעת בארץ · הקדמתי מקץ שני חדשים וכתבתי אליכם אגרת
ובתוך אגרות ראש הגולה יעזרהו קדושנו וכל ראשי הישיבות אמצם משגבנו
להודיעכם כי בתוך הקיץ שעבר בהיותי בחלב שמעתי כי בן מאיר חושב
להכריז מרחשון וכסלו חסרין וכתבתי אליו כמה אגרות להזהירו לעשות כן
ולהודיענו כי המה שלמין ולבאר לו מאי זה טעם המה שלמין
ושבתי אני וירדתי בגדד והייתי סבור כי קיבל · עד אשר באה
השמועה בבגדד כי הכריזם חסרין ועל זאת נבהלו כל רבותינו חכמי
הישיבות כי כמוה לא נהיה מעולם להכריז · המועדים שלא כהלכה על
כן בחרדתם כתבו אל כל ישראל אשר בכל המקומות להודיעם כי כלנו
שוין בדבר הזה · ואין בינינו חלוקה כל עיקר להזהירו לבלתי לעשות כן ·
ולא שמע ויהי כי הכריזם חסרין דאגו כל רבותינו אשר בישיבות כי לא
נהיתה ולא נראתה כזאת להכריז מועדים שלא כהלכה · ועל כן כתבו
בכל המקומות להודיע את ישראל כי ראש הגולה יעזרהו קדושנו וגם ראשי
ישיבות · כולם יתמכם משגבנו · וכל האלופים וכל החכמים ותלמידהם שוין
בדבר הזה · כי המה שלמין והפסח בשלישי ואין בינינו חלוקה · ואין פרץ
ואין יוצאת ואין צוחה ברחבתינו · ושלחתי מקץ שני חדשים את אגרותיהם
אליכם בתוך אגרתי עתה כבואם הקבצו וקראם ועמדו על עמדכם ואזרו

נא כגברים חלציכם וכאנשי חיל למלחמות ייי וחוסו על עם ישראל ועל נחלת ייי לבל יאכלו חמץ בפסח · ובל יאכלון וישתון ויעשו מלאכה ביום הכפורים ותהיה התקנה הגדולה הזאת על ידכם ופרשו לפנינו בכל אשר תעשו עם שלומכם וחפציכם ושאלותיכם ותנו שלום לרבניה ולכל רעינו אחינו ככבוד איש ואיש ושלומכם ירבה תחלה וסוף

POSTSCRIPT TO PAGE 29.

Mr. Schechter informs me that amongst the Egyptian fragments in the possession of Mrs. Lewis,—one of which is the fragment identified by him as part of the original of Ecclesiasticus xxxix. 15 to xl. 6, and since published by him with an English translation and copious and learned notes (see the *Expositor*, July last),—he found a contract in which *Meborakh* is mentioned as *Nagid* under the date of 1098 A. D. I hope that this document will be published by him, together with others preserved in the University Library at Cambridge[1].

A. NEUBAUER.

[1] See p. 115 sq. below.

THE THIRD BOOK OF THE MACCABEES.

It will probably never be easy to discriminate critically between the exaggerations and hyperboles on the one hand and, on the other, the substratum of authentic facts contained in the so-called *Third Book of the Maccabees*. Yet if recent investigation has affected this question at all, the tendency is towards a stronger belief in the historical genuineness of certain parts of that narrative. In the first place, it is obvious to a close reader of Polybius and of Plutarch's *Life of Cleomenes* that the writer of 3 Macc. presents the same picture of Ptolemy Philopator's character as do the former authorities. The writer of 3 Macc. may have been unjust to Ptolemy, but he had the same prejudices as those displayed by all other "foreign" critics of that monarch.

But we can go a little further than this now. Prof. J. P. Mahaffy's work on *The Empire of the Ptolemies* (Macmillan, 1895) may be almost described as an attempt to go behind the "foreign" historians, and to present the Ptolemies from the "native" Egyptian point of view. Ptolemy Philopator's reign, according to this latest of its chroniclers, "was not so worthless and mischievous as it appears. Had Polybius and Plutarch been lost, and inscriptions only been preserved, we should have formed quite another picture of Philopator" (p. 270). Prof. Mahaffy shows from inscriptions in the various temples, as e. g. of the Paphian Aphrodite, that this Ptolemy was a man of liberal propensities, so far at least as his money was concerned. We are here reminded strongly of 3 Macc. i. 7 : ποιήσας δὲ τοῦτο, καὶ

τοῖς τεμένεσι δωρεὰς ἀπονείμας, εὐθαρσεῖς τοὺς ὑποτεταγμένους κατέστησε. Further, Philopator was a great builder. "The remains of Philopator's work are more important than any left us by his predecessors, and they extend far beyond them to that region of the Nile which seems hitherto untouched by Ptolemaic influences. Not only did he build at Thebes, not only was he the second founder of Edfu, and busy at Philae, but he began the exquisite little shrine now known as Deyr el Medineh, over against Luxor. In fact we can clearly perceive that his architectural activity extended all over Upper Egypt. But this is not all. Now for the first time we find Ptolemaic cartouches in buildings as far off as Dakkeh, fully fifty miles above the First Cataract. They are added by Ptolemy Philopator to the inner shrine or adytum built by the Nubian King Ergamenes, who, as Diodorus tells us, broke through the bondage of the priests, and being educated in Hellenic learning, would not obey their summons to put himself to death" (pp. 272–3).

May we not here perceive part of the real motive which perhaps induced Philopator to persist so strongly in the desire to inspect the innermost shrine of the Temple at Jerusalem? It always seemed to me difficult to believe that, for all his Bacchanalian propensities as described by Polybius, Plutarch, and the author of 3 Macc., Philopator should have been the man to desecrate a foreign shrine. Besides the edifices already alluded to, and the ambitious building described by Athenaeus (v. 37–9), Philopator built many temples on the Upper Nile, "and the gods and goddesses of Nubia, and the deified Nile, offer him gifts" (p. 273). On this Prof. Mahaffy remarks: "The building of so many temples throughout Upper Egypt points to leisure from internal disturbances, a considerable outlay, *and a disposition to conciliate the national* [i. e. not his own] religion. It may have been the policy of the wily Sosibios, the king's minister, but could hardly have been carried out against the king's consent, so that Philopator, though the Jews believed him to have been very adverse to

their religion, was not opposed to that compromise which led ultimately to a re-assertion of the old creed, and of native ideas, against the imported Hellenism." Conciliation, rather than violent interference, mark Philopator's nature, and this would seem to render the narrative of 3 Macc. entirely incredible, when it represents him as a rabid missionary for the cult of Dionysus. But two considerations occur to me against this view. First, the writer of 3 Macc. nowhere asserts that Philopator had any religious animosity against the Jews. He simply tells us: *προέθετο δὲ δημοσίᾳ κατὰ τοῦ ἔθνους διαδοῦναι ψόγον* (3 Macc. ii. 27). The last word implies no religious persecution at all, and it may well be that the Jews read into Ptolemy's hostility a meaning it did not necessarily possess. Even according to 3 Macc., Ptolemy Philopator makes no attempt to interfere with the Jewish worship. It is worth contrasting the language used here with that of 1 Macc. regarding Antiochus Epiphanes:—

1 Macc. i. 41 seq.

καὶ ἔγραψεν ὁ βασιλεὺς πάσῃ τῇ βασιλείᾳ αὐτοῦ εἶναι πάντας εἰς λαὸν ἕνα . . . καὶ ἀπέστειλεν ὁ βασιλεὺς βιβλία ἐν χειρὶ ἀγγέλων εἰς Ἰερουσαλὴμ καὶ τὰς πόλεις Ἰούδα, πορευθῆναι ὀπίσω νομίμων ἀλλοτρίων τῆς γῆς, καὶ κωλῦσαι ὁλοκαυτώματα καὶ θυσίαν καὶ σπονδὴν ἐκ τοῦ ἁγιάσματος, καὶ βεβηλῶσαι σάββατα καὶ ἑορτὰς . . . ὥστε ἐπιλαθέσθαι τοῦ νόμου, καὶ ἀλλάξαι πάντα τὰ δικαιώματα.

3 Macc. ii. 27 seq.

ἐπὶ τοῦ κατὰ τὴν αὐλὴν πύργου στήλην ἀναστήσας, ἐκόλαψεν γραφήν, μηδένα τῶν μὴ θυόντων εἰς τὰ ἱερὰ αὐτῶν εἰσιέναι, . . . ἵνα δὲ μὴ τοῖς πᾶσιν ἀπεχθόμενος φαίνηται, ὑπέγραψεν, ἐὰν δέ τινες ἐξ αὐτῶν προαιρῶνται ἐν τοῖς κατὰ τὰς τελετὰς μεμυημένοις ἀναστρέφεσθαι, τούτους ἰσοπολίτας Ἀλεξανδρεῦσιν εἶναι.

Mr. Bissell's note on iii. 21 (a passage to be further discussed below) is therefore quite erroneous. "The Jewish religion," comments Mr. Bissell, "the king regarded as one which was now to be rooted out." In point of fact, Ptolemy

merely wishes the Jews to join in the Dionysian rites as a preliminary to following their own worship; he does not prohibit Jewish rites, nor does he foist Bacchus into the Jewish synagogue. We know (cf. Schürer, *History of the Jewish People*, English Translation, II, 2, p. 275) that in the very towns where the Jews enjoyed *ἰσοπολιτεία*, they excited much animosity by declining to worship the local gods as well as their own God. Josephus reports (*Antiquities*, XII, 3, § 2) a similar episode in Antioch. Ptolemy's action was accordingly just the desire to inflict a *ψόγον* (3 Macc. ii. 27) by forcing the Jews to abandon their old immunity from this local condition of citizenship (cf. Schürer, p. 274). Just as we should have expected, then, a careful examination of 3 Macc. implies no severe religious persecution, though we cannot doubt that the Jews themselves wished to regard any attack on their privileges as an attack on Judaism. Yet 3 Macc. is comparatively free from this suggestion, the religious colouring of 3 Macc. being far less conspicuous than is that of 1 Macc. But my point is that, though the subsequent elaboration be unhistorical, the author of 3 Macc. unconsciously reveals as the real motive for Philopator's desire to enter the Temple a consideration which becomes luminous and credible from the remarks of Prof. Mahaffy quoted above. For this is what we read in 3 Macc. i. 8 seq.: *τῶν δὲ Ἰουδαίων διαπεμψαμένων πρὸς αὐτὸν ἀπὸ τῆς γερουσίας, καὶ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων τοὺς ἀσπασομένους αὐτὸν καὶ ξένια κομιοῦντας καὶ ἐπὶ τοῖς συμβεβηκόσι συγχαρησομένους, συνέβη μᾶλλον αὐτὸν προθυμηθῆναι ὡς τάχιστα πρὸς αὐτοὺς παραγενέσθαι. διακομισθεὶς δὲ εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα, καὶ θύσας τῷ μεγίστῳ Θεῷ καὶ χάριτας ἀποδιδοὺς καὶ τῶν ἐξῆς τι τῷ τόπῳ ποιήσας, καὶ δὴ παραγενόμενος εἰς τὸν τόπον, καὶ τῇ σπουδαιότητι καὶ εὐπρεπείᾳ καταπλαγείς, θαυμάσας δὲ καὶ τὴν τοῦ ἱεροῦ εὐταξίαν, ἐνεθυμήθη βουλεύσασθαι εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὸν ναόν.* From this it is clear that Philopator's architectural tastes lent force to what was perhaps a mercenary motive (see p. 53 below). In point of fact the admiration he felt for the building is

distinctly assigned in 3 Macc. itself as his motive. Does not this fit in admirably with the propensity of Philopator towards building, a propensity now first clearly revealed by Prof. Mahaffy's researches? That Philopator had an artistic motive, as well as the mercenary one to be discussed below, is clear from his naïve surprise that there could be any *religious* objection to his proceeding further: καὶ ἐπυνθάνετο διὰ τίνα αἰτίαν εἰσερχόμενον αὐτὸν εἰς πᾶν τέμενος οὐθεὶς ἐκώλυσε τῶν παρόντων (3 Macc. i. 13), a remark which bears a clear stamp of genuineness. It well fits in with what must have been the general knowledge of Philopator's love of raising monuments and shrines, when, at the end of the deliverance, we are told (3 Macc. vii. 20): ἃς καὶ ἀνιερώσαντες ἐν στήλῃ κατὰ τὸν τῆς συμποσίας τόπον προσευχῆς καθιδρύσαντες, ἀνέλυσαν ἀσινεῖς.

I attach more importance to another incident: viz. the part played by Ptolemy's elephants in the story told in 3 Macc. Some discredit has been cast on the latter book by the very fact that Josephus repeats this episode of the refractory behaviour of certain Egyptian elephants who turn on their drivers instead of crushing the Jews. Josephus (*Against Apion*, II, 5) has this passage: "When Ptolemy Physkon had the presumption to fight against Omas's army, and had caught all the Jews that were in the city (Alexandria) with their children and wives, and exposed them naked and in bonds to his elephants, that they might be trodden upon and destroyed, and when he had made those elephants drunk for that purpose, the event proved contrary to his preparations; elephanti enim, relinquentes sibi appositos Iudaeos impetu facto super amicos eius, multos ex eis interemere." Schürer remarks (*History of the Jewish People*, II, vol. 3, English Trans., p. 217) that "some unascertained fact may certainly be the foundation of the legend, the older form of which seems to have been in the hands of Josephus, since all is in his account simpler and more psychologically comprehensible, and he was evidently unacquainted with 3 Macc. When

then the latter refers the history to Ptolemy IV instead of VII, this is already a divergence from the older legend, and still more so are the other additions with which the author has enriched the narrative."

But I think that a careful consideration of this elephant incident points rather to Ptolemy Philopator than to Ptolemy Physkon. It is surely difficult to avoid recalling the refractory behaviour of Ptolemy Philopator's elephants at the battle of Raphia, with which, be it remembered, the writer of 3 Macc. connects his whole story. This is what Polybius (V, 84) says (I cite the passage from Mr. Shuckburgh's translation): "Ptolemy (Philopator), accompanied by his sister, having arrived at the left wing of his army, and Antiochus with the royal guard at the right: they give the signal for the battle, and opened the fight by a charge of elephants. Only some few of Ptolemy's elephants came to close quarters with the foe: seated on these the soldiers in the howdahs maintained a brilliant fight, lunging at and striking each other with crossed spears. But the elephants themselves fought still more brilliantly, using all their strength in the encounter, and pushing against each other, forehead to forehead. The way in which elephants fight is this: they get their tusks entangled and jammed, and then push against one another with all their might, trying to make each other yield ground, until one of them proving superior in strength has pushed aside the other's trunk; and when once he can get a side blow at his enemy, he pierces him with his tusks, as a bull would with his horns. Now, most of Ptolemy's animals, as is the way with Libyan elephants, were afraid to face the fight; for they cannot stand the smell or the trumpeting of the Indian elephants, but are frightened at their size and strength, I suppose, and run away from them at once without waiting to come near them. This is exactly what happened on this occasion: *and upon their being thrown into confusion and being driven back upon their own lines, Ptolemy's guard gave*

way before the rush of the animals; while Antiochus, wheeling his men so as to avoid the elephants, charged the division of cavalry under Polycrates. At the same time the Greek mercenaries stationed near the phalanx, and behind the elephants, charged Ptolemy's peltasts and made them give ground, *the elephants having already thrown their ranks also into confusion.* Thus Ptolemy's whole left wing began to give way before the enemy."

We have, thus, a striking piece of evidence that those of Ptolemy Philopator's elephants, which were engaged at Raphia, were not easily manageable, and it is not too much to suppose that those which stayed at home were of the same disposition, and that his guards were equally incompetent to control them. Hence we are quite prepared to believe with 3 Macc. vi. 21, especially when Philopator's elephants are concerned: *καὶ ἀπέστρεψαν τὰ θηρία ἐπὶ τὰς συνεπομένας ἐνόπλους δυνάμεις, καὶ κατεπάτουν αὐτὰς καὶ ὠλέθρευον.* Nor does this exhaust the striking testimony which the elephants offer in favour of 3 Macc. For while there is evidence that Ptolemy Philopator was particularly devoted to the acquisition of elephants, and that in general, the military strategists of his day were all believers in the value of elephants in war, there is no proof that the subsequent Ptolemies had the same confidence in these unwieldy animals. I would suggest that the Battle of Raphia itself, added to the Roman triumphs over the Carthaginians, must have been largely instrumental in revising military notions on this subject. At Raphia Ptolemy triumphed, not because of, but in spite of his elephants, while the Romans may almost be said to have done the same when once they had overcome their fear of the beasts to which they were unaccustomed. According to Mr. Mahaffy's statement (p. 271) "there was recently found in Upper Egypt (Edfu) a votive inscription of Lichas the Acarnanian, the general sent up by Ptolemy Philopator to capture elephants in far Ethiopia." This is the full inscription, as cited by Mr. Mahaffy: *βασιλεὶ*

Πτολεμαιωι και | βασιλισσηι Αρσινοηι θεοις | φιλοπατορσι και Σαραπιδι και | Ισιδι Λιχας Πυρρου Ακαρναν | στρατηγος αποσταλεις | επι την θηραν των ελεφαν | των (then after a gap) το δευτερον. How pointed this fondness of Philopator for elephants was, must be emphasized from an earlier passage in Mr. Mahaffy's book: it will also show a negative reason against placing the elephant incident in any later reign than that of Ptolemy Philopator. "It must be, I think," says Mr. Mahaffy (p. 216), "to this king (Ptolemy III) that the story in Agatharchides (*apud* Phot. 14) is to be referred, who describes how the savages of the Troglodyte country killed the elephant, either by hamstringing him or by shooting at him with great bows worked by three men. They destroyed so many recklessly, as all savages are wont to act in similar circumstances, that Ptolemy feared the supply of these animals required for Egypt would fall short, and offered the people, through his generals, large rewards to preserve them. They replied that they would not take his whole sovereignty as compensation for their sport. *There is so little mention of elephant-hunting under any king later than Ptolemy IV, that I set this anecdote in the present reign.*" The earlier Ptolemies were far more concerned than were the later to obtain elephants. Philadelphus collected 300 (Polybius, V, 79) while Strabo (cf. Mahaffy, p. 128) tells us of the foundation of a "number of settlements on the Somali coast by the officers sent to catch elephants for the second and third Ptolemies."

Grimm rather unduly presses against the author of 3 Macc. the somewhat different part attributed by Polybius to Arsinoe at the Battle of Raphia. The former (3 Macc. i. 4) says: γενομένης δὲ καρτερᾶς μάχης καὶ τῶν πραγμάτων μᾶλλον ἐρρωμένων τῷ Ἀντιόχῳ, ἱκανῶς ἡ Ἀρσινόη ἐπιπορευσαμένη τὰς δυνάμεις παρεκάλει, μετὰ οἴκτου καὶ δακρύων τοὺς πλοκάμους λελυμένη, βοηθεῖν ἑαυτοῖς τε καὶ τοῖς τέκνοις καὶ γυναιξὶ θαρραλέως, ἐπαγγελλομένη δώσειν νικήσασιν ἑκάστῳ δύο μνᾶς χρυσίου. Polybius' narrative of the Battle of Raphia agrees with 3 Macc. (1) in asserting that Ptolemy won after

an initial discomfiture, (2) in attributing a brave part to Arsinoe. The differences, however, show that our author did not derive his narrative directly or entirely from Polybius. There are no similarities in the language, and Arsinoe in 3 Macc. addresses the troops during the battle, and offers them large sums of money—an offer which is regarded by some critics as highly improbable. "Ein Versprechen," says Grimm, "welches Arsinoe, wenn sie in der Angst gethan haben sollte, schwerlich hätte halten Können." "The promise," says Mr. Bissell, improving on the commentator to whom he owes so much, "which she is here said to have given, she could not have been in circumstances to fulfil."

Why not? That the writer was well acquainted with the position of Arsinoe is obvious, for, like Polybius, he terms her the king's sister, and not sister-wife, as she afterwards became. Arsinoe, as we shall see, had not passed through a happy youth, but Prof. Mahaffy (p. 276 n.) ingeniously suggests that her bravery at the Battle of Raphia earned her the position of queen. Is it unlikely then that her bravery was shown, not as Polybius says, in the calm before the battle, but as 3 Macc. would have it, in the hottest crisis of the fight, when Ptolemy's army seemed very near defeat, and was perhaps saved by her brave exhortation from destruction? That Arsinoe, Ptolemy's queen and sister, was a woman of strong and vigorous character is revealed by her face as it appears on her coin. It is a firm and determined countenance that looks out upon the beholder. The more one thinks of it, the less likely is it that Arsinoe remained, as Polybius' narrative implies, a mere silent spectator of the fight.

Moreover, in a subsequent book (Book XV, 25–33), Polybius describes the effect of the death of Arsinoe on the public mind in language which may lend additional strength to the foregoing conjectures. When Arsinoe was murdered, the truth only slowly leaked out, but when the Alexandrian populace became aware of what had happened,

their indignation was unbounded. "Though rumours," says Polybius, "which turned out to be true, had found their way among the people, they had up to this time been disputed; now there was no possibility of hiding the truth, and it became deeply impressed in the minds of all. Indeed there was great excitement among the populace; no one thought about the king; it was the fate of Arsinoe that moved them. Some recalled her orphanhood; others the tyranny and insult she had endured from her earliest days; and when her miserable death was added to these misfortunes, it excited such a passion of pity and sorrow that the city was filled with sighs, tears and irrepressible lamentations. Yet it was clear," adds Polybius, in a very inept comment, "to the thoughtful observer, that these were not so much signs of love for Arsinoe as of hatred towards Agathocles." It may well be that the author of 3 Macc. knew of this feeling for Arsinoe and also that he was aware of something in her earlier days which had won the admiration of the crowd. This something may well have been the active part attributed to her in the Battle of Raphia by the author of 3 Macc. It must be remembered that at the time of the battle she was still very young.

The further details of the events following Arsinoe's death may even be pressed into another confirmation of 3 Macc. For how does Agathocles endeavour to allay the popular resentment? He seeks to appeal to the soldiers' cupidity. Polybius tells us: *πρῶτον μὲν διμήνου τὰς δυνάμεις ὠψωνίασεν.* Does not this almost seem as though Arsinoe was herself a *persona grata* with the army, and that Agathocles bestows a money gift on the troops to obliterate the memory of similar gifts from her such as the impugned statement in 3 Macc. describes? It is interesting to see that the populace was by no means appeased by this and other measures. Agathocles himself paid the penalty of his life, and yet another incident reveals the hold which Arsinoe had over the hearts of her friends. "At the same

time some young girls *who had been brought up with Arsinoe*, having learnt that Philammon, the chief agent in the murder of that queen, had arrived three days before from Cyrene, rushed to his house; forced their way in; killed Philammon with stones and sticks; strangled his infant son; and, not content with this, dragged his wife naked into the street, and put her to death." It is hard in the light of such a popular veneration for Arsinoe, a veneration evidently gained in her youth, to maintain that the author of 3 Macc. may not have had in his mind a well-authenticated popular tradition when he assigned to her so important a rôle at the Battle of Raphia. As to the large sum promised by Arsinoe, in the event of victory, possibly she hoped to obtain it from the Syrian spoils. The Syrian kings were known to keep large reserves of gold for war (cf. Mahaffy, p. 197), and Arsinoe may have expected that Ptolemy would capture these. Besides the calculation that her offer applied to the whole 75,000 of Ptolemy's troops (as Grimm supposes) is probably an error. According to Polybius, it was Ptolemy's left wing which gave way. Hence, if Arsinoe addressed the rest of the troops after this partial defeat, she must have spoken only to the right wing on which were stationed the "Greek mercenaries." We do not know what proportion these formed of the whole army, but it is a not unnatural suggestion that her promise of two minas of gold each to the victors applied solely to them.

But we need not rely on conjecture. Instead of betraying ignorance, the author of 3 Macc. really displays much knowledge when he ascribes to Arsinoe the possession of considerable private treasures. The Egyptian princesses, says Mr. Mahaffy (p. 447), "seem to have had resources *always under their control*." Indeed one of the most remarkable facts in the history of the Ptolemies is the extraordinary wealth of the female members of the royal family. This would hardly have been inferred from Polybius, but is clearly proved by recent discoveries. The author of 3 Macc.

was evidently in possession of authentic information which Polybius either overlooked or could not obtain.

Let us now turn from this examination of the opening narrative of 3 Macc. to a passage which occurs towards the close. When the Jews, after their deliverance, returned home, we are told that they passed safely "over land, and sea, and river:" *ἀνέλυσαν ἀσινεῖς, ἐλεύθεροι, ὑπερχαρεῖς, διά τε γῆς καὶ θαλάσσης καὶ ποταμοῦ ἀνασωζόμενοι τῇ τοῦ βασιλέως ἐπιταγῇ, ἕκαστος εἰς τὴν ἰδίαν* (3 Macc. vii. 20). These words have been severely attacked. "There was no sea to cross in Egypt," says Mr. Bissel; "and the author was probably betrayed into this inconsistency by his straining after effect." Grimm said the same thing before him: "In Aegypten war kein *Meer* zu durchschiffen. In diesen groben Verstoss verfiel der Erzähler durch sein Haschen nach poetischer Schilderei." If, however, we follow the route which, according to the author of 3 Macc., the Jews took on their return to their Egyptian homes, it will appear that the author was perfectly accurate. The Jews all started together from Alexandria, and proceeded up the Nile or the natural Canal, and only parted company on reaching Ptolemais (3 Macc. vii. 17). This Ptolemais, as Grimm rightly points out, is not the great Ptolemais in Upper Egypt, but the nearer city of the same name, which was probably an anchoring-place on the Nile in Central Egypt. It was the "Ptolemais at the harbour," where, according to the Petrie Papyri (Mahaffy, 212), was situated the *βασιλικὴ κατάλυσις*. This and Crocodilopolis were the chief towns of the district. If some of the Jews lived in the Fayyum, they were bound to cross Lake Moeris in order to reach their homes. Now the Petrie Papyri (I, p. 43) establish the fact that in the settlement of the Fayyum Jews were allowed to found villages by Ptolemy I, and (this is of importance to another branch of my argument) the Jews of the Fayyum were not quite on a par with the Greeks. "Mr. Grenfell, among the papyri he acquired in 1895, has shown me," says Mr. Mahaffy (p. 86 n.), "one from the

Fayyum, speaking of the σαββαθιον (synagogue) of Aristippus, son of Jakoub, no doubt in Samaria there." (See p. 175 below). In another from Luxor a Jew named Danooul is mentioned. Both of these are of the second century B. C. Hence it is quite clear that some of the Jews must have resided on the other side of Lake Moeris at the time of Philopator. It will be sufficient to say that in the light of new discoveries the old belief in the extensive surface of this piece of water is fully confirmed. Strabo regarded the great lake as having once formed part of the sea, and it is at all events not improbable that, though an earlier Queen Arsinoe, in 262 B. C., reclaimed some of the district, the present lake, with a far higher level than at present, covered, in Philopator's time, some of the area now under cultivation. This, I suggest, is the "sea" alluded to so appropriately by the author of 3 Macc. as having been crossed immediately after leaving Ptolemais. In support of this theory, I cannot refrain from quoting a rather longer passage from Mr. Mahaffy's description of the lake and its approaches from the Nile (p. 173):—

When the train leaving Wasta on the Nile has passed a long cutting in the desert, through the saddle of high ground separating the oasis of Arsinoe from the Nile Valley, the traveller suddenly looks down upon a band of the richest green—orchards, gardens, farms—which extends north and south as far as the eye can reach; from its east border he looks downward about five or six miles, till the gradual slope reaches a long, very blue lake, stretched out as the western boundary of the oasis, and beyond it the amber mountains of the Libyan desert rising abruptly from its shores. The scene is one of strange and unexpected beauty, and probably the most fascinating in all Egypt. There is now little doubt that the lake at the bottom of this oasis, which lies far deeper than the level of the sea—not to say the low Nile—is fed by the same sort of supply that fertilizes the other oases—a deep underground drainage from the mountains far south in Africa. But at present this lake is brackish, its banks far round the eastern shore are salt marshes, not fit for cultivation, and only inhabited here and there by wild fishermen, who reap the harvest of the well-stocked water.

This lake, as it now stands, is of course useless to the irrigation of the district, except to hold surplus water sent down to it. There is

no possible escape but evaporation, as it, like the Dead Sea in Palestine, is far below the level of the Mediterranean. But along the upper rim of the eastern side, the traveller coming in from Wasta finds the ample supply of the so-called Bahr Yusuf, a natural canal which leaves the Nile far away south, and runs like an independent river in its own channel. As soon as it arrives over against the Fayyum [this, I should add, would be just at the Ptolemais of 3 Macc.], it is diverted into channels running south-west, west, north-west, in curved lines, so that on the map the district seems to have a hollow cup shape. All these various arteries amply irrigate a large area, and finally make their way, sometimes through ravines, and even by waterfalls, to the lake. But yet most of the downward slope is very gradual, and the whole aspect from the desert near the Nile is, not that of a cup, but of a crescent-shaped salad-plate, deepening very gradually as it reaches the outer rim, and holding in the bottom of this curved depression the water of the lake. . . .

Now the ancients who describe the place, Herodotus, Diodorus, Strabo, give a wholly different account. Though the two latter speak of the great fertility of the province (which Herodotus does not), they all agree that the lake, which they describe as one of enormous size, was designed or applied not to make a fertile province here, but to hold surplus water from the Nile, and give it back again when the inundation fell, thus irrigating middle and lower Egypt, below the point of exit (somewhere near the present Wasta). The old Lake Moeris, therefore, which they saw, or may have seen, must have been very much higher than the present lake. Instead of being far below the level, even of the sea, it must have been below the level of the low Nile. Either therefore the Lake Moeris of antiquity was an artificial lake, made at the high level, where the Bahr Yusuf enters the oasis, and separated by a large declining slope of land from the present lake, or the present lake must then have covered almost the whole of the Fayyum. The former is the French theory set forth by Linant Bey; the latter that of the English, supported in Major Brown's recent book.

Whichever theory be true, at all events it seems clear to me that the author of 3 Macc. was guilty of no *groben Verstoss* when he represented a section of his Jews as having left the river and "crossed the sea" after reaching Ptolemais on the Nile, or the Bahr Yusuf.

The temptation to linger over details must, however, be abandoned, and some more general considerations suggested, again, by Mr. Mahaffy's new data, in favour of

the authenticity of 3 Macc., must be examined. The evidence for something like a persecution of the Jews in the reign of Ptolemy Philopator is too strong to be resisted. The persecution was not religious, but the error of 3 Macc. merely represents the popular Jewish estimation of Ptolemy's attempt to intrude within the inner recesses of the Temple. (Cf. Daniel xi. 12 a.) Ptolemy Philopator was not only a debauchee; he was an extravagant and luxurious builder, fond, as Athenaeus tells us, of constructing huge and costly ships. M. Revillout has explained the lengths to which debasing of the coinage proceeded in his reign (cf. Mahaffy, *Greek Life and Thought*, p. 486). Ptolemy Philopator must have needed money, and he may very well have thought of despoiling Jerusalem when his hopes of gaining Antiochus' treasures failed. For after the Battle of Raphia, Ptolemy, in the language of Polybius, "being thoroughly satisfied with his unexpected success, and generally at his unlooked for acquisition of Coele-Syria, he was by no means indisposed to peace; but even more inclined to it than he ought to have been: influenced in that direction by the habitual effeminacy and corruption of his manner of living. Accordingly, when Antipater and his colleague arrived, after some little bluster and vituperation of Antiochus, for what had taken place, he agreed to a truce for a year . . . and started with his sister and friends for Alexandria." What is more likely than that on the way, Ptolemy, attracted by the artistic beauty of the Temple of Jerusalem, should also have planned the despoiling of its treasures, in order to replenish his coffers? We can gain an incidental confirmation of this from the strange narrative of Josephus, with regard to the nephew of the High Priest Onias, and Philopator's predecessor. Whatever may be thought of this narrative (*Antiquities*, XII, 494), one point comes out clearly. An effort was already being made by Ptolemy III to increase the taxation of Judea. This Judean youth visits Alexandria, and is present at the auction of the taxes of Coele-Syria,

Phoenicia, Samaria, and Judea. Josephus' narrative continues at this point as follows:—"Now when the day came on which the king was to farm the taxes of the cities, and those that were the men of principal dignity in their several countries bid for them, the sum of what was bidden for the taxes of Coele-Syria, Phoenicia, Judea, and Samaria, amounted altogether to 8,000 talents. Thereupon Joseph accused the bidders of having agreed together to estimate the value of the taxes at too low a rate, and promised that he would himself give twice as much for them, and for those who did not pay, he would send the king their whole substance, for this privilege was also sold with the taxes [and usually formed the perquisite of the farmer]. The king was pleased to hear that offer, and because it augmented his revenues, he said he would confirm the sale of the taxes to him." The Jews, however, remained faithful to Egypt in its wars with Syria, for this increase of taxation did not fall entirely on them, and moreover, the pill was gilded by the honour shown in this preference of a Judean over other bidders. But in the next reign, the fidelity of the Jews has vanished. They no longer side with Egypt, and despite the victory of Ptolemy Philopator over Antiochus III, they transfer their allegiance to the latter. This was an extraordinary change, for the Jews had been for upwards of a century devotedly attached to their Egyptian lords. Some explanation is needed for this change. Mere fickleness, as Polybius suggests, is an insufficient theory, for the Jews had not been fickle to the first three Ptolemies. The psychological need of a persecution surely agrees too well with the story of 3 Macc. for us to reject the explanation which the latter so readily supplies.

What the persecution really was may be conjectured with some ease by reading between the lines of 3 Macc. It began with a pecuniary extortion, and perhaps culminated in a policy of degradation which had to be met by great pecuniary sacrifices on the part of the Alexandrian

Jews. The tendency to ascribe the rescue to a supernatural agency is quite in keeping with Hellenistic Jewish practice. Just as the Jewish Sibyl puts in her appearance at Alexandria, so the author of 3 Macc. introduces us to the thoroughly Greek and very un-Jewish apparitions who come to the rescue in the hippodrome. How thoroughly Hellenistic, how like 2 Macc., and how *unlike* the Jewish 1 Macc., is this: *τότε ὁ μεγαλόδοξος παντοκράτωρ καὶ ἀληθινὸς θεός, ἐπιφάνας τὸ ἅγιον αὐτοῦ πρόσωπον, ἠνέῳξε τὰς οὐρανίους πύλας, ἐξ ὧν δεδοξασμένοι δύο φοβεροειδεῖς ἄγγελοι κατέβησαν φανεροὶ πᾶσι πλὴν τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις, καὶ ἀντέστησαν, καὶ τὴν δύναμιν τῶν ὑπεναντίων ἐπλήρωσαν ταραχῆς καὶ δειλίας, καὶ ἀκινήτοις ἔδησαν πέδαις. καὶ ὑπόφρικον καὶ τὸ τοῦ βασιλέως σῶμα ἐγενήθη, καὶ λήθη τὸ θράσος αὐτοῦ τὸ βαρύθυμον ἔλαβε.* It almost looks as though this phrase *πλὴν τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις* was intended to silence Jewish eye-witnesses who might have denied that any such angels appeared.

But, I repeat, though the sophistication is here obvious enough, the writer has a way of revealing the authenticity of his story amid its impossibilities or exaggerations. We can with a little trouble discover exactly the designs which Ptolemy Philopator may have formed against the Jews of Egypt, but which he abandoned, no doubt for a substantial consideration. The author of 3 Macc. unfolds Ptolemy's motives in two passages. First comes the threat (ii. 28): *πάντας δὲ τοὺς Ἰουδαίους εἰς λαογραφίαν καὶ οἰκετικὴν διάθεσιν ἀχθῆναι, τοὺς δὲ ἀντιλέγοντας βίᾳ φερομένους τοῦ ζῆν μεταστῆσαι.* The other passage is contained in the concocted letter of Ptolemy, which seems to contain at least one element of truth, viz. (iii. 20): *ἡμεῖς δὲ τῇ τούτων ἀνοίᾳ συμπεριενεχθέντες, καὶ μετὰ νίκης διακομισθέντες, καὶ εἰς τὴν Αἴγυπτον τοῖς πᾶσιν ἔθνεσι φιλανθρώπως ἀπαντήσαντες, καθὼς ἔπρεπεν ἐποιήσαμεν. ἐν δὲ τούτοις πρὸς τοὺς ὁμοφύλους αὐτῶν ἀμνησικακίαν ἅπασι γνωρίζοντες, διά τε τὴν συμμαχίαν καὶ τὰ πεπιστευμένα μετὰ ἁπλότητος αὐτοῖς ἀρχῆθεν μύρια πράγματα τολμήσαντες ἐξαλλοιῶσαι, ἐβουλήθημεν καὶ πολιτείας αὐτοὺς Ἀλεξανδρέων καταξιῶσαι καὶ μετόχους τῶν ἀεὶ ἱερέων καταστῆσαι . . . οὐ μόνον ἀπεστρέψαντο τὴν*

ἀτίμητον πολιτείαν, ἀλλὰ καὶ βδελύσσονται λόγῳ τε καὶ σιγῇ τοὺς ἐν αὐτοῖς ὀλίγους πρὸς ἡμᾶς γνησίως διακειμένους, παρ' ἕκαστα ὑφορώμενοι διὰ τῆς δυσκλεεστάτης ἐμβιώσεως διὰ τάχους ἡμᾶς καταστρέψαι τὰ κατορθώματα.

I am far from asserting that Prof. Mahaffy's discoveries have rendered these passages completely lucid. But so much has been revealed that it would argue considerable obtusity in a critic who would fail to recognize that there breathes over these statements of 3 Macc. an air of literal truth. First about Mr. Mahaffy's discovery, for it is nothing less, of what I may call an *Alexandrian citizenship* outside Alexandria. That the Alexandrian citizenship entailed distinct privileges has long been known, but it is only recently that this particular citizenship has been found to apply to others than those resident in Alexandria. I would particularly point to the Fayyum, because we have already seen that Jews were settled in that district with the enjoyment of considerable privileges. But they held no land, and were not on an equality with the Macedonian veterans or κληροῦχοι. These veterans retained their Alexandrian rights under Ptolemy II, "for they speak in their wills of the furnished house in Alexandria, 100 miles distant. No doubt this enabled them to retain the privileges of that sort of citizenship" (Mahaffy, p. 77). The rights conferred were (1) the freedom from poll-tax; (2) freedom from indirect taxes on stores and oils, as is shown from the Revenue Papyrus, cols. 61 seq., where the formula frequently occurs: και ωστε εις την εν Αλεξανδρειαι διαθεσιν ου τελος ουθεν πραξεται. The Fayyum Jews were on a different footing. They seem to have paid the poll-tax (λαογραφίαν κ.τ.λ., 3 Macc. ii. 28), and certainly must have been subject to dues on commodities, for the Fayyum Jews were entirely engaged in trade and not in agriculture. Now the passage I have just cited from 3 Macc. fits in admirably with this. The Fayyum Jews were offered by Ptolemy certain privileges which shall constitute them "Alexandrian citizens." It will be clearly seen that

Ptolemy throughout is represented as dealing with the Egyptian Jews who lived outside Alexandria, and the use of the word "sea" in the passage discussed above, leads me to infer that he was chiefly thinking of the Jewish settlers in the Fayyum district. That Ptolemy's innovation was mainly concerned with non-Alexandrians is clear enough from the whole tenor of 3 Macc., the chief element of interest being the accumulation of masses of country Jews in the capital. Thus ch. iii opens: *ἃ καὶ μεταλαμβάνων ὁ δυσσεβὴς ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον ἐχόλησεν ὥστε οὐ μόνον τοῖς κατ' Ἀλεξάνδρειαν διοργίζεσθαι, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς ἐν τῇ χώρᾳ βαρυτέρως ἐναντιωθῆναι.* From ch. iv. verses 11 seq. it appears that the Alexandrian Jews were, at least in the first instance, less concerned than their brethren in the country, and in chs. vi and vii the Alexandrians are quite forgotten and the whole interest centres in the country Jews. How the narrative ignores them is seen from these passages of chs. vi and vii. The king entertains *the Jews* after their triumph: then (apparently *all* the Jews involved) *ἐνέτυχον δὲ τῷ βασιλεῖ, τὴν ἀπόλυσιν αὐτῶν εἰς τὰ ἴδια αἰτούμενοι* (vi. 37). Again, he issues a favourable proclamation but (again *all* the Jews involved are tacitly meant): *Λαβόντες δὲ τὴν ἐπιστολὴν ταύτην, οὐκ ἐσπούδασαν εὐθέως γενέσθαι περὶ τὴν ἄφοδον* (vii. 10). But subsequently: *αὐτοὶ δὲ οἱ μέχρι θανάτου τὸν Θεὸν ἐσχηκότες, παντελῆ σωτηρίας ἀπόλαυσιν εἰληφότες, ἀνέζευξαν ἐκ τῆς πόλεως παντοίοις εὐωδεστάτοις ἄνθεσι κατεστεμμένοι μετ' εὐφροσύνης καὶ βοῆς, ἐν αἴνοις καὶ παμμελέσιν ὕμνοις εὐχαριστοῦντες τῷ Θεῷ τῶν πατέρων αὐτῶν αἰωνίῳ σωτῆρι τοῦ Ἰσραήλ. παραγενηθέντες δὲ εἰς Πτολεμαΐδα κ.τ.λ.* (vii. 16 seq.).

This thrusting of the Alexandrian Jews into the background quite falls in with the suggestion I have made. Ptolemy, for various reasons which it is not hard to understand, was very desirous of simplifying the organization of the Fayyum, and in order to do this may (for a lump sum down in place of the poll-tax) have offered the "Alexandrian citizenship" to the Jews resident out-

side the city[1]. But as a condition of ἰσοπολιτεία, in the public mind at least, the worship of the national gods was essential. The old Alexandrian Jews had evaded this condition, but in the new birth of regard for local feelings on matters of religion which characterizes Ptolemy IV, the king may have been unwilling to permit this relaxation to newly-admitted citizens. It may have occurred to him to find a vent for his irritation at the indignity he received in Jerusalem, by insisting more stringently than he need have done on this condition. There is some confusion here, for the author evidently cannot make up his mind whether a "stigma" (ii. 27) or a "privilege" (iii. 21) was intended by Ptolemy. Perhaps the king did not know himself. We may rely upon it that the Jews were heavily fined and perhaps ill-treated so severely as to give rise to the story of a cruel persecution. I will add just one word in confirmation of a portion of the previous argument. In iii. 21 (already quoted above) the king declares that he had two objects, (1) to confer on the Jews (of the country districts) the "Alexandrian citizenship," and (2) μετόχους τῶν ἀεὶ ἱερειῶν (this is I believe the correct reading; cf. Mahaffy, p. 261 n.) καταστῆσαι. I take this sentence to mean that Ptolemy wished the Jews to accept citizenship through the road of conformity with the national religion. To this extent only was his treatment of the Jews a religious persecution. As to the pecuniary oppression implied somehow in Ptolemy Philopator's proposed change of the Jewish status, the Jews were perhaps only under this monarch beginning to feel the pressure of the complicated bureaucratic rule, which exploited the whole country for the benefit of the royal exchequer.

I. ABRAHAMS.

[1] Cf. the similar desire of Antiochus IV "to register the inhabitants of Jerusalem as citizens of Antioch" (2 Macc. iv. 9).

CHRISTIAN DEMONOLOGY.

II.

WE have next to consider the beliefs of Origen, the most philosophical of the Fathers of the Church, who reflects the opinion of the cultivated Alexandrian Church during the first half of the third century.

Origen's views.

According to Origen [1], the problem of the beginning of evil is so bound up with that of the revolt of the Devil and his so-called angels, that it cannot be understood apart therefrom. Without, however, going deeper into the question of first beginnings, Origen is content to state that the Devil was not always the Devil, and that the demons are creatures of God, so far forth as they are in a manner rational beings (λογικοί τινες).

Demons evil.

That all demons are evil, says Origen [2], is an opinion held not only by us (i. e. by Christians), but by nearly every one who affirms their existence at all. And as they are all bad, it cannot be said that all things have their law from the Supreme God. For the demons, through their own wickedness and badness, have fallen away from the divine law and follow the law of sin.

Demons half material.

These demons have cajoled men into worshipping them, have taken names which their votaries are careful to ascertain; and they have various powers [3] and favourite charms and herbs which they individually prefer, as well as different forms which admit of symbolical portraiture on engraved stones. We see that Origen attributed outward form and also bodies of

[1] *C. Cels.* bk. iv. § 65. [2] Ibid. vii. 69. [3] Ibid. viii. 61.

a kind to demons: "their body," he says[1], "is naturally subtile and thin as air (*naturaliter subtile et velut aura tenue*); wherefore many opine them to be incorporeal." In the New Testament, as we saw, demons are held to be without flesh or bones, and so far incorporeal. Nor is Origen really in conflict with this opinion, for his demons are made of the "material spirit" (*ex spiritu materiali*), of which Tertullian[2] had declared all angels—good and bad alike—to consist.

Demons haunt the lower air.

The grossness, says Origen, of many sorts (παχύτητες) which they contract from earth[3] and from the myriad evils of earth, weigh down the demons[4] and prevent their rising from the earthly localities, which they have chosen, into the purer and more divine regions of the sky. So far, however, as they do haunt the air[5], they cause plagues and droughts and bad seasons, and the rough weather in which the poor mariners perish. All such demons are averted by the death of the one just Messiah, an act of self-sacrifice which Origen does not hesitate to parallel from the similar acts of those who of old allowed themselves to be sacrificed to avert plagues or bad harvests or adverse winds. It is these aerial demons also that make revelations to man by means of augury.

On the other hand, many of them are cast down and punished with imprisonment under ground. And of such the hot springs[6] that well up in many places were the tears, according to Celsus, the assailant of Christianity, with whom Origen was not inclined to differ on such a point.

They haunt temples and altars.

The localities[7] most affected by demons are, says Origen, temples and shrines, where incense is burned and blood offerings made. For the demons are not so immaterial as that they can do without food[8], and they find it in the fumes and reek and blood

[1] *De Princ.* i. 95 (ed. Redepen). [2] *C. Marc*, lib. 2.
[3] *C. Cels.* iii. 36. [4] *Exh. ad Martyr.* 45. [5] *C. Cels.* i. 31.
[6] Ibid. v. 52. [7] Ibid. vii. 35, 64. [8] Ibid. vii. 56.

of the slaughtered animals[1]. Here note that the Jewish idea of the blood being the life recurs. The blood, says Origen, is separated from the flesh before we eat it, for fear lest demons be nurtured on it along with ourselves.

Things strangled.

This, he says, is why the Word forbids Christians to eat things strangled. For the blood, he says, is rightly held to be the food of the demons (*τροφὴ δαιμόνων*).

The grounds upon which the Clementine *Recognitions* (bk. iv, ch. 18) inculcate fasting and strict abstinence from over-eating are similar. If we over-eat, the demons enter into us with the food which we cannot digest. And when we eat things offered to idols, says the same book, the demon or evil spirit, which by the heathen rites has been put into the food, enters therewith directly into our bodies. Thus the demons batten on the souls of the victims slain, and the gods of the heathen[2] are gluttonous demons (*λίχνα δαιμόνια*). Thus the slaughter of victims is in itself enough to lure the demons to the heathen temples. But even without that, they can be attracted to a place and *laid*[3] therein by use of certain incantations and black arts (*κατακλίσεις δι' ἐπῳδῶν καὶ μαγγανειῶν*).

Why wicked to sacrifice to demons.

Unless the demons have the blood and reek of sacrifice to snuff and lick up, they grow weak and torpid and impotent for evil[4]. Hence the peculiar wickedness of sacrificing to them, as do apostates in time of persecution. Such renegades give a fillip to the life of the demons that are the unseen foes of mankind, and so commit a worse sin than if they fed and kept brigands and outlaws and other visible enemies of the emperor and of society.

Celsus inspired by demons.

On such grounds Origen explains the enmity of Celsus, the early critic of Christianity, towards the faith. He was inspired by some hungry demon, whose altar had been forsaken, and who was

[1] *C. Cels.* viii. 30.
[2] Ibid. iii. 37.
[3] Ibid. iii. 34; vii. 64, 69; viii. 61.
[4] *Exh. ad Martyr.* 45.

therefore suffering starvation through the preaching of Christ [1]. The demons, says Origen, equally instigate emperors and senate to persecute [2], in order to destroy a religion which threatens to starve them out. But every martyr that resists administers a blow to the demons from which they do not recover for a long time. Hence the long intervals between great persecutions. Again, the sorrow displayed by judges when a martyr suffers torture, and their joy when he recants, is not due to human sympathy on their part, but is a reflex of the emotions felt by the demons on such occasions.

Jesus intolerant of all demons.

Like Justin Martyr, his predecessor, Origen regards the main work of Jesus as having lain in his successful struggle with the demons, who after his advent no more held undisputed sway over mankind [3]. "The voluntary death and self-sacrifice of Jesus, of the one just man for the many, in a mysterious way averts and turns away the activity of the evil demons." And Origen loves to dwell on the exclusiveness, or, as some moderns might put it, the intolerance of the Christian religion. No half-allegiance was allowable. The demons might be and were tolerant of each other's honours and activity; Heracles is not jealous of the cult of Pollux, nor Jupiter of Apollo's; but Jesus aspired to sole empire over men's souls, and so forbade the cult of any god or hero other than himself [4]. And in him, says Origen, the demons recognize their conqueror [5], in his name an influence with which they cannot cope. Echoing the statement of St. Peter in the Acts, Origen declares that in every cure which he wrought, Jesus destroyed myriads of demons [6].

Counter kingdom of evil spirits.

Thus an Homeric war is in Origen's mind for ever being waged between God and his angels on the one side, and the Devil and his demons on the other. In this war every man must take a

[1] *C. Cels.* vii. 56. [2] Ibid. viii. 43, 44. [3] Ibid. i. 31.
[4] Ibid. iii. 35. [5] Ibid. iii. 36. [6] Cp. Acts x. 38.

side[1]; and if he will only brave the enmity of the demons, he will secure the support and aid of all the powers of good.

From the fact that Christ's mission was primarily to save man from the demons, Origen also derives an argument against Docetism, i. e. the early belief that Jesus was only a man in semblance and not in reality. Christ must have come in the flesh and was no mere appearance, because otherwise he could not have got at the demons, so to speak, on their own ground; for demons[2] are not afraid of the name of a mere phantasm (*φάσμα*). St. Athanasius (*de Incarn.*, Migne, xxv. p. 140) goes further in the same path of reasoning, and argues that Jesus was crucified rather than decapitated or sawn asunder, because the Ruler of the Power of Evil dwells in the air, and he only that is crucified dies in the air. By so dying *aloft*, the Lord cast down the Devil "like a flash of lightning," purified the air, and so "cleared for us a road by which we may mount to heaven." Just because he came[3] to liberate all who are oppressed by the devil (Acts x. 38), Jesus declared (John xvi. 11) that "now is the prince of this world judged." And Christians, continues Origen, still have a remedy against demons: they can drive them by prayer and lessons (*μαθήματα*) from Holy Scripture, not only out of men's souls, but—and mark this—out of animals as well[4]. For demons often conspire for the ruin of animals as well as of human beings.

The Jews had believed, and Origen hardly disputed this point with them, that circumcision averted the activity of a malign angel or demon. But ever since the advent of Jesus, circumcision had lost this magic efficacy[5].

Exorcism through the name.

It was now the calling out of the name of Jesus[6] along with the recitation of the histories about him, and nothing else, which drove the demons out of men, especially when the reciters recited them

[1] *C. Cels.* viii. 64. [2] Ibid. vii. 35. [3] Ibid. viii. 54.
[4] Ibid. vii. 67. [5] Ibid. v. 48. [6] Ibid. i. 6.

honestly and with genuine belief. Such a formula of exorcism we quoted above from Justin, and the constant use of the *name* to exorcise demons in the church of his age is testified to by Origen in no less than six passages in the single work against Celsus. Of these I select the following: "Even still the name of Jesus takes away ecstasies or fits of madness (ἐκστάσεις) from the minds of men, and expels demons, yea, and diseases as well[1]." And this: "The Creator of all things[2] . . . ordained him (Jesus) to deserve honour not only from such men as desire to be right minded, but also from demons and other unseen powers. Demons and men alike up to the present time display respectively either their fear of the name of Jesus as stronger than themselves, or their reverential acquiescence in his rule as in accordance with their laws."

Origen's experience of demons cast out.

"For unless Christ's nature and composition (σύστασις) had been bestowed on him from God, the demons would never yield to the mere mention of his name, and retire from the victims of their enmity." "There are those," he says in yet another passage[3], "who in their cures show clearly that they have acquired, through this faith of ours, miraculous powers; for they invoke over those who need to be healed nothing else except the Supreme God and the name of Jesus along with the history of him." Elsewhere he attests[4] that he had with his own eyes seen miracles thus worked by Christians.

We may ask: Why had the name of Jesus such effect? Why had certain other titles the same, in particular that of "God of Abraham, God of Isaac, God of Jacob," at the mention of which, says Origen (in agreement with Justin), the demons are cowed and overcome? The reason assigned by Origen is sufficiently simple. The unseen powers, he declares, *must* come when they are called—whether it be God or Christ

Explanation of use of name.

[1] *C. Cels.* i. 67. [2] Ibid. iii. 36. [3] Ibid. iii. 24.
[4] Ibid. ii. 8; i. 2, 26; vii. 4; viii. 58.

or Demon that is invoked—provided only they be properly addressed and by their true names, and in a tongue which they are familiar with and understand.

Certain sounds and syllables, says Origen[1], and certain titles pronounced with aspiration or without, pronounced long or short, bring at once to us, by some incomprehensible nature inherent in them, the persons summoned. For names are not conventionally (*θέσει*) given to the things they denote, but belong to them by a natural and highly mysterious affinity. It is in accordance with a certain ineffable analogy (*ἀπόρρητος λόγος*) that the names of Sabaoth or Adonai have been assigned to God[2]; or those of Michael, Gabriel, and Raphael to certain angels. "The same abstruse philosophy of names is," adds Origen, "respected and observed by our Jesus also, whose name has ere now been plainly seen to drive thousands of demons out of souls and bodies by its energy and inner influence working upon those from whom the devils were driven." We see most clearly from such a passage as this, that the use of the name of Jesus Christ in prayers and exorcisms was in Origen's regard the same in principle as the use of any other name in Jewish and pagan formulae. The sole difference was that devils were more afraid of Christ, their future judge, than they were of Jupiter or Solomon.

Each Power to be called by its right name,

It is therefore sinful, argues Origen, to suppose with Celsus that Zeus is but another name for the Highest God[3]. For it is right to call God by no other names than those of Sabaoth, Adonai, Saddai, or, again, by the title of God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, by which Moses, the servant of God and the prophets, and our Lord knew Him. Zeus is merely the title of a greedy and incompetent demon, and to apply it to God would be the direst blasphemy. In spite of such purism, however, Origen[4] would allow inhabitants of the Scythian desert and other barbarians to call

[1] *Exh. ad Martyr.* § 46.
[2] *C. Cels.* i. 25.
[3] *Exh. ad Martyr.* § 46.
[4] *C. Cels.* v. 46.

God by the names, e.g. Pappaeus, assigned in their vernaculars, just because they mean well and know no better.

and not by a paraphrase.

Nor, he insists, in invoking God is it well to call him by a paraphrase. For example, in any incantation, no matter whose, the name Sabaoth followed by the connatural train of words (*συμφυοῦς εἱρμοῦ*), and with such titles added as skilful exorcists are acquainted with, will effect a result; but if, instead of Sabaoth, we substitute the Greek paraphrase of the Hebrew word, and say, "Lord of powers," then no effect will be produced. And the same rule, continues Origen[1], applies to demons as to the Most High God. If a demon or a man has a Greek name from birth, we can only cause him to do or suffer something by adhering to that name. We must not translate it into Egyptian or Latin. Conversely in incantations, you must not translate a Latin name into Greek. If you do, it becomes nerveless and impotent. Hence a general rule[2]: every demon must be addressed by his local name; and some have Egyptian, and others Persian designations. And these names have, says Origen, a certain potency, if pronounced with the string of titles connatural to them (*λεγόμενα μετά τινος τοῦ συμφυοῦς αὐτοῖς εἱρμοῦ*)[3], as the wise men of the Egyptians, or the Brahmans of India or Samanaei, well know how to do. For so-called magic, says Origen, is far from being the unsubstantial thing which Epicurean and Aristotelian sceptics imagine it to be. On the contrary, it is a very substantial reality, and has mysterious doctrines (*λόγους*) known to very few. After adducing such arguments as these from the Fathers of the Church, I hope I shall not be accused of irreverence, when later on I assimilate the use of the name of Jesus Christ to ancient magic in general. Origen is not the only Father who so assimilates it. I merely follow the example set by them.

[1] *C. Cels.* v. 45. [2] Ibid. i. 25. [3] Ibid. i. 24.

Relation of sound to thing.

Just because proper names are not accidental, and because the qualities and peculiarities of sounds, quite apart from their meanings, have in themselves a certain potency in regard to one reality or another, it is plainly wrong, argues Origen [1], for Christians to call God Zeus, or by any other foreign name. And they are ready to die rather than do so. For to do so, would only gratify the demons who are longing to be called by a more exalted name than really belongs to them, just because it gratifies their ambition.

Professional exorcists.

Origen further tells us [2], that in his day even private and unprofessional persons (*ἰδιῶται*) could expel demons from men's souls and bodies by mere prayer and simple kinds of adjurations, without recourse to wizardry or magic, or any use of drugs and potions. The stress here laid on the fact that *unprofessional* exorcism was so successful, implies that there was already a recognized order of exorcists in the Christian Church, though we only read of them for the first time in the Canons of the Council of Antioch [3]. But, as we saw above, Justin Martyr testifies [4] to their existence both among the pagans and Jews as a regular order. Such a regular order of exorcists must of necessity soon have arisen also in the Church, since in baptism the evil spirits in a catechumen had to be driven out before the Holy Spirit could enter into him; in accordance with what we learned from Hermas, there is no room in the same vessel for both at once. Thus Cyril [5] of Jerusalem says that without exorcism the soul cannot be purged (*ἄνευ ἐπορκισμοῦ οὐ δύναται καθαρθῆναι ψυχή*). And the terms *Purgari et Baptizari* are conjoined in the Sentent. Episcop. of the Council of Carthage, A.D. 256 [6].

In the Apostolic Constitutions [7] it is decreed that the exorcists be not ordained, unless their services are wanted as bishop, presbyter, or deacon. The reason given is that

[1] *C. Cels.* i. 25. [2] Ibid. vii. 4. [3] Can. 10, Conc. An.
[4] Justin M., *Apol.* ii. 6, p. 45; *Dial.* 311 D. [5] *Procat.* 9.
[6] Cypr. Ed. Hartl. p. 441. [7] *Const. Apost.* 8, Can. 26.

the power of expelling demons and the χάρισμα, or grace of healings, are declared by the revelation of God, and depend on the visitation of the Holy Spirit. Septimius[1] assails certain heretical women for daring to exorcise. In Origen's age the professional exorcists were fairly numerous in the Roman church, and seem to have formed a regular grade. For Eusebius[2] records that in the middle of the third century (A. D. 251) there were in Rome fifty-two exorcists with readers and doorkeepers, to forty-six presbyters. In all the Christian churches we find regular rituals of exorcism, to be used as occasion requires. In the Eastern churches, and more rarely in the Latin communion, they are still in use.

Exorcism in English Church.

There used to be a ritual of exorcism in the English Prayer-book, but for many generations it has ceased to be printed in it. So thoroughly has the old belief in possession by demons faded out of the minds of our cultivated classes. We must go to our ritualistic priests, or to the wildest and most superstitious parts of Ireland, if we would still find in existence a belief upon which, nevertheless, almost more than on any other, early Christianity hinged, and which, though forgotten, still underlies the rite of Baptism.

The idea that sickness is due to Satan is also traceable in the Order for the Visitation of the Sick, in which the minister prays to God to defend the sick "from the danger of the enemy." But in the rest of this very beautiful and touching service the sufferer is assured that his sickness is God's visitation.

The exorcism was effected in the early Church not only by adjuration and use of the name along with short recitals of the history of Jesus, but the touch and afflatus, or on-breathing, of the exorcist was necessary. The Arabic Canons of Hippolytus (Canon 19, § 6, and Canon 29) further enjoin the exorcist, after the adjurations, to sign with the cross the breast, forehead, ears, and mouth of the

[1] *De Praescr. Haeret.* cap. 41. [2] *H. E.* vi. 43.

person afflicted. Lactantius (*Div. Inst.* iv. 27) refers to the use of the *signum passionis* or cross in exorcism. The patient lay flat on the ground (Origen, *Hom. in Matt.* 13, § 7). In the *Directorium Anglicanum*, a manual for the use of the English Church, we find a form given from the Exeter pontifical for the exorcism of water, as follows: "I exorcise thee, creature of water, in the name of God the Father Almighty, and in the name of Jesus Christ His Son our Lord, and in the virtue of the Holy Ghost, to become water exorcised, to chase away all the power of the enemy, and to be able to uproot and overthrow the enemy himself and his apostate angels; by the virtue of the same Lord Jesus Christ, who will come to judge the quick and the dead, and the world by fire." Salt is similarly exorcised, and so also are even flowers before being used to decorate the Church, as witness the following, which, I am told, is commonly used on Palm Sunday in those English Churches of which the hierophants desire to re-introduce in England the superstitions of a bygone age. It is, with unconscious irony, called a formula of "Blessing of Flowers and Branches," and runs as follows: "I exorcise thee, creature of flowers and branches, in the name of God the Father Almighty, in the name of Jesus Christ His Son our Lord, and in the power of the Holy Ghost. Henceforth, thou whole might of the adversary, thou whole inroad of evil spirits, be rooted up and pulled out from these creatures of flowers and branches, that thou pursue not with thy wiles the footsteps of those hastening to attain unto the grace of God. Through Him, who shall come to judge the quick and the dead, the world by fire" (p. 327 of the *Directorium Anglicanum*, edited by F. G. Lee, 1866).

Cyril on Possession.

Before I pass to the evidences of demonological belief contained in Jewish literature, I venture to quote a description of demoniac possession such as was still to be witnessed in Jerusalem in the fourth century from Cyril, who was bishop and head of the

Christian community there from A. D. 351–380. He is distinguishing the several sorts of spirit, and how they should be called[1]. "If you speak of spirit in connexion with the human soul, you add 'of man,' and say, spirit (*pneuma*) of man. If you are speaking of the wind, you say, spirit of the storm (*pneuma kataigidos*). If of sin, you say, spirit of adultery. If you speak of the demon, you say, an impure spirit; that we may know what is in each case being spoken of, and not suppose that the Holy Spirit is in case. For the word spirit (*pneuma*) is a neutral one, and everything which has not a solid body is in general called spirit. And because the demons have not such bodies, they are called spirits."

"And," he continues, "there is a vast difference. For the unclean spirit, when it comes upon the soul of a man (and from such a visitation may the Lord preserve every soul of those that hear me, and of those who are absent), it comes like a blood-thirsty wolf ready to devour the lamb. Most fierce is its presence, overwhelming the sensation. The intellect is lost in darkness; and its assault is brutal, is the violent robbery of what belongs to another. For it takes forcible possession of, and uses as its own, another's body, and another's organ (? of speech). It throws down him who is standing up; for it is nearly allied to him that fell from heaven. It distorts the tongue. It twists awry the lips. Foam replaces language. Darkness covers the man. The eye is fixt wide open, and through it looks not forth the soul; and the wretched man throbs and trembles before death comes. Truly are the demons the enemies of men, treating them shamefully and pitilessly."

This is a powerful though distressing description of epileptic madness; and I only quote it in order to drive home my chief point, namely, that the demonological beliefs of the New Testament are absolutely the same as those of prior and subsequent ages. In Cyril's remarks preliminary to this description, we even have a mention

[1] Cyr. Al. c. I. xvi. 15.

of the spirit of the whirlwind which Jesus encountered on the Lake of Gennesaret, and, with the characteristic rebuke, "Be thou muzzled, be quiet," subdued, saving his disciples from a watery grave.

Not less interesting are Cyril's references to Exorcism. "Man," he writes just below[1], "as long as he carries about a body, has to struggle with many most fierce demons. And often the demon, who could not be restrained by many using iron manacles, is subdued by the words of prayer, by the power inherent in the Holy Spirit; and the simple in-blowing (*emphysema*) of the exorcist (*eporkizôn*) becomes a fire to the unseen foe."

Cyril on Exorcism.

Here once more we see that it was of fire that the demons were most afraid; and this was a belief extending far beyond Christian circles, as we shall see from the accounts preserved of the exorcismal triumphs of Apollonius of Tyana. In another passage[2], to which I have already referred, Cyril describes the use of *breathing* on the possessed, and compares the exorcist to a gold refiner. The human body is a crucible, the human soul is the gold hidden beneath the demonic dross. The breath of the exorcist strikes in terror by means of the Holy Spirit, and fans the smouldering spark of the soul into a flame. At once the hostile demon flees; but salvation remains behind along with hope of immortal life.

Such a passage as this agrees with Tertullian's references to *tactus et afflatus*, already cited, and no less with the rite of Baptism as practised in the Roman Church. It is clear that the *breath* of the exorcist was conceived to be itself the Holy Spirit, and not a mere symbol thereof. So also Jesus blew on his disciples and gave them the Holy Ghost.

In another passage[3] Cyril describes the use of the exorcised oil (*elaion eporkiston*). It went immediately before the descent into the pool or piscina. The catechumens were first stripped naked before all, "like Adam in Paradise," females no less

Use of exorcised oil.

[1] Cyr. Al. c. I. xvi. 19. [2] Ibid. *Procat.* 9. [3] C. M. 2, 3.

than males; they were then anointed with the exorcised oil from the crown of the head to the soles of the feet. The real purport of the anointing was to block up all pores and inlets of the body against the return of the evil spirits. Wherefore on a great occasion, when among Gentiles, St. Thomas, according to his early but gnostic acts (§ 5), anointed the top of his head, his nostrils, his ears, teeth, and the region of his heart. "In the same way," writes Cyril, "as the in-blowings of the saints and the invocation of the name of God burn up like a most powerful flame and rout the demons; so this exorcised oil also, through the invocation of God and prayer, acquires such a power, as not only to burn up and cleanse out the traces of sin, but also to chase away all the unseen powers of the Evil One."

Demons pictured as manikins.

And these powers do not seem to have been always invisible; for in old Christian representations of exorcisms the devils are pictured in their flight as little black manikins making off[1]. Why they should have been so small, I do not know; probably, like the soul at death, they were supposed to come out by the mouth of the possessed. Into the question of the representation of demons in later Christian art, I need not enter.

Evidence of Jewish Literature.

Necessity of reading N.T. in a critical spirit.

The Gospels are a tale told with touching simplicity of a man who went about doing good, who felt it his mission to heal the sick, to comfort the repentant sinner, and himself to suffer as an expiatory sacrifice for the sins of mankind. We have the records of many famous saints, but not of many who were quite free from pride and respect of persons. Many have affected a contempt for riches

[1] See woodcut in Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible*, art. Exorcism.

and fame, even for the shams of priests and the pedantry of divines. But few have really put away all this; and I can think of no other teacher, except perhaps the Buddha, who within a few years of his death was honoured with the title of the *sinless* servant of God, not only by personal followers, but by many who had never known him except in visions.

Such a record demands our reverence. But it is asked of us by the churches and orthodox sects, that in reading it we should also suppress our critical faculty. Not only are we told that we must believe in every incident narrated in the New Testament, but we are further to accept, without question, such dogmatic interpretations of the text as have been, long centuries ago, elaborated by the Catholic Church. The New Testament is thus put on a pedestal and invested with a dignity and sacro-sanctity which is not even claimed for the Old. For our leading divines of the present day, our Gores and our Farrars, our Swetes and our Temples, are willing to walk some way along the path of a more rational interpretation of the Old Testament; but from a similar treatment of the New they recoil. They cleave to the miraculous birth of Jesus, even when an ancient form of gospel turns up which clinches the many proofs of fabulous character which the Gospels already afforded. Jesus still walks upon the waters, raises the dead, converses on a mountain top with Moses and Elias, and feeds 5,000 hungry men upon nothing; he still issues alive and with restored flesh and blood from the tomb, and, with all his human and earthly appurtenances intact, ascends into heaven. No detail of this phantasmagoria is to be touched. They imagine that all doubts are silenced, because they have pushed back the date of the synoptic Gospels and of Acts, or rather of the previous materials used up in them, to within half a century of the death of Jesus. For they cannot realize that the general psychological conditions of orientals, the ecstasy of men who believed that the end

of the world was close at hand, the necessities of the messianic argument, the uncertainties of a tradition admittedly oral at first, the atmosphere of pagan myth breathed from birth by the Gentile converts, would explain an accretion in fifty years of fable round so great a personality many times as thick as that which actually obscures it.

Birth of early Jewish apostolic records.

But if one circumstance more than another reinforces the uncritical attitude of the orthodox sects, it is the apparent isolation of the New Testament narratives. Here is a body of literature which suddenly, and without any congeners, makes its appearance. Allied writings neither precede and herald it, nor yet follow it so closely as to assist us in clearing up its problems by supplying analogies.

It is certain that in the second century, when the canon of the New Testament was drawn up and imposed upon itself by the Church, there were still in existence writings of the earlier Jewish and of the apostolic age which the later Church either destroyed or allowed to perish as hostile to its later dogmatic developments, which would yet be invaluable to us now. Indeed, The Shepherd of Hermas, and The Didache, and The Epistle of Barnabas, and the Gospel of Peter have been restored to us. Yet, after all, the New Testament is not quite so isolated for us in respect of what went before it as is supposed. And in the apocryphs ascribed to Enoch we have Jewish books, unquestionably anterior to Christ, which bring before us at least some of the conditions of belief and expectation which preceded and rendered possible the ministry of Jesus. These apocryphs have only come down to us chiefly in Ethiopic or in Old Slavonic. Dillmann first translated the Ethiopic text in Germany; and lately Mr. Charles has given us in two volumes a scholarly English edition of the Enoch literature, which, according to Tertullian, writing as late as 200 A.D., "rang of Christ" (*Christum sonat*).

A *locus classicus* for the origin of the demons is found in a section of the book of Enoch[1], which Mr. Charles ascribes to a period before 179 B.C. The passage is also preserved in its original Greek in Syncellus and in the Bouriant Papyrus lately dug up in Egypt, as well as in the Ethiopic version. This Greek text of Enoch, it must be remembered, was in turn a translation of a lost Hebrew book. From it we learn that the strong or evil spirits, which have their habitation on earth, are the giants that were begotten of mortal women by the watchers of heaven, the angels. They were thus born at once of spirits and of flesh." "Wicked spirits," the apocryph proceeds, "came out of the body of them (i.e. of the women), for they were generated out of human beings; and from the holy watchers flows the beginning of their creation and their primal foundation. The spirits of heaven—in the heaven is their dwelling; and the spirits begotten upon earth—in the earth shall be their dwelling. And the spirits of the giants will devour, oppress, destroy, assault, do battle, and cast upon the earth and cause convulsions. They will eat nothing, but fast and thirst, and cause visions and cause offences. And these spirits will rise up against the children of men and against the women, because they have proceeded from them." Here in a few lines is portrayed, just as in the Gospels, the activity of the demons. They are lost angels. They haunt the earth's surface. They assail men's bodies and convulse them, they cause visions and otherwise oppress mankind.

Enoch on giants and demons.

This vindictive war of demons is, so we learn[2], to continue until the day of consummation, until the great judgment, when the watchers and the godless will receive condign punishment. This belief also, as we saw, is present in the Gospels, in which the demons cry out to Jesus "Art thou come hither to torment us *before our time*?"

The impending judgment of demons.

[1] Enoch, ch. xv.

[2] Ibid. ch. xvi. 1.

In a later chapter[1] of Enoch we are told that the evil spirits, assuming many different forms, shall defile men and lead them astray to sacrifice to demons, as if to gods, until the day of the great judgment, in which they will be judged and ended, while wives of these angels which transgressed will be turned into sirens. Here the beliefs of Paul and John and Jesus are anticipated and presented as the popular beliefs of the Jews nearly two centuries earlier.

In a later chapter[2] of the same apocryph we read, just as we have read in the epistles of Peter and Jude, of the iron chains prepared for the hosts of angels, when they are cast down into the abyss of condemnation, as the Lord of spirits commanded. We read also of the fiery furnace into which Michael, Gabriel, Raphael, and Fanuel will cast them, that the Lord of spirits may take vengeance on them for their unrighteousness in subjecting themselves to Satan and leading astray the dwellers upon earth. Mr. Charles points out in his general introduction[3] how many features of the New Testament demonology first appear in Enoch. "The functions of the satans in Enoch," he says, "are threefold: they tempted to evil, lxix. 4, 6; they accused the fallen, iv. 6, 7; they punished the condemned as angels of punishment, liii. 3; lvi. 1."

The Testaments of the twelve patriarchs.

The Testaments of the patriarchs is an apocryph which has been wrongly ascribed to a church writer of the early second century. It is in fact, like Enoch, a Greek translation of a lost Jewish work; and, though later than Enoch, it is yet—with the exception of a few interpolations—in the main a pre-Christian document. In the Testament of Reuben we hear of the seven spirits given from Beliar against mankind, to wit, the spirits of life, seeing, hearing, smell, of talking, taste, and of the philoprogenitive impulses. To this group is added, as it were by an after-thought, an eighth, the spirit of sleep. Then the writer enumerates the members of another group of seven, namely, of fornication,

[1] Enoch, ch. xix. 1. [2] Ibid. ch. liii. 5. [3] Ibid. p. 53.

of gluttony, of combativeness, of flattery and sorcery, of pride, falsehood, and injustice. We see how fond the demons were of the number seven. In the magic rituals of ancient Assyria, the demons commonly go about in groups of seven, as Lenormant has noticed in his work on Assyria (*Ancienne Histoire,* liv. 6). The Prince of Deceit, we read in the testament of Symeon [1], sent a spirit of envy and blinded the patriarch, till God sent an angel and rescued him. And fasting is recommended, as it was by Jesus, along with fear of God as a means of overcoming the demons of envy. For if a man flees to the Lord, the evil spirit runs away from him and his mind is *lightened. Lightened,* for, as we already know from Origen, the evil spirits were heavy, and weighed down with the dross of earth. Nor do the Testaments disagree with the New Testament as to the fate which will overtake the evil spirits: "When the Lord, the great God of Israel, shall appear on earth as man and save in his person Adam, then shall all the spirits of error be trodden underfoot, and men shall rule over the evil spirits." "Hate ye," says Aser [2], "the spirits of error which contend against man."

Bad men pursued by demons after death.

And we also have in the Testaments some curious beliefs about the behaviour to us after death of the demons whom we encouraged in life: "We must rest in the Lord, returning ourselves unto him (in death). Because the ends of men (when they die) show if they were just, and if they distinguished the angels of the Lord and of Satan. For if the soul departs troubled, it is being tormented by the evil spirit of which it was the slave on earth in lusts and evil works."

This particular belief was very popular among the early Christians, nor was it peculiar to them. For Origen declares [3] that he in common with Jews, Greeks, and barbarians believed that the pure soul, which is not weighted with the leaden weights of sin, soars at death aloft to the regions tenanted by the purer and etherial

[1] *Test. Sym.* 2. [2] *Test. Aser.* 6. [3] *C. Cels.* vii. 5.

bodies, leaving the dense bodies of earth and the pollutions they contain. But the bad soul is dragged down to earth, and, without being able even to take breath, is carried and rolled about on it; one evil soul towards the tombs, where are actually seen the phantasms of shadowy souls; another, simply and solely around and about the earth. How many such spirits, he asks, must we not suppose to exist, that have been bound, so to speak, whole aeons long either by certain sorceries or by their own wickedness to houses and particular spots.

Philo on the nature of demons.

We must now turn to the Alexandrine Jew Philo, a contemporary of Jesus, and our sole surviving representative of that great school of philosophic Judaism which blended old Greek speculations with Semitic monotheism. In his book "Upon Giants," Philo comments on the text of Genesis: "But the angels of God saw the daughters of men that they were fair; and took to themselves wives of all whom they chose[1]," as follows: "Those beings whom other philosophers call demons, Moses is wont to term angels; and they are souls flying about in the air. And let no one suppose that the statement is a myth; for it must needs be that the entire Cosmos is throughout instinct with soul (ἐψυχῶσθαι), and each of its primal and elementary parts contains its peculiar and appropriate living beings, to wit: the earth, animals of the dry land; the sea and rivers, those which live in water; fire, those begotten of fire, a kind which is said to exist specially in Macedonia; and heaven, the stars. For the stars are souls, through and through stainless and divine; for which reason they move in a circle with the movement most akin to reason. For each of them is reason pure and unalloyed.

The demons fill the world.

"It must needs be then," he continues, "that the air too is replete with living beings, though these are invisible to us, just as the self is not visible to the senses. Of these souls," he continues in

[1] Gen. vi. 2.

the next section, "some descend into bodies, but others have never deigned to associate themselves with any portion of earth; and the latter, hallowed and devoted to his worship, their Father and Creator is wont to use as his servants and deacons in regulating the life of mortals.

Their incarnations.

"The former kind, however, have gone down into the body as into a river, and are in some cases caught and engulfed by the swirl and violence of the whirlpool; but in other cases they manage to resist the current, and after swimming to shore they end by flying off back to the region whence they started. These, then, are the souls of those who were inspired from on high in their philosophy, and from start to finish studied to die to the life of the body, in order to win the life which is disembodied and incorruptible in the presence of Him that is neither begotten nor yet corruptible."

Then follows a deeply interesting chapter, in which Philo weighs the reasons for and against the belief in evil angels or demons; and after his manner he tries to give a higher spiritual meaning to the Enoch myth, with which, it is clear, he was acquainted.

Philo allegorized the Enoch myth.

In souls and demons and angels, he says, we have, it is true, different *names;* but in conceiving the thing represented by them all to be one and the same, you will set aside a heavy burden, namely, superstition (lit. fear of demons). However, he continues, just as the many say that there are good demons and bad, and souls to match; so you yourself will not be wrong in supposing that among angels too some are worthy of their good appellation, being in a manner envoys of man to God and of God to man, inviolate and holy by reason of the blameless and noble service so rendered; while others, on the contrary, are unholy and unworthy of the appellation. There is, he adds, evidence for me of this in the declaration of

Bad demons, if real, servants of divine justice.

the hymn-writer (i. e. psalmist) in the following song: "He sent forth among them the wrath of his indignation, anger, and wrath, and tribulation, and missions of wicked angels[1]." These are the wicked ones, he continues, who, falsely assuming the name of angels, know not the daughters of right reason, to wit, the sciences and virtues; but run after mortal offspring of mortal men, to wit, pleasures, which are not arrayed with the true beauty—that is to say, are not beheld in a purely intellectual manner by the mind alone, but with a bastard fairness of form by which the sense is tricked."

In other treatises[2] Philo identified outright the heroes and demons of Greek speculations with the angels of Moses and of holy writ. In one other passage he glances at the popular superstition, namely *De Mon.* 2. 226. 15. The oracular breastplate (λογεῖον) of the high priest is diversified with a double web, of which one half is called Manifestation (δήλωσις), and the other Truth. By truth it is signified that falsehood may not lawfully mount to heaven; but that all falsehood has been routed and banished into the region near the earth, there dwelling in the souls of wicked men. With which cp. St. John viii. 44: "He is a liar, and the father of it."

Philo disbelieved in bodily possession.

There is thus no evidence in the works of Philo that he believed in possession of men's bodies by demons in the crude form in which the New Testament, St. John's Gospel excepted, presents this superstition. It is clear indeed from the passage I have quoted, that Philo was reluctant to believe in the existence even of bad angels; anyhow, he distinctly assigns the belief in bad demons to the vulgar, and betrays his consciousness of the painful evils of contemporary superstition. In many parts of his works he shows a profound acquaintance with medicine and surgery, and he was probably lifted by his culture far above the super-

[1] Ps. lxxviii. 49.

[2] *De Plant. Noe*, § 4, vol. I, p. 332; *De Somn.* i. 22, vol. I, p. 641.

stitious tendencies which led the Evangelists, if not Jesus himself, to see not only in fever and rheumatism, but even in the winds, demoniacal agencies. In this respect, and yet more in the spirit of comprehensive charity with which he often treats of the sincere beliefs of the pagans in their gods and heroes and demons, he was far in advance not only of the authors of the New Testament, but of all the Fathers of the Church.

Josephus believed in possession.

With Josephus, whose period of literary activity coincides with that of the Evangelists, we pass from cultured Alexandria into Palestine; and we find ourselves at once in an atmosphere of evil spirits, such as we are already familiar with in the pages of the New Testament. In his *Antiquities*[1], Josephus relates how God vouchsafed to King Solomon "to learn the art of opposing the demons for the succour and healing of men. So that he (Solomon) composed incantations, by which sickness of all sorts is assuaged; and left to posterity methods of exorcising, by which they that are bound can chase away the demons, so that they shall never come back again. And this system of healing," he adds, "still prevails among us." And he forthwith relates how he saw Eleazar, a fellow Jew, expel, in the presence of Vespasian, a malignant demon, by holding to the nostrils of the man possessed a ring, under the seal of which was one of the roots recommended by Solomon. "By this means he drew out through the man's nostrils, when he had snuffed at it, the evil demon. The man fell down at once, and Eleazar adjured the demon never to return into him, mentioning the name of Solomon, and repeating over him the incantations which he (Solomon) had composed." More than this, to convince the bystanders, Eleazar set a basin of water close by, and commanded the demon in going out of the man to turn it over, and so prove to those who were looking on that it had really left the man.

Solomon's incantations.

Eleazar the Exorcist.

[1] Joseph., *Antiq.* viii. 2, 5.

If it was believed, in that as in later ages, that a demon cannot pass water, it was natural for this one to trip over and upset the basin. So Jesus believed that a demon, when he quits a man, goes through waterless places in his quest for a resting-place. But we are probably here merely in presence of the belief, common then as now in the East, that the desert is the peculiar home of evil spirits. In another passage[1] Josephus tells us about a certain root, which had the property of instantly driving out the so-called demons; which, he says, were no other than the spirits of wicked men insinuating themselves into the living, and slaying those who have none to help them.

Demons in the O. T.

The Old Testament is remarkably free from the stories of possession by demons which are so common in the Synoptic Gospels. Not that kindred elements are altogether absent. For example, the representation of the Lord God in Genesis[2] as snuffing up the sweet savour of sacrifice, recalls Origen's picture of the demons, not to mention many other passages (e. g. Ps. l. (xlix.) 9, 13; 1 Sam. xv. 22; Isa. i. 11–13, lxvi. 3; Amos v. 21, 22), in which a material view of sacrifice is reprobated. By the time of Origen, indeed, more than one attribute of the God of the Old Testament had been passed on to the devils; for the gods of one age are the demons and fairies of the next, and the Old Testament exegesis of Philo, which the Church soon appropriated to itself, made impossible, except with the most vulgar, the ascription to the Almighty of so barbarous a trait.

In the Psalms we already read, as in Enoch and Paul, that the gods of the heathen are devils. In the book of the prophecies of Zechariah (xiii. 2) the Lord of Hosts threatens to expel the prophets of the idols and the unclean spirits out of the land. In the book of Tobit[3] we read of a simple remedy against a fiend: "Thou shalt take the ashes of some perfume, and shalt lay upon them some of the heart and

Tobit's recipe against demons.

[1] *De Bello Iud.* vii. 6, 3. [2] Gen. viii. 21. [3] Tobit vi. 10.

liver of the fish, and shalt make a smoke with it. And the devil shall smell it, and flee away, and never come again any more. The which smell, when the evil spirit had smelled, he fled into the utmost part of Egypt[1]. And Raphael the angel went and bound him there." In

Saul's demon.

1 Sam. xix. 9 we read that an evil spirit from the Lord was upon Saul as he sat in his house. Earlier in the same book, when the spirit of the Lord had departed from Saul, an evil spirit from the Lord troubled or terrified him (xiv. 15). In Judges ix. 23 we also read of God sending an evil spirit between Abimelech and the men of Shechem. In Isaiah we read of the night-monster Lilith, which was of course an evil spirit; and those who wish to realize how profoundly the early religion of Israel was influenced by beliefs in evil spirits, can read about it in Robertson Smith's *Religion of the Semites*.

I could wish that it was sufficient for my purpose to have traced these beliefs in such Jewish writings as immediately preceded or were contemporary with the earliest

Talmud, hard to use.

Christian literature; for I hesitate to approach the Talmud in connexion with my subject for two reasons. Firstly, I am not acquainted with it in the original, and so can only use it at second hand; and, secondly, there is a way with apologists, when they are confronted with some striking identity of the thought or practice between the New Testament and the Talmud, of arguing that the Talmud as a later work borrowed it from the New Testament. Thus, the late Dr. Edersheim, in his *Life of Christ*, argues that the comparison of the spirit of God with a dove, which is found in the Talmud, is an echo of the New Testament, regardless of the fact that the same comparison is frequent in the works of Philo, and that the whole of Jewish history after the fall of the Temple makes it extremely improbable that the Talmudists would have borrowed from the New Testament this comparison or any other.

[1] Tobit viii. 3.

Wünsche has published in German a very useful volume of illustrations of the Gospels from Talmudic sources ; and to his work, and to Lightfoot's *Horae Hebraicae*, and Eisenmenger's *Entdeckter Judaismus*, I am indebted for my slender knowledge of this aspect of the later Jewish mind.

Satan in Talmud.

Satan then in the Talmud is the slanderer, the accuser, the tempter, and the mischief-maker, according to Berachoth, fol. 58 a. He is not only the evil instinct in man's heart, but an evil agent objectively real and external to man (Wünsche, p. 24, note).

Demons in Talmud.

Bodily defects and all physical sufferings, not otherwise explicable, are in the Talmud ascribed to evil spirits. The Mishna, or earliest portion of it, written down before 135 A.D., bears little trace of the belief in possession of evil demons; but the Babylonian and Jerusalem Gemara, written down respectively as early as 500 and 400 A.D., teem with evidence of such beliefs. Their pages make one feel as if Jewish life in the early centuries was a prolonged *Walpurgisnacht*. We learn the names of countless demons, their places of resort, and the various means of rendering them visible, and of confronting them. Every hour of the day and night had its own particular demon, and the whole atmosphere was peopled with them (Berachoth, fol. 6 a). We hear of one, Agrath bat Machlath, who had a following of 180,000 deadly demons, reminding us of the legion of devils in the Gospels. And the Talmudic demons are visible or invisible at will, and assume all sorts of shapes (Joma, fol. 75 a). Like the demons of the New Testament, they haunt the dry, waste, and unfrequented places of the earth, and are especially active at night-time. Like destroying angels, they bring harm, ill-luck, illness, and deformities on mankind ; and they lie in wait for us until some weak act lays us open to their assaults. They enter into some men, take possession of them, and drive them out of human society. Such is the fate of the madman who goes out

alone by night to wander among the tombs of the dead. Upon him an impure spirit falls, by means of whom the possessed reads the future and performs works of necromancy (Chagiga, fol. 3 b). The prince of the demons, by whose aid (Matt. viii. 31) Jesus was accused of casting out devils, was either the Aschmedai or Asmodeus of the Talmud, whose regular title therein is ruler of demons, or Samael, also called Satan. Any one who had this king of evil spirits for his friend was believed to have all hostile spirits subject unto him (Midrash, Vajikra r. par. 5, and Gittin, fol. 68 a. Cp. More Nebuchim, part ii, c. 30).

A Roman emperor's daughter possessed.

Lastly, in the Talmud (Meila, fol. 17 b) it is related that Rabbi Simeon ben Jochai could cast out demons exactly as did Jesus. This rabbi was on his way with another to the Court of Rome, to secure the repeal of an edict hostile to the Jewish religion, when a demon called Ben Temelion met him. "May I go with you?" asked the demon. "Let the portent come, whencesoever it be," answered the rabbi. Thereupon the supposed spirit hurried on in front and entered into the daughter of the emperor, who at once went mad, raved and shrieked out continually that they must bring to her the Rabbi Simeon. When he arrived he summoned the froward spirit to go forth, saying: "Depart out of her, Ben Temelion;" and the evil spirit obeyed. "Ask what reward you will," they said to the liberator, leading him into the treasury. There the two rabbis found the edict which was the object of their mission, and at once tore it up.

This story recurs in Acts of Abercius.

It has not been noticed by any one that this story is none other than that related in the Acts of Abercius, bishop of Hierapolis, who was visited by a demon, which then went to Rome and possessed Lucilla, daughter of Marcus Aurelius. The girl in her frenzy called for the Christian bishop, or rather the evil spirit in her proclaimed that he would only

submit to Abercius, who accordingly, having been sent for in hot haste, came and cured the girl. The Jewish tale was certainly borrowed by the Christian hagiologist of the fourth century, and seems to have in it germs of truth. For the Rabbi Eliezer, and not Ben Jochai, was the envoy who expelled the demon, and the embassy was either to Vespasian or to his son Domitian. This Eliezer was no doubt the same rabbi whose exorcismal powers, displayed before Vespasian and his family, Josephus mentions. Domitilla may have been the emperor's daughter cured by Eliezer [1].

Unclean or necromantic demons.

And in the Talmud we also find the same distinction between merely evil spirits and unclean ones which is so common in the New Testament. Thus the gloss in Sanhedr., fol. 65, 2, explains the term "spirit of uncleanness" as equivalent to "spirit of the tombs." And a Pythonic or divining spirit was unclean, because the man who was possessed by it acquired it by calling up the dead and sitting on a corpse. Lightfoot supposes—and with good reason—that the man in the synagogue (Luke iv. 33) who had in him a spirit of an unclean devil, and who cried out, "Alas, what have we to do with thee, thou Jesus of Nazareth? Art thou come to destroy us?" was a necromancer, such as is described in the above passage of the Talmud. He had wilfully and by magic incantations absorbed the foul spirit of the dead. But some, like the demoniac of Gadara, had been overpowered and forcibly taken possession of by such a spirit, and were by it driven among the tombs. In

Wicked spirits.

contradistinction to such foul spirits, those which inflicted infirmities merely (ἀσθενείας) were only wicked spirits. In the Talmud (Gittin, fol. 77, 2) drunkenness is due to possession by a demon called Cordicus or Cordiacus; and it was probably the fear of being oppressed like Noe, by a demon, rather than a genuinely ascetic

[1] For a fuller discussion of the story see the *Academy* for June 6, 1896.

tendency, which dictates to Mohammedans their strict abstinence from wine. Another evil spirit, called Shibta, assailed male children between the ages of two and seven, seizing the muscles of the neck and so killing them. Such probably was the evil spirit which possessed the epileptic boy in Matt. xvii. 14 (= Mark ix. 33 and Luke ix. 39), and which the disciples could not cast out.

Talmudic charges against Jesus.

The Talmudists regard as the worst of evil spirits Baal Zebul, who was in a way their prince, and who, reigning among idols and inspiring the oracles of the heathen, wrought their miracles for them. Just as in the New Testament the Jews accuse Jesus of working his miracles by help of Baal Zebul, so in the Talmud he is accused of having been a magician, who by infernal arts got possession of the secret name of the Most High, and with it worked miracles, leading the people astray into idolatry. In the *Acta Pilati* the Jews prefer the same charge against him, that he was a *goês* or cheating wizard.

Thus in the Talmud we find the same beliefs which pervade the New Testament and dominate the writings of the Fathers. And this is entirely what we should expect, for the Talmud was being composed contemporaneously with those writings, namely, from 150 to 500 A. D. It is singular that the Old Testament is so free from demonology, hardly containing—as Lightfoot (*Horae Hebr.*, vol. II, p. 312, ed. 1699) notes—more than one or two examples thereof. Lightfoot's explanation of the relative frequency of cases of possession in the New Testament is not uninteresting. Firstly, the Jewish people, he says, had reached the pitch of iniquity, and so were reaping the full harvest of curses promised in Lev. xxvi. and Deut. xxviii. And secondly, this race, more than any other given up to magic arts, had wooed the devil so earnestly that he had finally taken up his abode in them (*Horae Hebr.*, vol. II, p. 312, ed. 1699).

Evidence of Greek Pagan Writers.

Classical writers fairly free from superstition.

The belief in demons is equally to be traced in Greek literature from the earliest period. But it is noticeable that in the earlier and more classical writers it rarely comes to the surface. Of a truth the great historians, philosophers, and poets of Athens, and equally the Latin writers of the Republican age and early empire, were drawn as it were from an aristocracy of intellect, and approached more nearly in their freedom from this form of superstition to ourselves than do the authors of any intervening epoch. If, however, we had the books of the poor and uneducated during these two golden epochs of ancient literature, we should certainly find them rife with the crude beliefs which come to the surface and dominate the literature, profane and Christian alike, of the first century A. D. and of all succeeding ages.

Greek demonological terms.

Even in Homer, however, as Prof. Tylor points out[1] in his thoughtful chapters on Demonology, "Sick men racked with pain are tormented by a hateful demon (στυγερὸς δέ οἱ ἔχραε δαίμων)." And common language revealed the popular belief in possession in its use of such a term as ἐπίληψις, "Epilepsy," which is called by Hippocrates and Aristotle the sacred disease (ἱερὰ νόσος), because in it the demon took possession of the sick man. If it was a wood-nymph whose spirit took possession of a man, he was νυμφόληπτος, a word already used in Plato and Aristotle. But a mad person was simply said to have a demon (δαιμονᾶν); and the circumstance that Socrates called the supernatural principle which he believed to reside within him a demon (δαιμόνιον), proves that his contemporaries were familiar with the idea. Indeed, Plato[2] defines a demon as an agent halfway between God and

[1] *Primitive Culture*, vol. II, ch. 15; Hom., *Od.* 5. 396, and 10. 64.

[2] *Symp.* 327 F.

mortal, interpreting and ferrying across to the gods messages from men, and to men those of the gods; the prayers and offerings of the one set, and the behests and acceptances of sacrifice of the other. One such demon was Eros; but they were many and various.

Belief in bad demons old as fourth cent. B. C.

His successors, Xenocrates (396–314 B. C.) and Chrysippus, says Plutarch[1], following the theology of the ancients, declared the demons to have been superhumanly strong men, in whom the divine element was alloyed with a soul-nature and a faculty of bodily sensation, in virtue of which they felt pleasure and pain. And as among men, so among the demons there were, according to these older authorities, distinctions of virtue and vice. Plutarch actually cites a passage of Xenocrates to the effect that beside the good demons, who, like the gods, must not be invoked on unlucky days, there are in the atmosphere around us great and strong natures or agencies, which are, however, intractable and morose.

Empedocles on Demons.

Like Enoch, Empedocles[2]—so we read in the same context—held that these evil demons are punished for their sins and offences by the higher cosmic powers; but their punishment is in the nature of a purification (καθαρθέντες), after which they regain their natural place and position. Here then we have proof that the idea of good and bad demons—powers of air—was quite familiar to Greek philosophers of the fourth century before Christ. A similar belief is found in Dionysius of Halicarnassus (*Ant. Rom.* i. ii), in Aristides (*T.* ii. p. 106), and Maximus Tyrius (*Diss.* xiv. 8). The belief that the demons are ultimately purified and regain their lost position resembles and may underlie even Origen's view, for which the Church condemned him, that as all things are possible with God, even the Devil himself may at the last be saved.

[1] *De Iside*, 360 E.

[2] On Empedocles see Hippol., *Philosophum*, 3, 1 (*Doxolog.* p. 558).

Chrysippus (350 B. C.) believed[1] that the demons roamed about the world as agents of divine justice to punish the impious and unjust, a view also found in Origen[2], who quoted in proof of it the same Psalm (lxxviii. 49) which we found Philo quoting in proof of the existence of bad angels. Plutarch[3] also refers to the Ephesian writings (Ἐφέσια γράμματα), which the Magi ordered those who were possessed to recite, naming names to themselves. Here Plutarch uses the same word to denote possession (δαιμονιζόμενοι) which we find in the Gospels. These Ephesian spells, which we already read of in Aristotle, must have contained potent names of which the demons stood in awe. Of such spells or incantations (ἐπῳδαί), as the Greeks called them from Homer downwards, we have very few specimens left that go back to any great antiquity; and this lacuna in our knowledge of the older religions[4] is largely due to Christian copyists, who whenever they lit on such a formula in a MS., either left it out or substituted a Christian form of exorcism. Such formulae were primarily drawn up with a view to drive off demons. But the strictly medicinal ones, called ἀλεξιφάρμακα, were often to be used in conjunction with some root or herb; and every doctor was supposed to know how to expel, not so much diseases in our modern sense, as the demons which produced them.

Chrysippus.

Ephesian spells.

In Egypt during recent years vast numbers of papyri containing exorcisms have been found, and many of them edited. They are usually full of ancient names, Jewish, Chaldaic, Egyptian, Persian; and much of the apparent gibberish they contain may consist really of prayers in those languages. Origen, as we saw above, insists on the necessity of keeping to the original tongues[5];

Egyptian papyri.

[1] Plut. *Quaest. Rom.* 277 A.

[2] *C. Cels.* viii. 32.

[3] *Symp.* vii. 706 D.

[4] See *Jahrbücher für Classische Philologie*, 1893, art. entitled "Incantamenta magica graeca latina, collegit Ricardus Heim," to which learned and exhaustive monograph I am indebted for much information.

[5] Cp. Pap., *Anastasy*, 486; *Mimant.* 118 (in Wessely): "I am he who called

and the early Christians claimed it to be the great merit of their Lord Jesus that his name was cosmopolitan and known to all demons, whereas the demons were, as a rule, only to be got at by addressing them each in his own tongue.

The prevalence of Jewish names in these formulae agrees with the reputation as exorcists which in antiquity the Jews enjoyed. Origen[1] himself noticed this, and preserves us such a formula in the passage following: "The God of Israel and the God of the Hebrews and the God who overwhelmed in the Red Sea the king of Egypt and the Egyptians, is often brought into the spell and named against demons or against certain evil demons." In this formula the supernatural power is first named, and then it is recited what he has done so as to make it quite clear to the demons what power it is that is brought into play against them. In the formula of Christian exorcism, which I quoted above from Justin Martyr, an early and short form of creed was for the same reason appended to the name of Jesus.

Papyrus exorcism.

Among the papyri bearing on this subject, one of the most remarkable is the Paris 3,009, reprinted and re-edited by Dr. A. Dieterich in his remarkable work entitled *Abraxas* (Leipzig, 1891). It is a ritual for exorcising demons. The exorcist takes oil with certain herbs, and saying a string of gibberish, beginning thus, Iôêlôssarthiômi emôri theô chipsoïth sithemeôch, he bids the demon to begone from so-and-so. The formula, ἔξελθε ἀπὸ τοῦ Δεῖνα, is that which was commonly used by Jesus. A phylactery was to be written on a tin plate as follows: Iaeô Abraôthiôch phtha mesen, &c., and hung round the neck of the possessed, as calculated to scare off every demon. Then the exorcist took his stand opposite the

thee in Syriac the Great God . . . do Thou I pray, not mishear the sound in Hebrew. Do this thing, because I exorcise thee with the Hebrew sound." (See Anrich, *Antike Mysterienwesen*, p. 96.)

[1] *C. Cels.* iv. 34.

possessed and had to read a long exorcism (*orkismos*), beginning thus: "I adjure (*orkizô*) thee by the God of the Jews, Iaeô[1] Iabaiaê aia thôth ele elô," &c. The most powerful exploits of the God of the Jews, as related in the Old Testament, especially the passage of the Red Sea, are summarized for the good of the demon in some fifty lines, and then the ritual ends thus:

"I adjure thee by him that is in the pure Jerusalem, for whom the unquenchable fire is through all eternity stored up at his command, by his holy name, Iaeô barrenuzoun.

"Recital: Whom Genna of fire trembles before and flames flame up around, and iron and every mountain dreads from its foundations. I adjure thee, every demon-spirit (*pneuma daimonion*), by him who surveys the earth and makes its foundations to quail, and brought all things out of nothing into being. And I adjure thee that receivest from me this form of adjuration (*orkismos*) not to eat swine, and then there shall be subject unto thee every spirit and demon of whatsoever kind. And in adjuring, blow from the extremities and from the feet, removing the blowing (*phusêma*) up unto the face, and it shall be eliminated. Preserve it purely; for the form of words (*logos*) is Hebrew, and preserved among pure men."

Although the above *logos* or ritual form terms itself Hebraic, I have not classed it with the Jewish evidence but with the Greek, because the objective manner in which it alludes to the God of the Hebrews indicates that it was not purely Jewish. It may have been in use among Greek proselytes. Dieterich refers it to the second century B. C. The similarity of its language to that of the New Testament is significant. The passage, "There shall

[1] Dieterich allows κατὰ τοῦ θεοῦ τῶν Ἑβραίων Ἰησοῦ to stand, though of course for the last word Ἰάω τοῦ or something similar should be read. For in the same ritual just below we have ὁρκίζω σὲ μέγαν θεὸν Σαβαώθ. Ἰησοῦ must be a misreading of the papyrus, the contents of which Dieterich refers to a pre-Christian age.

be subject unto thee every spirit and demon," is expressed in the very terms of Luke x. 17, 20.

Creeds arose as part of exorcisms.

Origen, we saw, repeatedly insists on the necessity of attaching to the name of God or demon a string of words in which his full history and attributes are given; and in exorcising with the name of Jesus Christ, *μαθήματα*, or lore, from the Holy Scriptures was added. It was doubtless the necessity of forging a compendious but effective instrument against the devil which helped to give rise to those abstracts of teaching about Christ which we call creeds. And the recitals of the history of Christ[1], spoken of by Origen[2], were in all probability nothing else. Traces of the same belief are to be observed in the New Testament. For example, in Acts[3] the Jewish exorcists adjure the evil spirits "by Jesus *whom Paul preacheth*," so as to make it clear to them which Jesus and what power was enlisted against them. In the same book of the Acts[4] we find Peter appending to the name of Jesus, the Messiah of Nazareth, a brief mention of his life, death, and resurrection, when he explains to the elders of Israel how the sick man had been saved. And in the Gospels we are repeatedly assured[5] that the demons themselves knew from the first who Jesus really was, and recognized him as the Son of God; otherwise they would have needed to be informed. Indeed, the testimony of the demons was barely less weighty and valuable than that of the dove-shaped Holy Spirit or St. Peter.

Parallels from ancient charms.

This practice of adding in an incantation a short history of the demon, or passages from the Sacred Books, is already referred to in Herodotus[6], who relates that when a worshipper had named the particular god and prepared his expiatory sacrifice, the magus came

[1] Οὐ γὰρ κατακηλήσεσιν ἰσχύειν δοκοῦσιν (sc. οἱ χριστιανοί), ἀλλὰ τῷ ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦ μετὰ τῆς ἀπαγγελίας τῶν περὶ αὐτὸν Ἱστοριῶν.

[2] *Cels.* i. 6. [3] Acts xix. 13. [4] Ibid. iv. 10.

[5] Matt. viii. 29; Mark i. 24, 34; v. 7. [6] Herod. i. 132.

forward and sang an incantation, consisting of a theogony or history of the birth and origin of the god—a creed, in fact. The same idea, though not so clearly, inspired most ancient charms used to avert the demons of sickness. In Marcellus[1], an old medical writer, we accordingly read of a cure for ophthalmia, which consisted in writing on a bit of paper a line of Homer, explanatory of the sun-god's attributes: "Sun, that beholdeth all and heareth all," and then hanging it like a phylactery round the patient's neck. Similarly a short history about a god or goddess had to be recited, and the name, and mother's name, of the sick man specified by the person who dug up the magic root or herb for application. R. Heim, in his valuable monograph[2], gives many instances of this, and the magic papyri are full of verses of Homer to be thus repeated over the sick, and ancient amulets frequently have the same inscribed on them. The purport of adding such citations of a sacred book was to acquaint the disease-demon with the nature of the power arrayed against him. At the entrance of a mosque in the East are to be seen native scribes, who for a fee write out passages of the Qûran for the use of the sick. Such phylacteries soon become mere fetiches, potent in themselves, as are charms. But in origin they were Holy Scriptures, i. e. histories of the god, written for the instruction of the disease-fiends.

As faith was a condition of Christian cures, so it was of pagan ones. So Marcellus says: "It is only with great faith (*cum magna fiducia*) that we must approach the healing of this kind of illness with this sort of remedy." Alexander[3] of Tralles also insists upon the need of faith: "I exhort you," he says, "not to reveal such lore as this to any and every one, but only to godly persons who know how to keep it secret. For this is why the divine Hippocrates exhorts us, saying: 'Matters that are holy are shown to holy men, but to profane and unbelievers it is

[1] Marcellus Burdigal, viii. 58. [2] Fleckeisen's *Jahrbücher*, 1893.
[3] Alex. Trall. ii. 377 (ed. Puschmann).

wrong to reveal them.'" Lucian[1] ridiculed this talk about faith as the condition of healing in one of his dialogues, and makes one of his interlocutors, who is the champion of faith-healing, address to the impugner thereof the following rebuke: "You seem to me not even to believe in the existence of the gods, unless at any rate you believe that cures can be wrought by use of sacred names."

Richard Heim, in the monograph I have referred to, gives many pagan formulae of healing, which illustrate to us how the ancients had many deities to help them against the disease-demons, just as Christians have Christ, the Virgin, and the saints. Thus in a work falsely attributed to Pliny[2] we have the following against quartan ague: "Write on a clean piece of paper, to be attached to the sufferer's right arm, the words 'Begone from yonder Gaius Seius, Solomon is after thee (*te sequitur*).'" Here is another formula from an ancient gem: "Flee, O Gout, Perseus pursues thee (*φύγε ποδάγρα, Περσεύς σε διώκει*)." Here is one from Alexander of Tralles[3] against colic: "Take an iron ring, make it octagonal, and inscribe it with the words: Flee, flee, gall of poison, the crested lark is after thee." In the *Hippiatrica*[4] we have a remedy for distemper in horses. You gave the animal a potion, and *blew* upon him, saying, "Flee then, O evil distemper, Poseidon is after thee (*διώκει σε Ποσειδῶν*)." How vividly do such remedies illustrate the miracle of Jesus when he *rebuked* the fever, "and it left her." Nor must we forget in this connexion how the ancients raised altars to fever, that scourge of man in southern lands.

Demons transferred.

In the miracle of Gadara, the demons are transferred to the bodies of animals; for it was the popular belief that any pest will leave you if you provide for it fresh woods and pastures new. Thus in the *Geoponica* (xiii. 5, 4) we have the following formula against mice: "I exorcise the mice here caught. Do me no harm

[1] *Philops.* 10.

[2] Pseudo-Plin. iii. 15, p. 89 R.

[3] Alex. Trall. p. 377.

[4] *Hippiatrica*, p. 15, c. 22.

yourselves, nor suffer another to do so. For I give unto you *this* field (here he shall name the particular field). But if I catch you here any more, I will invoke the aid of the mother (i. e. Cybele) and cut you into six parts." Here, again, is a cure for toothache from Marcellus [1]: "Put your shoes on and, standing on the earth in the open air, take a frog by the head, open its mouth and spit into it; and you shall ask it to carry off with itself your toothache. Then let it go alive, and from that day and hour you will be quite well." The Arabs to this day believe that a tooth-ache is a fiend sitting in the tooth. Mr. Whitley Stokes has informed me that in Ireland it is still a common belief that diseases can be transferred from human beings into animals; and that in India the people think that the transferee may be a plant.

Again, if your liver distressed you, you could, according to Marcellus [2], catch a green lizard, and by observing certain precautions get it to carry away in itself your malady; and you had to address the lizard thus: "Behold, I will let you go alive. See that, no matter what I eat, my liver shall give me no trouble."

The same writer gives a receipt for transferring a man's stomach-ache into a live hare [3]; and Pliny the elder (died 79 A.D.) gives [4] this cure for the bite of a scorpion: "You at once whisper into the ear of a jackass: A scorpion has stung me; and the pain will be immediately transferred into the animal."

And though it does not come under Greek or Latin examples, let me conclude this section with a more modern instance furnished by Prof. Tylor [5]: Charles VI of France was possessed, and a priest tried in vain to transfer his demon into the bodies of twelve men who were chained up to receive it. That the Christian fathers themselves regarded the Gadarene swine in the light suggested by the magic remedies which I have quoted, is clear from some

[1] Marc. xii. 24. [2] Ibid. xxii. 11. [3] Ibid. xx. 66.
[4] Pliny, xxviii. 155. [5] *Prim. Cult.*, vol. II, ch. 14.

lines of St. Gregory of Nyssa which occur on an amulet. In these the disease is first bidden to flee from the patient's head, and the epigram ends thus: "Christ the king commands thee to flee into the depths of the sea, or down the rocks, or into the herd of swine, like the destructive legion long ago. So get thee gone."

Latin terms.

Just as the Greeks called a madman δαιμονιζόμενος, so the Romans called him *larvatus*, i. e. one filled with a larva or ghost. "*Iam deliramenta loquitur; larvae stimulant virum*," says Plautus (*Capt.* iii. 4, 66), who is fond of both the word and the idea. So the Jews said to Jesus, by way of indicating that he was mad, "Thou hast a devil."

Apuleius.

In Apuleius' (born 130 A.D.) *De deo Socratis* we have a philosophy of demons, whom he classifies according as they were immortal spirits that had never been embodied, or merely the ghosts of deceased men, good or bad. His doctrine is the same as Philo's, and the frequent identity of his thought and phrase with Philo's proves that both writers drew from an old and pre-Christian source. Apuleius, however, does not, any more than Philo, propound a theory of possession, and we cannot certainly say that he believed in it. It is worthy of remark, however, that he believed that demons were sometimes visible, though oftener they were not.

Beliefs of Porphyry same as Origen's.

Departing from the chronological order of writers, and reserving the works of Pausanias and of Philostratus, let us next take account of the views of Porphyry, who was born in Palestine about 233 A.D., because in him we have a more complete philosophy of demons than in any pagan writer of the first three centuries, excepting Apuleius. Except that he admitted the existence of good demons as well as of bad, Porphyry's beliefs are identical with those of Origen. And even this difference is only nominal, since his good demons are identical with Origen's angels. But, in spite of such resemblances, we cannot suppose that he was

influenced by Christianity, of which he was a bitter opponent. The truth is that the Pagans, Christians, and Jews of the first five centuries all breathed the same air, and were inspired by the same beliefs about good and evil spirits. There was some difference of names, but nothing more. All minds moved together on the same plane. The malignant demons live, according to Porphyry[1], close to the earth; are sometimes visible, sometimes not. They love the blood and stench of victims slain, and grow strong and fat upon it. They disguise themselves as animals, and have Serapis, who is the same as Pluton, for their president. They are ambitious to be thought real gods, and therefore seduce men into worshipping them by working signs and wonders. Their president would fain supplant the Supreme God in men's minds.

They ever lie in wait for men, and fall upon them; for ἔμπτωσις, "falling upon," is Porphyry's word for possession; and his dread of possession made him a fervent advocate of vegetarianism. For eaters of blood and flesh lay themselves open to the risk of demons insinuating themselves (εἰσδύνειν) into their bodies. Abstinence alone could keep them off, as Jesus and the unknown author of the Clementine homilies had long before taught. The demons, furthermore, when they enter one along with the flesh-eaters cause him whom they thus possess to emit obscene sounds and winds, a proof that they are enjoying themselves within the glutton's belly. It is the business of priests, says Porphyry, to drive out (ἐξελαύνειν) the demons, in order that when they have departed God may enter (ἵνα τούτων ἀπελθόντων παρουσία τοῦ θεοῦ γένηται). And purificatory rites (ἁγνεῖαι) are not primarily celebrated for the sake of the gods at all, but simply to get rid of demons (ἵνα οὗτοι ἀποστῶσι). A house is full of demons, and we must purify it first (προκαθαίρουσι) and eject (ἀποβάλλουσι) them, whenever we would call upon

Grounds of his Vegetarianism.

[1] *Ap. Euseb.*, pr. ev. iv. 22 seq.

God. Such purificatory rites were the pagan analogues to baptismal and other exorcisms among Christians. Porphyry is a late writer, and so it may be argued that he was influenced by the Christianity around him. But according to Eusebius in the same context, Porphyry was largely following Theophrastus (died 281 B.C.). The latter writer specially taught that the beings to whom sacrifices were appropriate and fitting offerings were not gods, but only demons, deceitful and wicked.

Celsus.

Origen lets us know that Celsus [1], the assailant of Christianity during the reign of Antoninus Pius, not only believed in demons, but reckoned Jesus to have been one. Celsus believed [2] that demons watched over every region of the earth, and over all the periods of human life; and he was not even averse to the Egyptian belief, that thirty-six demons preside over the thirty-six parts of which the body is made up, and that cures [3] can only be effected by invoking them. However, Celsus was suspicious [4] of the worship of demons as likely to involve men in magic arts, and make them forgetful of beings higher than demons. "For," says he, "we should not perhaps distrust wise men who say that most of the demons that haunt the earth (περιγείων) are immersed in material things and riveted to blood and reek of altars, and are led captive by monstrous chantings, and are enchained by other such charms, so that they can hardly do more than heal the body, and foretell what is going to happen to a man or to a community. What concerns the actions of perishable beings, this much and no more do they know and are able to do."

We see from such passages as the above that, as regards demons, Origen stood with his feet on the same ground as Celsus and Porphyry, the representative pagans of the second and third centuries; not only so, but their common doctrine of the natures, habits, and faculties of demons is

[1] *C. Cels.* viii. 39.
[2] Ibid. viii. 55.
[3] Ibid. viii. 58.
[4] Ibid. viii. 60.

carried back by Celsus' reference to the wise men, with whom he hesitated to disagree, to an earlier period than his own, certainly to the first century of our era. Theophrastus, to whom we have already alluded, may very well have been one of these wise men. His picture of demons feeding on blood and reek of sacrifice is identical with that drawn by Celsus. These wise men were also pagans, or Celsus would not speak of them with so much respect.

Demons in dry places.

Another of Origen's extracts from Celsus bearing upon demons is to be noticed, because of the allusion it contains to demons that lived in waterless places. "As many demons," he says, "as live in dry places (*τόποις ἐνδιατρίβουσιν αὐχμηροῖς*) and have their bodies rather dry (*ὑπόξηρα*), as are, they say, the demons with donkey's legs—all these transform themselves into human beings, though they occasionally liken themselves to dogs and lions and other animals that have a manly look about them." Now the empusa or hobgoblin, of whom we read in Aristophanes [1] and Demosthenes [2], also had donkey's legs. It is clear then that the demon who sought rest in waterless places was one of these dry demons that had a partiality for the human form divine, though he had donkey's legs, as Satan in Christian pictures of him has those of a goat, like an ancient fawn. Thus he was quite a classical being. It may have been an ancient belief that evil spirits cannot pass running water. It has certainly been so in later times. "A running stream they dare na' cross," as Burns wrote in his *Tam o' Shanter*. In this case there was a bridge, and yet the demons in pursuit of Tam could not cross it; any more than the evil spirits in the *Avesta* could cross the Chinvat bridge over the water into heaven. But neither could the good souls have entered Paradise without this bridge, which was a *farsang* in breadth. The shades of old equally required Charon with his boat to ferry them over the Styx; and in the folklore of every race we find bridges, often merely of

[1] Aristoph., *Ran.* 293, and *Eccl.* 1056. [2] Demosth. 270, 25.

string, stretched over a river, provided for demons and souls of men to cross by. Mr. Whitley Stokes reminds me that in the Vision of Adamnan there is given an elaborate description of such a bridge. But I suspect that the New Testament demons simply resorted to waterless places because the dry desert was the natural haunt of evil spirits, as in Isaiah. Edom laid waste is to be the home of the satyr and night-monster.

In another passage Celsus[1] relates how he had seen in the hands of certain presbyters, of the Christian persuasion, barbarous (i. e. non-Greek) books containing the names of demons and gibberish. These books which Celsus saw the Christians use must have been similar to some of the magic papyri found in recent times in Egypt, in which the name of Jesus competes with the names of Abraham, Solomon, and other Hebrew worthies, and even with those of pagan deities. The barbarous tongue which the Christian presbyters used in the middle of the second century was no doubt Aramaic or Hebrew.

Apollonius of Tyana.

It is in the life of Apollonius by Philostratus that we have some of the most remarkable tales of demons and exorcism which remain to us in Greek literature. Apollonius was a contemporary of Jesus Christ, and made it his mission, as a follower of Pythagoras, to banish from the religion of his Greek contemporaries sacrifices of animal victims. He died in Ephesus, where he may very well have come into contact with St. John. Several contemporary writers left lives or memoirs of him which are unfortunately lost, so that we depend for our knowledge of him on the life by Philostratus, a sophist born 182 A. D.

The ironic demon.

The scene of the following incident is laid in India, and it seems to have been taken by Philostratus from the memoirs of the sage, composed by his credulous Syro-Greek follower Damis. There was brought to him a woman who besought him to heal her son,

[1] *C. Cels.* vi. 40.

a boy sixteen years of age, who had been possessed for two years by a demon of an ironical and lying disposition. Her account of it was that this demon was in love with her child because of his good looks; and that it allowed him to have no sense, nor to go to school or drill nor yet remain at home, but drove him out into desert places. "And the boy moreover had lost his own voice, and spoke in a deep hollow tone, like a grown up-man; and looked at you with another's eyes rather than with his own. And I, said the mother, weep and mope and reprove my son, as is natural, but he does not know me." The demon, she went on, had used the boy's voice to proclaim himself, and said that he was the shade of a man who had died long ago on the battlefield, and out of disgust for his wife—who had married another man on the third day after his death—he had transferred his affections to this child. The demon, we read, was very angry with the mother when she proposed to appeal to Apollonius for aid, and threatened to kill her son if she accused him to the sage. The boy was far away, so Apollonius merely took a letter out of his bosom, full of threats of a kind to scare off the shade, and gave it to the mother, saying, "Be of good cheer, for he will not kill your boy when he has read this." The threats which cowed this demon were probably similar to those used by Christian exorcists. They were of burnings and tortures, such as we read of in the Book of Enoch, in Minucius Felix, in Tertullian, and in the Gospels. In another story, which I shall quote, of Apollonius this point is made certain.

The demon and the bridegroom.

Here is the outline of another story[1] which Philostratus relates on the authority of the same Damis. Menippus, a young philosopher, was to marry a rich and beautiful Phoenician girl at Corinth. The sage appeared at the marriage-banquet, and denounced the bride as a *φάσμα* or ghost, of the kind known as an empusa or lamia or mormolukia, a species of hobgoblin

[1] Philostr., *Vit. Apollon.* iv. 24.

given up to sensual enjoyment, and after a while devouring the body of the youths they seduce. Instantly all the lights and goblets vanished from the young man's eyes, and the ghost appeared to weep; and she besought the sage not to punish her, nor compel her to avow what she was. But he pressed her hard and gave her no respite till she admitted that she was an empusa, and was fattening Menippus with pleasures in order to devour his body. Ἐλέγχειν, to convict, is the word used[1] in this book to express the sage's triumph over the demons. So, we saw in reading Tertullian and Minucius Felix, the Christian exorcist's success lay in his being able to force the demons to own to being demons and nothing more.

The demon and the statue.

On another occasion a drunken youth scoffed at Apollonius for his piety[2]. But he looked up at him and said, "'Tis not thou that art thus insolent, but the demon who drives thee on without thy knowing it." And apparently, goes on the narrator, the young man was possessed without being aware of it; for he kept laughing at things at which no one else laughed, and then would fall to weeping without any cause, and talked and sang to himself. After a while Apollonius fixed him with his eye, and the shade (εἴδωλον), after it had uttered sounds of fear and wrath, proper to beings who are being *burned and tortured*, at last swore that he would leave the youth and never fall on any man again. Then the sage, speaking in anger, as a master would to a criminal and shameless slave, bade the demon give a token of his departure as he went out. "I will throw down yonder statue," answered the demon, pointing to one of those which lined the king's stoa. And the statue at first moved slightly, and then fell with a crash. There was an uproar of applause; but the youth, as if he had just woke up, rubbed his eyes and looked at the sunlight, and was ashamed, because all eyes were turned on him. And from that day he gave up riotous living, and was a serious

[1] Philostr., *Vit. Apollon.* vi. 11, p. 112.

[2] Ibid. iv. 20. 72.

dévoué of philosophy, and a pupil of Philostratus. This story also is given in a context which shows that Damis was the original teller of it. It illustrates the early Christian belief that statues and idols were inhabited and possessed by evil spirits.

Trustworthiness of Philostratus.

It is astonishing that even critical writers, like Baur and A. Reville, have suggested that these tales were composed by Philostratus in imitation of the Gospel narrative. It is true that Hierocles, the persecutor of the Christians at the end of the third century, casting about for a cult and a demi-god to play off against Christ and Christianity, pitched upon Apollonius. But no careful reader of the work of Philostratus, composed nearly a hundred years earlier, can entertain such a notion. If these anecdotes were drawn from Damis, as the context serves to show, they must have been originally penned before 100 A. D., at the very time when, and in the very localities in which, the Gospel was shaping itself out of oral traditions of Jesus. Unfortunately, we have not got the actual memoirs of Damis, and only know them through the references which Philostratus gives to them; but Eusebius, who probably had access to them, does not suggest that either Damis or Philostratus had any idea in composing them of imitating Christ's miracles. He is indeed sceptical about some of the miracles [1] related of Apollonius, but is far from accusing Philostratus of having coined them. On the contrary, he ascribes them by implication to the inventiveness of Damis the Syrian, when he blames, as he does, Philostratus for not having followed the more sober biography of Apollonius, composed by Moeragenes. Nor does Eusebius for long maintain this critical attitude, so unusual to him, in regard to the demon stories; for he ends by candidly admitting [2] that they were true, and argues that Apollonius really worked miracles, but by infernal means only. He had merely ejected lesser demons with the aid of a greater one. If, then, there is

[1] Euseb. in *Hierocl.* 432. [2] Ibid. 456, 457, 459.

a certain resemblance between the miracles of Apollonius and those of the Gospel narratives, it is assuredly due to the fact that the evangelists, like Damis, were Syro-Greeks. It should be further observed in confirmation of this view that there is a very close resemblance between Philostratus' story of the demon that threw down a statue as it went out of the youth, and that told by Josephus of the demon that tipped over a basin of water in its exit. This, and not any Gospel miracle, is therefore the nearest analogue. And this resemblance to Josephus demonstrates not only that Philostratus had no thought of imitating the New Testament, which there is no reason to suppose he had ever read, but that the tale, though only preserved in the pages of the later rhetorician, may yet date from the first century. And if Damis, a Syro-Greek follower of Apollonius, had such things to tell of his own master; why should not the followers of Jesus, also Syro-Greeks, have told similar stories of him? I believe that if the memoirs of Damis could be recovered, they would go farther to establish the antiquity and *bona fides* of the evangelistic records than all the apologetic commentaries ever written.

We have seen how, during the first three centuries of our era, Pagans and Christians vied with one another in credulity; and this monotony of superstition forms a dark background over which, in the latter half of the second century, there suddenly flashes out, like summer lightning, the wit and good sense of the single rationalist writer of that long period, whose works remain to us.

Lucian, the Voltaire of the second century.

I refer to Lucian of Samosata, who, being born about 130 A.D., was exactly a contemporary of Irenaeus. This writer, in a dialogue entitled "Philopseudes, or the Lover of Lies," has satirized with the most subtle irony the faith, so general in his age, in magic cures and in demonic agencies of every kind. He begins with an ironical defence of the old classical myths, which, as having inspired much that was beautiful in art and poetry, were respectable in comparison with

what was believed in his own age. "And what would become of Hellas," he asks, "if you took away the halo with which these myths surround her? Why, the *cicerones* would die of starvation, for the visitors they show around would not care to hear the truth, even if they paid nothing for the privilege." Substitute Palestine for Hellas, and a modern Syrian dragoman for the ancient *periegetes*, and how much of truth, old and new, have we not in this remark?

His dialogue, Philopseudes.

The scene of the dialogue is laid in a sick-room, and there are present, the physician Antigonus, and a long-bearded philosopher Eucrates, and one Ion. A remedy is propounded to ease the pain in the sick man's legs. It is this: Take with the left hand off the ground the tooth of a field-mouse killed in a particular way; tie it into the skin of a lion just flayed off, and wrap it round the legs, accompanying each action with the proper incantation.

Lucian hints a doubt whether even the Nemean lion's skin would be much use. And why, he asks, should a fever or a swelling be afraid of a miraculous name or a formula uttered in a barbarous tongue, and forthwith run away out of the groin? Are not such remedies old wives' tales? The answer made by Dinomachus, the champion of the superstition impugned, is one not peculiar to the second century: "If you don't believe that cures are wrought by means of holy names (ἱερῶν ὀνομάτων), why, then you must be an atheist." Lucian is not convinced; so to confute the sceptic, another interlocutor recounts a cure which he had himself witnessed. His gardener had been stung on the big toe by a viper, and was lying down and like to die. A Babylonian was fetched, who set the sick man on his legs at once, and drove the poison out of his body with a certain incantation, and by merely tying to his foot a bit of stone chipped out of the tomb of a dead virgin.

This is the first allusion I know of in literature to the

efficacy of the relics of a dead saint, though we have, of course, in Acts[1] much earlier testimony to the virtues inherent in handkerchiefs or aprons taken from the body of a live one.

Ion follows up this experience with a still better one. There was a field infested by reptiles. The same Chaldaean came at dawn and pronounced over it, out of an ancient book, certain names hieratic in character and seven in number. At the same time he purified the ground with a sulphur torch, going round it thrice. Out marched the serpents many, and asps and vipers, and horned snakes and adders, and toads and bull-frogs; all except one old dragon, who from age could not creep out, or else did not hear aright the summons to quit. But the magus knew that one was left in; so he chose out the youngest snake and sent him to fetch the old one, who thereupon came forth in a trice. And when they were all mustered, the Babylonian blew upon them, and they were all burned up in a second by his breath, to the astonishment of the bystanders. "And please tell me, interrupts Lucian, how did the old dragon manage? Did the young serpent, sent back as ambassador, lead him by the hand, or had he a walking-stick to help him along?"

The Chaldaean and the snakes.

Then another of the faithful recites what he had seen, namely, a certain Hyperborean sage walking on the sea in his native brogues, and floating in the air; not to mention the demons which he could bring up, and the stale corpses which he called back to life.

Lucian is still incredulous. "What then," asks Ion, "do you say to those who rid the possessed of their bogies (δειμάτων), and who so manifestly exorcise or 'sing out' (ἐξᾴδοντες) the spectres (φασμάτων)? I need not," he goes on, "speak of what I have seen myself; for is not every one familiar with the Syrian from Palestine who is an expert in these

The exorcism of the possessed.

[1] Acts xix. 12.

matters? Think of how many people he gets hold of, who swoon with the moon and roll their eyes and foam at the mouth, and yet he sets them on their legs and sends them away all right, provided he is well paid for getting rid of their ills. For so soon as he stands over them, as they lie on the ground, and asks whence they came when they entered the body, the sick man himself says nothing, but the demon answers in Greek or in a barbarous tongue, and says where he is from, and how and why he entered into the man. Then the Syrian brings his exorcisms into play, and if the demon does not obey, he threatens him, and so drives him out. Why, I myself saw one go out whose complexion was black and of the colour of smoke."

"Oh, that's nothing!" answers Lucian. "Why you, Ion, can even *see* the ideas of your father Plato, which are a very dim spectacle to my weak eyes."

We recall the title, "The Black One," applied by Barnabas to the Devil; we recall Tertullian's demons that blushed with shame when the Christians cast them out; we think of the dragon in Revelations, of the miracles of Lazarus, of the Gadarene, and others. And at first sight we are inclined to suppose that the shafts of Lucian's satire are directed against Christianity. The magician blows on the reptiles as Christ blew on his disciples, and as Christian priests and exorcists blew upon catechumens and others from whom demons had to be ejected[1]. Not only this, but the Syrian from Palestine consumes them with his breath as Christ was to consume the anti-Christ. The possessed in Lucian lie down on the ground to be exorcised, even as they were cast upon the earth by the demons of the Gospel, and as they also lay down in the exorcistic ritual of the Church[2]. But our inference would be too hasty, for the blowing was

Did Lucian assail Christian superstition?

[1] So Cyril Hierem. (*Catech.* I. c. v. p. 18) prays that his catechumens may be blessed, whether they had been blown upon or exorcised (κἂν ἐμφυσηθῆς κἂν ἐπωρκισθῆς).

[2] See the *Dictionary of Christian Antiquities*, art. Exorcism.

the regular way of driving out evil spirits. You blew in a good spirit and the bad ones made off. Hence the luckiness of a sneeze among all races, civilized or savage, for it is a symptom that you are full of good spirits ; just as with Porphyry, internal wind betokens an evil spirit inside one's stomach. Celsus, so Origen informs us [1], had seen quacks in the public places of Alexandria selling for a few pence their august formulae (*μαθήματα*), and driving out demons from men, and *blowing away diseases* (*νόσους ἀποφυσῶντας*), and calling up the shades of heroes, and feasting their dupes on course after course of imaginary viands. If Celsus *saw* all this, why could not Lucian his contemporary satirize it? To see in his satire, as many have done, a covert attack on Christianity, is absurd. But even if it were without the parallel testimony of Celsus, the context in Lucian would of itself assure us that he is assailing not the Christians but the Neo-Platonists.

Raising of the dead.

It is true that a few pages further on, when Antigonus declares that he knew a man who had risen from the dead twenty days after his burial, and that he had attended him professionally both before his death and after his resurrection, we are tempted to see an allusion to the story told by Irenaeus and also to that of Lazarus. But there is no real reason why we should. People rose from the dead with some frequency in those times, and the *ὑστερόποτμοι*, or persons who had come back to life, were so numerous that the right mode of their re-entry into their properties had to be regulated by custom. They were to come back through a hole in the roof, and not through the gates or doors. There is a certain class of critics who insist upon seeing in any history of a demon exorcised or of a dead man raised to life, no matter who the writer, an imitation of and a covert attack on the Gospel miracles. If they only read a little further they would realize that such incidents were extremely common in almost any age except our own.

[1] *C. Cels.* i. 68.

Let me close my chapter upon pagan demonology with the delightful story of the Demon of Temessa, told by Pausanias (bk. vi. p. 184 of ed. 1583).

Pausanias' Demon of Temessa.

After the fall of Troy, Ulysses was driven by the winds from one to another of the cities of Italy and Sicily, and in the course of his wanderings touched at Temessa also. There one of his sailors ravished a virgin after intoxicating her with drink; and the citizens, to avenge the insult, stoned him to death. Ulysses left the outrage unpunished and departed; but the shade of his murdered companion continued to rage against the inhabitants of Temessa of all ages, so that they at last thought of quitting their country to escape from the pest. Before taking this final step they consulted the Pythian Apollo, who in an oracle bade them appease the hero and, consecrating a site, raise a temple to him. They were moreover, to devote to the dead hero, year by year, the most beautiful they could find of their virgins. This they proceeded to do, and thenceforth they went unmolested. It happened, however, one day, that a man named Euthymus came to their city, just when the usual sacrifice was being offered to the god. And they say that when he heard of it, he asked to be allowed to enter the temple. There he beheld the girl, and at first he pitied her, but soon his pity turned to love; and the girl promised that she would be his if he saved her. So he seized his arms and did battle with the demon, overcame him, and drove him beyond the walls and out of the territory; and the demon, thus banished from the company of men, drowned himself in the sea. "And they relate, continues Pausanias, that after the entire city was thus delivered from the foulest of calamities, Euthymus had a very splendid wedding. And about this Euthymus, he says, I have myself learned from very ancient monuments that he lived to a great old age, and did not die after all, but ceased to be a man in some other way. Temessa is still inhabited up to my day, so I heard from a merchant who

had sailed thither. All this I only heard, says Pausanias in conclusion; but what follows I know, because I saw it in a picture, which in turn was a copy of an old picture. The picture represented a youth of Sybara, and the river Calatrus, the spring Calyce; and there was Hera as well, and the town of Temessa, and among these was the demon whom Euthymus cast out. And in colour he was awfully black (δεινῶς μέλας), and his appearance altogether most awful. But he wore for raiment a wolf's skin, and his name was given in letters on the picture as Lybas." Pausanias wrote soon after the middle of the second century; but Strabo, who died A.D. 25, glances (p. 255) at the same legend. The demon terribly black is already familiar to us in the epistle of St. Barnabas.

Tatian on Demons.

Tatian, who was a pupil of Justin Martyr, and flourished about A.D. 150–180, is our first explicit witness to the existence of all four Gospels, of which he made a concordance. In his address to the Greeks, he seems to incline to a rather more material view of the nature of demons than most of the early Fathers. "The Demons," he writes [1], "so called by the Greeks, are composed of matter (*hulê*), and have acquired therefrom spirit (*pneuma*). They are dissolute and greedy beings." But he does not consistently maintain this view; for in the next sentence he admits that some of them have turned towards what is purer (i.e. in matter), and that not all turn toward that which is inferior, and adapt their conduct thereunto. "These demons," he continues, "you Greeks worship; and they are generated out of matter, but far removed from its true order. For through their own wickedness they became vainglorious, and taking the bit between their teeth, they were eager to become stealers of the godhead. But the Lord of all allows them to plume themselves, only until the present world (*kosmos*) reaches its term and is destroyed, and the Judge comes."

And after a little, Tatian writes in a way which enables

[1] *Ad. Gr.* 255.

us to understand the animism of the Gospels. "There is," he declares, "a spirit in the stars, a spirit in the angels, a spirit in plants and waters, a spirit in men, a spirit in animals. It is one and the same spirit, but it has differences in itself."

Demons have not flesh.

Further on in the treatise (p. 257), Tatian has more to tell of the nature of demons. They have, he says, no flesh at all; but their composition is spiritual (*πνευματική*), like that of fire or of air. And only those who are under the protection of the Spirit of God can easily behold the bodily nature of demons. Other men, namely the psychics (*psuchikoi*), cannot see them[1]. For the lesser cannot rise to a comprehension of the greater.

They are not souls of dead men.

The demons cannot repent, being emanations or rather eradiations of matter and wickedness. Nor are those demons who impose commands on men the souls of deceased men. For the latter will not gain through death gifts of power and insight which they had not when alive in the body. No; demons to please their own ill-will revel like Bacchants inside men, and pervert our depraved and sunken wills with various lies as if we were puppets, in order to frustrate our attempts to soar upwards to heaven. Psychics also, he goes on to admit, can see demons, but only if the latter reveal themselves, in order to impose on their dupes, so that they may be worshipped by them as being something better than they really are. If they could, the demons would drag down heaven itself in their own ruin. But this, being made of inferior and lower matter, they cannot do. They are only able to take credit to themselves for causing diseases and dissensions in the matter (*hulê*) within us, by assailing us whenever we are ill. Sometimes, however, they of themselves disturb by the hurricane of their own wickedness the state of our bodies. But in such cases they will depart in fear if we

Possession.

[1] Cp. 1 Cor. ii. 14.

smite them with the recital of God's power. In such a manner the sick man is to be healed.

Summary.

Let me sum up the points of chief importance in these records of demonological belief and practice among the pagans.

1. As early as the fourth century B. C., Xenocrates and Chrysippus, Empedocles and Theophrastus, taught that there were evil demons as well as good ones. These evil ones were often the departed spirits of bad men, and were in the end to be punished and so purified. They, and not the true gods, delighted in the sacrifice of live animals.

2. The evil stories related of the gods were in reality true, not of the gods, but only of bad demons. This teaching we meet with not only in these older writers, but in Dionysius of Halicarnassus [1], who died B. C. 7. It was really meant as an attempt on the part of pious Greeks to purge their religious stories of the gross immoralities which disfigured them. But in the hands of Christian apologists it became a weapon against the entire fabric of the older religion. The gods of the heathen were evil demons, and therefore it was that they committed these immoralities. As R. Heinze truly remarks [2], the substitution by the Christians of evil demons for the ancient gods was suggested and grew out of the old Greek philosophy itself.

3. There are indications in Plutarch, who was born about 40 A. D., of the exorcism of demons by the use of names. Lucian's dialogues prove that in the second century the use of names was very common. Moreover, the Ephesian formulae, already mentioned by Aristotle, were exorcisms.

4. Except, however, in popular language, there is little notice taken in pagan writers of demoniacal possession before the first century A. D. After that century it is extremely common; and literary pagans of the second and third centuries held practically the same beliefs as

[1] Dionys., *Halic.* ii. 47.

[2] *Xenocrates*, p. 116.

the Christian writers who were their contemporaries. Concurrently with Christianity, itself in a Roman's eyes a Syrian superstition, there was a diffusion over the Greek and Roman worlds of oriental demonological beliefs akin to the Christian.

5. The pagans, like Celsus, were in a sense less of heathens than Origen, in that their view of nature was less sombre. Celsus[1] attributed less influence to evil demons, and consequently more to good ones, and to the Almighty God, whose agents the good demons are. God, he held, could not be injured, and was pleased when honour was rendered to good demons. We must not forget to be grateful to the good demons, because there are bad ones. The objectionable element in ancient myths he regarded as mere poetic lies, and he was in this respect less superstitious than the Christian Fathers who condemned, yet believed, such myths.

F. C. CONYBEARE.

[1] *C. Cels.* viii. 66, 33; iv. 33.

THE LEWIS-GIBSON HEBREW COLLECTION.

I.

MRS. LEWIS and Mrs. Gibson, whose names are now a household word with all students of Semitic languages, acquired, on their travels during the last three or four years, a fair number of Hebrew MSS., which extend over almost all branches of Jewish literature. They consist, it is true, mostly of fragments, but this by no means diminishes their significance. I need only remind the reader of the Ecclesiasticus Fragment, which by general consent is one of the most important discoveries made within recent decades. I therefore propose to give in this "Quarterly" a short list of the treasures in their possession. I can hardly doubt that it will prove interesting to the student of Rabbinic literature.

MS. No. 1. Paper. 2 leaves, representing legal documents of the year 1409 Selu. (= 1098), written in Hebrew characters, but the language is a mixture of Arabic and Hebrew.

(1 a) בתרין בשבה דהוא עשרין וארבעה יומין בירח ניסן דשנת אלפא וארבע מאה ותשע שנין למנינא דרגילננא ביה בפסטאט מצרים דעל נילום נהרא מותבה חצר לבית דין מ׳ ששון בר נתן וטלב מ׳ משה בר משה הלוי הידוע . . . . . ומאי דהוה קדמנא כתבנא וחתמנו למיהוי לזכו ולראיה יצחק בי׳ שמואל נ״ע נתנאל בי׳ יפת נ״ע אברהם בר שמעיה החבר נבחוּוּא נין שמעיהו גאון נ״ע.

These signatures are followed by another document which begins: בתרין בשבה דהוא תמניה יומי בירח אייר דשנת אחט לשטרות. It finishes with the same formula as the preceding, but is not accompanied by signatures.

(1 b) בחמשה בשבה דהוא עשרין וחד יומין בירח אדר דשנת אלפא וארבע מאה ותשע שנין למנינא דרגילננא ביה בפסטאט מצרים דעל נילום נהרא מותבה הוה חצר לבית דין הקבוע מפי כבוד גדלת קדשת מרנו ורבנו אדונינו מבורך אלוף הבינות חכם (?) הישיבה סנהדרא רבא שר השרים עוז בית ישראל ירום הודו.

This Meborach is probably identical with that mentioned in MS. Add. 3335 in the Cambridge University Library, in the following connexion: והיה לנו לפני המלך הגדול הזה איש עברי צדיק וחסיד רופא וחכם ויועץ היה מנעוריו ושמו מבורך נע[1]. The date of this document, which is defective at the beginning, may thus safely be fixed in the generation succeeding Meborach, about the first quarter of the twelfth century.

The parties mentioned are Yason and Moses, as above. The document breaks off at the end of 1 b in the middle of a sentence.

(2 a) begins: חצד בית דין יום אלאתנין אלתאמן עשר מן אדר שנת אתט בפסטאט מצרים בשארה בר חלפון וטאלב שלמה בר הלל.

(2 b) Another document of בחמשה בשבה דהוא שיתה יומין בירח ניסן דשנת אלפא וארבע מאה ותשע שנין . . . . . The parties mentioned are מ מבשר בר חלפון and שלמה בר הלל.

MS. No. 2. Parchment. 1 leaf. Greatly injured. Many words erased, whilst certain lines are cancelled. It commences: שהדותא דהות באנפנא, &c. Names occurring in it: מרוֹר יפת הזקן ישׁעו בר מרוֹר שמריה הזקן נע. Again: מכארם היקר יצישו בר שלמה בר רבנא ישועה החבר נע. The date is missing.

MS. No. 3. Parchment. Represents the remainder of a marriage contract (תוספת כתובה). Name, date, and signatures are all missing.

MS. No. 4. Parchment. 1 leaf. Containing a divorce-letter of the year 1492 Selu. (=1181). It begins: בשבה דהוא . . .

[1] Almost all the names mentioned in this MS. occur very often in another collection of MSS. on which I am working now, where they are treated in a fuller and completer manner.

עשרין וארבע מאה ותשעין ותרתין שנין לשטרות בפסטאט מצרים אנא [צ]דקה בר חלפון נע . . . . ליבי אנתתי סמר בת יוסף נע. Signatures: לוי הלו בי׳ר אברהם זלה״ה and מבורך בר נתן החבר זצל.

MS. No. 5. Parchment. 1 leaf (33 × 29 cm.). Written in the so-called square Syriac letters, probably not later than the beginning of the twelfth century.

It represents a fragment of the Jerusalem Talmud, corresponding with edd. (Krotoschin) Tractate Gittin, 44 b, line 9 (from the top), and continuing to 44 d, line 27 (also from the top). It commences:

(1 a) אתא עובדון קומי רבנן וכשרין וחשון הדה מסעייה לר׳ יוחנן מן דרבנין ופליגה עלוי על דר׳ שמעון הדא מסייעיה לר׳ שמעון בן לקיש מן דר׳ שמעון ופליגה עלוי מן דרבנן. הל בכל בותבין.

(1 b) תגרשי בי אלא במקום פלוני פרק ג מהו מקרין מלמדי וגו׳

The Text of the Mishnah is *not* given at the beginning of the *Perek*. The MS. breaks off in the middle of a line with the words: ברם הכה בנותן על מנת כן ר׳ עזרה בעה קומי ר׳.

The variants are numerous, and the following is a full list of them. It is hardly necessary to say that some are mere clerical errors. The first reading, before the comma, is that of the editions, the second that of the MS. In some few cases the reading of the editions was put in brackets for the sake of greater clearness.

44 b, l. 9 עובדא, עובדין; l. 10 וכשרין, וכשרון; ההד, הדא מסייעא; מסייעה; ופליגא, ופליגה; l. 12 הלכה ג׳, om.; חוקק, חקק; ll. 13–15 א״ר חסדא . . . אפי׳ חוקק, omitted; l. 15 פינקסא, פינכסא; l. 16 עורב, עירב; l. 18 מדינח׳, מדנחא; ערומין, ערימין; l. 19 מסטירין, מיסטיריקון; כותב, כתב; והן, והך; l. 20 הפין, עפין; ll. 20–21 דאמרי משום; משרשיא, משרשיה; l. 24 וסקרה, וסיקרא; תריהון אמרין, תרויהו; ר׳ שמעון בן לקיש, ר״ל; l. 25 משם כתב ומשם מוחק, מוחק ומ׳ כותב; ll. 25–26 והן . . . בסיקר׳, om.; l. 27 שאינן, שאינן; בהלכות, בהילכות; לפניהם והן חותמין, לפניהם וחותמין; ומקורע, ומקרע; l. 28 מתירין, מתירים; l. 29 מרחיב לפניהן, מרחוב לפניהם; l. 30 לינו, לינן; l. 31 וערר, ועירר;

שתתנה לי, om.; l. 32 זה ג׳, בתבנית כתב איש (כתבנית כתב כשר); ר׳ יוסה לכשתרצה, ר׳ יוסי לכשתדיני; ולא דאמ׳, ולא דא l. 33; שתתננהו לי, והוה; תרונגיה, תרונגא l. 35; ובמצוותיו, ובמצוותו; ב״ר בין, בי ר׳ בון l. 34; ויש כתב פורח · נקרע, ויש כתב · עור הנקרע l. 38; כים, טם l. 37; והווה; פסול נקרע הרי זה פסול בשלא נקרע, פסול · בשלא נתקרע l. 39; תנא בינה שילוח l. 41; בית דין פסול אי זה הוא, ב״ד אי זהו ll. 39–40; לכתובתך, לכתובתיך l. 44; ואתייה, ואתייא l. 42; תנה בינה בר שילה; עזרה בעה–מנה–מהוא, זעירא בעי–מנא–מהו l. 46; ליה, לה l. 45; l. 47 נקנה המקנה והכה – אבין – שנייה, נקנה המקח והכא – הכין – שנייא l. 48; ספר מיוחד שאינו א׳, ספר שאינו אוכל l. 50; יוסה, יוסי (טעמא) l. 51; טעם ודרבנן – ספר מיוחד שהוא, (דרבנן – ספר שהוא האוכלין l. 52; האכלים באכלים נשמענה, כאוכלין נישמעינה נגרו, נרדו וחתמו l. 53; בפירוש, כפרוש l. 56; זיכרותו, זכרותו l. 55; וחיתמו; אף להכשר l. 57, אף לעינין הכשר; או – דכת׳ וכל משקה אשר ישתה בכל ll. 59–60, חישב l. 60; אי – דכ׳ ומשקה בכלי טמא ומשקה בכל טמא, כלי יטמא; חשב l. 61; הל אין כותבין, &c.; l. 62 הלכה ד׳ אין; הכה, הכא בטפס כשר ר׳, (בטופס כשר ר״ל א׳ כתב) l. 63; הדא פליגה, הא פליגא זעירה אמ׳ בהדה פליגין ר׳ יוחנן א׳ כתב טרפו בטפס כשר ר׳ שמעון בן אבה–כיתבו וחיתמו–ותולשו, אבא–כתבו וחתמו–ותלשו l. 64; לקיש א׳ כתב; ליעזר, אלעזר l. 66; בה בר יודה ר׳ ליעזר, בה ר׳ יודה · ר׳ אלעזר l. 65; l. 67 דיפתר, די פתר; היא, om.; l. 68; ועידי, ועדים; l. 69; l. 70 עדים, ועדים l. 72; לעזר, אלעזר l. 71; וקשיה על, וקשיא א״ל על; שיהא, שהיה l. 75; הלכה הכל כשרים, &c. הלכה ה׳ הכל; שני, שתי l. 74; ר׳ יוחנן בעי והא הוא וכתב, ר״י אמר והכתיב וכתב לה לשמה l. 76 לה לשמה.

עימו ואתייה כיי דאמר ר׳ שמעון בן, (עמו ואתייא כיי דמר ר״ש) 44 c, l. 1; לקיש הלכה קיבל, &c. הלכה ו׳ קיבל, &c.; l. 2 עובדה, עובדא l. 3; לא שמיע ר׳ אימי, לא שמיע ר׳ אסי l. 5; אמי אילולי, אסי אילולא l. 4; להך) l. 10, אלא, om.; גט כותיו, גט כוותיך l. 8; שקיבל, שיקבל l. 7; הלכה ח׳ אף הנשים . . . בעלה כו׳ אפי׳ נכתב ll. 10–11, להם משם, (משום אותה, ולא נחתם מאמינין אותה · הל אפילו בכתב ולא מיפים מאמינים l. 12 אף אתה מתירה, אף אתה אין מתירה l. 13; דאמר, דמר l. 17; תינרשי, תנרשי; ll. 18–55 the Text of the Mishnah, om.; l. 57

הלכה – כו׳, om.; l. 58 יתר, יותר; l. 59 תנינן, om.; l. 61 לא, om.; לה, om.; l. 64 ועור בר חננא אמ׳ ר׳ בא בר חננא אמר; ll. 65–66 דר״י אמר כתב תרפו בטופ׳ כשר –) מילתיה . . . בתופס פסול, om.; l. 67 מה הוא, מהו; l. 68 דמר ר׳ יוחנן תרפו בטפס פסול – לעזר (אלעזר), l. 69 כן הוא שאל, כן שאל; l. 70 דצריכה – לפם, דצריכין – לפום.

44 d, l. 3 פשיט ליה, פשיטא פשיטא ליה; l. 4 הוא צריכה, הוא פשיטא; l. 6 בשתי – פסולין; l. 7 יוסה – יוסה דתמר, יוסי – יוסי הדא דתימ׳, והא תנינן, והתנינן שני גיטין ששילחו שנים ונתערבו; l. 8 בשני – פוסלין; l. 10 שנים ששילחו שני גטין שווים ונתערבו; l. 12 זה–זה, זו–זו; l. 13 לי, לו (om. דר״ש היא); l. 14 ר׳ יוסה בשם ר׳ בין בר׳, (ר׳ יוסי בשם דר׳ ביבון דר״ש היא דתני אם לאו מן) חייה דר׳ שמעון דתני א׳ לאומן; l. 15 לי–לצורות, לו–לעורות; l. 16 לי–לישיבה, לו–לשכיבה, בטהרה; l. 17 בטהרם; l. 18 (ר׳ חיננא בשם) כן הוא א׳ הכה עד, כך הוא אמר עד; ר׳ חנניה בשם ר׳ בון בר׳ חייא דר׳ היא אמר ר׳ יוחנן, (רבי ביבון בר חייה א״ר); l. 19 פסולין, פוסלין; l. 20 שאינן, שאינו; l. 22 שתתני לי, שתתן לי; l. 24 הרי הוא – התנאין שהתנינו, תנוייו – תנוייו; l. 25 תנאו – תנאו, הרהי – התנאין שתנינן; l. 26 חננא, חיננא; l. 27 עזרא, עזרה.

MS. No. 6. Parchment. 1 leaf. Containing a fragment of the Mishnah, Seder Teharot Tractate כלים. It commences: לידים הטהורות בלבד (chap. xxv, § 7 in the edd.), continuing to ואחד מן העור (chap. xxvii, § 3). Before each chapter the numbers of the paragraphs (which do *not* agree with the edd.) are marked, as for instance before chap. xxvi. הלכ׳ י. The writing (in square, and probably executed in North Africa), which is very fine and clear, testifies to a comparatively early age (not later than the twelfth century). The text differs occasionally from the edd., offering better readings.

MS. No. 7. Parchment. 2 leaves. Containing a fragment from the Babylonian Talmud Tractate Shabbath. It commences, 1 a, with the words from the Mishnah—the *whole* chapter of which precedes the Gemara which comments on it, as is the case now in the Talmud of Jerusalem—תחת הכסת והן נופלות ר׳ אלעזר בן עזריה with the

conclusion-formula סליק פירקא. Next comes the Gemara: במה טומנין ובמה אין טומנין וכו׳ נמ׳ איבעייא להו, &c., continuing to מעשה ולא קשיא הא (corresponding with edd. ff. 47 b–50 a, about the end of the page) with which 1 a breaks off. 2 a commences: ואמר אביי אמרה לי אם, breaking off at the end of 2 b with אבל חינוק שנשבה לבין הגוים (corresponding with edd. ff. 66 b–68 b). About a third part of the space of 2 b is taken up with the text of the seventh chapter of the Mishnah Shabbath. The writing is Spanish square, probably of the thirteenth or fourteenth century, and the text offers comparatively few fresh readings.

MS. No. 8. Parchment. 2 leaves. Containing a fragment of a collection of Responses and Pesakim (probably by the Geonim).

(1 a) commences: דאית ליה זוזי מהימננא, breaking off at the end of (1 b) with ואמ׳ רביהודה אמרב.

(2 b) begins: ועל הבאין ברשותך לא הוא, breaking off at the end of 2 b with שיפרשו מנשוחיהן סמוך.

The writing suggests the twelfth century as the date of the fragment.

MS. No. 9. Paper. 3 leaves. Containing a fragment of the Babylonian Talmud Tractate Berachoth. The MS. is greatly injured, many lines having been eaten through by age.

(1 a) Title-page, but subsequently cancelled: מסכת ברכות תלמוד בבלי לכבוד גּ״ק מר׳ ורבנא ישועה בר צ״ק מ׳ יר׳ . . . . המלמד תּנצּבה והחיי[ם] והשלום ומלוי כל משיל (?) תהא לכבוד מר׳ ישועה ושני . . . משה רחמ . . . . ובן יהי רצון. After this occurs the name ליבין (?) בר חלפון.

(1 b) Blank.

(2 b) ברכות תלמוד של אנשי מזרח (?) לצדקה בן מהתאר (?). Only the letters מאר in this last word are clear and certain. By a later hand on the same page: לשלמה ולארח בני כבוד גדולת קדושת מרנא ורבנא נתן השביעי בחבורה נטריה רחמנא ואורך יומי. Parallel with these words the signature . . . נתן בי״ר אברהם בי״ר.

(2 b) Heading: בערבים וגו׳. This is probably only the reference to the text of the Mishnah. Next comes the גמרא, provided with vowels and accents. The latter were probably intended to assist the student in the task of recital, it being customary to employ a certain intonation in the study of the Oral Law as of the Written Law[1]. The first word is torn away, and the leaf commences now: קאי דכתי [אקרא] קאים קורין דקאתני מאימתי תנא בשכבך ובקומך והכי קת אמ[2] זמן קרית שמע אימת בשכבך ובקומך איבעי אימא יליף מבריתו שלעולם, &c. Before ורמינהו (in 2 b in the edd.) the MS. has סימן קורין ... מתחילין, whilst the words אמרמר are omitted. The page breaks off with the words עני וכהן חד, after which some leaves are missing.

(3 a) commences: ברשעים בעולם הזה (edd. 7 b), and breaks off at the end of 3 b with דמר זוטרא (edd. 8 a). In this leaf the accents are rather rare. The writing points to the twelfth century.

S. SCHECHTER.

[1] See Megillah, 32 b, and Tosaphot and *Aruch Completum* s. v. זמר and גמר. To the references given there are to be added the מעשה אפר by Profiat Duran, p. 21: ודע כי ברוך זה מהשיר בטעמים הנזכרים עם שהוא מיוחד למקרא כבר נהגו בו הקודמים גם כן במשנה והיו קוראים אותה בקבוצם הנבחרים בטעמים ... ולזה תמצא כל ספרי המשנה הקודמים כתובים עם נקוד והטעמים. Cp. also Stern's מבוא, p. 27 a, to his edition of the תשובות תלמידי מנחם. With regard to modern times see אבן ספיר, I, 55 a.

[2] These abbreviations are filled out by a later hand, קתני מאמתי.

(To be continued.)

MASSORETIC STUDIES.

III.

The Division into Verses.

1. *Age of the Division into Verses.*

It is known that the older form of the Biblical text is contained in the scrolls as used in the Synagogues; all external additions which were not admitted in such scrolls are of comparatively later origin. The text of the Torah authorized to be used in the Synagogal service shows the division into books and sections, but not the division into verses. The former division, the *Parashas*, are therefore of greater age than the latter, the *Pesukim*. The text had first been divided into sections according to the contents, and afterwards subdivided into sentences; the division progressed from the greater to the smaller. For the same reason it may be confidently asserted that the subdivision of the verses themselves into smaller portions, according to the sense, has followed, and not preceded, the division into verses; the complete verse is older than the half-verse. The analysis of the text has progressed gradually from a division into books to one into sections, verses, and half-verses.

As the books and sections of the Pentateuch are severally marked in the scrolls used in the Synagogues by empty spaces, and the various verses are not so distinguished, there can be no doubt that the former division hails from pre-Talmudic times, otherwise it would not have been introduced in these scrolls; just as little as the division into verses, which was already known to the oldest traditions that have come down to us. From an historical point of view the *Parashas*, and the division into five books of the Pentateuch, must therefore be called pre-historic. From this it by no means follows, however, that the division into verses first arose in historical times, which, in this case, means the first century of the common era. A distinction must be made between the division into verses and its external indication. The beginning and end of each verse have been marked by external signs only in post-Talmudical times, and yet we find the older Tanaites already speak of separate verses, and there can be no question that even the oldest Tanaites were acquainted with them. It is pure chance that no maxims have been

handed down in their name in evidence of this fact. The counting of the verses, and, consequently, the division into verses, is in Kiddushin, 30 a, attributed to the Soferim. It is therefore beyond doubt that this process took place at a period to which the tradition of the Tanaites does not reach up. The proofs of these assertions will be adduced in the course of our inquiry.

The information afforded by tradition cannot, therefore, fully answer this question. A. Dillmann has condensed the results of the previous investigations in the following sentence: "There is no evidence to show whether larger or smaller sentences were separated in writing; it was certainly not done regularly; but probably occasionally, and in special cases (on the Mesha stone), by means of a vertical stroke, and in poetry verses and parts of verses seem to have been usually marked by distinct lines, for even at a later time poems were written always after that fashion; and with other nations, for instance the Arabians, this mode of writing poetry dates from antiquity[1]." D. H. Müller, in his latest work[2], expresses himself much more confidently: "I believe myself able to maintain, and in certain cases also to prove, that the Prophets in writing down their speeches divided them in lines or verses."

Even if Dillmann's and Müller's opinions be correct, the question remains, whether in Hebrew prose also the text was divided into separate verses? The idea that this might have been effected by means of a vertical stroke, must, I think, be discarded, for no trace of such distinction can be found either in the text of the Bible, or in the older traditional literature. If the text of the Torah had ever possessed such signs to divide the sentences, they could not have been so thoroughly eliminated from it as not to leave some reminiscence at least in the tradition. It is true M. Friedmann[3] wanted to infer from Soferim, 3, 7 (vi. ed. Müller = Sefer Tora, 3, 4), the existence of a division by means of a vertical stroke, but without sufficient ground. For, in the first place, ספר שפסקו does not necessarily mean a stroke, it means merely a division, which might have been effected by an empty space; and, secondly, this prohibition, which is to be found neither in the Talmud, nor in the Midrash, may have originated only at the time when the signs for the vowels and accents came to be developed, and cannot therefore serve as an evidence of antiquity.

[1] Herzog-Plitt, *Protestantische Real-Encyclopaedie*[2], II, 383.

[2] *Die Propheten in ihrer ursprünglichen Form*, Vienna, I, 61. Müller holds that the פתוחות and סתומות, and the formation of stanzas, date from the oldest times.

[3] Literaturblatt of the *Menorah*, I (1891), No. 3. Cp. on this point, Pinsker, *Einleitung in das hebräisch-babylonische Punktationssystem*, p. 133, n. 1.

For the same reason is the expression ושניקד ראשי פסוקים not to be understood as referring to a division in the oldest time by means of points[1].

In the absence of all historical evidence, nothing remains, as far as the oldest time is concerned, except turning to the text of the Bible itself and drawing conclusions from it. Not desiring to enter upon the frequently discussed question of Hebrew metres, stanzas, and versification[2], this being beyond the scope of our investigations, I bring forward only one proof for the pre-Massoretic, or, more exactly, the pre-Talmudic origin of the division into verses[3]. I allude to the alphabetical portions of Holy Writ[4]. It is especially Psalms xxv, xxxiv, and cxix, with their symmetrical half-verses, and the third chapter of the Lamentations of Jeremiah, with its short verses, which seem to me to supply a proof that the division into verses was not a product of theological knowledge, but had its origin in the very thought and speech of the ancient Hebrews. These short sentences cannot be considered as *strophae;* if we were to designate them as such, it would amount only to giving another name to the same thing. In the same manner I believe Psalms cxi and cxii to afford a proof for the primitive nature of the half-verses. Dichotomy is an inherent law of ancient Hebrew literature. The application of the alphabet to denote the commencement of verses bears ample evidence that the authors appreciated the separate nature of sentences; it may, therefore, be justly assumed, that the authors of the Bible had such consciousness of a division of the speech according to sentences, not only in poetry but also in prose. The melodious mode of recitation on solemn occasions, which is mentioned in the Talmud[5], may be

[1] There were scrolls of the Torah in the Middle Ages in which a space of the size of one letter was left empty between the verses. Isaac ben Shesheth says in his *Responsae*, No. 286 : מה שמצאת בספר תורה אחר אויר מלא אות אחר בין פסוקא לפסוקא וכו", and permits the questioner the use of the scroll.

[2] Besides the works of Dillmann and Müller, already cited, cf. Delitzsch, *Psalms*, 1st ed., Preface x, part II, p. 394 sqq.; 3rd ed., I, p. 17 sqq.; Budde, *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, II (1882), p. 1 sqq.; *Das Hebräische Klagelied*, XI (1891), p. 234 sqq., and the literature quoted there. Especially important for the subject of versification is S. Berger, *Histoire de la Vulgate*, Paris, 1893, p. 316 sqq. and p. 363 sqq.

[3] I see from Delitzsch, *Psalms*[3], I, p. 20, n. 2, that Hupfeld and Riehm adopted this assumption (*Luth. Zeitschrift*, 1866, p. 300).

[4] Pss. ix, x, xxv, xxxiv, xxxvii, cxi, cxii, cxix, cxlv; Lam. i–iv.

[5] Megilla, 32 a : הקורא בלא נעימה והשונה בלא זמרה. Whether the intonation in use at the present day is identical with this נעימה remains an open question.

of very ancient origin; it certainly is pre-Talmudic. I think that no stronger proof than this for the pre-Talmudic origin of the division into verses can be adduced. Sufficient proofs are only given by the tradition.

2. *The Division into Verses in the Talmud and the Midrash.*

In order to be able to form a judgment on the division into verses by the authorities of Tradition, it is necessary to make a complete collection and examination of the material referring thereto; a thing which has not hitherto been done[1]. The attempt shall therefore be made here to reconstruct a sort of mosaic picture out of the occasional, and widely scattered utterances of the doctors of the Talmud and Midrash.

The word פסוק is of the same formation as the word כתוב; both require the noun דבר as their complement[2]. The root פסק does not occur in Biblical Hebrew, but in the Aramaic dialect it denotes various things[3]. But the way the word is applied in new-Hebrew sufficiently explains the technical meaning of the word פסוק. Only the two following meanings need be considered: (1) "to cleave asunder," (2) "to interrupt." Friedmann, in his aforementioned essay, decides for its derivation from the former meaning, and concludes from it that the separation was marked, either by a vertical stroke at the end, or by a dot at the beginning of the verse. But, as we have already explained, the term פסוק is older than any written designation of the beginning or the end of the verses. We therefore prefer the second meaning; פסק means "to interrupt the reading," "to make a pause." In the Mishna Sheviith we read: מלאכה שהיא פוסקת בשביעית משמטת אינה פוסקת וכו׳ "Labour, which rests in the seventh year," &c. In the same sense the term הפסיק is applied in innumerable passages; for instance, Mech. to 12, 6 (6 a 2): הפסיק הענין; Tosifta Megillah, 4, 10: ממקום שפוסקין שחרית משם מתחילין במנחה וכו׳. ר׳ יהודה ממקום שפוסקין שבת שחרית שם מתחילין שבת הבאה. Similarly we read in Mechilta to 15, 23 (45 a 19): קורין בשבת ומפסיקין באחד בשבת וכו׳. Single passages from the Bible are either called כתוב, after the Writing, or מקרא, after the Reading. Now it is probable that the expression to denote separate verses was taken from the Reading,

[1] Strack, *Prolegomena critica in Vetus Testamentum hebraicum*, pp. 78–80, 122; Harris, JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, I (1884), pp. 224, 231; Friedmann, Literaturblatt of the *Menorah*, I, No. 3. They have dealt with very small fragments only of Talmudical data.

[2] Blau, *Zur Einleitung in die Heilige Schrift*, p. 18.

[3] Cf. Elia Levita, *Methurgeman*, s. v. פסק.

because the reader paused for rest, and not from the Writing, where no external sign marked the division of verses.

A distinction must be sharply drawn between מקרא and כתוב on the one hand, and פסוק on the other hand. The former expressions denote any passage from scripture, without regard to its length; the latter term applies exclusively to a verse. This use of the terms is the predominant one in the older traditional literature. In the Thirteen Rules of R. Ishmael, in which the Torah in its written shape was foremost in the mind of the Tanaite, the term כתוב only is used, because there is no question of verses. The words כתוב and מקרא occur in the same sense in no end of passages; the word פסוק, however, mostly, when it is not so much intended to lay stress on the contents, but rather on the length of the quotation. The portion of the פרשה is therefore called פסוק, e.g. Sifre, II, 4 sub fin.: מי ששמע פסוק אחד ‥‥‥ מי ששמע פרשה אחת וכו׳. Just as, in the same passage, פרק is divided into הלכות, thus פרשה is divided into פסוקים. In Aboth, 6, 3: והלומד מחברו פרק אחד או הלכה אחת או פסוק אחד וכו׳, the word פרשה is perhaps missing. Sifra to 16, 23 (82 b Weiss): כל הפרשה אמורה על הסדר חוץ מן הפסוק הזה[1]. פסוק can also be used as "part of a book"; e.g. Boraitha Sanh. 99 a 38: ת״ר הקורא פסוק של כל התורה כולה מן השמים חוץ מפסוק זה; ib. 101 a 4: שיר השירים ועושה אותו כמין זמר; Tosifta Megilla, 2, 2 (223, Zuckerm.): הקורא את המגלה וטעה והשמיט בה פסוק אחד. פסוק is also used when a certain number of verses is given, e.g. Mishna Megilla, 4, 5: הקורא בתורה לא יפחות מג׳ פסוקים. These instances we shall give completely later on.

We are, however, in a position to show, that in our texts the word פסוק has frequently taken the place of מקרא or כתוב, and this not only in texts of a later origin, but already in the oldest, in the Tanaite Midrashim. Mechilta, 19, 1 (61 b 3), verse 1, 8 of the Song of Solomon is introduced by Johanan ben Zaccai with the following formula: כל ימי הייתי מצטער על פסוק זה; but in the otherwise identical parallel passage of Sifre, II, 305 sub fin. (130 a 12), we find: וכל ימי בקשתי מקרא זה; Tosifta, Kethuboth, 5, 10 (26, F 10), is said in the name of Eleazar bar Zadoc: וקראתי עליה את המקרא הזה, similar to Kethuboth, 67 a 7; it occurs in the same form in Echa Rabba, 1, 16

[1] Ed. pr., Malbim, the parallel passages Joma, 32 a and 71 a, all have פסוק; Jer. Joma, 7, 2 (44 b 33), the word פסוק is omitted. Besides this passage פסוק occurs only twice more in Sifra: at the end of מדות י״ג where most likely וכך הכתוב אומר ought to be read, instead of הפסוק; and to 11, 29 (52 b) כשהיה ר׳ עקיבא מגיע לפסוק זה = Chullin, 127 a. מקרא and כתוב occur, of course, hundreds of times.

(34 b 20), Jerush. Kethuboth 5, 13 (30 e 2), and Pesikta Rabbatai, ed. Friedmann, 140 a, with the difference that פסוק is read instead of מקרא. In Aboth de R. Nathan, ed. Schechter, I, c. 17 (p. 33, l. 5), we read: רי"בז . . . כל ימי הייתי קורא מקרא זה. Besides other differences in the wording we find in the same sentence three times פסוק, and four times מקרא; the latter reading is certainly the original one, for there is no question of the length, but of the contents of the passage. Another instance is this. The contradiction and harmonization of two scripture passages is in numerous cases expressed by the following formula: כתוב אחד אומר וכו" וכתוב אחד אומר וכו" כיצד יתקיימו שני כתובים (מקראות) הללו. Thus Mechilta, 20, 7 (p. 69 a 1): כיצד יתקיימו ד' כתובים אלו; 20, 17 (70 b 2); 20, 24 (73 b 9); 23, 11 (100 b 9). Somewhat differently Mechilta, 22, 8 (92 b 4): ר' שמעון אומר קורא אני עליו כאן וכו" וקורא אני להלן וכו" כיצד יתקיימו שני מקראות הללו. Without regarding the variation of כתוב and מקרא, on which point Mechilta, 12, 5 (4 b), is important, as after ב' מקראות the rule is cited with the expression שני כתובין; cf. Mech. 13, 6=20 b 4 and 12, 15=8 b; and also Sifre, II, 134=Menachot, 66 a, we maintain, that in Mech. 15, 4 (38 a 7) the strange formula: כתוב אחד אומר ירה וכתוב אחד אומר רמה כיצד יתקיימו ב' פסוקים הללו is undoubtedly corrupt, for one word, ירה or רמה, cannot be called פסוק. As a matter of fact I do not think that there is any other passage in which the words כיצד יתקיימו שני פסוקים הללו occur. In the same way ג' פסוקים של צדוק הדין in Sifre, II, 307 (133 a) is a corrupted reading, for in the parallel passage in Aboda Zara, 18 a 20, we read correctly שלש מקראות של צדוק הדין. I learn from my notes that the subtle distinction between פסוק and כתוב or מקרא was disregarded after some time, so that in Echa and Koheleth Rabba the word פסוק is generally used without any notice of its original meaning being taken. This occurs so frequently that it is unnecessary to quote passages from these and other Midrashic works, such as Pesikta de Rab Kahana, &c.[1]

The important question has next to be considered, whether Tradition knew of a fixed division into verses, and of what nature such may have been. We can answer both questions from the tradition, and will therefore quote our sources first. The existence of a fixed division of verses is borne out by the fact that certain numbers of verses are mentioned. The previously quoted Mishna Megilla says: "Not *less*

[1] Baba Bathra, 82 a: א"ל רב אחא בריה דרב אויא לרב אשי מכדי פסוקי נינהו ולקרי מקראות; it is an Amora of the fifth century who speaks. Here פסוקים are equivalent to מקראות; it is an Amora of the fifth century who speaks. Sabbath, 118 b 31, פסוקי דזמרא. There are, besides, numerous other instances from the later tradition.

than *three* verses of the Torah must be read[1]." The Tosifta (ibid. 4, 17, 18) on the other hand says: "No *more* than *three* verses are read without interruption; if it is a Parasha of *four* or *five* verses, it is all read; if it is a Parasha of *five* verses, *three* are read and *two* are left, and the next person reads these *two* and *three* more from the next Parasha, but if this one had *four* or *five* verses, it was all read. As Haftara from the Prophets not more than *three* verses are read; if the Parasha had *four* or *five* verses, all of it is read; if it is a small Parasha, as, for instance, Isa. lii. 3, it is read by itself. At the end of a book (of the Torah), not less must be left than would suffice for seven persons[2]." From the Babylonian Talmud we quote the following Baraithot: Berachoth, 22 b, R. Meir teaches that one who is unclean may read only three verses from the Torah[3]; in the Synagogue not less than ten verses must be read[4]; as Haftara not less than twenty-one verses may be read[5]; if a slave had read in the Synagogue he was not yet declared free[6]; if one had betrothed a wife asserting that he was a Reader, it was enough that he had read three verses in the Synagogue[7].

[1] Deuteronomy Rabbah, c. 7 (227 b): למה התקינו שלא יפחות משלשה פסוקים כנגד אברהם יצחק ויעקב ד"א כנגד משה ואהרן ומרים שניתנה התורה על ידיהן. This is, of course, an Agadic interpretation; such also is that given in Megilla, 21 b: כנגד כהנים לוים וישראלים or כנגד תורה נביאים וכתובים. The law that not less than three verses be read shows that it had been done before; perhaps the reading of one verse is meant. Jer. Kethuboth, 2, 10 (26 D 21): א"ר זעירא א"ר ירמיה העבד עולה משבעה קרויות וידבר עולה מג' פסוקים.

[2] אין קורין בתורה יותר משלשה פסוקין בכרך אחד · אם היתה פרשה של ארבעה ושל חמשה הרי זה קורא את כולה · אם היתה פרשה של חמשה קורא שלשה והניח שנים ועומר אחריו לקרות קורא אותן שנים ועוד שלשה מפרשה אחרת · אם היתה של ארבעה ושל חמשה הרי זה קורא את כולה · אין מפטירין בנביא יותר משלשה פסוקים בכרך אחד · היתה פרשה של ארבעה ושל חמשה הרי זה קורא את כולן · אם היתה פרשה קטנה כגון כה אמר ה' הנם נמכרתם קורין אותה בפני עצמה · אין משיירין בסוף הספר אלא כדי שיקראו שבעה · שייר כדי שיקראו שבעה וקראו ששה ועד שבעה מחומש אחד וכו". The apparent contradiction can be solved in this way, that a difference is made in case other persons have still to read; for then two verses of the Parasha can remain for the next person. Cf. on this rule Jer. Megillah, 4, 5 in (75 b).

[3] אמר ר' מאיר אין בעל קרי רשאי לקרות בתורה יותר משלשה פסוקים.

[4] Megilla, 21 b 22: אלא הא דתני רב שימא אין פוחתין מעשרה פסוקים בבית הכנסת וידבר עולה מן המנין.

[5] Baraitha in Megilla, 23 a: המפטיר בנביא לא יפחות מעשרים וא' פסוקים כנגד שבעה שקראו בתורה. Ibid. 23 b 6: וכי הוי קרינן עשרה פסוקיא אמר לן (ר' יוחנן) אפסיקו.

[6] Kethuboth, 28 b 2: או שקרא (העבד) שלשה פסוקים בבית הכנסת הרי זה לא יצא לחירות.

[7] Kiddushin, 49 a: ת"ר על מנת שאני קריינא כיון שקרא שלשה פסוקים בב"ה הרי זו מקודשת רבי יהודה אומר עד שיקרא ויתרגם.

These figures presuppose a fixed division into verses. So do those sentences in which single verses are mentioned. The aforementioned Mishna in Megilla, 4, 5, reads: "No more than one verse at a time is read to the interpreter, but three verses from the Prophets[1]." To this rule belongs also the observation of the Amoraite R. Chisda: "The interpreter may not commence before the reader has finished the verse, nor must the reader commence before the interpreter has finished his interpretation[2]." "One who reads the book of Esther, either letter by letter, or verse by verse," &c.; "he who wrote and read the Megilla verse by verse[3]." "The threats in Leviticus xxvi and Deuteronomy xxviii must not be read without break, together with the verse preceding them and the verse following them[4]." "The reading of a verse which is not found in the twenty-four books of the Bible is equivalent to the reading of a verse from the Apocrypha[5]."

As a third proof that the verses and their parts bore a fixed distinction, the decisions about the commencement and middle of verses may be cited: "Simeon ben Gamaliel says that on Sabbath the commencement of the verses may be arranged for children by lamplight[6]." Best known is the interpretation given to Neh. viii. 8, according to which ויבינו במקרא means the beginning of the verses[7]. The king Ahab appears to the Amoraite Levi, who had

[1] ולא יקרא לתורגמן יותר מפסוק אחד ובנביא שלשה.

[2] Sota, 39 b: ואמר רבי זירא אמר רב חסדא וכו" ואין המתרגם רשאי להתחיל בתרגום עד שיכלה פסוק מפי הקורא ואין הקורא רשאי להתחיל בפסוק אחר עד שיכלה תרגום מפי המתרגם.

[3] Megilla, 18 b: ת"ר השמיט בה סופר אותיות או פסוקין וקראן הקורא כמתורגמן המתרגם יצא—ת"ר השמיט בה הקורא פסוק אחד לא יאמר אקרא את כולה ואח"כ אקרא אותו פסוק אלא קורא מאותו פסוק ואילך—אלא כתב פסוקא פסוקא קרי ליה. Cf. on the second sentence, the above cited Tosifta Megilla, 2, 2; and on the Talmudical question אלא דכתב וכו", Megilla, 25 a, דאמר פסוקי פסוקי (of the Sh'ma), Berachot, 13 b (cf. Succah, 42 a), פסוקא קמא of the Sh'ma is mentioned.

[4] Megilla, 31 b 23: תנא כשהוא מתחיל (ברכות וקללות) מתחיל בפסוק שלפניהן וכשהוא מסיים מסיים בפסוק שלאחריהן.

[5] Numbers Rabbah, c. 14 (117 a): כל מי שקורא פסוק שאינו מ"כ ספרים כאלו קורא בספרים החצונים. In Kohelet Rabbah, sub fin., Ben Sira and Ben Laana are named as examples. Mention may also be made of Jer. Erubin, 10, 3 (26 b 9), ספוקיא as contrasted with ספר; Jer. Succa, 5, 1 (55 b 20), Jer. Sabbath, 6, 1 (8 b 18): אין קורין פסוק על גבי מכה בשבת · והדין דקרי על יברוחה אסור בוא וקרי את הפסוק הזה על בני שהוא מתבעת · תן עליו ספר תן עליו תפלין בשביל שיישן אסור. Cf. also Sabbath, 103 b 30: ובלבד שיכתוב את הפסוק כולו.

[6] Jer. Sabbath, 1, 4 (3): תני רשב"ג אומר התינוקות מתקינין להן ראשי פסוקיהן לאור הנר; and a little before, מהוא מתקן ראשי פרקים פסקין.

[7] Jer. Megilla, 4, 1 (74 d 50): רבי זעירא בשם רב חננאל . . . ושום שכל אלו המעמים ויבינו במקרא זה המסורת · ויש אומרים אילו ההכרעים · ויש אומרים

been wont to interpret 1 Kings xxi. 25 to his disadvantage, and says to him: "Thou only hast regard to the beginning, but not to the conclusion of the verse[1]." Samuel bar Nachmann says of Num. xxiii. 19, and Simon ben Lakish of Ps. cii. 18 that the beginning of the verse contradicts its latter part[2]. The middle of the verse is also mentioned[3]. Long and short verses are distinguished[4], and even half-verses have a special name[5]. In writing most verses occupied two, three, or four lines[6]. From all these data it is sufficiently clear *that the texts of the Bible as possessed by the Tanaites and Amoraites had an established division* of verses. If therefore the Talmud, Kiddushin, 30 a, attributes the division into verses to the Soferim, it is only meant to express the

אילו ראשי פסוקים. In accord with this, but more accurately, Genesis Rabbah, c. 36 (149 b Wilna): ושום שכל אלו המעמים · ויבינו במקרא אלו ראשי הפסוקים · רב הונא בן לוליאני אומר אלו ההכרעות והראיות (?) · רבנן דקסרין אמרי מכאן למסורת. In Megilla, 3 a, and Nedarim, 37 b, this important passage reads thus: דאמר רב איקי בר אבין אמר רב חננאל אמר רב . . . ושום שכל אלו הפסוקים ויבינו במקרא זה פ׳סוק טעמים ואמרו אלו המסורות. It seems that טעמים is the same as פסוקים, and פסקי טעמים the same as הכרעות. Both expressions mean, respectively, complete and half-verses. The preceding note shows that ראשי פסוקים, which, according to Soferim, 3, 7, were, at a later period, also externally marked, were of importance in Palestine. I know of no passage in the Babylonian Talmud in which ראשי פסוקים, nor in the Palestinian Talmud in which פסקי טעמים, occurred. Whether in Jer. Chagiga, 2, 4 (77 a 45), בתחלה רבו פותח לו ראשי פסוקים ומסכים is not corrupted from ראשי פרקים I should not like to decide. The question is, מעשה מרכבה and פסוקים may be correct, although afterwards פרק is mentioned. On ראש פ׳ and סוף פ׳ cf. Rappoport, Erech Millin, 110 b.

[1] Jer. Sanhedrin, 10, 2 (28 b 18): איה לך רישיה דפסוקא וליה לך סופיה; similarly Levit. Rabbah, c. 36 (96 a): רישיה דהדין פסוקא או סיפיה; Berachoth, 10 a 7: שפיל לסיפיה דקרא, referring to Isa. liv. 1 b; ibid. is Ps. civ. 29 in its relation to civ. 1, called סיפא דענינא, and not דקרא?

[2] Genesis Rabbah, c. 53 (215 b 2), and Pesikta de R. Kahana, ed. Buber, 181 a 1. The same words occur in both passages: הפסוק הזה לא ראשו סופו ולא סופו ראשו. Benjamin ben Levi speaks similarly of Ps. lxix. 34 (Gen. Rabbah, c. 71 init.), and Jose bar Chanina of Song of Solomon vi. 2 (Shir. Rabbah, s. v. = 65 a); cf. *Pesikta Rabbathi*, Friedmann, 8 b.

[3] Jer. Berachoth, 2, 1, sub fin.: באמצע הפרשה ואפילו באמצע הפסוק.

[4] Zebachim, 28 b. Lev. vii. 18 is called קרא אריכא in contrast to xix. 7. In Bamidbar Rabbah, c. 4 (27 b), Num. vii. 9 is called פסוק קטן שהתינוקות קורין.

[5] Numbers Rabbah, c. 13 (108 b), פסקה. This chapter and chapter 14 are from a later date.

[6] Jer. Megilla, 71 c 10: מעה והשמיט פסוק אחד אם יש בו שתים שלש שיטין מתקנו וקורא בו ארבע אינו קורא בו. There were, of course, also verses of only one line, and of more than four lines.

fact generally known and recognized at that period, that this division was ever so old, and its origin lost in the remotest antiquity[1].

Having settled this point we now approach the important question whether the division of verses, known to the doctors of the Talmud, was different from the one we possess? It is only by the production of the direct and indirect testimonies contained in the Talmud and Midrash that idle speculation and gratuitous conjecture can be put a stop to. The material is much more ample than is commonly assumed, and quite sufficient to enable us to come to a decision on the question. For the purpose of greater lucidity we shall produce the proofs in several groups, and commence with those which contain evidence as about certain numbers of verses.

According to the Mishna Taanith, 4, 1, those Israelites whose Mishmar was on service in the temple, had throughout the week a religious service in their towns, in which the history of the creation was read in the following order[2]: first day, Gen. i. 1–8; second day, Gen. i. 6–13; third day, i. 9–19; fourth day, i. 14–23, &c. The Talmud, 27 b, observes in reference to this: בראשית has five verses, יהי רקיע three verses[3], together eight verses[4]; i. 6–13 has 8 verses[5]. Therefore, already at the time of Rav and Samuel, who are the disputants in that passage, the section Gen. i. 1–13 had the same division as in our time. This is the more noteworthy, because ויהי ערב וגו׳ i 3, 19, 23 form a verse by itself, whereas these words are in ver. 5 and 8 only a part of another verse. Indeed, the Palestinian Talmud[6] says that, according to the opinion of those who allow one verse to be severed into two, these words at the reading formed a separate verse.

Numbers Rabbah c. 14 (123 b), and Midrash Tadshe, c. 11 (Epstein,

[1] This view also finds expression in the well-known maxim: כל פסוקא דלא פסקיה משה אנן לא פסקינן; instead of כל פסוקא, Berachot, 12 a, reads כל פרשה.

[2] וקורין במנשה בראשית ביום הראשון בראשית ויהי רקיע׳ בשני יהי רקיע ויקוו המים׳ בשלישי יקוו המים ויהי מאורות׳ ברביעי יהי מאורות וישרצו המים וכו׳. This can serve also as an example of the mode in which, in ancient times, biblical passages were cited.

[3] Cf. Megilla, 22 a.

[4] Jer. Megilla, 4, 2 (75 a) = Taanith, 4, 3 (68 b): והא ליח בהון אלא תמניא.

[5] This follows from: ודא תנינן בשנ יהי רקיע ויקוו המים׳ מן דמר חוור חוור בפסוקים׳ ומן דמר חוהך אפילו חוהך אין בו.

[6] L. c. ומן דמר חוהך ויהי ערב ויהי בקר פסוק בפנ עצמו. Rashi, Megilla, s. v. פוסק, says that verse 1, 3 was divided into two, which Samuel perhaps did not mean. In Babli, Rav and Samuel dispute whether וולג or פוסק; in Jerushalmi, Kahana and Asi whether חוור or חוהך.

Beiträge zur jüdischen Alterthumskunde, p. xxv), bears testimony that Gen. i. 1 to iii. 14 contained seventy verses[1]. That the section about Amalek, Exod. xvii. 8-16, did not have ten verses is testified by Jer. Megilla, 4, 2 (75 a), on which point compare Tosafoth, s.v. אין פוחתין in Megilla, 21 b. The Mishna Sota, 37 b, and the Talmud, 40 a 7, declare that the blessing of the priests, Num. vi. 24-26 (ברכת כהנים), contained three verses[2].

Our division of verses of Numbers xxviii. 1-15 is borne out in all its parts by Megilla, 21 b[3], so is our division of the Shema, Deut. vi. 4-6, Jer. Berachoth, 1, 5 (3 b 9)[4]. The last eight verses of the Pentateuch are, as is well known, mentioned in the old Boraitha Baba Bathra, 14 b[5], and by a Tanaite of the middle of the second century in Makkot, 11 a 12[6].

The Prophets and Hagiographa were not revered in the same degree as the Torah, and were not, therefore, as assiduously studied. Consequently they afford less proofs for our theory; yet they are not entirely missing even in these books.

1 Kings i. In Koheleth Rabbah, 8, 8 (44 a), R. Levi says: "Almost fifty-two times we find the expression 'the king David,' but in the narrative of his death it is only said 'David' (ii. 1), because 'there is no sovereign on the day of death.'" The strange

[1] Numbers Rabbah: מראש ספר בראשית עד קללת נחש שבעים פסוקים א"ר פנחס שני אויבים לא נאררו עד שהשלים עליהם שבעים פסוקים הנחש והמן הרשע מבראשית עד ארור אתה מכל הבהמה שבעים פסוקים · המן מאחר הדברים האלה גדל המלך וגו" שבעים פסוקים (ibid. vii. 10) עד ויהלו את המן (Esther iii. 1): Midrash Tadshe similarly, but shorter. The Pinchas mentioned here is Pinchas ben Jair, to whom the book of the Jubilees was attributed. If Epstein's conjecture is correct, that the passages are quoted from the book of Jubilees in the name of Pinchas ben Jair, this date would be old enough; but even if the Hebrew rendering of the book of Jubilees belongs to a later period, the date would still be pretty old.

[2] Cf. also Numbers Rabbah, c. 11 (86 a) and c. 14 (126 a).

[3] בעא מיניה עולא בר רב מרבא פרשת ראש חדש כיצד קורין אותה צו את בני ישראל ואמרת אליהם את קרבני להמי דהויין המניא · · · פשו להו שבעה דביום השבת הויין תרי ובראשי חדשיכם הויין חמשה וכו".

[4] א"ר מני וכו" ג' פסוקין הראשונים צריכין כונה · מן גו דאינון ציבחר מיכוין. Vide 2, 1 (4 a, at the bottom) בר קפרא; Sabbath, 1, 1 (3 a 9, at the bottom); 2, 1 (4 b 1) and Babli Berachoth, 61 b = Jer. Berachoth, 9, 5 (14 b 15, at the bottom) = Jer. Sota, 5, 7 (20 c) לעקיבא, Deut. vi. 5. These passages leave no doubt that שמע ישראל was divided in the same manner as we have it.

[5] יהושע כתב בספרו ושמנה פסוקים שבתורה. Vide ibid. 15 a; Menachoth, 30 a: אמר רב גידל אמר רב שמנה פסוקים שבתורה יהיד קורא אותן; Jer. Megilla, 3, 8 (74 b 63): רבי יוסי בי רבי בון תומנתי פסוקייא אחרייא דמשנה תורה מעונין ברכה לפניהן ולאחריהן.

[6] פליגי בה ר' יהודה ור' נהמיא ה"א שמנה פסנקים וח"א ערי מקלט.

expression, "almost fifty-two times," can only be understood thus, that Levi counted in the first chapter of 1 Kings fifty-two verses, and means to say that the words "the king David" occurs in almost every verse, but immediately after, when David's death is mentioned, he is called "David" only[1].

Leviticus Rabbah, c. 6 (20 b 1) ascribes the authorship of the two verses, Isa. viii. 19, 20, to Beeri, the father of Hosheah, and says that they were embodied in the prophecy of Isaiah because they afforded too little material for a separate book[2]. Of the prophets, three verses were read consecutively to the interpreter, but if such three verses constituted three separate sections, in that case they were read separately. The Talmud, Megilla, 24 a, says in explanation of these words of the Mishna, "for instance, Isa. lii. 3–5," which verses we also have as two Parashas[3].

Psalm xix. 8–10 are called three verses in Numbers Rabbah, c. 13 (108 b)[4]; that the people responded Ps. ciii. 20–22 to the blessing of the priests is mentioned in Jer. Berachoth, 1, 1 (2 c 25), and Babl. Sota, 39 b, and that text is called expressly three verses in Numbers Rabbah, c. 11 (86 a, at the bottom), in the name of Amoraites[5]. Of less importance is the evidence of the tradition that Threni i. 1–5 formed five verses[6], and that the third chapter of the same book had a threefold alphabet of verses[7]. Numbers Rabbah, c. 14 (114 b,

[1] The Agadah reads: א"ר לוי קרוב לחמשים ושתים פעמים כתיב והמלך דוד כיון שנשמה למות כתיב ויקרבו ימי דוד למות משום ואין שלטון ביום המות (1 Kings ii. 1). Verbal communication by Prof. Bacher. In our text the chapter has fifty-three verses.

[2] א"ר סימון בארי לא נתנבא אלא שני פסוקים ולא היה בהם כדי ספר ונשפלו בישעיה ואלו הן וכי ודברו. In the parallel passage, c. 15 (40 b, at the bottom), we read דברים instead of פסוקים.

[3] ולא יקרא למתורגמן יותר מפסוק אחד ובנביא שלשה · היו שלשתן שלש פרשיות קורין אחר אחר. The Talmud mentions as an instance of this Isa. lii. 3–5. Baer, in his edition of Isaiah, restores also the third Parasha, but only on the ground of our passage from the Talmud, which is inadmissible, as Baer wanted to give the Massoretic text.

[4] כנגד ג' פסוקים של תורה (i. e. Bible) שבהם ו' סדרי משנה.

[5] פליגי בה רב מארי ורב זביד חד אמר פסוק כנגד פסוק וחד אמר בכל פסוק אומר לכל ג' הפסוקים.

[6] Jer. Moed Katon, 3, 7 (83 b 44), says, in reference to Jer. xxxvi. 23: מהוא שלש ולהות וארבעה הלת ארבע פסוקין · כיון שהגיע לפסוק החמישי כי ה' הוגה. Parallel passages: Genesis Rabbah, c. 42 (169 a); Leviticus Rabbah, c. 11 (32 a), and others. The identification of ולהות and פסוקים is interesting; it is possible.

[7] Echa Rabbah, proœmium No. 28 (15 a): שהוא מן תלתא תלתא פסוקא באלפא ביתא.

at the bottom), says that 2 Chron. vi. 18-41 consisted of twenty-four verses[1]. That Esther iii-vii numbered seventy verses, has already been mentioned above, when we spoke on Genesis. According to S'adyah, *Emunoth Weduoth*, c. 7 (ed. Cracow, p. 147), Daniel xi. 2-xii. 3 had forty-seven verses; and details are given as to groups of these verses, entirely in accord with our division of verses.

The allegations as to the number of verses of whole books can also be taken advantage of in proof of the division of verses. It is known that the principal passage is in Kiddushin, 30a, where a statement is made as to the number of verses of the Pentateuch, the Psalms, and the Chronicles. On account of the importance of the subject we shall devote a special chapter to the number of verses of the Pentateuch, and in connexion therewith, to those of the Psalms and the Chronicles; and shall, therefore, mention here only Samuel bar Nachman's statement as to the number of verses of the Proverbs. He says, in Shir Rabbah, 1, 1 (5b), in agreement with our Massorah, that he had not found in the whole book of Proverbs more than nine hundred and fifteen verses[2]. Midrash Tadshe, c. 20 (p. xxxviii), says of Threni that it consisted of one hundred and fifty-four verses[3], which agrees with our number. This statement would, of course, be of importance for ancient times, only if we knew that it emanated from an ancient source.

[1] כ"ד פסוקים. This is a later interpretation, after כ"ד רננות, as older sources interpret it.

[2] אמר ר' שמואל בר נחמני הזהרנו על כל ספר משלי ולא מצינו שכתב בו אלא תשע מאות ומ"ו פסוקים ואת אומר ג' אלפים משל (?) אלא שאין לך כל פסוק וסוק שאין בו ב' וג' מעמים. Pesikta, 34b; Pesikta Rabbathi, 60a; Koheleth Rabbah, 7, 23; Tanchuma חקת, 14; Numbers Rabbah, c. 19 (156b): אלא קרוב לשמונה מאות פסוקים. Although this latter reading had already been possessed by Kimchi (Commentary to 1 Kings v. 12), I believe, nevertheless, that only Shir Rabbah has preserved Samuel bar Nachman's statement in its authentic form. It was easy for תתקמו' (915) to be turned into תת קרו'= קרוב לשמנה מאות. Strack, *Prolegomena*, p. 12, assumes the figure 915 to be a correction of the copyist, in order to obtain agreement with the Massorah. We do not share this opinion, because there can be no question of another system of division into verses; and it is, therefore, impossible to cause 115 verses to disappear. The term מעמים will have to be taken to mean the single sentences in the middle of the verse, equal to the פסקי מעמים in the Babylonian Talmud. He therefore says only that in each verse two or three מעמים were contained, although 915×3 still does not give 3,000. If he had meant what Bacher assumed in *Agada der Paläst. Amoräer*, I, 501, that each verse had *several meanings*, this limitation would be out of place. Friedmann, n. 55, ad loc., thinks that Samuel bar Nachman had merely counted the משלים, and found 800 (?).

[3] פרשיות הן בספר הזה ויש בהן קנ"ד פסוקים (?) ד'.

We shall now adduce passages from the Talmuds and Midrashim demonstrating to certainty that single verses commenced and terminated with the authorities of the tradition in the same way as in our Massorah. For the sake of shortness we shall content ourselves, in most cases, with indicating the sources, without communicating the matter itself. In by far the greater portion it is quite impossible to have any doubt as to their demonstrative value. In order to facilitate the survey as much as possible, we have, as far as our exposition allowed it, retained the order of the Biblical passages. We do not claim to have been exhaustive; on the contrary, we are convinced that a careful study would be rewarded by a rich gleaning. We omit several allegations already given in reference to other points.

Our division of verses is testified: for GENESIS ii. 16 in Pesikta, 100 b[1]; for iv. 23, 1 Kings i. 33, Esther viii. 8 in Genesis Rabbah, c. 51 (209 a); for xiii. 7 in Pesikta Rabbathi, 9 b[2]; for xix. 24, 25 in Pesikta, 170 a[3]. For EXODUS ii. 4 in Sota, 11 a 17[4]; the full and half verses of chap. xv, in Mechilta, 15, 1, Tosifta Sota, 6, 23 (303[16]), Mishna Sota, 5, 6, Jer. Sota, 20 c 9, Babli Sota, 30 b[5]. LEVITICUS: we have already spoken of the "long verse," vii. 18, in contrast to xix. 7 (Zebachim, 28 b 14). Pesikta R. interprets the whole verse, Lev. xxiii. 24, when it says בו בפסוק "in the same verse;" xxiii. 27, 32; xvi. 29, 31, Num. xxix. 7, are entirely quoted in

[1] ר' יוסי בר סימן פתר ' ' וכולם בפסוק אחד.

[2] א"ר יהודה בר סימן קָרָא סופו של פסוק והכנעני והפריזי או יושב בארץ.

[3] Two commencements of verses, with omission of the rest, in one quotation.

[4] אמר ר' יצחק פסוק זה כולו על שם שבינה נאמר, followed by an interpretation of the *whole* verse.

[5] An exposition of the different readings, and an explanation of the passage, would occupy too much space, and we must therefore leave the reader to do it for himself. For our purpose the following words of the Mechilta are already sufficient: ר' אליעזר בן תראי אומר משה היה פותח בדבריו התלה וישראל עונין אחריו וגומרין עמו ' משה היה פותח ואומר אשירה לה' כי גאה גאה וישראל אמר סוס ורוכבו רמה בים ' משה היה אומר עוי וזמרת יה וישראל עונין אחריו ויהי לי לישועה ' משה היה פותח י' איש מלחמה וישראל עונין אחריו וגומרין עמו י' איש מלחמה י' שמו. Thus the passage reads without Friedmann's correction. It seems that Moses intoned the first half-verse, whereupon Israel responded with the second half, so that they concluded the verse at once together with Moses. I would, therefore, strike out the second י' איש מלחמה. The short ver. 3 is particularly conclusive. I would give it as a conjecture that one of the controversies of the disputing Tanaites was whether each sentence (=ענין) formed a separate verse. The שירת הים is, as is known, written, according to the Massorah, in separate verses.

Joma, 76a. NUMBERS viii. 19 is testified in Leviticus Rabbah [1], c. 2 (8 a 8); xxiii. 19 in Genesis Rabbah, c. 53 (215 b 2); xxiv. 9 in Talmud Berachoth, 12 b (in the middle). DEUTERONOMY viii. 8 is testified in Berachoth, 41 a, and parallel passages; xvi. 14 in Pesikta, 100 a. The first words of xxxii. 1, 7, 13, 19, 27, 39, are abbreviated and composed into a mnemonic in Rosh Hashanah, 31 a 16 [2]; xxxiii. 18 is testified in Numbers Rabbah, c. 13 (109 a).

For the division into verses of the second portion of Holy Writ the following passages are of importance: 1 Sam. xxv. 32 is testified in Jer. Sanhedrin, 2, 3, at the end (20 b); 1 Sam. i. 11 in Pesikta Rabbathi, 18 a [3]; i. 16, 18 in Sanhedrin, 93 a, at the bottom [4]; 2 Sam. xii. 3 in Megilla, 13 a 29, where it is quoted in full; 1 Kings xxi. 25 in Jer. Sanhedrin, 10, 2 (28 b 18); Isa. iv. 6 in Sukka, 6 b, at the bottom (quoted in full); lxv. 24 in Exodus Rabbah, c. 21 (79 b) [5]; Jer. ii. 2 in Sanhedrin, 110 b 18 (quoted in full by Jochanan); xv. 2 in Baba Bathra, 8 b 6; Ezek. viii. 16 (a long verse), x. 2, 7, 9, 11, 1 Kings ii. 26 (long verse) are fully quoted, neither less nor more, Joma, 77 a, at the top.

Of the Hagiographa, the Psalms are most frequently quoted, and for the division of their verses the most proofs can be adduced; which is of special importance for the double mode of division into verses, of which we shall speak later on. For the examples to be cited prove that the ordinary division into verses was the one we have. We have made the following notes. The well-known Baraitha in Sukka, 55 a, cites in full Ps. xxix. 1, l. 16, xciv. 16, xciv. 8, lxxxi. 7, lxxxii. 5 b. The last verse seems to have commenced with יכוטו. The single verses of this Psalm have, indeed, two parts each, with the exception of ours. Ps. xxi. 9 is testified in Esther Rabbah, 1, 1 (6 a); xxxi. 6, Berachoth, 5 a, at the top; xxxix. 2, Gittin, 7 a 11 [6]; xlv. 8 in Pesikta

[1] The same in Pesikta d. R. Kahana, 17 a: א"ר יודן בוא וראה כמה חיבב הק"בה לישראל שהוא כוזכיר חמשה פעמים בפסוק אחד. The verse has thirty words, and there is no verse of similar length near it.

[2] במוסגי רשבתא מה היו אומרים (?) אמר רב חנן אמר רב הוי"ו ל"ך [ה=האזינו · ואמר רב חנן אמר רב כרך שחרלקין כאן כך חולקין בבית הכנסת [ז=וכר וכו"]. The first four sections consist, according to Rashi, of six verses each, the last two of eight verses each, which does not answer; for then there would be only forty verses, whilst האזינו has forty-three verses. Even if Rashi meant that the last three sections had eight verses each, there still remained a superfluous verse, namely, between 27 and 39.

[3] א"רב יהודה אמר רב כל הפסוק הזה.

[4] א"ר שמואל בר נחמני שלשה פעמים כתוב בפסוק זה אֲמָתֶךָ אמתך כנגד שלש מצות וכו".

[5] שני פעמים בפסוק הוא אומר אני ואני.

[6] שרשש וכתב ליה (ר"א למר עוקבא).

Rabbathi, 150 a[1]; xlvi. 8 (and 12), Jer. Berachoth, 5, 1 (8 d 47); l. 7, Sanhedrin, 110 b 11; lxix. 34 in Genesis Rabbah, c. 71, at the commencement (277 a)[2]; civ. 31 in Chullin, 60 a, at the bottom; civ. 35 and Isa. liv. 1 in Berachoth, 10 a 7.

The other books of the Hagiographa are also represented by some verses: Prov. xiv. 34 in Pesikta d. R. Kahana, 13 b; xxx. 4 in Pesikta Rabbathi, 15 a; Job xxxvi. 3 in Leviticus Rabbah, c. 14 (38 b 2, at the bottom); Koheleth ii. 12 in Exodus Rabbah, c. 2, at the commencement (33 b); Esther i. 14 in Megilla, 12 b 30[3]; Dan. iv. 34 in Leviticus Rabbah, c. 13 (38 a 3); 2 Chron. vii. 3 in Shebuoth, 16 b; xv. 3 in Leviticus Rabbah, c. 19 (52 a 5, at the bottom).

There is yet another formula which furnishes an unmistakable proof for the division of verses, and which occurs often enough. We allude to the favourite sentence that "three things are contained in one verse[4]." If the ancients had had a division of verses different from ours, there should be cases of passages of scripture having now two verses of which it was said that "all three things occurred in one verse." But no such case occurs in the passages noted by me, and which follow here. That there is no question here of the opinions of single individuals is proved by the circumstance that many a statement in reference to this occurs several times, in the most different sources, and in the name of many authorities, as will be clearly seen from our list: Gen. iii. 6 in Genesis Rabbah, c. 19 (84 b), Jose ben Zimra=Koheleth Rabbah, 5, 10 (30 b); Exod. xv. 13 in Numbers Rabbah, c. 12 (97 a), which same interpretation is applied to another biblical passage in Jer. Megilla, 3, 7 (74 b 39); Deut. xiv. 7[5] in Leviticus Rabbah, c. 13 (37 b); xxxiii. 23 in Jer. Berachoth, 7, 6 (11 d, at the top); Isa. li. 16 in Jer. Taanith, 4, 2 (68 a, at the bottom, bis)[6]=Jer. Megilla, 3, 7 (79 b 39); Zech. x. 1 in Jer. Taanith, 3, 2 (66 c 18, 28) in the name of Eleazar (ר׳ לעזר)=Leviticus Rabbah,

[1] Introduced by the words שהפסוק הזה, and fully indicated. When we make no remarks, the reader should carefully consider the cited passage before doubting its demonstrative value.

[2] לא ראשו של פסוק הזה סופו ולא סופו ראשו, already quoted before, as is also the following passage. But the passages, already adduced before in proof of the designation of the portions of the verses, are not all repeated.

[3] אמר ר׳ לוי כל פסוק זה על שם קרבנות נאמר.

[4] ושלשתן בפסוק אחד.

[5] Not Lev. c. 11, where these three significant words are scattered over vers. 4, 5, 6. The original place of the Agadah was in Deuteronomy, whence it was taken over. We cannot, therefore, agree with Harris, *J. Q. R.* I, 140. It seems that Harris allowed himself to be carried away by Strack, *Prolegomena*, p. 80.

[6] The whole verse is interpreted.

c. 35 (103 b); Koheleth xii. 1 in Jer. Sota, 2, 2 (18 a) in the name of Levi; 2 Chron. vii. 14 in Jer. Taanith, 2, 1 (65 b 3), Eleazar[1].

On recapitulating our investigations thus far, we find that an innumerable amount of data testify to the high—we may safely say the pre-Talmudic—antiquity of *our* division of verses[2]. We will now do what hitherto has been exclusively done, namely, to look at the reverse of the medal, and look for those statements which speak against our division of verses. In order to prevent misunderstandings, we observe at the very beginning that here only the information given by the tradition and the oldest Jewish commentators shall be taken notice of, as these can also be regarded as the Massoretes of their age. On the other hand, the views of the modern commentators who differ from the Massorah shall not be taken into account, because the subject of inquiry is, above all, to establish the historical conditions of the question, but not to investigate the correctness of the views of the Massoretes. We have no reason to believe in the infallibility of the Massoretes; for, with all our admiration for their truly grand achievements, we cannot close our eyes to the fact that they have made now and then serious mistakes[3]. Historical importance would attach to the conceptions of the ancient versions when contradicting those of the Massorah, especially to those of the LXX and the Peshita; there is, however, as yet a want of more modern special inquiries[4].

Only a small number of verses divided in a different way from that of the Massorah can be pointed out; we shall adduce them in as far as we know them.

[1] The Agadah occurs also: Jer. Sanh. 10, 2 (28 c 9); Koheleth Rabbah, 5, 6 (28 b); Pesikta Rabbathi, 200 a, 200 b 16, ר"ח, as if it were a Baraitha; Genesis Rabbah, c. 44 (180 b).

[2] Vide Frankel, *Vorstudien zu der Septuaginta*, p. 217, holds that the "present division of verses" is younger than the Talmudical period. We return to that question in the course of our essay.

[3] Vide my *Massoretische Untersuchungen*, and my *Zur Einleitung in die Heilige Schrift*, pp. 100-120.

[4] Important observations on the stichometry of the Old and New Testaments have been made by Graux, Martin, Sanday, Zahn, Harris, Berger, and E. Klostermann. But detailed investigations would be required for our purpose. Such have not been made, to our knowledge, to such an extent as to enable the question as to the relations of the division of verses of the LXX, the Peshita, and other versions to be discussed. We shall, as soon as possible, devote a special inquiry to this subject. Azaria de Rossi, *Meor Enayim*, II, c. 8, at the commencement, has already drawn attention to the different division of verses between the LXX and the Massorah.

Rashi to Gen. xix. 18 connects אדני to the following verse, at which Norzi, ad loc., expresses his surprise. Ib. xxxv. 22, we have a פסקא באמצע פסוק, whilst Pinsker, *Einleitung in das babylonische Punktationssystem*, p. 48, states that, in an old code of the Bible, this passage formed two verses, which Geiger had already assumed (*Urschrift*, 373). The Massoretes differ about it, as Norzi observes ad loc. From Megilla, 25 b 22, it might be inferred that this text had been taken as *one* verse; for we read there that when, during the reading at the synagogue, the passage ויהי בשכן ישראל was read, Chanina ben Gamliel called out to the Meturgeman, "Translate only the last[1]." If the verse had terminated with the words וישמע ישראל, the Meturgeman, to whom it was not allowed to read more than a verse at a time, would have had nothing to translate. At any rate, the possibility that in reference to this verse Massorah and tradition were in conflict is not excluded. Similarly, the *possibility* of a contradiction must be admitted in reference to Gen. xlix. 7. It is known that this verse belongs to one of the five passages, the division of which is doubtful, so that ארור of the following verse is brought in connexion with the preceding one[2]. It is true the Massorah had to decide for one of the two modes of division. All scholars who dealt with the division of verses, take their stand on the Talmudical passage in Kiddushin, 30 a (=Nedarim, 38 a), according to which, in Palestine, Exod. xix. 9 was divided into three verses. We should have, therefore, historical evidence for the discrepancy between the Babylonian and the Palestinian division of verses. We shall soon have occasion to speak about this.

Numbers xii. 2, 3 was read as one by Nathan, Sifre I, 100[3]. This is not, however, to our mind, a proof for any difference in the division of verses from ours, for such license was admissible in interpreta-

[1] אל תתרגם אלא אחרון.

[2] Mechilta, 17, 9 (54 a, at the top); Jer. Aboda Zara, 2, 8 (41 c, at the bottom); Babl. Joma, 52 a; Genesis Rabbah, c. 80 (303 b), and elsewhere: חמשה דברים יש בתורה שאין להם הכרע. The other examples and the divergence in the sources do not concern us here. I must confess I cannot understand how a Tanna could have had any doubt whether Gen. iv. 7, שאת ואם לא תיטיב, was to be read. The matter is very obscure. Cf. also יד מלאכי, No. רעח. On the הכרעה in the middle of a verse, vide Minchat Shai to Gen. xxxiv. 7, Exod. xxiv. 5, xxv. 34, Deut. xxxi. 16. In this connexion the saying of Raba's becomes of interest: א"ל רבא סכינא חריפא מפסקא קרא (Menachoth, 74 a; Baba Bathra, 111 b; Arachin, 26 a). Geiger, *Urschrift*, p. 143, tries to explain why they wanted to connect ארור with the preceding verse.

[3] ר' נתן אומר . . . שנאמר וישמע ה' והאיש משה.

tions[1]. Deut. iv. 30, 31 is introduced in Pesikta, ed. Buber, 162b 2, with the words הפסוק הזה. It is, however, possible that originally only the first verse was cited here, and that afterwards the second verse was added to it; or also, that הפסוק is equivalent to הכתוב, since the difference between these two expressions was no longer felt in the idiom of the later Midrashim, as we noted above[2]. It is not impossible that Sifre took Deut. xviii. 12, 13 to be one verse, as both verses are treated in one Piska; it is true, in a short one (II, 173)[3]. The majuscle Tav in תמים would, in that case, have to be considered as a polemical sign against the connexion of the two verses. Deut. xxv. 2 terminates, according to the Massorah, with במספר, and ver. 3 commences with ארבעים. According to the Mishna, Makkoth, 22 a, as also Sifre, II, 286[4], these two words belong together. The Septuagint concurs *with this*, for there ver. 3 commences *καὶ ἀριθμῷ τεσσαράκοντα*[5]. Josh. xiii. 3 concludes with והעוים. This is also assumed in the Talmud, Chullin, 60b, where the question is asked and answered, why five Philistine princes are mentioned and six enumerated. But, at the same time, it is recorded that Rab and a Baraitha are of a different opinion, and maintain that the עוים came from Teman[6], to which Tosafoth correctly observes that, according to this conception, והעוים must be drawn to the following verse. Ps. lxxxii. 5 b was perhaps the commencement of a new verse; this has already been conjectured before, after Sukka, 55 a. In the Mishna, Aboda Zara, 2, 8, there is a controversy between Joshua and

[1] In the Halachic Midrashim we found several, but did not note them down. Cf. Strack, l. c., pp. 78 and 155.

[2] Jer. Sanhedrin, 10, 2 (28 c), also has הפסוק הזה, and likewise cites both verses required by the context. The possibility of a divergence between Massorah and tradition may therefore be admitted.

[3] There are, of course, many Piskas that treat on several verses. But in this passage a connexion of the two verses meets with no difficulty, so that the possibility may be admitted.

[4] יכול ארבעים שלימות ת"ל במספר ארבעים מנין סמוך ל' מ' ר' יהודה אומר ארבעים שלימת. The controversy is perhaps based on a discrepancy in the division of the verses. 23 a 19, Rabba Kahana cites כרי רשעתו במספר.

[5] This was already pointed out by Azaria de Rossi, *Meor Enayim*, II, c. 8, at the commencement; but it escaped him that in this case the Tradition with the LXX gave evidence against the Massorah.

[6] ופליגא דרב דאמר רב עוים מתימן באו • תניא נמי הכי עוים מתימן באו וכו". The Vulgate accords with the Talmudic division, which might be referred back to Jerome (Geiger, *Jüdische Zeitschrift*, X, 277). But the Talmudic passage shows also that our division was not only known, but also generally adopted; otherwise the question, "five are named and six enumerated," could not have been raised at all.

Ishmael about Song of Solomon, i. 2, which has been much discussed. A. Perls tried to prove [1] with arguments, some of which are plausible enough, that the difference of opinion turned on the question, whether מיין has to be drawn to the next verse; and that Joshua negatived it by citing the Song of Solomon iv. 10, where מיין could not be combined with וריח. Accordingly, in the Mishna, וריח שמניך would have to be read instead of לריח שמניך, and טובים to be struck out, as being a later addition. In post-Talmudical time, S[e]adyah has, in ten passages, adopted a termination of the verses different from the traditional [2]. The Orientals and Occidentals differ about Deut. xvi. 3; according to the former כי בחפזון is ראש פסוק, according to the latter מצעות פסוק[3]. They also differ about Isa. xx. 2, which the Orientals divide into two verses [4]. Ps. xlvi. 6 terminates, according to the St. Petersburg Codex, as also the Peshita, with the first word of ver. 7 [5].

Only ten of the passages discussed here belong to the Talmud and Midrash, and I have my doubts about them, whether they really contradict the Massorah; since only Deut. iv. 30, 31 and Ps. lxxxii. 5 b have been handed down by the tradition without controversy, and it is not at all clear that they are contradictory. Exod. xix. 9, which is considered by the scholars to clinch the question as to the divergence in the division of verses, proves at the same time that this passage formed one verse in Babylonia; consequently, that our Massorah is based upon the Babylonian traditions. The Massorah

[1] In the Hungarian Magazine, *Magyar Zsidó Szemle*, XI, 158 sqq. One of his chief arguments is taken from Jer. Aboda Zara, 2, 8 (41 c, at the bottom): אם להפליגו ברברים היה מבקש היה לו להשיא בחמש השיאות שבתורה. This interpretation is disputed by A. Sidon, l. c., p. 266 sqq.

[2] Cf. on this point, Bacher, *Abraham Ibn Ezra als Grammatiker*, pp. 38, 39, where also the opinions of Jehuda Halevi (*Kusari*, III, 21), Ibn Ezra, and Efodi (*Maasse Efod*, c. 7, p. 41) on the distribution of verses are given. It is held to be the work of either Ezra or the Ecclesia Magna. Samuel ben Meir, in accordance with Shocher Tob (ed. Rosin, p. 46), connects also והמנצ, Gen. xxxvi. 12, with the preceding verse. In our copies of Shocher Tob, the passage is not found (vide Rosin, ad loc., n. 10), Jad Maleachi, n. 283.

[3] Vide Baer, *Liber Genesis* (Lipsiae, 1869), p. 81, n. 1.

[4] Baer, *Liber Jesaiae* (Lipsiae, 1872); Pinsker, *Einleitung in das babylonisch-hebräische Punktationssystem* (Vienna, 1863), p. 4.

[5] Pinsker, l. c., p. 133, corrects at the same time פניו after xlii. 12 and xliii. 5, into פָּנַי. Pinsker expresses himself there on the division of verses and accentuation in general; he gives several conjectures about Biblical passages in contradiction to the Massorah, and quotes such also from older and newer works. We also refer to Buhl, *Kanon und Text des A. T.*, pp. 233 sqq. and 241; Dillmann, *Hiob*[4], XXIV, on xi. 6 and xvi. 4.

has thus made a choice out of two traditional opinions, but there is no question of a conflict with tradition. Besides, there seems also to have been a Massorah, which followed the Palestinians, which we shall try to show in the chapter on the number of verses of the Pentateuch. Too far-reaching conclusions have been drawn from the passage in Kiddushin, 30a. It was overlooked that there the question is that of fixing the exact half of the number of verses of the Pentateuch, namely, whether Lev. xiii. 33 belongs to the first or the second half. A decision on this point can be arrived at by counting, only when there is no doubt about any one verse of the whole Pentateuch in reference to number. It can, therefore, be understood why R. Joseph *in a dispute about words* declines a proposal to count the verses of the Pentateuch by referring to the statement of an Amoraite as to the division of Exod. xix. 9. But this does not show yet that in Babylonia the division of verses was carried on in an arbitrary manner, or that there had been greater differences of opinion about the same. Just the contrary. Since R. Joseph refers to a Palestinian and not to a Babylonian controversy, we may conclude with confidence that in Babylon there was no difference of opinion on the point. R. Joseph, in saying, "We are not conversant with the division of verses," means, as may be gathered from the context, that there may be some verse or other which was divided in Palestine into two verses, as the example he refers to shows; but he never thought of a different system of dividing the verses, or even of one that was divergent in a number of instances. On the other hand, in asking the question whether the Massoretic and Talmudic mode of dividing the verses were identical, we do not mean to say that every single verse of the twenty-three thousand must concur. The identity of both modes of dividing the verses is established even if—and this is not the case—in some ten or twenty of the five thousand eight hundred and forty-five verses of the Pentateuch an essential discrepancy between Talmud and Massorah could be shown. Even between Madinchaë and Maarbaë differences are shown to exist on this point, and yet nobody will think of maintaining that these schools had two different modes of dividing the verses.

We were not able to oppose anything to the numerous decisive proofs for the concurrence of Talmud and Massorah, even after a diligent investigation of the sources and the literature, except a few uncertain passages. The proofs in favour of the identity emanate both from Palestinian and Babylonian sources, and belong to various periods; and this *testifies to the same division of verses in the divers lands during the course of centuries.* This disposes also of Rappoport's conjecture (*Halichoth Kedem*, Amsterdam, 1846, pp. 10 and 17) that in Palestine, where the whole Pentateuch was read

in three years, most verses were divided into two or three[1]. It is also groundless, when Friedmann, in the final note to *Sifre Numeri* and the *Litteraturblatt* of the *Menora*, I, No. 3, speaks of an uncertainty in reference to the division of verses having crept in at some period, so that we no longer know which verses were formerly divided. We have traced our division of verses from the most ancient time up to the conclusion of the tradition, and shall find the same again in the various statements of the Massorah. The far-reaching inference, which Grätz (*Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judenthums*, XX, 52) draws from a Gaonic expression is also unjustified, and must be rejected[2]. If we look without prejudice upon the age of the division of verses, we must consider the differences that have arisen in the course of centuries in various countries as rather too few than too numerous, and, in opposition to most scholars, take them as exceptions to the rule, tending to confirm the high age of the division we possess.

3. *The Division of Verses of the Massorah.*

In the preceding investigations it was presumed that the division of verses of the Massorah was known, and that, with very few exceptions, it was identical with that of our editions of the Bible. This identity is, in the first instance, based upon the tradition; for our editions flowed from manuscripts in which the division of verses was marked. It is further based on the concurrence of the numbers of the verses of separate sections (Pentateuch), and of the sums of the verses of the separate books and of the three parts. That also the separate verses in respect to their magnitude, i.e. the division of verses, in a narrower sense, are the same in our copies as those which the Massorah hands down and demands, follows from the diversified statements about the "Pesukim," which can be verified by the "Pesukim" of our copies. It is for the purpose of establishing

[1] Baer also, *Orient*, XII (1851), p. 263, rejects Rappoport's opinion without attempting the proof given by us as to the verses mentioned by the tradition. Cf. also Luzzatto's *Letters*, p. 345 seq.

[2] ואפילו במקראות . . . יש שנוי בהם בין בבל לארץ ישראל בחסרות ויתרות ובפתוחות וסתומות ובפסקי הטעמים ובחיתוך הפסוקים. From this it follows that in only a few passages there existed a difference between Madinchaë and Maarbaë; but there is no question of different systems or of numerous differences. Pinsker, *Punktationssystem*, p. 133 seq., also speaks of the division of verses as of something changeable. Cf. also at the end of the fifth chapter the confutation of Grätz's conjecture about the division and the middle of the verses of the Pentateuch.

this assertion, and, at the same time, of illustrating what importance the Massoretes attached to the division and limitation of verses, and what amount of labour they consequently bestowed on them, that we will produce here a few characteristic data from the Massoretic material extant. For this object we shall make use of the *Massora marginalis* and *finalis*, such as Frensdorff's Massoretic works (*Ochlah We-Ochlah*, Hanover, 1864, and *Massoretisches Wörterbuch*, Hanover and Leipzig, 1876), and Ginsburg's *The Massorah* (3 parts). In the latter books the reader can find the further explanations of the data we produce, and, of course, a great number of other data on this point[1].

We commence with the proofs for whole verses. There are three verses (Gen. ii. 5, Num. xxvi. 8, Josh. xi. 14) which number eighty letters (*Ochla*, No. 316, cf. *M. W. B.*, p. 377 b); three verses commence and terminate with שׁ (*Massora Exodus*, 29, 30; *M. W. B.*, p. 378 b; Ginsburg, שׁ, No. 17). Eleven other verses begin and terminate with נון (Ginsburg, II, נ, No. 13=Lev. xiii. 9; Num. xxxii. 32, &c.). There are ten verses each word of which contains a שׁ (*Massora*, Num. xxvi. 24; *Mf.*, שׁ, 8; Ginsburg, שׁ, 18); the whole alphabet (Ginsburg, פ, 277; *M. W. B.*, p. 381 b; for instance, Zeph. iii. 8: cf. *Minchat Shai*; Ezek. xxxviii. 12, &c.). Five verses have forty words each: Jer. xxxviii. 4, Dan. iii. 15, v. 23, Esther iii. 12 (*Massoret. Wörterbuch*, 380 and 381, No. 1). The fifth verse was unknown to Frensdorff; it is, as Ginsburg, מ, 442, correctly states, Dan. vi. 13. Fourteen verses of the Pentateuch contain three words each (*Massora Exodus*, 28, 13, &c.; *Mf.* ד, 1; *M. W. B.*, p. 381, No. 4; Ginsburg, מ, 439). Four verses have each seven words consisting of four letters (*Mp.*, Psalm lxxiii. 2, Prov. xvii. 3). Ps. cxix has four verses—namely, 15, 47, 113, and 146—having four words each (*Massora*, Ps. cxix. 47: *Mf.* עד, 17).

LUDWIG BLAU.

(*To be continued.*)

[1] Vide particularly Ochla, Nos. 39, 164, 171–175, 179, 194, 225–230, 268, 274–282, 286–288, 296–360, 362–365, 374; *Massoretisches Wörterbuch*, pp. 373–381. The Massorah follows, on the whole, in its arrangement the *Masora finalis*; the above-mentioned book, the *Massoretisches Wörterbuch*, can therefore be used. It is rather more difficult, as we have done, to look out the needful passages from the register to vol. II. But, having regard to the space at our disposal, we can only give a small fragment. After some study of the Massoretic material, the corresponding data can easily be found in these four collections. We, therefore, refer to this only occasionally. Ochla is the handiest of them, but contains, comparatively, the fewest data; which proves that, in the course of centuries, the Massoretic material has increased also in this respect. We do not especially cite Frensdorff's notes.

CRITICAL NOTICES.

TALMUDICAL FRAGMENTS.

קונטרסים מתלמוד בבלי כריתות ותלמוד ירושלמי ברכות. *Talmudical Fragments in the Bodleian Library.* Edited, with Introduction, by S. SCHECHTER and S. SINGER. (Cambridge, 1896. 6 and 28 pp. large 4to.)

TWO prominent and representative men of the Jewish community in England have joined in presenting a festive token to the learned author of the *History of the Jewish Tradition*, on the occasion of his eightieth birthday. Under the above title they publish, in brilliant outfit, a lengthy piece from the Babylonian Talmud, and a small fragment from the Talmud of Jerusalem, taken from the most recent acquisitions of the Bodleian library. The MS. from which they edit the piece from the Babylonian Talmud, occupying as much as twenty-six pages of an ordinary pocket edition (Keritot, 4 b-6 a, 18 a-28 b), has the distinction of bearing a date. We read in a note, following the treatise of Keritot, that it was ended in the month Adar I, A.M. 4883, i. e. in the year 1123, and that the MS. was written by the scribe Joseph b. Samuel b. Ephraim from the mountain of Nefusa (in Tripoli) for R. Nissim b. R. Saadia. This date alone, which, as the editors point out in their Introduction, stamps this MS. as the oldest dated Talmudical book extant, is sufficient to commend it to the notice of scholars, now that it has thus become accessible to all. But this Talmudical text exhibits, besides, a good many peculiarities and numberless readings, which differ from those of the ordinary editions. These are all of the greater importance, because, as the editors point out, the treatise of Keritot is one of those that were less frequently read, and has, for this reason, been more corrupted by the copyists of former centuries and by the printers of later time. This present edition of almost half the treatise of Keritot constitutes an important evidence of the condition of the text at an unusually early age. It is true, six centuries had already elapsed since the conclusion of the Talmud before this text was written; it is nevertheless of great, and in some cases of a decisive value for the emendation and completion of the original. It is, however, a fact that this text itself also requires emendation

and completion, for it is as well to state that O (by which letter we shall all along designate the text of the Oxford MS.) cannot by any means be considered as an exemplary text. The editors publish the text—and with good reason—without any critical apparatus. If they had undertaken to edit the text of O with all its various readings, the size of the book would have become double what it is, since—as they observe in the Introduction—the text of O "offers in almost every line readings varying more or less widely from the editions." I shall adduce only a few specially remarkable examples, in order to show that O, although not in equal measure as ed. (thus the text of the editions is designated), yet contains very bad omissions and errors, which prove that the same causes which made the text of the editions appear in such deformed and neglected shape, had already been at work when this MS., and perhaps its prototype also, was written. On the whole I take it for granted that the text of O has been printed with all possible accuracy; and indeed, the beautiful and clear writing of the MS., of one page of which a photographic facsimile is reproduced, puts no difficulties in the way of a correct reprint. Nevertheless, it must be assumed that some of the errors are not those of the MS., but owe their existence to the printer and the proof reader. In the following list, and also in my further remarks, I shall quote the page and line of the book. P. 2. l. 28 זבראי r. זבדאי. 3. 28 איתביה r. אית ביה. 3. 31 קפהו r. קפחו. 4. 5 dele תניא. 4. 15 על r. כל. 4. 27 בראר׳ r. בדארי (ed. בדרי). 5. 10 כתחלה r. בתחלה. 5. 23 ואי לא r. ואילא; ליומי r. ליומא. 5. 30 עילו r. עולו. 7. 7 מתחלקות r. ספק מתחלקות. 8. 26 והגביה r. וחתך. 12. 9 בלבו r. לכלבו; דבלב r. לכלב. 12. 25 דהא מחפי r. דקא מחפי (ed. דקמחפי); in the same manner 18. 12 הא תאני r. קא תאני. 12. 25 מיהת r. מחמת (vid. l. 28). 13. 1 לומר r. צמר (שצמרו). 13. 7 בהמה r. מהלכי שתים. 14. 1 אלא r. או לא. 14. 3 dele ו ר׳ יוחנן. 17. 26 בל r. כל. 18. 26 מאי טעמיה r. מאימתי. 20. 8 ומעשיה r. ומיעטיה. 22. 4 לחתיכה r. להיכא. 23. 2, 3 דזבן r. רובן. 23. 27 dele משום ר׳ יוחנן. 24. 9 על אביו twice, r. אביו. 26. 7 ארבעה r. ארבע.

Of the gaps in O, such have to be mentioned first as are caused by a sentence ending with the same word with which the following ends (Homoeoteleuton). Thus 9. 7 after שנ׳ a whole passage ending שנאמר is missing. Also 12. 11 after אי חזי לאדם a whole piece, ending with the same words. Similar, smaller or larger, gaps are to be noticed: 12. 15 after העוף הטהור; 14. 6 after כל דם; 14. 15 after למחצה; 20. 9 after נינהו; 22. 10 after תקבר; 24. 17 after על החמורה. Other gaps, caused by the omission of a whole passage, are: 1. 15 before מאי; 24. 24 before איצטריך; 25. 9 before דתניא.

On 23. 11, before תא שמע, a piece also commencing תא שמע is omitted (14 lines in ed.). Of the omission of single words, spoiling the sense, may be mentioned: 2. 19 לא omitted before אתי; 2. 24 after כרמל insert יוכיח; 4. 8 after כהן גדול insert בן כהן גדול; 20. 9 after נינהו insert לא מכפר.

Much more numerous, however, than the omissions in O are those of the editions which can now be corrected from O. Here also the gaps are for the most part occasioned by the besetting evil of MSS., the Homoeoteleuton. In the following I give the smaller and greater passages from O which are wanting in the editions: 1. 22 sq. (vid. in reference to this passage Kohut's Aruch, III, 77 b); 3. 24 sq. (ואי . . . הכרעה); 6. 7 sq. (אמר רב פפא . . . מעילה); 8. 22 sq. (. . . דהאי פטור); 9. 29–31; 12. 3 sq. (אי . . . בהמה); 14. 31–15. 1 (. . . והתניא רב נחמן); 17. 3 sq. (לא צריך . . . דאפרשיה); 19. 25–30 (several pieces); 22. 16–22 (several pieces); 23. 11 sq. (שתי . . . יפה); 27. 20 sq. (several pieces); 23. 31–24. 2; 24. 29–31; 25. 15–26. 1.

A few examples will show how O can serve to correct errors in the editions: 2. 25 ניחייב more correct than מחייב in the editions. 2. 27 כי קלי (=כקלי), in ed. בקלי. 3. 16 כל שעה, ed. כל עשייה. 3. 23 כתב רחמנא, ed. רחמנא כתיב. 3. 29 בו שולקין, ed. משלקו (r. בו שלקו; in the parallel passage, Horajoth, 11 b היו שולקין בו, but cod. Munich reads there בו שלקו).

The editors have noticed in their clear introduction some of the idiomatical peculiarities in O, and observed that some forms and particles display the idiomatical characteristics of the Palestinian Talmud. I shall complement the editors' observation with some remarks of a general nature. O exhibits an endeavour to Hebraize. Thus: 2. 10 we find והלא for והא; 6. 2 על קילקלי instead of אקילקלי; 6. 9 שנעשתה for דנעשית; 2. 22 שכן איתינון for דאיתנהון. Compound particles are preferentially dissolved into their parts. For לית we find לא אית in 12. 10; 12. 29; 13. 9. לא איכא for ליכא in 6. 15; 25. 20. אי זה הוא for איזהו in 13. 24, 25, 28, 29. מנא לן for מנלן in 12. 5. For כיצד we find once (16. 21) כאיזצד (= כאיזה צד in Pal. Talmud). The enclitic particle קא is severed from the verb; קא תאני (ed. קתני), קא טרח (ed. קטרח). Thus we find the particle of comparison כי separated, כי בהמה (12. 6) for כבהמה; כי דם (13. 26) for כדם; כי זבח (18. 18) for כזבח. By means of such a severance we learn the important, and probably correct, etymology of a well-known particle, namely, of the particle הילכך. Levy, I, 472 a, says that the word is a compound of הֵי (= הא) and לְכָךְ. In O we find הילכך consistently written הואיל וכך (2. 1, 25; 7. 2; 17. 4). This

reading is in complete accord with the meaning of הילכך "since it is thus," "since that is the case," and this etymology explains the meaning much better than Levy's derivation. Besides, it explains also the ־ under the ה; the ־ of הוֹאִיל remained behind after the ו and א had been elided. This derivation throws also a new light upon a reading which, according to Rabbinowicz (Dikduke Soferim, VI, 1) is consistently given in a certain MS., namely הולכך; this is not הוא לכך but another contraction of הואיל כך. For מידי O writes מידעם (18. 22), and that this is the original word is shown by the circumstance that in another passage of Keritot (8 b) ed. have also מדעם (vid. Liebermann, *Das Pronomen und das Adverbium des babylonisch-talmudischen Dialektes*, Berlin, 1895, p. 30).

Of grammatical peculiarities it may be noticed that O has often נ for ל in the third person imperfect; the latter form being more usual in the Babylonian Talmud: ניכתוב 2. 16; ניכתוב 2. 17; נידע 5. 20; ניבעי 12. 17. In 5. 28 there is נהי instead of יהא (in the parallel passage, Horajoth, 12 a, the Munich MS. has also נהוי).

The spelling of the plural form in י with double yod is also remarkable, thus קראיי 2. 11. The double yod denotes its pronunciation as a consonant; this spelling seems, therefore, to prove that the pronunciation was not י־, but י־. But we also find קאיי for קאי, 6. 23, 7. 18, and in that case the sounding of the י as a consonant is out of the question (קָאֵי = קאים). But it is possible that in both words the א is quiescent, and that they ought to be read קְרָאֵיי and קָאֵיי. Another orthographical peculiarity of this manuscript is that the *status emphaticus* is always written with ה instead of א: גופה (1. 4), תלתה (1. 7, 20). The *scriptio plena* of the א is unusually frequent in O, and this has already been noticed in the editors' introduction. On the other hand, the י as *mater lectionis* is often absent in passages where ed. have it, e. g. 3. 12 ותהדר for ותיהדר.

The text of O also serves to enrich the Talmudical lexicography with some interesting data. In 5. 29 sq. we find several times the word רבונכון, also ריבונכון, for רבכון in the editions; "your teacher;" רִבּוֹן with pronominal suffixes was, except in the Targum, hitherto known only as applied to God, in the expression רבונו של עולם. מקום, as a name of the Deity, always used with the article המקום, is found 20. 21 and 21. 7 without the article. But 3. 24 המקום occurs, where the editions read הקדוש ב״ה. 2. 26 במיצעי (ed. באמצע), otherwise always מיצעא (Levy, III, 212 b). 6. 2 we read הרסנא for גילדנא of the editions; the Munich MS. has in the parallel passage, Horajoth, 12 a, also הרסנא. Both are names of a species of small fishes. 5. 25 תרנוגלא is read for תרנגולא, both pronunciations are

attested. 4. 26 for ממלא מקום אבותיו we read א׳ במקום ממולא. The phrase does not occur elsewhere in that form; in Horajoth, 11 b we find also א׳ מקום ממלא. 5. 30 משולם במעשיו for שלם במעשיו. The Biblical passage, Isa. xlii. 19 (מְשֻׁלָּם) seems to have exercised some influence. 13. 26 שמקליח, Hiphil for שמקלח, Piel. Levy, IV, 307, does not mention the Hiphil form of קלח. 6. 4, 5 משכה מלכותן for נמשכה מ׳. The Kal of משך is only in Aramaic used intransitively (to be prolonged), vid. the instance משכו מלכותייהו in Levy, III, 276 a. 8. 4 הילך (Piel) for הלך (Kal). The common phrase סלקא דעתא is abbreviated from סלקא אדעתא (= עלה על הדעת), vid. Levy, III, 536 b. In O we find once (1. 20) the complete reading, everywhere else (e. g. 1. 26; 2. 2) the abbreviated form.

There are a few noteworthy variations in the names of the authorities. The Tannaite ר׳ שמעון שזורי is in the Mishna (IV, 3), and the Talmudic sentences that refer to it, always called ר׳ ישמעאל שיזורי. This reading is found in the Jerusal. Talmud (Sabbath, 12 c), and in the text of the Palestinian Mishna, edited by Lowe (*The Mishna . . .*, p. 181 a), ר׳ ישמעאל השיזורי. In all other passages, even of that Mishna Text, we read ר׳ שמעון השזוני. It is nevertheless probable, that here, as in so many other cases, ישמעאל has erroneously been put instead of שמעון. ר׳ זירא, which name is only in the Palestinian Talmud written ר׳ זעירא, is found here in that complete form, 22. 8. 12. 2 רב אדי בר אבין for רב אידי בר אבון. 23. 25 ר׳ חייא בר אבא correctly for ר׳ זירא בר אדא. 5. 15 רב כהנא for רב פפא. 9. 4 אמר ר׳ אסי א׳ ר׳ יוחנן 20. 2 for רבא. 1. 5 רבה for רבא. רב יוסף for אמר ר׳ אמי אמר ר׳ חנינא. The name Simon b. Lakish is almost everywhere written in full ר׳ שמעון בן לקיש, and only rarely in the abbreviated form ריש לקיש, usually adopted by the editions. We may add here that the abbreviation ריש points to the form רי׳ ש (= ריבי שמעון).

In the preceding remarks, I have considered only a comparatively small portion of the various readings of O. It may be assumed that a considerable part of such readings are more in accordance with the original text than those adopted in the editions. This is particularly true in respect to the phraseology of the Talmudical discussion, which has a more archaic colour in the old MS. than in the printed copies. Thus, for instance, 1. 25 מן הבא נפקא לי מן הדין seems to be more original than the corresponding passage in the editions: קרא נפקא לי והא מהבא נפקא מהתם נפקא. Or 5. 7 דאתיא שם שם אתיא ודאתיא משמרת משמרת מ׳ אתיא seems more original

than the corresponding אתיא שם משמרת משמרת אתיא שם. But enough has been said about the *variae lectiones* to recognize the characteristics of O. I only add a few remarks about its outward appearance. The editors point out that the Mishna text of the whole chapter precedes the Talmud text, as it always does in the Palestinian Talmud. The sections in the Talmud text are in several cases separated from each other by the heading פים׳ (=פיסקא). (3. 6; 6. 5; 14. 26, 28; 8. 18, 20; 20. 17.) It is the same mode of dividing sections as that adopted by Tobia b. Eliezer in his Lekach Tob. It is equivalent with the term פצל, which, without further indications, is used by Arabic authors in the division of their chapters. The editors believe that in four places accents can be recognized (Introduction, p. 5, note 4). I must confess that I have a difficulty in recognizing accents in these signs, occurring as they do in this single case. If such a thing were possible at all, it would be in one passage (12. 9), where we find the interrogative ולא ("is it not so?") supplied with a sign (two strokes under the word), which is assumed to draw the reader's attention to the syntactic meaning and the interrogative accentuation of the word. The sign under למחצה (14. 17) might have some such meaning. But when in the phrase קול ומראה וריח (6. 7) the second word has the same sign (this time over the word), or when in לא מיתסרא the word לא is dotted on the top, I cannot possibly see what meaning such accents can have. The reason why in these cases a sign has been put must remain undecided. On the other hand, we have a very remarkable instance of the accentuation of a Talmudical text in two fragments of the Palestinian Talmud, consisting of only two pages (Berachot, 4 b and 6 b). The first part of these fragments is for the most part supplied with accents, which had to serve as aids towards the correct reading and accentuation of the text, and corresponds with our punctuation. They are the same accents that are made use of in an old MS. in the Vatican of the Talmudical treatise Berachot (Rabbinowicz, Dikduke Soferim, XI, 19: מונח פשטא זקף קטן ואתנחתא). As an instance of this curiosity I quote the following passage (27. 24 sq.): אָמַר שמואל בר נחמן א הקבה לדוד דויד ימים מלאים אני לונה לך איני מונה לך ימים חסרין. The accent over נחמן and לדויד corresponds with our colon, that over דויד to our note of exclamation, the one under חסרין to our full stop. The sign over מונה (to which לך belongs) is a comma or semicolon.

The learned editors have supplied a valuable contribution to the critique of the text of the Talmud. The present specimen, not less than collections of *variae lectiones* made by the late Rabbinowicz,

shows how infinitely difficult, or rather how absolutely impossible, it is to establish a critically correct text of the Talmud, and to gain even a partially correct reading from the many various readings. The gentlemen who are preparing the new critical edition of the Talmud that has been recently announced are, therefore, right when they confine themselves to procuring a comparatively correct text such as is offered by the Munich MS. and the *Editio princeps*. Of course, such *variae lectiones* would, above all, have to be given as are found in the more ancient Talmudical documents. Of these latter, the MS., edited in such beautiful form by Mr. Schechter and Mr. Singer, deserves particular notice. Their festive gift came *post festem*, but it is none the less welcome, not only to the scholar to whom it was offered, but to all who have the study of Talmudics at heart.

W. BACHER.

PHILONEAN LITERATURE.

Beiträge zur Geschichte der Griechischen Philosophie und Religion, von PAUL WENDLAND u. OTTO KERN, Berlin, 1895.

Die Therapeuten, von PAUL WENDLAND, Leipzig, 1896 (besonderer Abdruck aus dem 22n. Supplementband der Jahrbücher für Classische Philologie).

Die Philonischen Citaten im Clemens v. Alexandria (besonderer Abdruck u. s. w.), von PAUL WENDLAND, 1896.

I HAVE joined these three works because they all three deal with the same range of subjects. In the first Dr. Wendland deals with the form of moral discourse known as the Diatribé, with special reference to the *Vita Contemplativa* and the essay *Quod omnis probus liber* of Philo. He shows how this form of literature culminated in the first century A.D., and how these two essays of Philo exemplify it. The aim of such essays was to sketch out a life according to nature after the Stoic-Cynical conception of it, and to contrast its simple nobility with the life of luxury and indolence.

Incidentally Dr. Wendland shows that these two works could only have been produced in the first decades of the first century and at no later epoch.

The second of the three works is a substantive and important contribution to the controversy respecting the authorship and date of the description of the Therapeutae. In seven chapters overflowing

with learning and full of acumen, Dr. Wendland deals with the direct and indirect transmission of the book, with its place among Philo's works and in Jewish literature, with its language and style, with the Philonean elements in the picture of the Therapeutae, with the origin of the sect; and lastly, he refutes the view that they were Christians. The bulk of these chapters, seventy-five pages of close print, was written before my own edition of Philo's work appeared, and is therefore independent. It is all the more satisfactory to me that Dr. Wendland arrives at substantially the same conclusions respecting its authenticity as myself.

As to the tradition of the text, Dr. Wendland only differs from me in that he assigns to the Old Latin version an independence of the Greek MSS. and of the Armenian version, whereas I had regarded it as flowing from the common archetype of the Greek MSS. I am not sure he is not right. Such independence would consort with the great antiquity of the Latinity which seems to belong to the second century. It would also help to set back the focus of tradition at which the different texts converge. Dr. Wendland agrees with me that this meeting-point must have been long anterior to Eusebius, and his account of the Philonean tradition in Clement clinches this point. For he shows that Clement had a text of Philo (including the *Vita Contemplativa*) independent of all other known texts. The meeting-point of these early divergencies must lie far back in the second century.

Dr. Wendland finally dissipates Lucius' theory that the book was written as late as 300 A.D. in defence of Christian Monachism, by producing from Clement two distinct citations of it, and from Origen and Lactantius two more.

In his second chapter Dr. Wendland gives a most valuable account of the matter of the Jewish apologies for monotheism, which afterwards became the basis of Christian Apologies; and he shows that, instead of the *Vita Contemplativa* being imitated from Christian Apologies, the debt lies the other way. He agrees with me that the book formed part of a defence of the Jews, to which Philo's second account of the Essenes, preserved only by Eusebius, also belonged. The entire work may well have formed the lost Ὑποθετικά. But I cannot agree with him and with Schürer in supposing that the title Περὶ ἀρετῶν τὸ δ′ which heads the *Vita Contemplativa* in the best codices is the error of a scribe familiar with the title Περὶ γ′ ἀρετῶν, which in the Codex Seldenianus and some others heads the three allied treatises Περὶ ἀνδρείας, φιλανθρωπίας, and μετανοίας. What has a fourth book about virtues to do with a book about three virtues? Moreover, how are we to explain the circumstance that in the best codex the *Legatio ad Gaium* bears the title Περὶ ἀρετῶν τὸ α′ and

immediately precedes the *Vita Contemplativa*. I would not claim that my explanation of these supplementary titles is the true one, but it seems to agree better than Schürer's with probability, with the confessedly fragmentary state of the Legatio, and with Josephus' statement that Philo appeared before Gaius with a written defence of the Jews in his pocket, which he began to read out, only the emperor silenced him.

In his third chapter Dr. Wendland enters on a still more minute examination of the language and idiom of the *Vita Contemplativa* than I attempted. Several usages which I regarded as ἅπαξ λεγόμενα peculiar to the book, he parallels from Philo. He shows that in its use of ἀτίθασος, θεμέλιος for θεμέλιον, ἀνάπλεων before vowels, σκότους as genitive, and σκότῳ as dative, δυοῖν, ἄλλ' ἄττα, ἕτερα ἄττα, &c., the *Vita Contemplativa* is true to Philo's general usage. In such minute points as the use of prepositions it is also characteristically Philonean. It uses ἀνὰ κράτος, not κατὰ κράτος, ἄχρι and ἄνευ after consonants, and μέχρι and δίχα after vowels; ἐπί, μετά, σύν, ἅμα, παρά, ἐν, περί, ἐξ, ἔξω, are all used as Philo alone used them. In these and many similar points the *Vita Contemplativa* proclaims its Philonean authorship, and they are just those minute indicia of style and Grecity which in the ancient world, when the language was still living, would have escaped the notice of any imitator. "Ich habe nachgewiesen," says Dr. Wendland, "dass der Verfasser der *V. C.* in der Formbildung sowohl die feinen Atticismen als auch die späteren aus der lebenden Sprache geschöpften Formen mit Philo gemeinsam hat; dass er in der Auswahl alltäglicher Worte und Wendungen, wo der einzige Reichtum der griechischen Sprache der subjectiven Willkür und dem Geschmacke den weitesten Spielraum gewährt, sowohl in dem, was er meidet, als auch in dem, was er bevorzugt, mit Philo übereinstimmt; dass er in der verschiedenen Anwendung synonymer Präpositionen, in der hier waltenden Rücksicht auf Wohlklang und Meidung des Hiates, den philonischen Gesetzen sich unterwirft oder, besser gesagt, sie unwillkürlich und unbewusst anwendet; dass er selbst ein sprachliches Missverständniss Philo's teilt." The last words refer to Philo's use of ἀνορθιάζειν τὰ ὦτα, "to prick up the ears." ὀρθιάζειν means properly to "sing out" or "raise a boating song or shout." Philo confounds it, however, with ὀρθόω, and so couples ὦτα with it. Now this erroneous usage often occurs in Philo, but in no other Greek writer. Yet the writer of the *Vita Contemplativa* employs it. Would a forger have copied even a mistake of the writer he mimicked?

In his fourth chapter Dr. Wendland summarises Philo's picture of the Therapeutae, and tries to distinguish between what of it is objective and what is Philonean colouring. Here he is, I believe,

too much dominated by the belief that Philo's ways of envisaging the Mosaic law and life in general, were almost entirely confined to himself, and not shared by him with any considerable number of his countrymen. Without affirming the genuineness of the fragments of Aristobulus, I yet think that in this matter Dr. Wendland is in error; Philo so frequently refers to schools of interpreters adverse or favourable to his own ways of thinking that I cannot believe him to have been an isolated writer or thinker. His very predominance, not only in his own community, but among Palestinian Jews, negatives such a view; and so do his allusions to the θεσπέσιοι ἄνδρες from whom he had learned how to allegorize the law.

The wide diffusion within a few decades among the Christians of Logos-beliefs closely akin to Philo's, yet not to be directly derived from him, is another proof that his was no isolated position, but that he was one of a large school, which may have had pupils in every one of the large Jewish communities all round the Mediterranean. I do not therefore agree with Dr. Wendland's attempts to explain away the statement of the *Vita Contemplativa* that these Therapeutae were to be found all over the world, but had their headquarters at Alexandria.

Dr. Wendland (chap. v) propounds the view that the Therapeutae were scribes and students of Jewish law, of the Thorah, who left their homes and families in order to consecrate themselves to their work. Is it not possible that they occupied themselves rather with the work of copying and interpreting the LXX than with the study of the Hebrew original? That they were mainly a Greek sect their use of words like μοναστήριον and σεμνεῖον proves. Clement of Alexandria styles Philo "the Pythagorean." May not the Therapeutae have been Pythagoreans to an equal extent, and have shared with Philo his cult of numbers and of their mysterious properties?

Dr. Wendland believes that they really held a high-feast every forty-ninth day, and that the banquet described is not merely the Pentecostal meal. But if they departed from Jewish practice so widely as to introduce a wholly new feast recurring every seven weeks, may they not have been fired, like Philo himself, with the ideals of the Greek Stoico-Cynical philosophy?

At the end of this chapter Dr. Wendland suggests that the *Vita Contemplativa* was written by Philo as a counterblast to Chairemon's account of the Egyptian priests preserved by Porphyry. This is rather fanciful, in my opinion, nor do I think that the treatise was written so late as after 40 A. D., as this view would require it to be. If there be any real connexion beyond community of atmosphere, then I think Chairemon was influenced by Philo's treatise, and not *vice versa*.

In his sixth chapter Dr. Wendland tears Lucius to shreds, and in his seventh enters a *caveat* against the assumption that we have so complete a knowledge of Jewish communities of the first century and of all the varieties of their religious life and developments as to say that this or that was impossible.

Prof. Schürer has already criticized this penetrating work of Dr. Wendland in the *Theol. Litt. Ztg.* He is still not convinced that the *Vita Contemplativa* is a work of Philo's; but he admits that Clement and Origen had it in their hands. He began by disbelieving its authenticity on the somewhat shallow grounds advanced by Lucius. My own work, and still more this of Dr. Wendland's, have dissipated these grounds *tenues in auras*, and the premises on which Schürer based his conclusion are gone all but a very meagre remnant. I sincerely hope that before long he will see good reason for sending his conclusion after the premises upon which it rested.

F. C. CONYBEARE.

"THE MESSIAH-IDEAL."

The Messiah-Ideal. Comparative Religions, Legislation, Doctrines, and Forms unfolding Ideal. 2 vols. By MAURICE FLUEGEL. (Baltimore, 1896.)

THE author of this study of comparative religion is known to the readers of our QUARTERLY by the review which we devoted to the *Spirit of the Biblical Legislation* (*J. Q. R.* VI, 580). The present work (in two volumes) was long planned by the author. He says, at the beginning of his introduction: "It was about ten years ago, at the University Library of Leipzig, Germany, that I conceived the idea of writing a series of treatises on the several religions and legislations of the foremost nations of history. I was then, for the first time, deeply engrossed by the study of the hoary Persian religion, with its sacred books and their leading idea, doctrines, and rites. I felt struck with the revelation of the great parallel lines and the affinity of the Zend-Avesta with the Bible, the Gospel, and the Koran. Gradually the far-reaching and cheering idea of the unity of religions dawned upon my horizon, like an illuminating flash of lightning in midnight darkness." The result was as the author felt "akin almost to Plato's doctrine that our ideas are primordial and not acquired. Long ago that idea has been foreshadowed in my early biblical reading. It was that sacred legend then, from hoary times, that man had worshipped but *Yahweh*, that the *Yahweh-cult* had been firmly established during the Adamic era of civilization, and

that far later, strife, corruption, and war, natural and human catastrophies, the 'deluge of Noah, and the ambition of Nimrod,' the Tower of Babel, and the violence of revolutions had disintegrated and scattered mankind, had brought about the differentiation of the race and the breaking up the *Yahweh-cult* into many hostile peoples and opposing creeds." Following this idea, Mr. Fluegel, after speaking of "Religion and Ethics," treats in detail "the religions, forms and seasons, Spring holidays and their evolution," and follows this up with a chapter on "The Messias-ideal, its origin, and Jesus aspirations." Next comes a chapter on "Biblical Parallels and Evolution," in which a full analysis of the Messiah ideal is given as inferred from the Sermon on the Mount, with parallel passages from the *Talmud* and *Midrashim*. We regret that our author has not given dates to these latter parallels. This is a primary necessity if we are to compare religious ideas. Such are the contents of half of the author's first volume.

The second volume is more original and more attractive. It begins with a comparison of Jesus, Mohammed, Buddha, and Zoroaster. We read: "Zoroaster, no doubt, was a shining pattern of Eastern humanity. The Zend-Avesta contains many fine pearls of ethics and wisdom, but it can hold no comparison with the telling and salient Sermon on the Mount, the many fine ethical and social parables and the wise teaching of Nazareth available for human improvement . . . . Buddha was, no doubt, a great and good man, and perhaps as self-sacrificing as Jesus was. But, unfortunately, he was a sceptic, without God-ideal, nor any great ideal: he posited nothing, he denied and negated, and his doctrine was despair; his very goodness was from sheer despair, not from hope; and hence he miscarried. He abrogated the Hindoo mythology, and left but negation, cold and barren negation! But people need something positive to go by, some faith." Next comes the work of Jesus, and the author puts Mohammed on the stage. He says: "Mohammed was a great man. He was essentially a good man too. But he had not the stamina to remain so always; nor was his goodness universal, cosmopolitan. He liberated his country, not the world. He was essentially an Arabian." It is a pity that the author did not give a sketch of the theology of Zoroaster and Buddha, and that he has omitted to mention the views of the regretted M. Darmesteter on Zoroastrianism, for he regards the Zend literature as a basis of Christianity. After having explained the idea of the kingdom of heaven, Mr. Fluegel returns to Christ, and discusses his ultimate objects and claims. Then follows a chapter on the analysis of the Gospels, which may be considered the best part of the book. Next comes an analysis of the book of Acts, and the Pauline writings. The next chapter has for its object the "History of the

Messiah-ideal from the Bible, the Roman writers, the Rabbis, the Apocrypha, and Philo." Next comes a chapter on the Messiah in the Syrian and the Roman epochs. These pages are full of information and are worth reading, although the matter is not quite new; we would specially draw attention to the passages on Rabbinic literature. Here the chronological arrangement of the documents is treated rather loosely, and there are many misprints in the Hebrew quotations. At the end the author gives passages in the two Talmuds which relate to Christ, and were expunged by the ecclesiastical authorities. Of course they have no claim to be historical, and still less the late book, in bad Hebrew, which bears the title of תולדות ישוע "the story of Jesus," which was not written before the fourteenth century, in various recensions, and even in the Jewish-German dialect. The final chapter of Mr. Fluegel's work treats of Mohammed, Islam, and Alkoran, a chapter which cannot claim originality, but the matter of it is well put together, though no recent authorities, such as Krämer, Sprenger, and Muir, are quoted. In a learned account of religions we should expect to find previous pioneers made use of. It seems that our author felt that there are considerable lacunae in his exposition of the various theological systems; for he promises to fill up the gaps at a later time, and concludes with the following words: "Circumstances allowing, we shall later consider some further trials at realizing the Messianic age, some more exemplars and versions of those highest aspirations and hopes of history. Continuing, we shall study the legislation of Zoroaster and the mystic doctrines of the Qabbalah, the bibles of ancient Parseeism and of later mysticism; the Zend-Avesta and the Sohar." We hope that our author does not mean that this last book is of the third century, as the orthodox Rabbis in the middle ages held. If the Zohar was fabricated in the thirteenth century, as the critics declare, what use is there in comparing it with Parseeism?

We miss again an index, which is a *sine qua non* in a book which treats of so many subjects.

A. NEUBAUER.

WIENER'S "BIBLIOTHECA FRIEDLANDIANA."

קהלת משה. *Bibliotheca Friedlandiana.* Catalogus librorum impressorum hebraeorum in Museo Asiatico imperialis Academiae Scientiarum Petropolitanae asservatorum. Opera et Studio SAMUELIS WIENER. Fasc. I (א), II (ב). (Petropoli, 1893–1895.)

A *complete* Hebrew Bibliography unfortunately still belongs to the things to be desired. The standard work of Steinschneider, the

father of this branch of literature, the *Catalogue of the Bodleian Library*, describes completely the Hebrew books till 1732 only, and the book is, besides, on account of its mode of execution and high price, not accessible to all. The *Thesaurus* (אוצר הספרים) of Benjacob goes only as far as 1863, and cannot be called *complete.* (Steinschneider has for years been engaged in preparing a supplement to it.) The catalogues of Zedner (British Museum), Roest (Rosenthal's collection in Amsterdam), Rabbinowicz (אהל אברהם, Merzbacher's Library in Munich), and Van Straalen (Supplement to Zedner) mention only such books as are contained in the libraries they describe. Nevertheless, these catalogues form an important contribution to a complete Hebrew Bibliography, and Wiener's catalogue, mentioned above, is a valuable addition to them. The collection described by him contains about 26,000 volumes, including 32 *incunabulae* (before 1500), and about 200 volumes printed before 1540. It must be especially mentioned that this library possesses the copies of the books used by the Gaon Elia Wilna with his autograph marginal notes; e.g. the *Mechilta*, ed. Amsterdam, 1712.

Wiener gives a full description in Hebrew of every book, and arranges his catalogue according to the names of the books, and not to those of the authors; a method which is the most practical in the case of Hebrew books. But he will surely not fail to give an index of the authors at the end of the work. In describing the books, he only reproduces, whenever possible, the words of the title-page, omitting all unnecessary phrases. He keeps to the following rubrics: name of the book, name of the author, frequently adding brief and valuable information about him, description of contents, place and year, size, character of type, number of sheets or pages. He also notes the names of the Rabbis who gave their approbations (הסכמות), which forms an important contribution to the history of Jewish literature; it frequently enables us to fix the date of Rabbis, several of whom were great men who left no books behind, and are only known from their approbations. Of particular importance are the approbations by the Synods of the four districts in Poland (ועד ד׳ ארצות). Wiener occasionally gives information about the history of the Jews in Poland from rare books (vide Nos. 59, 291, 411, 627, 1178, 1230, 1276, 1291, 1761, 1772), and he also notes which books are mentioned in the catalogues of Steinschneider, Zedner, Roest, and Van Straalen.

It is only after using the book for several years that a complete judgment about Wiener's work becomes possible. But it takes only a short time to convince the reader that the author executed his task with great conscientiousness and a complete knowledge of his subject, and it is to be wished that he were enabled to compose a complete

Hebrew Bibliography. I would make, however, the following remarks. In the titles of books the introductory words like ספר, קונטרס, מגלה, מאמר, are not taken notice of. But such words are frequently an essential part of the title ; thus, for instance, מאמר האחדות, by Joseph Jabez (No. 584; Steinschneider and Benjacob under מ), מגלת אליעזר ונפתלי (No. 669), &c. As to books with such titles as באור, באורי, באורים (Nos. 1151–91), it is also difficult to find one's way among them. The well-known commentary to the Turim, by Joshua Falk, ב"ח, ought to have been recorded under the title of דרישה ופרישה, by which name it is generally known, and not under its secondary title of בית ישראל (No. 1308). On the other hand, I do not know why the book, עמודי שטים לבית הלוי, by Levi Pollak, is registered under ב (No. 1315), and not under ע. Of the translated books, especially those from the Arabic, the name of the author and the translator ought to have been given whenever possible. It was done e.g. in No. 187 (אגרת המוסר), No. 721 (האמונות והדעות, where it ought to have been mentioned that the Arabic original was edited by Landauer, Leiden, 1880), but it was not done in No. 172 (אגרת בע"ח, v. Steinschneider, *Hebr. Uebersetz.*, p. 860), No. 703 (האמונה הרמה, on the title of the lost Arabic original, see Bacher, *Z. D. M. G.*, 1892, 541), so that the reader does not know that the books in question are only translations. The titles of such books as were not published by themselves, but appeared as commentaries or additions to other works, ought to have been briefly mentioned, it is done e.g. in the case of ביזת מצרים, ברית מטה משה, &c., but not in the case of so popular a work as בית יוסף by Joseph Karo.

As to the authors, it may be observed that the work אותיות דר' עקיבא (No. 563) may after all have perhaps been written by the Gaon Saadiah, v. Harkavy, היקב, p. 46. About the author of האמונה והבטחון v. also Jellinek, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Kabala*, i. 40, and B. Bernstein in *Berliner's Magazin*, 1891, 34. The translator of אניה טוערה (No. 824) was Mendel Levin or Mendel Satanow.—The *Commentary on the Pentateuch*, by Obadiah Sforno (No. 1168), was not called אור ה', v. Finkel, *R. Obadja Sforno als Exeget*, p. 19, note 1. The commentary on the Mishnah, ברכת אברהם (No. 155), is not of Ibn Ezra, v. Reifmann in החוקר, i. 44.

No description is given of the contents of the books Nos. 281, 522, 704, 812, 1018, and 1508. In the case of magazines and collections, Wiener enumerates the most important articles, but this is omitted in Nos. 1419, 1422, and 1546. In the case of several editions of a work, Wiener records only those that are possessed in the library

he describes, but several times he adds in brackets also those editions that are not in that library. In the case of בחינת עולם he gives a complete list of all (sixty-four) editions. But, at any rate, at least the *editio princeps* ought to have been given in all cases; it also ought to have been said which books were contained in others; this has only been partially done (v. Nos. 53, 162, 193, 204, 217, 506, and 642). Thus, for instance, in the case of אגרת רש"ג (No. 216), the editions in יוחסין, and in Neubauer's *Mediaeval Jewish Chronicles* ought to have been referred to. L. Gordon's אהבת דוד ומיכל is also printed in the complete edition of that author's poems (כל שירי יל"ג). The commentary on Job, אוהב משפט, by Simeon Duran (No. 350, the book has 211 pages, not 112), is contained also in the edition of the Bible, קהלת משה (Amsterdam, 1724–27). Of אותיות דר"ם (v. supra) the editions of Fürst in his *Concordantia*, and of Derenbourg in *Manuel du Lecteur*, ought to have been mentioned. Several alleged editions are merely title editions; Wiener observes this only twice (Nos. 988 and 1317), but omits doing so in innumerable cases, e.g. Nos. 274-76, 309-11, 491–92, 1367–68, 1469–70, &c.

In conclusion we make the following remarks. The first volume of the novel האבות והבנים appeared first under the title of למדו היטב (Warsaw, 1863). The אהבת ציון by Simcha b. Joshua (No. 268) is for the greatest part plagiarized from the Karaitic traveller in Palestine, Samuel b. David (v. Luncz, ירושלם, IV, 147–152), and it is altogether questionable whether the former ever was in Palestine (cf. Harkavy, ib. 45). On אור לעת בקר and אור לעת ערב (Nos. 490, 491) v. Steinschneider in Grätz's *Monatsschrift*, 1885, 527. The אותות השמים by Jehuda b. Salomo Cohen of Toledo (No. 557 is a portion of his unpublished encyclopedia מדרש החכמה, v. Steinschneider, in Brüll's *Centralanzeiger*, I, 109. The MS. of the second part of the ארחות חיים by Aron Cohen (No. 918), described by Luzzatto, is now in the Montefiore College in Ramsgate, but it is defective. Another copy is in the possession of Baron Gunzburg (v. Gross, *Monatsschrift*, 1869, 431 sqq.). A third exists in the library of the Synagogue in Warsaw. No more are known. On אשד הנחלים v. Simonsen, in Jubilee book in honour of Steinschneider, p. 166. Elia Levita's German translation of the Italian novel of Buovo d'Artona (בבא בוך) appeared first in 1508, v. Bacher in *Ersch und Gruber*, II, vol. 43, p. 301.—Meiri, Nos. 1263–70, wrote *Decisions and Chidushim*, v. שם הגדלים s. v., and *Hist. Littér. de la France*, XXVII, 532 sqq. On בנאות דשא (No. 1486) v. Simonsen, ib. 167. Wiener, in his references on the writings contained in the ברכה משלשת (No. 1666), follows Rabbinowicz's view

(דקדוקי סופרים, Berachot, Preface, p. 80); the same was done by Jellinek and Halberstam; on the other hand, cf. Zomber in *Berliner's Magazin*, 1878, pp. 26–34.

These observations do not detract in any way from the value of the excellent work; it is to be hoped that the work may proceed somewhat more rapidly. It is said in the Preface to Fasc. II, that the half of Fasc. III is already printed (two sheets are already in my hands), and that Fasc. IV (ה, ו, ז) is ready for the press. We look forward with pleasure to their speedy appearance.

SAMUEL POZNAŃSKI.

"TREASURES OF JERUSALEM."

גנזי ירושלים, edited from MSS., with Notes and Introductions, by SOLOMON AARON WERTHEIMER of Jerusalem. Part I, 10 pp. Introduction and 48 pp. Text, 8vo. (Jerusalem, 1896.)

THIS collection contains:—(1) Responsa of Hai Gaon and other anonymous Geonim. (2) הלכות ס"ת. Decisions on the Scroll of the Law, by Jacob Tam. (3) Responsa by Abraham ben Nathan ha-Jarchi. (4) Letter of Jonathan of Lunel to Maimuni. (5) Maimuni's answer. (6) מגלת מצרים. A Purim in Egypt. (7) An event in Narbonne in the year 1236. (8), (9), and (10) Poems by Abraham Ibn Ezra, Jehudah ha-Levi, Zedaka Kalai, and Abraham Ziphrani.

The editor observes in his Introduction, p. 4, about No. 2, that the MS. was taken from two books. I add that the piece given here, from p. 10 to p. 19, line 24, is already printed in *Machsor Vitry*, p. 651 sqq. But the readings occasionally vary, e. g. p. 14, l. 24 in the present edition: חמאל instead of תנינא in *Machsor Vitry*, p. 654. The passage from p. 18, l. 25, to p. 19, l. 13, does not occur in *Machsor Vitry*, and seemed therefore to have been taken from the second book.

The ס' תגי, mentioned by the editor in the Introduction, p. 5, was already printed in Paris in 1866 with an instructive introduction by the late Senior Sachs, and again in *Machsor Vitry*, p. 374 sqq.

No. 4 has its origin in a "Genusa" in Egypt and was hitherto unknown, and we must be thankful to the editor for communicating it. But he is mistaken when he asserts, in the Introduction, p. 9, note, that Jonathan also belonged to those who applied to Adret in favour of Maimonides (מנחת קנאות, 103), and that there "Jonathan" should be read instead of "Nathan," for Jonathan lived a hundred years earlier.

No. 6 is edited from the copy of a MS. which the editor had formerly sold in Oxford. This fact is not mentioned by him, and he was justly taken to task for this in the preceding volume of this REVIEW, p. 560, by my friend, Dr. Neubauer. The latter also carefully edited the מגלה, on p. 544 sqq., from this MS., and also from another, with the addition of many valuable remarks and inquiries. I read a "printer's proof" of this some months before the present edition appeared, as Dr. Neubauer had been so kind as to send it me. A fragment of this מגלה was, as Dr. Neubauer mentions in his excellent article, already printed by Harkavy from a St. Petersburg MS. in חדשים גם ישנים, No. 2, p. 345, but much is missing there, at the beginning, in the middle, and at the end; besides, one piece has been transposed there, and got into the wrong place; namely p. 5, l. 6, הפך שמו שר שלום, which belongs to p. 4, l. 5, קראוהו יולדיו ימיי.

No. 7 of the present collection was also edited before by Dr. Neubauer in his *Mediaeval Jewish Chronicles*, II, 251. The assertion of the editor that this MS. was Jonathan's being erroneous, everything he says about Jonathan in his Introduction must be corrected. Cf. Neubauer, in this REVIEW, l. c., p. 560; and Kaufmann, *Revue des Études Juives*, XXXII, 130. Since the character of writing of this piece is identical with that of p. 33, "letter of Jonathan," it is impossible for this to be an autograph letter as the editor erroneously avers in the Introduction, p. 7.

Abraham Ibn Ezra's poem את שה פזורה (p. 45) was also quoted by Zunz, *Literaturgeschichte*, p. 212, and Jehudah ha-Levi's poem למתי צפנת is already printed in the *Roman Machsor*. Cf. Landshutt, *Onomast.*, p. 73, and Zunz, p. 413. Zedaka Kalai (p. 46) is not mentioned by Zunz, who mentions, however, Joseph Kalai (p. 339), nor is Abraham Ziphrani named by Zunz. But in my catalogue קהלת שלמה, No. 359, some of his poems occur, pp. 81 and 83; in the latter place אברהם צפרוני מקורפו, but not the one given here.

It is to be hoped that Mr. Wertheimer may be enabled by a quick sale of this first part to follow it up by a second.

S. J. HALBERSTAM.

SHORT NOTICES.

Dr. A. Harkavy's Publications.

I THINK I am right in drawing attention to the publications of my learned friend Dr. Harkavy, which he is kind enough to send to me regularly. This is a privilege which I highly esteem, since many of them are out of reach of those who are busied with Jewish literature and history. Many of the readers of this QUARTERLY will be thankful even for the short notices which I can give here.

1. In the first rank I put his edition of the poetical pieces of Judah Halevi (ed. אביאסף), which has reached the second volume (Warsaw, 1895), with Luzzatto's notes and his own. A very handy edition indeed, which he will no doubt enrich with poetical pieces still in manuscript.

2. Additions and corrections concerning the Karaites, and additions to Graetz's History, 3rd edition. Indeed, it was high time to rewrite this part according to the new MSS. in the Imperial Library at St. Petersburg. My lamented friend, Prof. Graetz, had no opportunity to do so himself after the St. Petersburg MSS. became known. These valuable additions are written in German.

3. לקורות הכתות בישראל, on the *sects* in Judaism, in Hebrew, written originally in Russian (see *J. Q. R.* VII, 687), (Warsaw, 1895).

4. Notes, called חדשים גם ישנים. (*a*) No. 5. On Russian Settlements in the Holy Land, according to documents in the province of Lithuania, and the towns of Selz and Mistezki, in the seventeenth century, followed by those of the eighteenth century. This is followed (*α*) by the prospectus of a Hebrew weekly (1864); (*β*) by a correspondence of Dr. Mandelstam with the famous Firkowitz; (*γ*) Miscellanea, some extracts from MSS.; (*δ*) additions and corrections to Benjakob's bibliographical work, entitled אוצר הספרים, which may be welcome to Dr. Steinschneider for his nearly finished bibliographical work. (*b*) No. 6. A short description of Hebrew MSS. which Dr. Harkavy examined rather hastily in the East, when he was there in the year 1886, viz. in Jerusalem, Damascus, Aleppo, Cairo, and Smyrna, of course in private libraries. No. 7 (1896). Additions to the Hebrew translation of Graetz's History, vol. vi (in Hebrew, Part IV). These notes are of the highest importance, not only for the corrections, but for new documents, e. g. the fragments of a dictionary of Haya Gaon in Arabic, given here with a Hebrew translation. The same is the

case with Ben Balaam's commentaries on Biblical books in Arabic, of which Dr. Harkavy gives also a Hebrew translation. There are many additions and corrections in the Karaitic later works, additions to the bibliography of Abraham ben Ezra, and many other additions. This *fasciculus* is dedicated to the memory of Joseph Derenbourg in Paris, and of Joel Müller in Berlin. I conclude with two essays in Russian.

5. An extract from the Proceedings of the Society מרבי השכלה (St. Petersburg, Dec. 27, 1894) on the printing of Hebrew books in Russia and Poland. In the latter half of the sixteenth century, the Polish Jews had their presses at Lublin and Cracow. A great blow was dealt by the rebellion of Bogdan Chmelnicki and the troubles of Little Russia in the seventeenth century. The many presses established towards the end of the last and the beginning of the present century tended to spread Ḥassidism. A list of places with the date of the first book printed at each is given at the end of the essay, pp. 105–107. The first book printed was, at Lublin (Poland) in 1556, the Pentateuch.

6. Extract from the Memoirs of the Imperial Archaeological Society of St. Petersburg, on the origins of Islam, in which Dr. Harkavy expresses a hope that the time is approaching when these sources will be thoroughly known. Sprenger has shown that at first Mohammed approximated more to Judaism and Christianity. This he afterwards repudiated as he became more successful. But in the Koran and other works connected with Islam, there are many correct references to the Bible. Some, however, are incorrect, and in many cases these have arisen from carelessness more than design. Dr. Harkavy disagrees with Rösch, in thinking that the passage to which Mohammed referred in the Old Testament as containing his name is to be found in Haggai, Daniel, or the Psalms. It is well known that the allusion is to the 17th chapter of Genesis (verse 20), where there is a prophecy about Ishmael—"I will increase him greatly" (במאד מאד). If we take the letters as numerals במאד מאד and מחמד are both equivalent to 92.

Abraham ben Elijah Wilna's רב פעלים.

Herr Szimon Chones published in 1894 a posthumous study on Midrashim, by the R. Abraham son of the celebrated Gaon R. Elijah of Wilna, with the title of רב פעלים in Hebrew (Warsaw). It is a posthumous work, for the author died the 25th day of the month of Kislew 568 (=1808 A.D.), thus it is a forerunner of a part of Zunz's epoch-making work, *Die gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden, historisch*

entwickelt, which appeared for the first time in the year 1833. The editor, with good taste, dedicated it on the occasion of Zunz's hundredth birthday. After recommendatory letters from various Rabbis, and a preface by the late author, we find the description of various minor Midrashim in alphabetical order, beginning with מ' אבכיר, ending with סדר תנאים ואמוראים; of many of them we have only the names, quoted by authorities. The descriptions of many pieces are not yet antiquated, others are more or less so. The editor tries to supply notes and additions, with regard to modern criticism. He gives entirely the pieces of the Yalkut, which are marked by אבכיר; the same he does for the pieces extant of the Midrash אספה (Numbers xi. 16), from the Yalkut and Bahya's commentary on the Pentateuch. Then he gives in full the מדרש ויסעו, according to the text to be found in Jellinek's בית המדרש, III, 1, and the אלה אזכרה (ibid. II, 64), taken from an old MS.; Herr Chones does not mention where the MS. is now. The editor was not so fortunate as to be near a modern Library, and has omitted a great number of bibliographical notices, which are supplied by the well-known scholar in this branch of learning, Herr Salomon Buber, with the title of יריעות שלמה (Canticles i. 5; Warsaw, 1896). These omissions he communicated with great courtesy to Herr Chones, who had the opportunity of rectifying many inaccuracies and supplying many additions. Before Herr Buber's additions and rectifications, Prof. D. Kaufmann of Budapest supplied many references in the Monthly of which he is the editor, the *Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judenthums*, vol. XXXIX (New Series, III), p. 136 sqq., which is reprinted with great tact verbatim. Thus the Bibliography is put pretty fully, although inconveniently for the student, who has to look out in three places at least, in order to be sure of accurate data. The editor takes the opportunity to reprint (on p. 41) the בריתא דמעשה בראשית from a MS. in possession of R. Abraham (the author of the רב פעלים), which is unedited in its entirety. Herr Chones adds that it is not the autograph of R. Abraham. We recommend Midrash students to possess the two monographs described here, as they are full of information concerning Midrash literature. Unfortunately there is not a ghost of an index, by which the student could be guided in finding matter which he needs for his investigations.

M. Friedmann's "Onkelos and Akylas."

In his monograph, with the title of "Onkelos and Akylas" (III. *Jahresbericht der israelitisch-theologischen Lehranstalt in Wien*, 1895–1896), Lector M. Friedmann opens again the question about

Akila and Onkelos. The author does not claim to have discovered new documents concerning these two translators of the Pentateuch, but he presents those which writers on this matter used, and uses them more critically. Beginning from the expression in the Talmud תרגום דידן, "our Targum," or "the Targum receptus," it is clear that there was an old translation. He then discusses the origin and growth of the Septuagint, and its decadence. This is furnished with copious notes and corrections from those who made use of them in Part A. The three Akilas mentioned in various Talmudic books are discussed, proving that Akila was not a pupil of Akiba, and that Akila was often confounded with Onkelos. Our author proves that Akila's translation was approved by R. Eliezer and R. Joshua, who are styled רבינו, "our masters." Our author discusses the various opinions concerning the reason of composing this translation. Herr Friedmann believes that it was composed first for the schools, and then for the lessons in the synagogue. Having fallen out of use, it become fragmentary as we see it now. C. treats of the Aramaic language of the Targum in Babylon, and the influence of the *Methurgeman* (interpreters). Next follow the fragments of the Targum found in Talmudic books, also many in the Agadah, and a discussion of the high antiquity of the so-called Targum Onkelos. D. gives the data in the Talmudic treatises concerning Onkelos, and his relation to the two Gamaliels, adding the various opinions of old and modern writers. After these minute data, our author comes to the conclusion that the tradition gives us the right view of this question, agreeing with the conclusion of Azariah de Rossi, whose result is that Onkelos was of an early date and Akila of a more recent date, a pupil of R. Eliezer and R. Joshua, and there can be no doubt that the latter followed in his Greek translation the traces of Onkelos. The hypotheses concerning the two translators balance one another; neither is quite satisfactory, but the simpler is more satisfactory. We recommend Targum scholars to read carefully our author's monograph, for he is complete in his data, critical in the quoted texts, and almost exhaustive. In one word, the whole Targum question lies before us, with all existing documents from various sources.

Dr. M. Steinschneider's Medical Bibliography.

I hope the readers of our Quarterly will be interested to know that the Nestor of *Hebrew Bibliography*, Prof. M. Steinschneider, has just published the bibliography of articles and monographs written on medicine in the Bible and the Talmud, as well as on

Jewish physicians. It has appeared in the *Wiener Klinische Rundschau*, 1896, Nos. 25 and 26, in German, with the title of "Schriften über Medicin in Bibel und Talmud und über jüdische Aerzte." We were fortunate enough to receive the extract ("Separatabdruck") of twelve pages. The last page gives an index of the authors. It begins with the work of David de Pomis, Venice, 1585, and ends with the monograph entitled, "Maimonides als medicinische Autorität" (Maimonides as a medical authority), by J. Münz, Trier, 1895 (Extract from the *Jüdische Literatur seit Abschluss des Kanons*, Trier). This last Dr. Steinschneider criticizes severely, saying the author only repeats old errors, and has not consulted for this part the pages 762–774 of his German work, with the title *Die hebräischen Uebersetzungen des Mittelalters* (JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, VI, 146 sqq.).

A. NEUBAUER.

MISCELLANEA.

THE EGYPTIAN HISTORIAN AND POET ABRAHAM BAR HILLEL.

THE very fact that we know so little of the history of Jewish literature in Egypt should induce us to pay all the greater regard to every production emanating from the apparently inexhaustible contents of the *Genisot*. At any rate, the notion that the names of Saadiah, who emigrated from that country, and of Maimuni, who immigrated there, are the only noteworthy ones among Egypt's literary celebrities, has already been discarded. Thus far, the Egyptian fragments consisted of the contents from works, the origins of which had to be sought for outside the country. But Dr. Neubauer's latest publication (*J. Q. R.* VIII, 541 sqq.) refers to the products of Egyptian Jews born and bred on the soil, in which, nevertheless, historical research and Hebrew poetry are equally represented.

However hazardous it may be to offer an opinion about Abraham bar Hillel's Megilla without an examination of the MS., I cannot repress the conjecture that only a small portion of this new source of history has been preserved, and that we have not only mutilated fragments, but in these latter foreign matter has also strayed. I cannot help thinking that the passage from p. 547, l. 17 to p. 548, l. 2 from the bottom, strayed into our Megilla, say, from something like Charisi's Tachkemoni. So much is certain, that, as matters stand, no historical date can be evolved therefrom with any amount of certainty. However, although the original form of this source had to suffer many changes, the little that has been preserved to us suffices to enable us to draw conclusions as to the study of history and the facility in using the style of Hebrew *Makames*.

But Abraham bar Hillel could not only skilfully handle *Makames*, he was also an expert in the more difficult forms of versification. He left us, at the end of his Megilla, a specimen of his poetry, a clear proof of the Spanish poetry's influence on the Egyptian Jews, which only requires to be transcribed in the form intended by the author,

to make a restoration of the text, corrupted in numerous instances, possible by the guidance of the metre. Neither Mr. Wertheimer nor Dr. Neubauer regarded this circumstance, but had the poem "run on" equally with the other part of the Megilla. I therefore reproduce Abraham bar Hillel's verses in a pure and correct form :

– – ∪ – – – ∪ – – – ∪ – – ∪ – – – ∪ – – – ∪

אהה לזמן הנחותיו חשכן · ושמחותיו באנחותיו הפכן
וטובותיו ברע[ו]תיו דחפן · וכוסותיו בראש פתן מסכן
והוליך כל ימותיו הנעימים · אחורנית ועיות מהלכן
וזה דרכו אבל הוסיף תלאות · בכל שבר ושוד לא אעריכן
מסרנו ביד רועה אוילי · חמור[1] נוער להושיבו בדוכן
שמו זוטא אשר חטא והחט[י]א[2] · וכל ארחות מתועבות דרכן
והחשך בפניו שם מעונו[3] · והאופל בעיניו נח ושכן[4]
ולו יביט בפניי האפילם[5] · ולו בפני מאורות החשיכן
ולו בקש יהי[6] רועה אתונות · אזי בו מאנו להיות נסיכן
ולו יהיה בכלבי הכשבים · אזי בו מאסו להיות בתוכן
ובא לקח במסרותו למשרת[7] · קהלות אל ולהרג[8] משכן
והוליד[9] בן פריץ חיות כצלמו · וכדמותו וידיו הוא סמכן
עלי ראשו וראש אביו[10] יחילון · דמי נפשות נקיים ששפכן
ודמו כי בדמים יחזיקום · ידי מלכות ויושיבון עלי כֵּן[11]
והשיב אל עלי ראשם עמלם · וכתנין עלי עקב נשכן
והוא עשה לרב יצחק צחוק עם · קהלותיו ובצלליו סככן
והסיר מעלי שכמם חרפות · ורגליהן במעגליו תמכן
וחברתי מגלה זו בענין · ימי פורים ו[כ]מגילת[12] ממוכן
ושירה זו תהי לעד ערוכה · בפי שרים ושרות עם חניכן
ועוכר זה בעכרו עם ישורון · עכרו[13] אל בזה היום כעכן

[1] In former editions אויל וחמור. [2] והחטא.
[3] שף משונו. [4] נחשכן. [5] בפניו האפלים. [6] יהיה.
[7] למסרת, and he went to keep by his delatorship the regiment of the Lord's communities.
[8] אלו להרג. [9] והוליך. [10] וראש אביו correctly in e.
[11] And they [sc. the father and the son] fancied that the hands of the Government would protect them by money, and reinstate them in their former position.
[12] ומגילת. [13] בעבדו עם ישורון עבדו.

That this is the conclusion of the poem is certain, because it is followed by the sign of the end of the Megilla. Namely, the words תמה ושלום, which appear in the MSS., must be retained; they mean only that the Megilla is here at an end. שלום is the well-known formula of greeting, the Megilla being considered a letter. The following לבעצהם means here, as usually in Arabic collections of poems, that the following verse belongs to another poet; in this case to Samuel Hanagid. The date on the MS. indicates therefore only the time when this copy was written, but in no way refers to the time in which the events, described in the Megilla, took place.

Samuel Hanagid's verse was not, it seems, placed by chance at the end of the Megilla. Rather is it evident, that the writer mistook the verse for one of the Egyptian Nagid Samuel b. Chananya, who was frequently confounded in Egypt with the Spanish Nagid Samuel. Such confusion of these two persons explains also Joseph Sambari's assumptions, that Samuel Hanagid's introduction, quoted already by Abraham ibn Daûd, was the work of the Egyptian, and that Samuel b. Chananya had come to Egypt from Spain[1].

Karlsbad. D. KAUFMANN.

THE EGYPTIAN SUTTA-MEGILLA.

IN order to understand the historical contents of the Egyptian Megilla, brought to light by Mr. Wertheimer and Dr. Neubauer, we are compelled to assume that a number of leaves are missing, which bore upon several passages in the text where the want of continuity was not observed by the editors. Thus, the very beginning of the narrative proper, in which Samuel Hanagid's princely liberality seems to have been mentioned, is missing. For it is impossible that Samuel should have suddenly made his appearance, like a *deus ex machina*, as we see him do in our text, p. 545, last line but one; some mention of, and narrative about him must have preceded. But in that way, Mardochai, who was assumed by Dr. Neubauer to have been Samuel's predecessor and Nagid of Egypt (p. 553), disappears altogether from the scene. Mardochai is Samuel Hanagid himself, of

[1] Comp. Kaufmann, *Monatsschrift*, 40, 417.

whom (p. 545, l. 16) it is said, that he was מרדכי הזמן, the Mardochai of his time, who saved the Jews of Egypt from the hands of the Haman of his time. That the firebrand and disturber of the Jews in Egypt was called Haman is as impossible to assume as that the bearer of the honourable title of "the Mardochai of his time" should have been called Mardochai.

But there is also an important break only a few lines after the commencement of our text. On p. 545, l. 15, before the word פנה— where, by the way, read פנה הודה פנה זיוה = פנה ההדר instead of פנה החדר—the loss of a more or less large piece must be assumed, in which Samuel's forcible supersession by Sutta must have been narrated.

But the mourning at the triumph of the oppressor lasted only for sixty-six days, after which Samuel was reinstated in his dignity as Nagid (השיר, p. 545, l. 2 from the bottom). It was then that the author of our Megilla composed the ingenious four-lined epigram, which should read as follows (p. 546, l. 2) :—

בתי כנסיות לברד ישבו · בן כל ימי פגעם אשר נגזרו
דמו ליולדת בשבתה עד מלאת · ששה וששים יום וטהרו (?)

Sutta, so quickly deprived of his honours, secretly watched for an opportunity to raise his head again, and to recover his lost influence. He hoarded up a colossal fortune, which he thought would place the power in his hands again, as soon as the Egyptian finances had reached low tide.

Samuel Hanagid died before 1169, before the new Sultan Saladin had come to the throne. No sooner was he dead than Sutta made a denunciation about the treasures which the Nagid of the Egyptian Jews was alleged to have acquired. The sums were sought for, but were not found, the slander was proved to be baseless, and the informer remained in the disgrace into which he had fallen years before.

But Saladin wanted money; Sutta offered him large sums, and induced him to sell him the dignity of Nagid, and thus to play the game of the ambitious schemer, who even took the Messianic appellation of Sar Shalom.—P. 546, l. 10, read שר השרים—וישיג תאותו was the title of the Nagid, שררה designates the dignity of Nagid, with which the collection of the taxes, which the Jews were liable to pay, was connected. The payment was being enforced with inexorable severity, such as was only to be expected of such a man. He stretched forth his hand, says our text, p. 546, l. 19 (read וישט שעל), and took off the shoe from the barefooted.

The oppression continued for four years, after which a change was brought about by the man who is revered in Jewish literature as the eagle of the Synagogue. We learn from our Megilla, that Moses Maimonides was a person of historical significance, who had a great and salutary influence upon the affairs of his co-religionists in Egypt. Was it his position as Saladin's physician which enabled him to gain the ear of that ruler in favour of his brethren? In every way, it must be attributed to his interference that Sar Shalom was driven from his position, and that the oppression, which weighed down the Egyptian Jews, was relieved.

But unfortunately, another piece is missing in an important passage of our text. It is clear that the continuity of the narrative is interrupted on p. 547, l. 2, where the circumstances connected with the change in the conditions of the Egyptian Jews, brought about by Maimonides, were narrated. It may have been at that time that Maimonides was offered the dignity of Nagid, which he refused to accept.

Instead of the important piece, which is lost, we get, from p. 547, l. 16 to p. 548[1], l. 2 from the bottom, a leaf from a *Makame*, which has simply blundered into that place. Neubauer's proofs of Sutta's Rabbinical learning (p. 543) are, therefore, only a *quid pro quo*.

Sar Shalom Halevi, as Sutta was probably called when a Nagid (p. 555, App. II), soon enjoyed the assistance of a son, who became his master in all the arts of tyranny, and the practices of a pasha. Denunciations, the like of which were never before heard of, were of everyday occurrence; men of spotless reputation denounced as spies and enemies of the Sultan, and put to death. Egypt must at that time have presented a shocking picture of Jewish communal life. The communities, in their despair, had recourse to excommunication. The Nagid and his son, whose duty it was to manage Jewish affairs and to protect their brethren, were proscribed as informers. But mere excommunication was not enough to arrest the evil; till at last R. Isaac took matters into his hands, and led a deputation from the Jewish communities before the Sultan Saladin, to whom they described their unendurable position, and thus brought about the downfall of Sar Shalom and his son. Further information about this R. Isaac can only be expected when further documents on the subject have been discovered.

Karlsbad. D. KAUFMANN.

[1] P. 548, l. 6, I read תהגהו : l. 9 הנח הכמות שלא גמרתה וידעתה ; l. 24 והוא.

A JEW IN THE SERVICE OF THE EAST INDIA COMPANY IN 1601.

It is well known that many of the great navigators and discoverers of the fifteenth, sixteenth, and seventeenth centuries were under great obligations to the knowledge, linguistic and mathematical, of Jews. Jehuda Cresques was director of Prince Henry the Navigator's School of Navigation at Sagres. Columbus constantly used on his voyages the astronomical tables of the Jewish mathematician, Abraham Zacuto of Salamanca, and took with him as interpreter on his first voyage to America a recently baptized Jew. Vasco da Gama owed much to the scientific knowledge of Zacuto, and something to the skill and experience of the well-known Jewish pilot who, when compelled to undergo baptism, adopted the name of Gaspar da Gama. D'Albuquerque habitually employed Jewish interpreters[1].

It is less well known, and, indeed, the fact has, I believe, escaped the notice of writers on the "middle period" of Anglo-Jewish history, i.e. the period between the expulsion of the Jews from England by Edward I and their constitutional recall under Cromwell, that a Jew, settled in England and well acquainted with the English language, though not of English birth, took part in the most important English expedition by sea of the reign of Elizabeth, viz. the first voyage of the East India Company. The object of this voyage was the establishment of trading relations with the East Indies, a name which included not only India proper but also the Malay Archipelago. The importance of securing the services of an interpreter competent to carry on negotiations with the native rulers was well known to the leaders of the expedition, and to the adventurers who had sent them forth, more especially since John Davis, the great navigator, who went out as chief pilot of the fleet, was able, as a result of his former experience in the East, to inform them of the warlike power and disposition of the Sultan of Achen, the greatest kingdom in Sumatra, and of his willingness to enter into friendly relations with English traders if properly approached. Fortunately, Captain James Lancaster, the commander of the expedition, had as body-servant a Jew

[1] Kayserling, *Christopher Columbus* (New York, 1894), p. 115; *Jahrbuch für die Geschichte der Juden und des Judenthums* (Leipzig), vol. III (1863), pp. 305-317.

who had been taken by the English from the Barbary States, who had, during his long residence in England, learned to speak English well, and who was also familiar with Arabic, the language spoken in Achen.

The five ships that had been entrusted to Captain Lancaster for the purposes of the expedition, sailed from Woolwich in February, 1600–1, and cast anchor in the harbour of Achen in June, 1602. A few days after his arrival, Lancaster presented to the Sultan a friendly letter from the Queen, which, with similar letters to the other native rulers into whose territory he was likely to come, had been furnished to him on his departure from England. With the help of the Jewish interpreter, lengthy negotiations were carried on between Lancaster and the Sultan. In the end, the Sultan agreed to allow all English traders in his territory to enjoy protection, freedom of trade, and "freedom of conscience," and gave Lancaster a letter to take back to Elizabeth, in which he confirmed the grant of these privileges. After remaining for some months in the neighbourhood of Achen, the English went to Bantam in Java and established friendly relations with the king; and then, with their ships laden with pepper, cloves, and cinnamon, sailed homewards. Thus was laid the foundation of British power in the East.

The narrative of the English expedition makes no further mention of the Jew beyond the point at which it records that he acted as interpreter at Achen. For his subsequent history we are indebted to François Pyrard, the historiographer of the French expedition which set sail from St. Malo on a voyage to the East, three months after the departure of the East India Company's expedition from England. According to Pyrard, the Jew left the English ships at Bantam, carrying with him "twelve or fifteen hundred pieces of forty sols Spanish," which he had stolen from Lancaster. Thence he went about from place to place, spending his money freely and marrying a wife wherever he stayed. At last he returned to Achen, embarked on a ship bound for Surat, disembarked at the Maldives, where Pyrard met him and learnt his history, and "came to make offer of his services to the king, under the pretext that he was a good gunner; but he knew nothing about it. He was well received at first; but when it was seen that he was a liar, no further notice was taken of him. Soon after, he fell sick and begged me to get his leave of the king; and I, making the request through the lord with whom I resided, obtained it with great difficulty. He said he was married in Guzeratte, and had a child there, which was partly the cause why his leave was granted; though after he got it he remained three or four months longer, and spent the remainder of his money, and then embarked with the richest

merchant of Cananor, a Malabar Mahometan, and the greatest man of that place next to the king."

Pyrard, it will be seen, had a great contempt for the Jew. He summarily describes him as "the greatest scoundrel in the world." It is late in the day to dispute this severe verdict, but it is only fair to point out that the very full *quasi*-official narrative of Lancaster's expedition does not say a word about the theft of the "twelve or fifteen hundred Spanish pieces."

India Office. B. Lionel Abrahams.

Authorities: *The Voyages of Sir James Lancaster to the East Indies* (Hakluyt Society), 1877, pp. 74–101; *The Voyage of François Pyrard of Laval to the East Indies, the Maldives, &c.* (Hakluyt Society), 1887, pp. 283–285.

Σαββαθιον: NOTE TO PAGE 51 ABOVE.

In my citation of this term from one of Mr. Grenfell's Ptolemaic Papyri, I adduced that scholar's view that Σαββαθιον means "Synagogue." Professor Schürer, however, in an article just published in the *Theologische Literaturzeitung* (Sept. 26, 1896, col. 522), offers an alternative suggestion which is very attractive.

Professor Schürer admits that the translation "Synagogue" is possible in the context, but he argues that as the document in which it occurs contains a list of personal names, it is probable that Σαββαθιον also is the name of a person. Nay more, it is the name of a woman. Female names terminating in ιον are elsewhere found, as, for instance, Ταιον in a Jewish inscription at Phocea. (Cf. Reinach, *Revue des Études Juives*, vol. XII, 1886, p. 236 sq.) Reinach has noticed other instances. Moreover, there is evidence that the masculine form of the name was also current; thus Σαββατις occurs in the *Corp. Inscr. Graec.*, n. 9910 (cf. Schürer, *Geschichte des jüd. Volkes*, II, 518). I might also point out that the name "Sabbatai" has always been popular with Jews. At least three Talmudical Rabbis bear the name, and in the Middle Ages it was even more common. (See e.g. the Index to Dr. Neubauer's *Mediaeval Jewish Chronicles*, vol. II.) In modern times the name is

often used in the form "Sheftel," though the Hebrew form acquired unhappy notoriety in the person of Sabbatai Zevi.

I need hardly add that Professor Schürer's view as to the meaning of Σαββαθιον does not in the least vitiate the argument founded above (p. 51) regarding the existence of Jews in the Fayyum, during the reigns of the early Ptolemies.

I. ABRAHAMS.

THE

JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW

JANUARY, 1897

"THE MISSION OF JUDAISM."

THE editors of the JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, desiring to collect in these pages the opinions of various persons upon the conception of the "Mission of Judaism" which I submitted in the October number of the *Fortnightly Review*, have invited me to preface those opinions with a brief summary or recapitulation of what I have written on this subject. In complying cordially with that request it seems necessary to observe that I am, for the most part, unacquainted with the nature of the opinions which are being gathered.

Slowly and surely the conviction has grown upon me that here in England and in our own generation it is possible and reasonable to make some beginning in the active propagation of the Faith of Israel beyond the confines of the Jewish race.

The considerations which induce the belief that such a movement is both possible and reasonable are twofold. First and foremost, the apprehension of the Deity and of human responsibility which the Jews have inherited and developed, are such as are appropriate and adaptable to non-Jews as well as to ourselves. They are intrinsically religious ideas of human, and therefore of universal, character.

Secondly, there is indisputable evidence of the fact

that large numbers of Englishmen, especially of the educated classes, are in need and in quest of a religion which is at once Monotheistic and historical.

I have argued elsewhere that scepticism and agnosticism are not permanent traits in the English character. They appear at the present time in no small volume, and are spread widely, not alone among the thinking classes, but even to a greater degree among the half-educated. One of the effects of the spread and growth of national elementary instruction, as well as that of higher education, has been the loosening of certain chords which bound large populations either to the national Church as by law established, or to the many non-conformist sections of Christianity. From the Reformation onwards Christianity has ever, in one manner or another, exercised in its dogmatic aspects a direct authority over the mass of Englishmen. If the social idealism of the New Testament was less in the air a generation ago than now, the theological creed had a firmer grip. Whether for good or not it dominated the popular institutions.

All this is changing. A good deal of it has already changed. It is a mere platitude to refer to such an incident as the outcry twenty-seven years ago, when one of the contributors of the *Essays and Reviews* was appointed a bishop, and the complacency with which, not many years later, the same writer was translated to the important see of London [1]. This is only one of many typical cases which might be cited to prove that those dogmas of Christianity which chiefly differentiated it from Judaism are no longer held with as much tenacity as formerly by those who are still identified with the Church of England. The development of Unitarianism has steadily grown in this country,

[1] Since these words were written one notes with satisfaction that the same prelate (Dr. Temple) has been nominated to the Primacy. One of the contributors to the *Essays and Reviews* thus becomes the chief pastor of the Church of England. Who could have foreseen this change in religious public opinion when that important volume was published?

though it has never become, in the ordinary sense, popular. The independent Theistic movement of the Rev. Charles Voysey has penetrated far beyond the four walls in which he preaches. Societies of ethical culture, detached from religious worship, have been formed more recently still. But beyond Unitarianism as it is known by its actual places of worship, and beyond Mr. Voysey's church and wider circle of readers (his weekly sermons are printed and circulated in large numbers), and away altogether from every known organization, there are numerous people who are not Agnostics or Atheists, but who are estranged from the formulated doctrines of Christianity. Many of these persons are endowed with the religious temperament, but they are unfamiliar with the inner faith of any creed in this country except that of the prevailing types of Christianity. I propose that we, the people of Israel, should make some effort to place the inner spiritual life of Judaism within the reach of such persons.

I have heard it said at the mention of this proposal that the Synagogue is already open to visitors and we are always willing to welcome them. The answer to that is this: A religious organization, whether we call it a Church or a Synagogue, if it is to gather to itself recruits of any kind, must offer them, not the hospitality of guests, but the habitation of a home. When we consult the ideals of the Hebrew prophets we find that it is nothing short of this. The second Isaiah said of such people, "I will give unto them a place and a name within my house and within my walls better than of sons and of daughters" (lvi. 5).

Whatever may be said of the scheme I have propounded it cannot be urged that it is contrary to the ideal of that great Hebrew prophet. I might fill pages if I attempted to quote the words of Israel's most revered teachers on the subject; but it is needful to remind Jews themselves that their liturgy is steeped and saturated with the idea of the Mission. It is not too large an assumption to urge that so-called "orthodox" and "reform" Judaism are at

one in their reverence for the teachings of the Jewish prophets as to the Mission. "Ye are my witnesses" can have no meaning if the hope of spreading the truths of which we are the witnesses be excluded.

To avoid undue repetition of what I have written in former numbers of this REVIEW, and in the *Jewish Chronicle*, as well as in the *Fortnightly*, I would confine myself now to an aspect of this question which is likely to be misapprehended. It has been suggested to me by one or two whose devotion to Judaism is unsurpassed, that such a movement might produce the effect of drawing away from the synagogue Jews who are already weak-kneed and inducing them to join the Jewish Theistic Church, where obviously the service would be on Sundays and in English. An instructive feature in this most natural criticism is that it does not suggest that the movement would withdraw staunch Jews—only the weak-kneed or half-hearted ones. In other words, some Jews who now rarely or never come to synagogue, might be attracted by a weekly public worship conducted by Jews with the avowed object of teaching Judaism to the outer world. If, then, for the first time in their lives, such persons of Jewish birth are awakened to the dignity and to the efficacy of the Faith of which they are ruthlessly at present unmindful, the reactionary influence upon the Synagogue would be distinctly advantageous. No born Jew with a spark of hereditary and religious sense enough to bring him into such a place of worship as I have foreshadowed could leave it without an unspeakable accession of faith in the spiritual destiny of his race. If never before, he would then for the first time in his life perceive something of that transcendent miracle—*Jewish history*. The staunch Jew, on the other hand, would find in the spread of his faith an intensified obligation to maintain its integrity and to preserve such traditions as are indispensable for that purpose. The whole-hearted Jew is in no need perhaps of stimulus, for in his own person, as in that of his progenitors, his faith is still "as

a wonder unto many." But the contagion of that faith, carried beyond the boundary of its hereditary depositaries, could never weaken the trust in God and the abiding love of infinite righteousness out of which the faith of others shall have grown.

Religion, unlike many things, is spread by contagion rather than by precept. Communion with God, as Judaism can teach, is an achievement to be sought by common human faculties ripened and purified.

The education of the world, as of the individual, as Bishop Temple has pointed out, has three stages: law, argument, and example. And he not unnaturally typifies these stages by the three great Jewish teachers: Moses, Isaiah, and Jesus.

It is rather from contact with the life of the idealized Hebrew that the strongest spiritual culture in Christendom has sprung than from its theology. There has grown up a kind of personal intimacy with some one who lived with God, and whom Christendom holds to be the foremost illustration to mankind of the possibilities of development in the realization of God.

From the Jewish point of view which such a propaganda as I have proposed would set forth, the value of the example of the idealized Hebrew would not become diminished, but enhanced. The immanence of God in the human soul which Christianity has focussed through the instrument of mediation would be found to be present in all its intensity without mediation. This would be a new message to Christians. They would be reconciled to the eternal Father no more by adoption, but by natural affinity and legitimate sonship. The supposed barrier between God and his creatures would vanish under the fuller revelation which Israel has always possessed that there is no conflict in the divine nature between his attributes of righteousness and mercy, justice and love. It would be seen from the inspiration and tradition of Judaism that the terrible conception of the Fall was a pious misappre-

hension arising out of an imperfect knowledge of God: just as in earlier times the patriarch had an imperfect conception of God's righteousness when he believed that the slaying of his son was demanded, and his conception rose when it was revealed to him that such an act was not desired.

The apprehension of the divine nature is of necessity capable of rising to fuller and nobler ideals as the human mind advances. The prayers of the mediaeval rabbis were not less intense than those of the earlier psalmists, but they were free from many ideas which disfigure some passages in the ancient psalms. Anthropomorphic figures of speech in relation to the Supreme Being have been gradually fading away from devotional literature. Their inappropriateness becomes ever more apparent as our ideas of the Deity expand. The greatest non-Jewish Unitarian teacher of this century has said: "We exchange a God with a 'throne' and a 'footstool' and a 'right-hand seat' and a left, for the Living Presence of a Universal Mind, looking into our eyes in all that is beautiful, and communing with us in all that is right[1]." Here is complete religious fellowship between the spiritual ideal of the Jew and that of the non-Jew.

Is it not worth while to exhibit the results of a meeting of two spiritual waters, which have flowed ever so far through the ages out of one and the same source, and come at last together at the end of this memorable century of conflicting beliefs and of progressive knowledge?

Would it not be a distinct gain to civilization and to the development of the religious idea that there should be between Christendom and Jewry a channel of direct religious fellowship? Christians even of the advanced Unitarian school have been hitherto unfamiliar with the inner spiritual life of Judaism. I have proposed to make them acquainted with it. My proposition is that individual

[1] Rev. James Martineau, address at opening of Manchester College, Oxford, 1893.

Jews, whose attachment to the Synagogue is beyond suspicion, should hold services in the English language on Sundays, and deliver discourses that would at once present to the outer world the innermost faith of Israel.

Such services might be either held in the synagogue itself or in other buildings engaged or reared for the purpose. These congregations of English people not of Jewish origin should be in the closest alliance with the Jewish organizations of this country, though doubtless in the outset they would be initiated by independent individuals. No Jewish rite or custom should be introduced into such places of worship that would be calculated to retard the supreme object of the movement, namely, the adaptation of the Jewish faith to those who are not of the Hebrew race. In the fifth volume of this REVIEW I referred to the necessity in such a propaganda of avoiding all those forms which are merely the commonplace badges of an enforced isolation, such as the covering the head, the separation of the sexes, and the abstention of kneeling during prayer. The substance of the Jewish prayer-book, however, would be available, and in the highest degree essential. No better substitute for the Litany can be found than the ordinary daily Amidah. Nothing could be more significant of the universality of Judaism than its specific morning and evening prayer. Such items as these would need no amendment. The same remark applies to many of the prayers found in the volumes for the Day of Memorial and the Day of Atonement. The Shemang, that is the verses from Deuteronomy in the first paragraph, would be absolutely needed as they stand. And these words would constitute the sole form of creed to be recommended. On the other hand, there are a few selections from "Hymns Ancient and Modern" which would be useful for congregational singing. Those who might desire a more close connexion with the parent Synagogue itself should have every facility afforded them. I should be strongly opposed to any active steps to introduce the Jewish religion to any

Christian who reposes in any of the formulated creeds of Christianity. I would have it distinctly understood that our efforts are directed to fill a *gap* in the religious world, and not to assail any existing religious organization, whether Unitarian or Christian. No Jew would be of service in this cause whose fidelity to the religion and race of Israel was not loyal and whole-hearted.

Since writing the foregoing, I have had the advantage of hearing and of studying the address delivered by my friend Mr. Claude G. Montefiore at Manchester College, Oxford, upon "Unitarianism and Judaism in their relation to each other." The invitation to a Jew to "address a body of Unitarian students of theology at their central training-college at Oxford" is in itself a hopeful indication of the possibility of creating a direct religious fellowship between the Jew and the non-Jew. But an examination of the particular address (which appears on p. 240 below) will afford further illustrations of the idea that there are points of union which the Jew and the non-Jew have yet to cultivate. It would be beyond the immediate purpose of this brief preface if I were to enter into the field of thought which that address opens. I merely refer to it as an indication of the principle for which I am contending, namely, that the time has come when in England and in America the cause of religious development can be advanced by a definite alliance between the Theism of the people of Israel and that of non-Jews.

OSWALD JOHN SIMON.

APPENDIX.

(1)

I GLADLY pay my tribute of unstinted admiration for the lofty tone which pervades Mr. Simon's article. Its idealism is in striking and gratifying contrast to the materialistic

spirit that characterized another apologia recently published, which constituted a presentment of Judaism—with all the Judaism left out. I also willingly concede, that, at the first blush, the scheme he propounds for propagating the faith of Israel beyond the confines of the Jewish race has much to attract and fascinate. It would appear as though the realization of this project would free us from the reproach which Professor Max Müller levelled at us in his famous lecture on Missions, delivered by him in Westminster Abbey, Dec. 3, 1873 [1]. He asserted that the Jews, particularly in ancient times, never thought of spreading their religion, and that when in later days they did admit strangers to some of the privileges of their theocracy, they looked upon them, not as souls that had been gained, but as strangers (גרים), as proselytes (προσήλυτοι), men who had come to them as aliens, and that from the lack of this missionary spirit the days of Judaism were numbered. In a discourse I then published, under the title, "Is Judaism a Missionary Faith?" I disputed the validity of the Professor's assertion. I showed, by reference to history, that we had at all times been willing to receive proselytes who came to us prompted by sincere conviction, but I pointed out the perils and disadvantages attending active propagandism.

Now, it is true, Mr. Simon has made it perfectly clear that the religion he desires to disseminate is not Judaism as it is commonly understood, an historic faith with sacred rites and ordinances, but simply a belief in the Unity of God and the observance of the moral law. But would not the realization of such a project be fraught with the gravest perils, some of which, in his enthusiasm, he seems to have altogether overlooked? Would not half-hearted Jews eagerly welcome such a religion, freed from the, to them, irksome encumbrance of ritual, but which they would still view as some form of Judaism, since it would be preached, to them, *permissu superiorum*? It will be remembered

[1] *Chips from a German Workshop*, vol. IV, pp. 254, 319.

that Dr. Benisch, in his *Judaism Surveyed*[1] made a similar proposition, by pleading for the re-establishment of the order of the Proselytes of the Gate, and he admitted that his principal reason for this advocacy was his desire to facilitate marriage between Jew and Gentile. Now what is to be the religious practice of the offspring of such unions? Is it to be expected that they would celebrate the Sabbath or any of Israel's appointed times which their parent had been authoritatively permitted to disregard?

Much yet remains to be said on this head, but exigencies of space force me to pass on forthwith to another source of danger. Will not the divine service proposed to be established be viewed as a menace to the dominant faith? Is it wise, at a time when Anti-semitism is spreading far and wide, to inaugurate a movement which can so easily be misunderstood and so readily misinterpreted? It may be argued, Does not your caution—in reality but another name for cowardice—blind you as to your duty to those who are estranged from the formulated doctrines of Christianity? Why refuse them the solace of the pure and sublime faith of Judaism? My answer is, I refuse them nothing. Our sacred Scriptures are open to them as to us. Nor are our Synagogue portals closed to them. And if they need a form of divine service in the vernacular, Mr. Voysey's Theistic Church and Unitarian places of worship are prepared to receive them.

And there remains yet another argument to be touched upon. We justly deprecate Societies for the Promotion of Christianity among the Jews, when the treasure and the energy devoted to this work could be so much more profitably and worthily spent in converting to humanity the seething mass of vice and depravity which festers in the courts and alleys of great cities. Should we not, by fostering the movement in question, commit a folly of a like character? Is there no mission work to be done by us in the West of this mighty city to redeem and to elevate

[1] Pp. 129, 130.

lives steeped in luxury and self-indulgence, and trembling on the brink of apostasy? Is there not sufficient work to be done in the East to raise to a consciousness of human dignity the victims of long-standing oppression and evil government? Are all our young ones efficiently instructed in the principles and practice of Judaism? Do we, by lectures and publications, diffuse an adequate knowledge of our history and the right appreciation of our literature? To this and to kindred labours our energy and enthusiasm should at present be consecrated, but not to a scheme in which the germs of mischief can, I submit, be palpably discerned.

H. ADLER.

(2)

MR. SIMON'S scheme for establishing a Church of Israel shows that he has felt the pulse of a young generation questioning the meaning and value of the inheritance which it was the endeavour of the past to preserve. He has seen that our triumphant emancipation is now working out its natural results upon us; that constant intercourse with non-Jews and extensive secular education must materially affect our opinions; that we, who are young and earnest lovers of our religion, are struggling with new ideas which we hardly dare to formulate, because they are contrary to all accepted traditions. Such are the notions that our separateness seems now merely external and artificial, our racial distinctiveness often scarcely perceptible, and our religious ideas almost identical with those of Theists and true Unitarians. Mr. Simon realizes also that we are not necessarily irreligious because less observant than our parents, and finally, that Judaism need not suffer at all by its extension.

It is impossible to retire again within the ghetto to escape from the disintegrating process of modern life. We, the future pillars of English Judaism, must therefore trust that the stability of our faith does not solely depend on

a separateness which is being worn down by two growing forces: education and toleration. No martyrdom, not even Israel's long martyrdom, proved more than the faith of the martyr, nor convinced men of a truth which their hearts did not reveal to them. The preaching of separateness and practice of intermingling make for painful doubts, not for a martyr's faith. We cannot all honestly accept, under modern conditions, laws which were the tree of life to our fathers. A great Jew said: "Some of you boast that your laws are much what they were a century ago! You have laws to regulate what has ceased to exist . . . which, through the change of human events, prove to be new impediments to the very purposes of the institution (the Synagogue), and for the new circumstances which have arisen you are without laws."

Surely, it behoves the faithful remnant, if truly concerned with the preservation of the faith, to recognize our increasing difficulties, and by relaxing severity to win back those who, through the force of new circumstances, will otherwise be inevitably swept away. A practical adoption of a wider Judaism would immediately bring back young Israel himself, and with him numberless proselytes whom the Jewish religion has in its turn influenced.

Thus Mr. Simon's Church of Israel will become the safeguard of modern Judaism. For Judaism, as we conceive it, is greater than the Jews. It is surely destined to be the faith of the future, because the true Jewish ideal is at last in complete accord with the spirit of the age. The true Jewish ideal lies behind beloved traditions and customs, links uniting a religious brotherhood, but by their nature of transitory value. The true Jewish ideal rests on two dogmas: the Divine Unity and the Messianic state, i.e. unity of law and the triumph of justice in this world, or, the unity of forces and belief in progress.

When, therefore, the Israelite of the Old Testament meets him who, having discarded the myths of the New Testament, believes only in what is common to both—in the love of one

God, in the love of justice, of mercy, and of truth—what marvel if this meeting be, not a reconciliation, but a recognition?

SYLVIE D'AVIGDOR.

(3)

EVERY theist must share the desire to bring the ideas and the life of religion before those who have them not, or who have sought them vainly among existing organizations. The general object, therefore, which Mr. Simon proposes, at once enlists the sympathy of the sincere believer. The question is, How far is it likely that Judaism can supply this want, and by what means? If, as is probable, in commenting on Mr. Simon's suggestions, I show that I am involved in the general ignorance of the spiritual life of Judaism, my remarks may at least serve to reveal the kind of difficulty which such a movement will have to overcome. I will refer only to two points, and will assume without discussion the existence of a sufficiently numerous class corresponding to Mr. Simon's description.

In the first place, it will be impossible for such an effort to evade the question of religious authority, because this is precisely one of the grounds of the estrangement from dogmatic Christianity which leads to uncertainty of belief and loss of interest in worship. Now it may be a great misapprehension, but a common view of Judaism supposes it to rest on two bases, neither of which can be accepted in its crude form by non-Jews. There is, first, the element of race; there is, secondly, a conception of a peculiar revelation embodied in the Law and the Prophets. To deal with the latter first. So far as the new religious teaching is to be founded on conceptions of the Hebrew scriptures analogous to the older pre-critical ideas of the Christian Bible, it will fail to attract those who are already repelled by the narrower notions of the Churches. It will be necessary, therefore, to determine clearly the significance of the Law and its institutions, on the one hand, and of the Messianic idea—in

whatever forms it may still hold its ground in modern Judaism—on the other. In this respect I do not see that Judaism can offer anything more than the Unitarians, though fresh voices may win fresh hearers. But it does appear to me that the element of race may be capable of new and effective treatment. Can it be disengaged from the physical basis which non-Jews cannot share, and converted into a permanent historic type of spiritual experience? By an extraordinary faithfulness, amid almost inconceivable sufferings, the Jewish people have preserved the apprehension of certain great primary religious truths. In so doing they must have laid up an immense store of moral achievement, of which, in the older literature, the Psalms of course supply the most splendid example. Can they utilize these reserves of moral strength in their religious teaching? Can they show that their inner life really rests not on an external revelation, but upon a continuity of experience for more than 2,000 years? Then they will have a foundation analogous to that which the Christian finds in the Church without its dogmatic embarrassments, and can appeal directly to the simplest religious consciousness.

Secondly, there are certain aspects of religious endeavour which have been regarded (rightly or wrongly) as peculiar to Christianity. Consider that attitude towards sin, that movement for redemption, which is implied in the words: "the Son of Man is come to seek and to save that which was lost." Has this attitude been ever genuinely shared by Judaism? It may be that Judaism has been, by force of circumstance, compelled to concentrate all its force on its own self-preservation. But it would be interesting to the non-Jew to know how far Judaism has been able to inspire efforts like those of Francis of Assisi, of Wesley, or General Booth. From one point of view Christianity is a warfare with evil, physical and moral. Any fresh teaching which Judaism may have to offer will be likely to be tested by its applicability to new social ideals in which no race limitations can be recognized. The generosity of rich Jews

to their own people is well known. But those who are dissatisfied with the preaching of the Churches, and seek a religious guidance founded on the broadest facts of human experience, will ask for a universal and not a national philanthropy. If the time is ripe for new impulses in this direction to issue from the Synagogue, in line with that which some of us still feel to have constituted the great era for Western history more than eighteen centuries ago, then theists of all schools ought to make the new cause their own, and offer all the assistance in their power.

J. ESTLIN CARPENTER.

(4)

I CORDIALLY agree in Mr. Simon's theory of Judaism and its missions, and I think great service is done to the Jews by his view being constantly put before them—in as many different ways as possible.

The vicissitudes of the Jews in the various countries where they dwell—persecution, disabilities, poverty, wealth—have almost filled up their lives. Efforts on the one hand to throw off unjust civic restrictions, and on the other to build a wall of separativeness to guard their faith from destruction, have so occupied their thoughts and energies that the great bulk of them have never thought, and do never think, of their *raison d'être* in the world.

Even the section who pray to return to Jerusalem have only a dim notion of what they are to do there. As emancipation develops, the desire to leave the adopted country may proportionately lessen, and it is invaluable that Mr. Simon's ideal should, in anticipation of that circumstance, become generally familiarized in the Jewish mind.

But I do not think the time is yet ripe for any attempt to proclaim the mission of Judaism to the world at large. A much larger proportion of the Jews themselves must grasp it first. A little example is worth loads of precept. First let our people settle down among the nations enjoying

the fruits of emancipation as quiet, useful, unobtrusive citizens, earning their living in a variety of avocations.

I think it is most useful to impress on Jewish lads and girls that every one of them carries the banner of Jewish reputation, and that when they mingle with the rest of British youths in schools and colleges, workshops and factories, they need always to bear that in mind, and live up to it. That aspect of the Jewish mission might, I venture to think, be insisted upon with advantage from the pulpit at the autumn festivals, when the new year of school and industrial life is inaugurated, as well as the Jewish new year.

In short, to sum up, I think we want the true mission of Judaism preached to ourselves, constantly and persistently, in many forms and by many voices.

Mr. Montefiore and Mr. Simon have sounded the "silver trumpet" and led the way, and I hope and believe that hundreds of Jews and Jewesses will be helped and inspired by their ideal.

JULIA M. COHEN.

(5)

THERE are many to whom it must seem desirable that the Jewish race in this age—when everywhere, except in Spain and Russia, the spirit of religious toleration has triumphed—should resume their ancient task of exhibiting to the world an ideal of pure monotheism and of appealing to the nations to follow it. Only as missioners of a higher faith did they in the past deserve the name accorded to them of the chosen people of God, and only as resuming their rôle as teachers of such a faith can they deserve it in the future.

For the age is not yet past when the rest of the world can learn from the Jews. I have often been asked by orthodox Christians to subscribe funds for the conversion of Jews, and have as often replied that in my opinion the Christians rather than the Jews stood in need of conversion. For Christianity is everywhere, save among Protestants, indistinguishable from the old idolatry. It is the cult of

a woman whose history, as maintained by those who elevate her into a goddess, is ninety-nine parts pure myth to one of fact. It is a worship by men of the works of their own hands, of crosses, of bits of bread and cups of wine, of images and pictures. These products of art, sometimes refined, but oftener coarse and foolish, are invested by their devotees with magical powers and properties. And even among Protestants the man Jesus has supplanted God at such a cost to reason and good sense, and in such defiance of the Gospel records, that a candid modern divine, Canon Gore[1], is found exhorting his brother clergymen not to juxtapose, but to keep carefully apart, the rival statements that he was merely human and that he was also God, lest they should empty the evangelistic texts of all meaning and value.

It is ungrateful to dwell on the intellectual shortcomings of men who too often excel our more critical selves in spiritual fervour and good works. All the greater therefore is the need to brace ourselves for fresh efforts and, if we can, ally ourselves with those who, like the reformed Jews, reject the pagan and mythical elements which survive even in reformed Christianity. In proportion as the critical appreciations of the Old Testament, already common among orthodox Christians, spread also among Jews, so will the latter become reformed Jews, between whom and Unitarians the only dividing line is the reservation of Saturday rather than Sunday for rest and meditation. There is no other important difference. For Jews have by their history no such prejudices against reading the New Testament in a rational way, as beset the modern orthodox divine, who throws the Old Testament to the wolves of criticism as if to divert their attention from the New. I cannot therefore but hope that Mr. Simon's dream of uniting in common effort the reformed Jews and the most critically minded Christians may some day be realized.

FRED. C. CONYBEARE.

[1] See *Dissertations on the Incarnation*, 1895, pp. 97, 103, 105, 189, 203, 206.

(6)

THROUGH the courtesy of the editors I have been invited to express my opinion respecting the proposals of Mr. O. J. Simon, and it gives me much pleasure to respond to their invitation. These proposals appear to me extremely interesting, and calculated, if carried into effect, both to quicken the more spiritual impulses of Judaism itself, and to help in reviving the faith of some, perhaps of many, who have been repelled from religion by the insistence on dogmas which they are unable to accept. I have often wished that theists of every school, Catholic and Jew alike, would not limit their finest teaching to their own people, while against the outside world they defend what is special to themselves, but would really help the doubts and difficulties of the time by entering sympathetically into them, and setting forth with gentleness and love the more universal grounds of faith. There are many signs that this better spirit is beginning to prevail; and if the Jewish race has still in it the spirit of Isaiah, and can stand before the world with lips freshly touched by a coal from off the altar, assuredly I, as a Christian, can only rejoice, and hope that many a yearning soul will come and confess that God is present of a truth.

By way of criticism perhaps I may venture to remark that Mr. Simon seems hardly aware that Christians, though they may be very ignorant of modern Judaism, are quite familiar with the piety of the Old Testament, and that the immanence of God in the human soul without (as well as with) mediation would be "no new message," but is to many their most familiar thought. Even the Catholic has his hours of communion *solus cum solo*. Christianity has, no doubt, in the course of its history, incorporated much in its theology from the teachings of Greek philosophy, and much in its ritual from systems of sacerdotal mediation; but in its spiritual essence it is, at least as it appears to

me, the legitimate outgrowth and development of the finest and least sacerdotal elements of Old Testament teaching, which it sought to universalize by detaching them from national limitations, and especially from the legal portion of the Old Testament, which lay very close to the heart of the Jewish people. I cannot but think that a modern movement must be (I will not say carried out on Christian lines, but) similar in kind; and here Mr. Simon's proposals leave me a little in the dark. How far is any kind of observance of the Law to be put forward as an essential part of the religion? If the attempt be to make proselytes, in the old sense, I can anticipate nothing but failure. If, on the other hand, I am correct in supposing that the intention is to dwell on the great moral and religious principles of that monotheism which the Jews, and through them the Christians, have inherited from a remote past, we may reasonably hope that the dignity and power of an ancient faith, speaking to the world with a voice long silent, will find many a waiting heart, and bring it back to the reality of God. Surely, though we are so dull of heart to perceive it, there is a new outpouring of the Spirit, which is gradually drawing us nearer to the unity of faith.

In the foregoing remarks I trust that I have not unwittingly hurt any tender susceptibility. I have written frankly from my Christian point of view; but I think we have learnt in modern times to speak frankly without any violation of brotherly love.

JAMES DRUMMOND.

(7)

I HEARTILY concur in Mr. O. J. Simon's views regarding the importance and practicability of a Jewish "mission" at the present moment.

I have heard Jews object that though Judaism has a mission, its mission is a "life," not a "message." Why then were the older revelations of God always verbal ones?

Why were the prophets not dumb witnesses, converting Israel by their example and uttering no words? Judaism must recover the truth once familiar to it, that face-to-face speech, heart-to-heart communion, is the first and chief method of persuasion. "The Lord God hath spoken, who can but prophesy?" If the ancient people of God had refrained from promulgating their mission in winged words, if they had left the world to infer from imperfect Jewish lives the perfection of life according to God's will, the world to-day would have realized far less of divine truth than it has done. It is rather arrogant to maintain that because I may be possessed of a noble doctrine, I must necessarily myself be the fittest for practically manifesting that doctrine. Ideally there should be an assimilation of precept and practice. But I do not see why the world should be deprived of good Jewish precept because there may be a certain amount of bad Jewish practice.

Secondly, I think that the Judaism Mr. Simon desires to preach will be found to fulfil the needs of many who at the present time are dissatisfied with current forms of religion. But Mr. Simon must consent to proceed tentatively. We need a further analysis of our moral consciousness before we can formulate the religion of the future. We rely too much on the results of old, out-worn introspections. Now it seems to me that the heterogeneous members of the "Church of Israel" would be in a happy position for making this analysis. I am certain that Mr. Simon is right in believing that if the religious consciousness of all honest men were analyzed, it would be found to contain almost identical elements. I am further certain that though far from all the common elements could be claimed as Jewish, nevertheless the resultant principles would find themselves more easily and fully expressed in terms of a purified Judaism than in terms of any other purified religion. "All wise men have the same religion, but wise men do not tell what it is," said the cynic. But in Mr. Simon's "Church of Israel" men *will* tell, heart will speak to heart, and it will

be seen that God's Spirit which moved inspired men in all ages, but most of all the Hebrew prophets, is still strong to save.

Will the Mission fail? As I conceive Mr. Simon's meaning, this question is irrelevant. One must face failure or one is no missionary. And when did the fear of failure deter Jews in their older missionary efforts? The essence of Mr. Simon's proposal is its hope, not its assurance of success. But I cannot see why failure is inevitable. For the members of the Church of Israel would not be all drawn from the cultured "liberals," i. e. from those whose adhesion to the movement would be due to intellectual scepticism. This class would no doubt form the backbone of the movement, but it needs flesh and blood too. A mission must have emotion as well as intellect. Whence would it come? From the lower end of the scale. Mr. Simon should not overlook those whose scepticism is moral and social—he should look to the toiling masses, nominally Christian or Jewish, but often without a satisfying faith. To them the mission of Judaism, with its strong doctrines of duty and righteousness, its moral earnestness, its cheery confidence in this world's possibilities of a sufficing and ennobling happiness, its faith in the purity and perfectibility of human nature, in brief, its ethical optimism—to some of them the mission might be of saving effect. In a church preaching these principles to these classes, I would stand by Mr. Simon's side, an ardent disciple.

I. ABRAHAMS.

(8)

IN offering a brief "opinion" on Mr. Simon's recent articles about the need, the duty, and the feasibility of "an active propagation" by Jews "of the faith of Israel beyond the confines of the Jewish race," I propose to *assume* that the religious condition of English society is such as he describes it. On the whole his description is perhaps fairly accurate. I therefore only propose to

ask, (1) Is such a forward movement desirable? (2) is it possible?

1. (*a*) It is clearly desirable for the outside world, assuming the *data*. Unitarianism may be too "Christian" for some people; "Theism" may be too polemical. Moreover, the "historic" element of the proposed "new religion" is obviously attractive. "Theism" may be started to-day and may perish to-morrow. The Universalist branch of Judaism, the proposed "Church of Israel" (*Fortnightly*, p. 587), would be constant. It would have the permanence and the vitality of Judaism itself.

(*b*) Such a Church of Israel, such a direct preaching of Judaism to the "nations," is in full accordance with the highest conceptions of Judaism and its mission. It could only do honour and good to Judaism itself. It would give it warmth and energy; it would give it an interest in life. Its mission would no longer be a mere lifeless dogma, heard about from pulpits, but unreal and unrealized; it would be something actual, living, tangible, a proof that all this boasting about a duty and an office and a service to mankind was no mere vapid, idle talk, but was at last being seriously meant, was at last being translated into deed. At present, when Jews talk of their mission, it is as if a man boasted of the possession of a jewel finer than any in the land, but kept it wrapped up in a thick duster so that none could see it. As to the argument that the "movement" would draw away "weak-kneed" Jews from the old Saturday to the new Sunday synagogue, it has been refuted by Mr. Simon himself on p. 180.

2. "Is it possible?" Here my doubts begin. I think that Mr. Simon's ideas and writings are seminal and germinal. And the condition of Judaism and of society is not unfavourable to these seeds and germs blossoming and bearing fruit. The fruit may not be exactly what Mr. Simon conceives it, but none the less will he, all honour and all gratitude to him, have helped to sow the

seed. I reverence him for his grand, prophetic faith in Judaism and in the purer aspirations of the second Isaiah. But I doubt the "movement" being capable of any realization now. I do not think we have the men. Moreover, it is still not clear (hardly even to Mr. Simon himself, still less to his readers) what the attitude of the new Judaism (if I may so call it) is to be towards several most important questions.

1. What is to be its exact position towards the Pentateuch and the Law?

2. What is to be its exact position towards the miracles of the Old Testament?

3. What is to be its relation to the personality and the teaching of Jesus?

4. What is to be its attitude towards the New Testament as a whole?

Mr. Simon has not fully, as it seems to me, thought out these all-important questions. And not only he, but Liberal Judaism in general is still uncertain and halting about them. They must, however, be definitely answered before the "new departure" can begin, and upon the character of the answers there probably depends the success of the movement. More intimate knowledge must be acquired of the present condition of Christian theology in all its phases. Even Mr. Simon sometimes talks as if modern Christianity were inextricably bound up with the old-fashioned dogma of the Fall. More knowledge, therefore, on the one hand; more clearness of attitude on the other. On the great questions mooted above, our thoughts and points of view must be more *thought out*. As the Germans would say: *Man muss Stellung nehmen zu diesen Fragen*. Mr. Simon's articles will partly incite, and partly help, us to do this. I repeat again, all honour to him for his enthusiasm and his faith.

C. G. MONTEFIORE.

(9)

WHILE feeling that Mr. Simon has done a great service to the community by his recent article in the *Fortnightly Review*, I find myself at variance with him in his proposal to establish a Jewish mission or church for the benefit particularly of Gentiles whose religious cravings are not satisfied by the doctrinal teachings of Christianity. The proposal appears to be only the logical outcome of our convictions as described by Mr. Simon. Nevertheless, I do not think it is possible—as yet. It seems to me there are many *practical* objections to the scheme; of these I will deal here with three.

(1) It would prove a source of weakness to our own community. Mr. Simon himself anticipates this objection, though he hardly appears to appreciate its full importance. Half-hearted and indifferent Jews would find in the new church an excuse or justification for further indifference. They would feel a strong inducement to attach themselves to it and its very diluted Judaism, attracted by the prospect of belonging to a religious body, Jewish in spirit, which makes no irksome or inconvenient calls upon its adherents. Many would thus be lost completely to us whom we otherwise might win over—many who, were it not for the new church, might become identified as loyal members, if not as active workers, in the community proper. Indeed, I believe the mission would recruit its followers in larger numbers from born Jews than born Christians, and thus would stultify its own existence.

(2) We should expose ourselves to a deserved charge of attending to the mote in our brother's eye while neglecting the beam in our own. The great condemnation of the Christian missions to the Jews is, that they involve a huge expenditure of money and effort that could be far more usefully devoted to the work of humanizing, raising, and relieving the myriads of so-called Christians who, in our large towns, are in the toils of poverty and ignorance, or

are steeped in drunkenness and brutality. Let us not be guilty of the same error. We are not confronted by the same conditions as these among our poor, but we have our own internal problems too. On the one side there is the mass of foreign Jews whom it is our duty to patiently Anglicize, to teach to discard undesirable habits in thought and action which oppression has forced upon them. On the other side there are those brethren among the grown-up as well as the growing-up generation, to whom much in our form of worship does not appeal, and who are thus drifting from us, not always as a result of their own indifference. If we are to keep them for their good and ours, their requirements also need careful and loving and liberal treatment by our leaders. These are religious questions of moment in our own midst that have the first claim on our best thought and energy, for they are concerned with the preservation of the consciousness of our ideals and mission among our own people.

(3) I believe the establishment of the church would be resented by our fellow-countrymen, and might lead to a re-awakening of ill-will against us. It is true that our political emancipation is complete, but I seriously question whether the spirit of tolerance is sufficiently deep even in this land of liberty to permit Christians to regard with equanimity any organized attempt on our part to minister to religious needs outside our own community. I do not desire for one moment to cast any imputation upon the broad-mindedness of our fellow-citizens, but I must remark that we cannot expect two generations of tolerance to blot out completely the prejudice which has been the growth of centuries.

Mr. Simon's proposal is a lofty and spiritual one; but the time for active propaganda is not yet. We must be content for a few more decades to continue to work and impress, as before, by the silent force of example.

S. FRIEDEBERG.

(10)

O. J. SIMON'S advocacy of the re-establishment of the order of the Proselytes of the Gate is a proposal which contains the germ of such far-reaching possibilities and momentous consequences, not only for us of his race and faith, but for mankind at large, that it can neither be accepted nor dismissed lightly.

I agree that the true definition of the mission of Judaism as laid down in the Scriptures is the duty of impressing mankind with "the highest spiritual conception of God to which the creative human imagination has yet attained"; also, that from forces beyond its own control, the active participation of Israel in its mission has been in abeyance, but that nevertheless, by its unswerving fidelity to the religious idea through ages of martyrdom, it has borne eloquent, though silent, evidence of its faith in its mission.

It is incorrect, however, to infer that Israel has always been a passive agent. Jewish and Christian writers testify that at the dawn of Christianity Jewish proselytes were already numerous, and doubtless paved the way in no small degree for the spread of Christianity amongst the heathen nations. The conception of the Deity evolved by Christianity, that offspring of Jewish and heathen philosophies, was far in advance of those held by the Gentile world. The very fact that the Christian conception was so strongly tinged with heathen elements naturally facilitated its acceptance by Gentiles. Primitive man appears incapable of grasping a purely spiritual conception of Deity: he requires something tangible to his senses, whether it be a stock, stone, animal, man, or heavenly body. To account for the origin of evil, an infinite mystery to him, he evolves the idea of evil spirits warring against beneficent ones. The simple idea of a Deity who "creates both the good and the evil" for his own unfathomable purposes is incomprehensible to his understanding. Hence the religious idea of Israel at the dawn of Christianity found a world unprepared to grasp it

in its entirety, nor can we wonder at this, when it was only after a long probation of terrible suffering that Israel, to whom the revelation was made, became faithful to it.

For nearly 2,000 years the Jewish and heathen conceptions of divinity have been striving against each other to gain the upper hand in Christianity. An intellectual revolt against doctrinal Christianity has arisen in the minds of thousands of thoughtful men and women, who are struggling vainly for the Light now seen by them "as through a glass darkly." I agree with Oswald John Simon that the outer court of the Temple should be rebuilt for such as these, and its gates be open to all who desire to enter of their own free will. Proselytism that seeks to disturb the religious convictions in which one's fellow-men find the "peace that passeth all understanding" is to be deprecated as creating strife, but so also is the narrow spirit foreign to Israel's mission that refuses to point out the path to the anxious inquirer who has lost his way.

The question is, Is the *time* ripe for such a movement? The reply depends on whether the *man* is forthcoming or not. He must necessarily be of the chosen mediumistic race and of the Jewish faith, and be impregnated with the Divine Spirit that will impel him outside of his own volition to proclaim his message. Mankind is waiting for him, the rebuilder of faith on the ruins of worn-out creeds. To Oswald John Simon I would say, as was said of old, "Art thou Elias, or look we for another?"

ALBERT E. GOLDSMID.

(II)

SOME of the details of Mr. Simon's scheme are, in my judgment, open to exception; but for his general idea I have nothing but warm approval.

I should like to deal with some objections to it that have been raised in my hearing.

It is urged that we Jews must first learn to live in the

spirit of our religious and ethical ideals, and that then it will be time enough to formally invite others to accept them. The contention is beside the mark. The question involved is not one of conduct, but of organized religious teaching. We Jews claim to be the depositaries of certain theological truths; the claim logically binds us to disseminate those truths. If we refrain, we are either insincere or selfish. The dilemma has been formulated more than once—notably by Professor Max Müller on a memorable occasion several years ago. The stereotyped Jewish reply is that we Jews do teach Judaism, and by the most effective of all methods—by living it. But is this the most effective method? Would not a direct propaganda be more effective still, to say nothing of the cumulative influence of both methods combined. The rate at which our theological ideas filter into the general consciousness, under present conditions, must necessarily be slow. Are we not bound by our duty to our mission to accelerate the pace?

An active propaganda is not necessarily an aggressive one. No one proposes an aggressive one. Mr. Simon's missionary is not going to stand at street-corners and bawl the saving doctrines of Judaism into the offended ears of the passers-by; nor is he going to drag Christians into the synagogue by main force. He will merely conduct a service on Jewish-theistic lines, at which all persons of any creed or no creed who care to attend it will be heartily welcomed. Nor will he attempt to teach Judaism in its entirety; he will confine himself to expounding its great theological ideas in the hope that "inquirers" may find in them rest for their souls. That there are many such inquirers is more than probable. I have a friend—a lady of considerable intelligence and religious fervour—who, having broken with Christianity, is, to use her own words, "searching for a religion." She declared the other day that the only religion that satisfied her was Judaism, but that she was prevented from embracing it owing to a lack of sympathy with its ceremonial elements. Mr. Simon's

services would be a god-send to such a woman. And she is but a type. There must be hundreds in London alone who, like her, would welcome the opportunity of identifying themselves with Judaism on its theistic side.

Indeed, Mr. Simon's plan, as I understand it, is practically identical with the proposal to revive the ancient order of Proselytes of the Gate, which the late Dr. Benisch urged with insistence and force many years ago in the columns of the *Jewish Chronicle*. The Rabbins were not afraid of such an institution ; why should we be?

The argument that the creation of a Jewish Church would tend to detach the weaklings from Judaism has been demolished by Mr. Simon himself. He has also shown how inspiring is the reflex influence which the spectacle of the Gentiles, ranging themselves under the banner of Israel, would exert upon staunch Jews.

It is urged that an attempt to teach Christians Theism is superfluous, (1) because Christians do not want Theism ; their ideas, it is asserted, are slowly but surely tending in the direction of a godless worship of Christ, towards an agnostic Christianity: and (2) because there are agencies, like Mr. Voysey's Church, already engaged in the task. If the first contention is true—which I am not prepared to admit—then the need of some additional instrument for restoring to Christendom the God it has lost becomes evident. What a glory it would be for Judaism if it were to take a leading part in so splendid a work! As to the second plea, why, I ask, should not the Theistic Church learn to look upon us Jews as active allies in the stupendous task it is attempting with such pathetic courage? The more numerous the workers in the consecrated field, the earlier and the more bountiful will be the harvest. Do we not owe it to our Theistic comrades to be up and doing? When our brethren go forth to war, shall we remain here? I am bound to point out, moreover, that there are many religious inquirers, now intentionally holding aloof from Theism, who would willingly throw in their lot with *Jewish* Theism if they had the chance.

Surely there is something that appeals to the imagination in the thought of being associated with an *historic* religion, with a people that claims to have received a divine mission, and which has suffered, for its sake, lifelong agony. So far as its theology is concerned, Judaism has little more to offer than Theism has, but on the other hand it promises fellowship with Israel—a precious boon which an ever-increasing number of minds will eagerly grasp.

Finally, as to the danger of arousing anti-Jewish feeling. I do not believe that such feeling can ever be the result of a manifestation, on our part, of religious vitality. Quite the contrary is the case. It is quite true that there are malevolent people always ready to make our very virtues a grievance. But if these persons are to shape Jewish action, the only course left to us is self-effacement. Let us ignore this class of critics. In England, where the new movement is to be initiated, we can ignore them with ease. Religious zeal, even on the part of Jews, can command only respect from those whose opinion is worth having. It is the show of religious indifference that is the real enemy. The surest way for us to win confidence is to prove that we have faith in Judaism, and are loyal to the responsibilities which it lays upon us.

MORRIS JOSEPH.

(12)

MR. SIMON'S thoughtful paper will meet with general sympathy. He makes undoubtedly an honest attempt to return to an earlier and nobler conception. The prophets certainly regarded Judaism as a missionary religion. In the view of Isaiah, Assyria and Egypt are God's people no less than is Israel. In the psalms of the theophany God manifests himself to Jew and Gentile alike. It was even a reproach against the Pharisees that they compassed sea and land to make one proselyte. The Rabbis hold that Israel has been sown in the lands of their dispersion in order that an abundant harvest of proselytes may be reaped from

them. In South Russia an independent kingdom of Jewish proselytes persisted for several centuries. True, that in an age of persecution, sufferance became the badge of all our tribe, and we were forced to enter into our chambers and shut the door behind us. Now, however, a happier day has dawned, and if Judaism is still to justify its existence, it must do more than merely exist.

So long as monotheism is true to itself, it must be nobly intolerant of error. The stock argument that people can go to heaven by remaining staunch to the religion in which they were born is really irrelevant. If the world is to improve, it must be by going forward from strength to strength, and constantly attaining higher conceptions of God and duty. The Messianic idea, which has played so great a part in Jewish history, is no selfish forecast of racial predominance, but the fruit of a conviction that the perfect life will one day be realized by all humanity.

The particular scheme which Mr. Simon advocates is far more open to criticism. To differentiate between the religion of a Jew by race and of a Jew by adoption would be to create a new separation. Surely the old principle is better, that there should be one law for the homeborn and for the naturalized citizen of the Synagogue. Sooner or later we shall have to determine what elements of Judaism—doctrinal, ethical, and ceremonial—are alone essential both for us and others, and then press for their acceptance as a whole by the outside world. Mere reasoning doubtless will not solve the problem, nor is it needed. Time does the task for us. In religious life, as in physical life, the principle of the survival of the fittest holds true. Such ceremonial as justifies itself, by satisfying human needs, will continue; such rites as have outlived their time will inevitably die. Whilst much is hidden from us, it remains certain that Judaism will survive all changes, because in it are enshrined the principles of eternal truth. On the other hand, it is probably impossible, in this age of transition, to forecast the exact lines on which Judaism will

develop. Doubtless it will become finally a universal religion, suitable alike to Jew and Gentile. I distrust profoundly the policy of watering down the distinctive features of Judaism, which is, after all, no mere Unitarianism, but a historical religion, whose roots strike deep into the past. We shall not spread Judaism by cheapening the conditions of admittance into the fold. The nature of the demands which religion makes on man necessarily varies from age to age, but the regeneration of humanity has always been effected by those forms of religion which have required the greatest measure of self-sacrifice.

H. S. LEWIS.

(13)

I AM asked by the editors of this REVIEW to give my views on Mr. Simon's idea of a Missionary Judaism. It is an unwelcome task to me to criticize any form of religious enthusiasm, for indifference is the only thing in religious matters to which my sympathies are not responsive. Yet, as I feel sure that Mr. Simon's ideals are as mistaken as they are beautiful, and as impossible as they are mistaken, it seems right, when asked, to say why I feel so sure about it.

Mr. Simon believes that "large numbers of Englishmen are in need and in quest of a religion at once monotheistic and historical," and he proposes to supply this assumed "gap in the religious world" by "a weekly public worship conducted by Jews, with the avowed object of teaching Judaism to the outer world." "Obviously," says Mr. Simon, "the service would be on Sundays and in English," and, he adds, "no Jewish rite or custom should be introduced." Ethical lectures, in which Jesus is to become to Christians "the idealized Hebrew" and to Jews "an enhanced example" are to expound the "miracle of Jewish history" to a congregation of "people endowed with the religious temperament but unfamiliar with the inner faith of any creed;" and "complete religious fellowship between Jew

and non-Jew" is expected to ensue from the "exchange" of the God who was so anthropomorphically "near" to the psalmist and prophets and rabbis of Israel into "the Living Presence of a Universal Mind[1]." For my part, I can never see that even "anthropomorphic figures of speech" are more really lowering to ideal conceptions of the Deity than vague phrases. "Our Father which art in heaven," from very spiritual need, may now and again be realized with too human a precision of parenthood or of heaven, but, at the worst, it is vividly realized. This, however, is a detail and may pass. The essential part of the scheme is that "the synagogue is to offer not the hospitality of guests, but the habitation of a home," to "weak-hearted Jews" and conventional Christians—a "home," seemingly, which is to be that strange thing, a creation and not a growth—and in which human brotherhood is to become the whole and not a part of the divine law. This is, I think, a fair summary of Mr. Simon's idea, though it is but fair to add that *his* summary does but scant justice to his article in the *Fortnightly*, its necessary brevity denuding the idea of a good part of the ideal. On the wisdom or the policy of a Jewish attempt to proselytize I do not touch, it is distinctly from the religious and not from the expedient point of view that I look at it. And to me it seems, for all its beauty, a hurried ideal; a forgetting of the fact that "God

> Fails never. If he cannot work by us
> He will work over us."

In his own good time he will see to it that his earth shall be filled with the knowledge of him, but he needs no Procrustean methods. Much we know may be read into a text by learned or enthusiastic commentators, but of all quotable pleas in support of his plan, surely the most wonderful is that chosen by Mr. Simon, "Ye are my

[1] This periphrasis is quoted by Mr. Simon from the Rev. James Martineau.

witnesses." In what conceivable sense can the meaning of missionary and witness be interchangeable? To me there is the essential difference between them of the fleeting footprints on the mountain[1] and the abiding shadow of a Great Rock[2].

Judaism is this unchanging shadow of the Rock of Ages, this restful shadow in the lands that thirst. "Our mere existence," says Mr. Simon in the *Fortnightly*, "is a propagation of our faith." It is—so long as we exist, as Jews. But it is distinctively as Jews that we must "witness," holding fast to the Law that was given to us as a discipline and as a trust, and bearing, with no pose of martyr or pretence of mission, the burdens which the God of the spirits of all flesh laid upon us, especially, for the expressed purpose, that "all peoples of the earth may know thy name as do thy people Israel[3]."

It seems to me a poor sort of way to "propagate" by chipping away little bits of "the Rock from whence we were hewn."

KATIE MAGNUS.

(14)

I HAVE read with deep and absorbing interest Mr. Oswald Simon's article on "The Mission of Israel," which breathes the same earnest spirit that marks all that proceeds from his able pen. Mr. Simon, however, does not indicate the particular means by which he proposes to carry his great object into effect. If I rightly understand what Scripture teaches with respect to Israel's mission (see Deut. iv. 6, 7), it is to be worked out through our faithful adherence to the precepts of the covenant of Sinai, and through the influences we exert on the world at large by our personal conduct and example. This is the doctrine of the mission of Israel which I have invariably preached to my congregation.

If Mr. Simon be of opinion that the objects he has at

[1] Nah. i. 15. [2] Isa. xxxii. 2. [3] 1 Kings viii. 43.

heart would be furthered by the issue of a series of popular tracts, setting forth what Judaism really is, and correcting the errors and misrepresentations into which certain polemical writers have been betrayed by preconception, prejudice, and lack of knowlege, I would heartily participate in such a course of action. But I should be absolutely hostile to a conversionist propaganda, in any way akin to that which characterizes the London Society for the Conversion of the Jews to Christianity.

D. W. MARKS.

(15)

I HAVE read with warm interest and prevailing concurrence of feeling Mr. Oswald Simon's paper which you kindly sent to me, and the article in the October *Fortnightly* more amply treating of the same subject. As he himself placed the latter in my hand, I have, in returning it, reported to him the impression which it leaves on me, so far as it bears on his suggestion of a Jewish mission. If Judaism, as presented in the records of its origin, its authoritative code, and its historic working till the Temple fell, were identical with the "Judaism" of Oswald Simon and Claude Montefiore, I should concede to it a "mission" with hope as fervent as theirs. But they have emerged into a religion of spiritual insight and moral experience quite beyond the range, not merely of "the Law," but even of the ripest prophetic inspiration. To reach the springs of holy trust and loving self-surrender now, we must start, I am convinced, with appeal to our latest inward experience of conscience, rather than remain dependent on reported outward dictation of law and proclamation of judgment.

I avail myself, you see, of your kind permission, to content myself with a bare hint of my impression of the suggested movement.

JAMES MARTINEAU.

(16)

ALL must have welcomed Mr. Simon's article in the *Fortnightly Review* as a sign of the idealism and enthusiasm of its author.

The following thoughts occur to me with respect to Mr. Simon's suggestions.

Mr. Simon's aim is being fulfilled. The words of the prophet Malachi are truer now than they were when he spoke them: "For from the rising of the sun even unto the going down of the same my name is great among the Gentiles; and in every place incense is offered to my name, and a pure offering." Through the work of the Divine Spirit, through God who hides himself from our sight, the time foretold as near or far by the prophets is drawing nearer. All Christians, from Catholics to Unitarians, would call themselves Monotheists. All would indignantly repel the charge of Polytheism. Their Monotheism does not take the same form as ours, but avowedly it is Monotheism. The ethical ideals of Judaism are also becoming more and more the property of all religions. It is often said that Christianity is identical with other worldliness. But in no age more than in ours has greater thought been given by Christians to the wants of the poor and the distressed. I know many Christians who think less of "salvation" in the theological sense than of making the world brighter and happier. The Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster and the Chief Rabbi can stand on the same platform and plead for the same moral ends. Educated Christians, moreover, who do not call themselves Unitarians, often explain their dogmas in a manner which is not repulsive, philosophically, to those who believe in Judaism.

I do not agree with Mr. Simon that the world is yearning for a new religion. New religions do not come to the birth through the dissatisfaction which men and women may feel with the dogmas of the old ones. Christianity took the

place of the old religions of the Roman Empire because Rome was steeped in moral vice and corruption. It was not the objection to transubstantiation that gave Protestantism its power in Europe, but such blots upon the Roman Church as the sale of indulgences and the degradation of the clergy. When Rome purified herself at the Council of Trent, Protestantism made no real headway against her. There is much moral misery in the world, but all the churches, equally with the synagogue, are engaged in the work of stemming its tide. Mr. Simon has probably more especially in view educated Agnostics and Sceptics. I do not think that Agnostics and Sceptics are really so agnostic and sceptical as they say they are or as they think they are. They too bring their own pure offering. I do not know whether the prospects of Unitarianism and of Mr. Voysey's Theistic Church are encouraging to those who propose to start new religious movements. I fear, too, that we Jews have not a small proportion of Agnostics and Sceptics of our own.

I thoroughly believe that the noble prayer quoted by Mr. Simon will be fulfilled, that the world will ever grow nearer to the ideal of our prayer of the New Year and Atonement, that all men will form "one band to do God's will with a perfect heart." But this does not mean, I think, that all the world are to become Jews in actual name. The fundamental truths of Judaism will prevail, but we shall best do our duty by fulfilling the duties which lie nearest to us. The enthusiasm of the enthusiastic in our midst must be guided, the indifferent must be stimulated, there must be union amongst ourselves, we ourselves must be one band.

I heartily agree with Mr. Simon in believing that the separate existence of Judaism is the best permanent witness to its truth. We can still be witnesses in our lives, in our conversations with Christian friends, in our public speeches and writings. Mr. Simon thinks we can be better witnesses by organizing a Sunday religious service not absolutely in connexion with the synagogue. He may try. He has the

energy, the idealism, and the enthusiasm to try. Such a service will be no temptation to the weak Jew who is on the point of leaving Judaism. It may be a stepping-stone for him, but not more. He will join in the end a Protestant or Catholic church, according as he lives in a Protestant or Catholic country. But if the movement spreads, there would be a great temptation for its Jewish leader gradually to identify himself with it entirely, and fall away from the synagogue and its traditions.

On another point I must congratulate Mr. Simon. I have always felt that the description of Judaism, as merely "a religious brotherhood," in the deeply reverent *Bible for Home Reading*, did not express the whole truth. Mr. Simon's description is satisfying: "Judaism is a religious brotherhood united by a common ancestry."

L. M. SIMMONS.

(17)

IF the question of a Jewish propaganda is to be debated at all, the discussion could hardly have been started in a more laudable spirit than that which runs through Mr. Simon's various contributions on this subject that have appeared in the *Jewish Chronicle*, the *Fortnightly Review*, and the JEWISH QUARTERLY. But neither the ardour, nor the sincerity, nor the dignified tone of the writer must be permitted to obscure the gravity of the issue raised by him in his presentation of the Mission of Judaism.

The titles of Mr. Simon's articles—"Mission of Judaism" and "Missionary Judaism"—justify insistence upon this point, that no definition of Judaism can be considered as satisfactory which does not make it clear that, while it contains some of the elements of Unitarianism and of Theism, it contains much besides and beyond. But it is the very features which differentiate it from other and even from allied forms of faith that Mr. Simon feels himself compelled to suppress or to ignore in his desire to commend

"the inner spiritual life" of his religion to those outside his communion. Briefly, he aims at the diffusion of Judaism. And how does he propose to achieve his end? By the dilution of Judaism. Whether any class of Christians or Theists, who are not satisfied with the inner spiritual life of their respective faiths, will be permanently attracted by an etherealized Judaism, even with its denationalized festivals, its Sunday services conducted by avowed Sabbatarians, its Jewish liturgies modified so as to make them appropriate for non-Jewish congregations[1], and its avoidance of every characteristic Jewish rite and custom, is exceedingly doubtful. What is not doubtful is that to bid a man spread Judaism in this fashion is, in Talmudic phrase, to tell him to "break the vessel, but not spill the wine." The prophetic ideals to which Mr. Simon refers, high as they may soar, will generally be found, when examined in their context, to be anchored to the rock of the real. The divine promises in Isaiah lvi. 4–7 are made to those "who keep God's sabbaths" in particular, and "who hold fast by his covenant" in general.

As to methods, we are somewhat awkwardly put about. We are to make a propagandist revolution with theological rose-water. It is to be distinctly understood that we are "not to assail any existing religious organization, whether Unitarian or Christian." How I am to convince my non-Jewish hearers that my religion, or its inner spiritual life, is better than theirs, without giving them to understand that theirs is worse than mine, I cannot tell. How am I to recommend to Christian "inquirers" the Jewish conception of Monotheism without directly or by implication assailing the Christian conception? Indeed, Mr. Simon himself grows occasionally unconsciously militant. "The immanence of God in the human soul which Christianity has focussed through the instrument of mediation would be found to be present in all its intensity without media-

[1] *The Fortnightly Review* for October, 1896, pp. 586, 587.

tion. This would be a new message to Christians." Granted; but would not such a message be an attack upon existing religious organizations?

Let there be no misunderstanding then. Let the missionary door be open or shut, and Judaism be preached to the world frankly and fully or not at all.

The question remains: Because I believe my religion to be true, am I morally constrained to make it the basis of a universal religion? This depends upon the larger question, Is a universal religion, at this stage of human thought, a desirable thing in itself? Is it not rather the case that, especially in matters touching their spiritual life, men are so constituted as to be unable to see things always eye to eye, and that differences in religious conceptions are of God's own implanting? There is the somewhat parallel problem of nationality. The visionary's solution is, Merge all nationalities in one. Is there less wisdom with those who would have nations develop on their respective lines, and who call upon all true lovers of their kind to aim, not at an extinction of the national idea and an amalgamation of nationalities, but at the promotion of peace and goodwill among them all? So with religion. Imagine, too, the din and tumult, not always of the wordy sort, and the fresh terrors that would be added to life, if every religious sect yielded to the missionary impulse, exercised its equal missionary rights, and, salvation being in its keeping exclusively, carried on an internecine missionary warfare with every other sect! I very much doubt whether all the gains of the missionary spirit ever outweigh the attendant loss in charity.

Not that I would have my brethren in faith inactive in missionary work in other and, as they seem to me, more legitimate directions. Regarded as a mere question of religious economics, few things would be more wasteful than the suggested diversion of such missionary talent and energy as we possess from home to foreign service. In converting nominal into real Jews, in striving to preserve for

Judaism every son and daughter of the faith and making them worthy of their spiritual parent, we shall realize one part of our mission. The other part we shall fulfil, not by whittling Judaism away until every characteristic sign of it is obliterated, but by giving to the world from time to time clear, sound, and enlightened expositions of the great principles and teachings of our faith; by respecting and living at peace with all sincere followers of other religions, and, if possible, being merciful even to the insincere; by uniting with our fellow-men of all creeds in all works of pure humanity; and by never wearying, in presence of the endless diversities in the intellectual and spiritual features of the human family, to bear our testimony to the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. "*Many folds, one flock.*"

S. SINGER.

(18)

I FEEL the deepest sympathy with Mr. Oswald Simon's missionary enthusiasm, believing that the time has now come when the exposition, by able Jews, of the fundamental truths underlying their religion, and to which they have borne emphatic witness for two thousand years, may be a valuable contribution to the religious influences of the age. The monotheism of the Jews, their steadfast trust in a righteous God, their intense realization of the Invisible, of the immanence of God in the human soul, without mediation—these great principles harmonize with the convictions of Unitarian Christians; at the same time, it appears to me to be important that the two movements should be kept distinct, each working in its appropriate fields, and each tending to stem the wave of agnosticism which seems at present to be passing over England.

ANNA SWANWICK.

(19)

WHEN it is told that a quarter of a century ago the present noble proposition of Mr. Oswald Simon was

being discussed and advocated between the late venerable Dr. Benisch and myself, there will be no surprise felt at the eager delight with which I now welcome a practical revival of the scheme.

It seems to me highly advantageous to everybody concerned that the Jews of to-day should (without abandoning or abating any of their own exclusive duties and privileges) forthwith open their synagogues for further worship on Sundays.

And as they are set—in the language of Christian as well as of Hebrew Scripture—to be "a light to lighten the Gentiles," it is necessary that the liturgy as well as the sermon should be in English.

It is also essential, as Mr. Simon points out, that the services should be conducted and the sermons should be preached by Jewish ministers who are still in closest alliance with the Synagogue.

Among the advantages which seem to me the most important are:—

1. The right fulfilment of the paramount obligation of Israel to be a blessing to the world at large by teaching them to know, to trust, and to love God; to teach them those spiritual conceptions of God which are the special inheritance of Jews, and which, for various reasons, are not held in their purity by the mass of Christians.

2. It will be a great advantage to attract, if possible, the thousands and tens of thousands who have become alienated from the Christian creeds.

3. It will be an unspeakable benefit to the Jews *themselves*, who have been so long forcibly prevented from all missionary effort, and in consequence have lost sight of the divine purpose for which they have been marvellously preserved, and now only recently have been emancipated in this country and in America. It will also, it is hoped, rouse a number of worldly, self-indulgent Jews (whom ease and prosperity have made unmindful of God) to a sense of their obligations and the intense value of true religion.

But all will depend on how the mission work of the Jews is done. And how it will be done must depend on the *principles* solemnly adopted at the outset and steadfastly maintained.

And here I feel bound to utter a caution which possibly may not present itself to other minds as so important as it seems to me. The Jews must not be tempted, by any hopes of winning adherents, into any compromise whatever; still less into the shadow of a shade of pandering to the popular idolatry and false sentiment about Christ.

"Ye are God's witnesses," and if you do not know by your own instinct the unswerving fidelity to which you are called and pledged, learn it forthwith of your own prophets, your Elijahs, your Isaiahs, your Jeremiahs, your Ezekiels, who never for one moment wavered in their faithfulness and courage.

I cast no stones at individuals, but I do say that the cause of God, the one true God of Israel and of the universe, has been greatly hindered by those who, while professing monotheism, have preached a great deal more about Christ than about God, and have made the common mistake of raising a mortal fallible man like themselves into an object of unique and exclusive admiration.

Beware! Do your duty, but prepare to suffer for it. You cannot give unto the Lord that which will cost you nothing. And if you undertake this noble mission for the God of Israel, all the while intending not to forgo the praise and favour of men, intending to trim your speech to suit the followers of other gods, your mission will be worse than a failure—it will be ingratitude and treachery to God himself.

CHARLES VOYSEY.

(20)

WHILE I fully recognize the earnestness which prompts Mr. Oswald Simon's proposal, I am bound to say that I see nothing to attract me in it. As a mere experiment in

spiritual activity, apart from any zeal for a particular religious system, it does not strike me as practical. The people to whom Mr. Simon desires to offer his diluted Judaism would be just as effectively appealed to by books and magazine articles as by the religious services he contemplates. As a form of Jewish missionary effort, the scheme strikes me as positively distasteful. It does not propose to make Jews, but only a sort of unattached proselytes, and its inevitable result would be a compromise which to every "loyal and whole-hearted" Jew would be profoundly mortifying. Thus, if only a selection is to be made from Jewish doctrines and the Jewish ritual, you cannot refuse to make a like selection from the doctrines and rituals of the Christian churches. If an idea common to Mr. Simon and to the straying sheep whom he has in his eye is better expressed in a Christian prayer, he could not exclude it from his service. Indeed, he admits as much when he proposes "a few selections from *Hymns Ancient and Modern*." Has he considered what the resultant service would be like? I, for one, should not care to see ever so small a corner of the mantle of Judaism thrown over it. We must either propagate Judaism in its entirety or not at all. A compromise would not only prove as lifeless as Unitarianism, Voyseyism, and other struggling movements which lack the inspiration of a great historic sanction, but it would inevitably weaken the claims of Judaism upon its indigenous adherents. A mercantile cynic might say that it would be an attempt to realize the Mission of Judaism with a fifty per cent. reduction.

But my chief objection to all Jewish missionary enterprise outside the pale of Judaism is that it would be a waste of valuable energy—of energy, too, which has an immense amount of work to do at home. The ultimate aim of all religion is to influence conduct, and until it can be shown by domestic results that our own methods are infinitely more effective than those of other creeds, what chance can we have of winning proselytes? That they are

more reasonable, and that they have been more successful, no one would maintain more strongly than I; but we have a great deal yet to do in our present field of activity—in the way of bringing the Jewish ideals home to Jewish hearts—before we can go to the Gentile with an absolutely convincing message of salvation. Mr. Simon himself discusses the possibility of weak-kneed Jews joining his Jewish Theistic Church, and thinks that they might find in it a way back to orthodox Judaism. It would be a very roundabout way. My impression is, indeed, that it would prove a halfway house to Christianity pure and simple. Surely Mr. Simon would do better to concentrate his missionary zeal on these weak-kneed Jews—and Heaven knows they are numerous enough!—than to hunger after the souls of weak-kneed Christians, who have plenty of Simons of their own to look after them.

LUCIEN WOLF.

(21)

OTHER dreamers of the ghetto have preceded Mr. Oswald John Simon in the aspiration to preach a universal Judaism. He is, possibly, the first to assert that the question has come "within the range of practical politics." His article in the *Fortnightly* is brilliantly written and sincerely felt. But from the point of view of "practical politics," his idea has perhaps missed the psychological moment. For, as he says, "scepticism and agnosticism are not permanent traits in the English character," and, it might be added, the European character. Consequently we are at this moment face to face with a Christological reaction, fed by disappointment at the failure of science to live up to the vulgar conception of its powers and promises. Nevertheless, as a wandering Jew who has seen the manners of Englishmen and English cities, and talked with British clergymen and British churchwardens, I am of opinion that the corrosive action of modern criticism has irretrievably sapped the ancient conception of the Christ, and that the spasm of neo-mysticism has no real

vitality. Of itself, despite inevitable temporary reactions, the Church is working towards a human conception of Jesus of Nazareth, and even though he be still deemed divine, it is by a modern transfiguration of the concept of divinity. To this gradual transformation in the concept of Christ, it is not easy to maintain that the Jews have contributed anything *quâ* Jews. It is being wrought through the larger forces of the time. That the transformation will add immensely to the historic dignity of Judaism there can be no doubt. But had Judaism been only an historic memory, the transformation would have taken place just the same. What has Judaism then to say to the Christians of to-morrow or the sceptics of to-day? Well, all depends upon what you mean by Judaism. And the particular conception of this many-sided complexity favoured by Mr. Simon does not appear to me to contain any elements not already in Christianity. If it is the Unity of God, the Christians will get to that of themselves by re-reading and depolarizing the New Testament, which will take its true place in the Bible of humanity. And as for the sceptics, they have as much chance of finding comfort and repose in a transfigured New Testament as in a transfigured Old Testament. For note that Mr. Simon's pretence of offering the wandering Christian an old and tried article is a piece of self-deception. His Old Testament is very different from that Old Testament which, inspired in every letter, moulded for so many centuries the thought and faith of Israel. "Our ideas of Deity expand," he says. Well, but this is to accept evolution in religion. Mr. Simon really offers, not "an historic theism," as he pretends, but an historically-evolving theism. And as the route of this evolution passed independently through Christianity, Christians have as much right to claim the latest conception of God for Christianity as Jews have to claim it for Judaism, although it must be conceded to Mr. Simon that the terminus is on a main line from Hebraism while Christians have had to "change."

It seems to me that a vast deal of analysis is yet needed of all these words and conceptions in which we deal so glibly. Mr. Simon, for instance, offers seekers after God "an historic theism." This is what they want, he assures us, and we are the proprietors thereof. To me there lurks in the phrase a deliciously subtle patronage of Deity. "We are the first monotheists." As if God depended on our recognition! As if the modern searcher could not find him except by way of an ancient people to which he had cautiously and progressively revealed himself. Worship by all means, but for your own sake, not for God's sake. Infect others with your emotional conception of the cosmos if you have the genius to do so, but do not, in emulation of the Christian missionary, offer them those dead propositions called truths, which are spiritual veneers, and not spiritual realities. I am sometimes tempted to exclaim that everything is true in religion except its truths.

Mr. Simon, to recapitulate, plays at once with the old and the new conceptions of Judaism, offering in the guise of an ancient God a modern God with an ancient pedigree. For my part, I cannot think that it is fair to the Christians to offer them Christianized conceptions as superior Jewish ideas. "The mission of Judaism" is either on specifically Jewish lines or on none at all. But as we Jews are just now unanimously disagreed as to what *are* specifically Jewish lines, and as we are in the very midst of a chaotic period of transition, it would almost seem better to wait a little longer—since we have possessed our souls in patience so long—so as to be quite sure what we have got to teach, before opening our class-rooms.

I. ZANGWILL.

By the courtesy of the Editors I shall have in the April number an opportunity of reviewing some of the foregoing criticisms.

O. J. SIMON.

AN INTRODUCTION TO THE ARABIC LITERATURE OF THE JEWS.

I.

In the year 1845, I thought to have already compiled the most important materials for an essay entitled *Bibliotheca judaeo-arabica*, containing short biographical notes on the Jewish authors (their lives are, with but few exceptions, exhausted in a few lines), and a full account of the works, the MSS. (of which at that time scarcely one had appeared in print), the translations into Hebrew and other languages. I also prepared an alphabetical list of titles, partly extracted from Arabic sources, at that time not yet printed. I hoped to compose a small book which might be useful to those who had access to the treasures in Oxford and Paris; to visit Oxford myself I could not even dream of, and a journey to Paris was likewise out of the question. I was in search of a publisher, when Zunz and Lebrecht declined the invitation to write the article "Jüdische Literatur" in the great *Encyclopaedie* of Ersch und Gruber, and I was recommended for that purpose by Zunz, and accepted by the publisher, Brockhaus. This essay engrossed all my spare time till 1847, and the following year was not favourable to scientific writings that had no immediate interest for the public. Soon afterwards Munk began his valuable accounts of Arabic MSS. in Paris and Oxford, and in 1850 I was able to glance at the Bodleian MSS. with my own eyes; but my special business was to register the *printed* Hebrew books, and the *Catalogus* was not

finished before 1860, when the state of my health prevented me from returning to Oxford. Since then I have taken notes of the numerous contributions to this branch of literature, but I have not been able to give its appropriate form to the accumulated matter. During the same period I was, however, compelled to prepare some general remarks and observations for a course of lectures in the *Veitel Heine'sche Lehranstalt*, which were first delivered in 1861 and repeated in 1864, 1866, 1869, 1872, and 1892.

It is now my purpose to recast these lectures in the form of an English essay, and to prefix to it an examination of the Arabic names borne by the Jews. This may to some readers of this REVIEW appear a dry subject, but to others a necessary piece of preliminary knowledge, and I shall endeavour to show its importance by some striking examples.

I venture to write in the English language, considering that in scientific matters the fault of offending the linguistic taste of the student by an inelegant style is more pardonable than offending the critical judgment by inaccuracy of thought, which is so imminent a danger in translations.

1. *The Names of the Jews.*

I do not intend to treat the subject of names in general, or even of the Jewish names in particular, in order to introduce the Arabic branch of our inquiry. We possess a monograph of the master, Zunz, composed in 1837 (enlarged 1876, in the second volume of his works)[1], on the occasion of an intended order of the Prussian Government to restrict the Jews in the choice of names to such as were supposed to be distinctively Jewish, and which would mark—not to say stigmatize—the bearer, even in his absence, as the old yellow "wheel" on the garment did in his

[1] Few readers will know that in the first edition the word *Dünkel*, at the end of the short preface, is an alteration of the "*Censur*," instead of "*Misthaufen*," restored in the second edition.

presence. Zunz, with brilliant scholarship, demonstrated that through 2,000 years the Jews have not been limited in choosing their names from every country and all languages. He might have dwelt on the counterpart, the old Hebrew names adopted by pious Christians, not only in England and at the time of the Roundheads. Zunz restricted his researches to the individual or *proper* names of Jews and Jewesses; he did not treat of *family names*, which, indeed, were not common among the Jews of old. Among these we have to distinguish the names derived from the fatherland, or the residence of a man, or similar accidental designations, which his descendants preserved after his name, so that in some cases we are not sure whether we may apply such a name to each of them. For instance, the name רופא (medico—later on Medigo, del Medigo), which is to be found in the Italian family of ענוים (*Mansueti, Mansi, Piatelli*), one of the four families who claim to have resided in Italy from the remotest time, the other three being: זקנים (*del Vecchio*), תפוחים (*de Pomis*), and אדומים (*dei Rossi*). In France and in the north of Europe the family names of the Jews were an artificial and arbitrary product of laws and governmental orders after the French Revolution. There is no natural consequence, no internal evolution, and, so far, no historical importance in the investigation of this practical institution, though it served as a kind of emancipation, or nationalization, and replaced the antique form of designation "X son of Y," which is still perpetuated in the family names composed with *son*, whose prototype seems to have been the German civilizer Mendelssohn. This remark has not really been a digression. On the contrary, it leads me directly to explain why I include in my essay on the Arabic names of the Jews all that class of designations which we find attached to the name of a person in superscriptions, addresses, signatures, &c., in books, documents, letters, and inscriptions. We are obliged to do so, because all Arabic names are so very long and complicated that we must

premise a few short remarks about them, before we turn to the use made of them by Jews.

2. *Arabic Names of Persons.*

The Orientalists of Europe early felt the necessity of explaining the various Arabic names, and I shall briefly mention some articles which may be of service to those who want more detailed information than the statements that must suffice for this essay. But I shall not minutely report, or translate the titles or superscriptions of the respective papers. I shall content myself with giving the names of the authors and the place where their works are to be found, for they are almost all inserted in journals or collections of memoirs, though sometimes they were also printed separately.

The first monograph known to me concerning the names of the Arabs is a German article of Prof. Kosegarten in the *Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*, Vol. I, p. 297 ff., which I have quoted in my discourse, *Die fremdsprachlichen Elemente*, &c. (Prag, 1845, p. 13), where also I promised this present article, published half a century after its first conception.

Wüstenfeld thought it convenient and almost necessary to insert some remarks on Arabic names in the preface of his useful *Geschichte der Arab. Aerzte* (Göttingen, 1840, pp. x–xv).

The celebrated, but not very critical Orientalist, Joseph von Hammer (-Purgstall), wrote a paper, inserted in the year-book, *Das Morgenland* (*altes und neue*), published by Preiswerk, Basel, 1839, which I have not read myself but which is quoted in the *Literaturbl. des Orients*, 1840, p. 487.

Another exhaustive essay by the same writer is inserted in the Papers (*Abhandlungen*) of the Imp. Acad. of Vienna, and was likewise published as a separate essay in 1852.

Garcin de Tassy published in the *Journal Asiat.*, 1854 (also separately), his " Mémoire sur les noms propres et les

titres musulmans," which does not confine itself strictly to the Arabic names in their proper sense, as the title implies. We may also point out the section of *Biblical* names, p. 435, which will form a special paragraph in the present essay.

English scholars are represented by a paper of T. E. Colebrooke's, "On the Proper Names of the Mohammedans," inserted in the *Journal of the Roy. Asiat. Soc. of Great Brit.*, New Series, Vol. XI, 1879, pp. 171–237; the author promises, at the end, a special chapter on female names, I do not know if he has fulfilled this undertaking.

We may add an important Arabic work, the *Lubb al-Lubab*, by Sujuti, published by Veth, with a supplement, Lugd. Bat., 1840–42.

We proceed to enumerate the different parts of a full Arabic name without regard to the position which the various parts commonly occupy in relation to the other parts; indeed, the custom is not rigidly observed; but generally the surname (*abu*, *ibn*) precedes the proper name, which is followed by the pedigree, the patronymic, and so forth.

1. *Nomen proprium*, Arab. אסם (Hebr. שם), a simple name, like Ali, Omar, &c., or a composite name, as *Abd Allah* (=עובדיה), given to the child. The store of these names has been enlarged by Islam, for instance, by using *Biblical* names, slightly altered. It is almost an offence to address any one by his proper name.

2. *Cognomen*, a kind of *Appellative*, Arab. כניה (Hebr. כנוי), which is originally a designation of a "relation" in its narrower sense of parentage or descent (Arab. נסבה, Hebr. יחס). It is a composite name formed with one of the words: אבו (gen. אבי, acc. אבא) father, אם (*Umm*) mother, אבן or בן son (plur. בנו, בני), בנת daughter (plur. בנאת). The composite with *abu* is the designation most in use of a man who is father of a son, whose name follows the word *abu*; so, for instance, Muhammed is called Abu 'l-Kasim, father of al-Kasim, with contraction of the article

al, which we shall consider later on. This *Kunya* (cognomen) is preferentially taken from the name of the *eldest* son, at whose birth the father gets a name at once with the son.

When this kind of appellation became common, it was necessary to introduce a surrogate for *childless* men. In the absence of historical documents, we may suggest that the first substitution was the name of a son which had served to form the cognomen of another man in the same family, or of a man renowned in some way, even in times past. This artificial compound of two names became by reiteration a stereotyped form. Similar combinations were formed by two *Biblical* names which occur in juxtaposition in the Koran, whether they belong to father and son, or not, a circumstance that has not been recognized in all its consequences, as we shall see below.

(*b*) Another kind, and very probably a later development of the primitive combination, is the composition of *abu*, not with a personal name, but with an *abstract* substantive, which in most instances designates a good, rarely (in satire) a bad quality. We might call this *Kunya* "qualifying," in contradistinction to the former, which would be "genealogical," or "historical." The qualifying *Kunya* was applied to childless people, not only in the lack of the genealogical appellation, but also as a mark of devotion, flattery, or blame. Von Hammer-Purgstall, in his *History of the Arabic Literature* (VII, 555), exhibits occasionally some specimens of this combination. I will give several of his examples, substituting an English translation of the Arabic word for his German, omitting the word "father (of)," (instead of *abu'l* we give the full article *al*) and altering his orthography of the Arabic according to our system of transcription; the succession of the names, being quite irrelevant, remains unaltered:—(abu) al-*Maali*, nobility (in Arab. a plural); al-*Barakat*, benedictions; al-*Fadhl*, excellence; al-*Fadhâil* (plural), virtues; al-*Sa'ada*, beatitude (Hammer translates: *Glauben*, creed!); al-*Karam*, generosity; al-*Makarim*,

acts of generosity; al-*Ma'hasin,* laudable qualities; al-*Fakhr,* glory.

3. *Patronymia,* always an *adjectivum relationis* derived from the name of a country, province, town, &c., by a final *i,* and composed with the article *al,* for instance: *al-Faresi,* the Parsi; *al-Bagdadi,* native or resident of Bagdad.

(*b*) By analogy with this rubric there are formed different designations of a class of men, surnamed from its chief, or founder, &c., for instance, the follower of a sect or party; the most frequent names of this kind are derived from the four orthodox schools, like *al-'Hanbali* (the school of ibn 'Hanbal), *al-Sunni* (the Sunnite).

This kind of name is sometimes identical with a compound of *ibn* (son, or in some relation with somebody or something) and the original name of something, like the Hebrew בן, but we do not enter into this more metaphorical branch of the subject, as it lies outside our special purpose.

4. *Titles,* in the widest sense of the term, which are, however, not connected with the position or function of a man, but are simply marks of *honour* and respect, which were in later times of Islam frequently employed by the pious and loyal, and readily accepted and adopted by patrons, by the ambitious and the vain. The most common titles, which by and by sank to simple surnames, are composed with the word *Dîn* (law, religion) and *Daula* (state), such as *Nur al-Din* (light of the religion), *Schams al-Daula* (sun of the state). We have mentioned these names, though they were not frequent with the Jews, who resisted the enticements of Islam.

3. *Arabic Names of the Jews.*

The method of a literary inquiry depends upon the point of view from which the investigation is to be made, and this again depends upon the object we are aiming at. If the names of the Jews were to be considered as an accessory study of the *history* of the Jews in the dominion

of Islam, the prominent feature of the inquisition would be an *historical* one. In this case we ought to inquire where and when the Jews first adopted Arabic names, what were their motives in doing so, from whom they borrowed these names, and to what extent they made use of them ; whether the Arabic names entirely replaced and supplanted the Hebrew, how the first stock increased, or why it remained as it was. A complete solution of this problem requires an exhaustive study of the history and literature of the Arabs for that purpose, so far as it bears upon the question at issue—a task which I have not undertaken, and which probably nobody will undertake, at least not in the immediate future.

There is a great impediment at the very first stage, viz. a gap in the history of old Israel (or Judah) and old "Ismael," to use a name by which Arabia as well as Islam is designated in later Hebrew literature ; our Orientalists are not unanimous, nor are any of their assertions authentic, with regard to the Jews in Arabia before Muhammed, as we shall soon see ; for we cannot avoid taking into consideration that early Jewish Arabism, or Arabic Judaism, although our aim is the discussion of the names occurring in the Arabic *literature* of the Jews, which begins some time after Muhammed, if we except a few scattered lines of Jewish poets in Arabia, perhaps preserved only by oral tradition and written down by collectors of poetry some centuries after their composition or improvisation. We shall, therefore, abridge our few following remarks on the old names of Jews in Arabia, designed merely as a preliminary inquiry. The body of this paper is to be divided into two parts :

I. General observations, forming the key and the criterion of an analysis of the respective names.

II. An alphabetical list of a few hundreds of names, surnames, titles, &c., derived from the Arabic, which are to be found in numerous places, especially names of authors, copyists, owners of MSS., of persons occurring in

documents, in legal opinions, or decisions, &c.; men or women, individuals or families, of which we shall now and then point out the known members, everywhere quoting our sources.

4. *The Jews in Arabia.*

Of the first settlements of Jews in Arabia, we have scarcely any historical witness of full validity; legends, oral traditions penned down after centuries, combinations and conjectures of recent scholars, partly in direct contradiction to one another, puzzle the student. We must at once remark, that the early history of the Jews in Arabia fails to distinguish between those of the north, connected with Judaea and its southern neighbours, Idumea, &c., and those of the south, partly allied with, or dependent upon, their transmarine neighbours in Africa.

Amongst the Jews, Rapoport was the first to draw the attention of students, in a Hebrew article on the "Free Jews" in Arabia, which Julius Fürst, after his fashion, clothed in a German garb.

Franz Delitzsch collected various notes about the history of the Christian church in Arabia; his first article, "Kirchliches Chronikon des petraeischen Arabiens," appeared in the *Zeitschrift für die gesammte Lutherische Theologie, &c.* (1840), and an extract of the facts, which are of some importance for the history of the Jews in that country, was inserted without the name of the author (perhaps Fürst) in the *Literaturblatt des Orients*, 1841, pp. 273 ff., 295 ff. A few other short notes by Bodenheimer and the author of the present essay were inserted in the same *Literaturblatt* (1842, p. 784; 1843, p. 238). A popular article of Graetz without any reference to the sources, "Die freien jüdischen Stämme und das jüdische Reich auf der arabischen Halbinsel vor Muhammed," was inserted in the *Jahrbuch für die jüdischen Gemeinden Preussens*, published by the secretary, Ph. Wertheimer (Berlin, 5619, pp. 143–158). In 1847, Caussin de Perceval published his

Essai sur l'histoire des Arabes, a work which exhausted the sources then known, but did not afford sufficient information about the Jews (for instance, Vol. I, pp. 92, 121, 143, 145, 242 [cf. p. 283], 264 [Waraka ben Naufil, perhaps ben Theophil, a Christian], 321). At the same time, Selig Cassel (not yet changed into "Paulus"), in his article "Juden," in the voluminous *Encyclopaedie* of Ersch und Gruber, which is, as I can attest, the fruit of a long and independent study—it was originally intended to be an article "Judensteuer," in the *Jewish Encyclopaedia*, as early as 1842, prepared by his brother David and by the author of the present paper—gave (p. 166) a short and general account of the state of the Arabian Jews before Muhammed; he mentions also (p. 194) a Chronicle of *Said Da'ûd Man'sur* of Tawila, near 'Sana'a, in Yemen, a work given by another Jew to the missionary Wolf. This chronicle, perhaps of a very recent date, and of questionable value, seems to be unknown to our authors; it is not mentioned in the erudite essay on the "Literature of the Jews in Yemen," in Vol. III of the JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW (pp. 604–622)—which is itself a contribution to the spiritual history of those Jews, as well as Franz Delitzsch's congratulatory essay, "Jüdisch-arabische Poesien aus vormuhammedanischer Zeit" (reviewed in *Hebr. Bibliographie*, XIV, p. 28; N. Brüll, *Jahrbücher*, II, 189). Of course this part of Jewish history is not neglected in the general history of the Jews by Grätz (V, 80). The last monograph on our subject is the article of Dr. H. Hirschfeld, "Essai sur l'histoire des Juifs de Médine," in the *Revue des Études Juives*, tom. VII (1883), p. 167 ff., tom. X (1885), p. 10.

I have not been able to pursue the literature of *inscriptions*, brought from Arabia, which seem to offer some information about the Jews; we hear the traveller, Edward Glaser, speaking in his commenced sketches of the history and geography of Arabia (München, 1889, only 82 pp.; II, Berlin, 1890, a volume of more than 500 pages) of the treasures

brought together by him with great difficulty and danger. These are still to be published; they promise to shed new light on the dark antiquity of Arabia, and particularly on the Jews and their influence on the complicated political events of that country (see pp. 17, 20, 46, 82; II, 120, 123, 361, 404 ff., the genealogical table in Gen. x. 22 is not of Jewish origin; p. 469, on the importance of the Jews in later times; p. 534, Dsu Nuwas, the Himyar genuine Jews). I am not competent to judge, whether, or how far, the digger overrates the treasure he believes himself to have discovered. But I think we should not place too much confidence in the opposite assertions of the critics, which are not quite free from prejudices, and especially with respect to a certain question which is of importance for our research. We are interested in knowing whether the oldest bearers of Arabic names were genuine Jews who gradually adopted these names, or whether the "Jews" in Arabia were originally Arabs who, in the course of time, adopted Jewish religious ideas and ceremonies, while remaining in political and social respects Arabs as before.

Here we must be on our guard against the logical error of a *circulus vitiosus* by assuming the Arabic names as a sufficient argument of the Arabic descent of Jews, and then explaining their occurrence by that very descent which we have proved by the names. The same is to be observed with respect to the occupations, the customs of the Jews in early Arabia, if we take account of the acknowledged faculty of the Jews to assimilate themselves easily to their neighbours in all matters, idolatry alone excepted[1]. The balance of mere possibilities on both sides of the historical question is such as to preclude any deduction being drawn without historical evidence based upon authentic facts, and these are wanting; and we can easily conceive how vague sympathies or antipathies may lead the inquirer to decide unconsciously *pro* or *contra*.

[1] A striking instance with respect to Greek names of Jews is given by Sayce in the JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, vol. II, p. 405.

A way can always be found of demonstrating things in accordance with the recent theory of races; and respecting Jews, Christian controversy has formed a certain *type* of Jewish character, which has been perpetuated in the drama, even against historical tradition, a striking example of which is Shylock. The man who asks the bond of flesh in a bargain *must* be the Jew, though, in the original tale, it is the Christian who wants the blood of the Jew[1]—just as the Jews *must* want the blood of children for the eastern ritual, where there is not the least trace of such a horrible usage, while the oldest accusation is aimed at the "Lord's Supper," and the legend of the Graal as late as the seventh century narrates that the host had the taste of "young children's flesh"—the Jews of Arabia *must* be essentially the same as the Jews of barbarous Germany in the Middle Ages; they must speak a gibberish Arabic, they must be cowards, &c., unlike the genuine Arabs; but they may participate in Arabic superstition like their brethren in Palestine[2]. We read in the sketches of Wellhausen (III, 162): "The Hebrews of old gave a part of their meal to the dead (Deut. xxvi. 14);" the reader who does not know the Pentateuch by heart may open it to see how easily an assertion can be based upon a simple quotation, which might as well be alleged to prove the contrary!

It would be worth while to examine more closely the assertions of that renowned critic respecting the Jews in Arabia; but we must confine ourselves to some striking quotations, the first of which touches our subject. We quote the words of Wellhausen (III, 198): "Religiöse Propaganda zu machen scheinen die Juden gar nicht bestrebt gewesen zu sein. Von einer Verbreitung des

[1] About the type of the Jew in modern drama a very instructive "Conférence" of M. Abr. Dreyfuss has been published in the *Revue des Études Juives* of 1886, vol. XII (Actes et Conf., p. xlix ff.).

[2] "The superstition is international, neither Arabic nor Jewish" (Wellhausen, *Skizzen*, III, 216); but the different superstitions have a native country, and it seems to me more just to name them by a *patronymium* than by a race.

Judenthums unter den Stämmen der Araber ist nicht die Rede." After this remark, we were not a little struck by the following passage (IV, 13): "Manche jüdischen Geschlechter waren arabischen Ursprungs; die Juden machten gern Proselyten; Samuel ben Adijja[1] war Gassanide, Kaab ben al-Aschraf, wenigstens von Vaters Seite, Taït," &c. In the first place then the Jews seem to make no propaganda whatever; of a propagation of Judaism among Arab tribes there is no question; in the second place, some Jewish families are of Arabic extraction, the Jews were inclined to proselytism; in the third place (vol. IV, p. 75), Wellhausen doubts whether a number of Aus and Khasradj worth mentioning adopted Judaism! Happily, no future Wellhausen could attribute these obvious contradictions to different authors and times, and we may learn to estimate how uncertain is the evidence of facts which admit such various conclusions, and to be on our guard against other assertions, which indeed require a special and unprejudiced study of the sources[2]. There is probably no Christian professor, or Orientalist, or theological author more objective than Noeldecke. According to his opinion, the greater part of the Jews of Northern Arabia probably were the descendants of Arabic proselytes; he does not give the reasons for this verdict, which is merely pronounced by the way (*Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenl. Gesellschaft*, vol. XLIX, 1895, p. 713), but he adds that he would scarcely believe, even if his conception of a doubtful passage should be wrong, that the Jews deserve the credit of cultivating dates. The defender of the Jews is here no other than Wellhausen, who says (III, 14): "In agriculture and horticulture, the Jews were the teachers of the

[1] The poet, proverbially celebrated as a man of fidelity and heroism—he cannot be of Jewish extraction!

[2] How unseasonable is the sneering remark of Wellhausen (IV, 14): "Von Handwerken betrieben sie *echt jüdisch* die Goldschmiedekunst;" did not Wellhausen know the essay of Fr. Delitzsch on Jewish handicraft at the time of Jesus (1879)? We leave to others his other remarks, l.c., and III, 141, 201, 209; IV, 31, 61.

Arabs, &c., and as late as the time of Muhammed they seem to have been better furnished with tools and *more* zealous labourers than the Arabs of Medina."

We ought not to dismiss the question of the origin of the Arabian Jews without mentioning a peculiar feature of the Arabian system which is perhaps to be taken into fuller account than has been hitherto done, viz. the *patronage* or *clientage* which constitutes a peculiar relation between tribes, indigenous or immigrant; Hirschfeld (VII, 171) mentions some Arabic tribes under Jewish protection, a part of which adopted Judaism.

We close these generalities with the suggestion of Wellhausen (III, 200, 210), that the Hebrew *Biblical* names, as Daoud, Suleiman, Isa[1], seem to have been introduced by Christians, their form not arguing a Jewish mediation; king Daoud already occurring as an armourer in *heathen* legends. Wellhausen does not say that these legends borrowed the Jewish king from Christian sources.

If the origin of the Arabic names of the Jews is obscure, their *disappearance* is not simply explained by the extermination of the majority of the Jews in Arabia. The fact itself has not yet been established, as far as I know, and there may even remain some exception, to be found in Arabic sources unknown to me. The principal source of Jewish names in early Arabia is the biography of the Prophet by Ibn Hischam[2]; the largest enumeration of names (p. 351 of the text) has been transcribed by Hirschfeld (l.c., X, 12), who adverts to the few names which may be considered as, or may be reduced to, Biblical or specifically Jewish names. I owe to Dr. Poznański extracts of some other passages (pp. 13, 652–4, 687, 691–3) of Ibn Hischam, where Jewish names are reported.

[1] This Arabic name of *Jesus* has been recently derived from עשו; I have not found it among the Jewish names.

[2] He died the 13 Rabi' II, 218 H. (Wüstenfeld, *Die Geschichtsschreiber der Araber*, p. 16, n. 48); his work has been edited by Wüstenfeld (1858–60), a German translation by G. Weil (1864).

We prefer to give the names in Hebrew characters. Hirschfeld claims a Biblical or Jewish origin for עזיר (=עזרא), פנחאץ (the alteration shows an *oral* tradition), עאזר and אזאר (also אזר)=Elazar—we shall in later times find this interpretation of the initial אל as the Arabic article, which is no essential part of the name and may be omitted—שמויל, (also סמואל, p. 692), perhaps נחאם (=נחום, the form *fâ'ûl* is not genuine Arabic, and might have been altered, we find later דנן and דנאן). I would admit a few more, as נעמאן (a foreign name in the Bible: it occurs also as a name of Christian princes)[1], באטא (also p. 691) reminds us of באטי, or בטי, in the Talmud, where it is distinctly said to be a name of non-Jews. One Phineas ben Bata, author of a work of uncertain description, is quoted, as the source of some particulars in old Hebrew history, in the Chronicles of Hamza al-Isfahani. This work was published by J. M. E. Gottwaldt in the original Arabic (1844), and I translated into German, with some notes, the passages respecting Hebrew history, in the *Zeitschrift für die religiösen Interessen des Judenthums*, published by Z. Frankel, vol. II (1845), p. 271. This translation remained unknown to Gottwaldt, who published a Latin translation of the whole work in 1848. In a supplementary note (l. c., p. 447), I remarked that a teacher of Muhammed is called Phineas ben עאזורא (=עזריה?), and that the authorship of Phineas ben Bata is not incontestable. We might as well point to an old Rabbi Phineas, "president of the Academy" (ראש ישיבה), whom Bacher (in Winter und Wünsche, *Die jüd. Lit.*, II, 127) places about 750.

We return from this little digression to the names in Hamza. סלאם Sallam, and סאלם Salim, may be a variation of שלום. Abd Allah (a translation of עובדיה, or עבדאל), the son of Salam, the learned renegade, who probably invented a part of his communications to the ignorant first followers of Muhammed, received his name by an order of the

[1] This name is recurrent in the thirteenth century; a Jewish author of this name is referred to in Brüll, *Jahrbuch*, IX, p. 82.

Prophet; his Jewish name was חצין (Hu'sein, is the צ here a substitute for ס, as in פנחאץ?). צוריאֵ may be compared with צוריאל; סעיה is perhaps correct, =שעיה, =ישעיה, an aphaeresis which we find in later times in Arabic as well as in the German "Schaje" [1]. יאמין (p. 654) is probably derived from בן ימין; Ibn Jamin is mentioned by Hirschfeld (*Jüdische Elemente im Koran*, p. 25). The names לאוי, for לוי (as regularly in later times), הארון (=אהרון), and תנחום occur in an interesting pedigree (p. 13) from which we only extract the names, omitting the word "son" between each of them. סבט—יסע—סעד—לאוי—כיר—אלנגאם—תנחום—יעקוב והו—לאוי—(!) קאהת—יצהר—עמראן—ה א ר ו ן—עזרא—עאזר—אסראייל, &c. The names עדי (p. 351 שאם בן עדי is omitted by Hirschfeld after Srhas ben Kais; "Adyy b. Zeid," Hirschfeld, p. 12, l. 1,) and עדיה (father of the poet Samuel) are probably the same as the עדיה and עדיאל of the Bible.

It remains a remarkable fact, that only a few names might be identified with, or derived from, old Hebrew names with sufficient probability, while we miss the most frequent in the Middle Ages, as Abraham, Moses, David, Solomon, Mordechai, which indeed are also missed among the great number of Talmudical authorities and of persons mentioned in the Talmud.

On the other side, not only the names of the Jewish tribes vanish with their political existence, but also the proper names, such as Ka'ab (כעב), which seems to have been popular—it is repeated in the passage quoted of Ibn Hischam—sank into permanent oblivion.

These facts are strange, but they are not without analogy in Jewish history; we might well apply to them the trite proverb upon books, *habent sua fata—nomina.*

MORITZ STEINSCHNEIDER.

Berlin, June, 1896.

[1] I scarcely venture to combine with it אשיע, though it seems of Hebrew origin.

(To be continued.)

UNITARIANISM AND JUDAISM IN THEIR RELATIONS TO EACH OTHER[1].

According to Mr. Leslie Stephen, the author of the life of Miss Martineau in the *Dictionary of National Biography*, the Central Unitarian Association some sixty-seven years ago offered prizes for three essays intended to "convert" respectively the Roman Catholics, the Mohammedans, and the Jews. In the year 1896 an unconverted Jew has received the honourable invitation to address a body of Unitarian students of theology at their central training college in Oxford. The two contrasted facts illustrate a great change not merely in the mutual relation of Jew and Unitarian, but (since big movements have small issues as well as large ones) in the general relation of varying creeds and religions to each other. This change would, I think, be regarded by most of those here present as one of progress and enlightenment.

In the days when Miss Martineau wrote the three prize essays, which, as Mr. Stephen concisely puts it, probably converted nobody, but brought her in forty-five guineas, people were wont to hold that one religion was wholly true, and any other religion was wholly false—at any rate, so far as it differed from their own. If Mohammed was an impostor and the Koran worthless, so much the better for Christianity. And Jews were at pains to prove that whatever was new in the Gospels was not true, and that

[1] An Address delivered to the students of Manchester College, Oxford, at the opening of the session, on October 20, 1896.

whatever was true was not new. Both Jews and Christians were not sorry to pick what holes they could in the religious teaching of the founder of a rival faith. To-day the tendency is different. It is rather the imperfections of Mohammedanism than its excellences that would give pain to a liberal Christian of our own generation, and the elements in Mohammed's character and life which point more clearly to imposture than to inspiration are those which give us the greater difficulty in our theistic explanations of the world and of its history. We would fain that there were as much goodness and truth as possible in all those creeds which have influenced, and influence still, the lives and actions of so many millions of our fellow-men. Seeing darkly and in part as we do, it is the good which tends to testify to us of God, by whatever name it calls itself, in whatever guise or pattern it may be found.

Yet, though we are glad to mark and to discover elements of truth and goodness in alien creeds, we are none the less attached to our own. We are not less fervent believers in the reality of truth because we are more conscious of its infinite complexity. The love of our own religion is consonant with an appreciation of others. And a love which realizes imperfection in the beloved object may be more fruitful than a blind affection which, because it sees no weakness or blemish, can strive for no improvement and attempt no purification.

It is in this spirit and temper that I would propose to-day to make a few rather disconnected and random observations on Unitarianism and Judaism in their relations to each other.

The friendly meeting of the Jew and the Unitarian may be taken to imply a sort of reconciliation between the present and the past. Judaism in some respects seems to be the very embodiment of conservatism in matters of religion, while your own faith seems to mark the *ne plus ultra* of liberal Christianity. But both may allow that the living roots of the present lie hidden in the past, while the

ultimate value of the past for the present lies in its influence over the future. We look backward in order to see more clearly what lies around us, to meet and mould more intelligently what lies ahead. Oxford seems an appropriate place in which to suggest thoughts like these.

It is profitable for an individual to have points of contact with many different persons, and perhaps it is no less profitable for one religious community to have several points of connexion with others. Unitarianism seems to be in that respect very favourably situated. And if it be true that the old Greek virtue of σωφροσύνη, that untranslatable mixture of sanity, balance, self-control, and moderation, be still a desirable excellence in thought and practice, in social and political opinion as well as in religious belief, surely it is the virtue which you, students of Manchester College, should straightly aim at, and which your position and training should enable you to attain. Of all teachers and theologians, you might and should have a wide and calm and sympathetic outlook upon the world and its affairs. You of all men might most justifiably set yourselves as an ideal the character of Plato's philosopher—of him "who is ever longing after the whole of things, both divine and human," whose mind is truly comprehensive, "synoptic," to use Plato's own significant word. Of all theological students, you should best be able to free yourselves from Baconian "idols"; and this emancipation in one field should serve you in good stead when you come to the practical work of life, guarding you and setting you free from idols of party and politics, free even from the idol of freedom.

Yours, I should imagine, is the only theological training college at which the inaugural address of the session might, with a certain degree of fitness, be entrusted one year to an orthodox Christian, the other—I am afraid I cannot make the antithesis perfect—to an unorthodox Jew. You have relations and points of connexion with Judaism on the one side, and with orthodox Christianity on the other. You are in a position of vantage to absorb the permanent

elements of truth and value lying at your right hand and at your left.

For, looked at from one point of view, though you might yourselves deny it, you constitute a phase of Judaism; looked at from another, though many Christians deny it, you are a phase of Christianity. The paradox of the one assertion to some of yourselves is no greater than the paradox of the other to many beyond your pale.

Clearly your relation to all forms of Christianity other than your own is of much nearer and greater importance than your relation to Judaism. But that which is of less importance need not therefore be of none. And if Judaism should ever move resolutely forward out of the ruts of mediaevalism, it may still constitute an allied spiritual force of value and interest to yourselves. In America this forward movement has already begun.

That the Bible of the Jews ends with Malachi and not with Revelation may seem to form a gulf between them and you, over which no bridge can well be thrown. And this gulf may yawn wide in their eyes as well as yours. Again, the fact, if it be one, that the Jews as a body persistently ignore or misinterpret the mission and message of the greatest teacher of their race, may seem to put them out of court in the religious discussions of Europe and her colonies. The religious development of Judaism may seem to have been violently arrested 1900 years ago, so that it counts only as an interesting survival, but not as a living religious force, of danger as an enemy, of service as an ally. As to these views, a few words later on; but meanwhile, be the truth of them what it may, it is only fair that in your estimate of Judaism you should remember, as a starting-point for the formation of judgment, how it stood out and suffered for a doctrine to your belief in which your very name is a witness and a pledge. For that doctrine you, as well as we, have suffered in the past, and for that doctrine the greater number of the Jewish race is still suffering sore persecution from the hands of Holy and Orthodox Russia

even to this very day. That doctrine may be interpreted well or interpreted ill; it may even become a fetish of meagre value and little meaning. But taken at its best and fullest, with all its implications and corollaries, it surely constitutes a true bond of union between the Unitarian and the Jew.

Even as students—and many of you will, I trust, not cease to be students when you leave Oxford—it might be well to take some account and form some estimate of Judaism in your appraisement of the world's religions. Perhaps the best way to set about that is to go back to the beginnings, and to make a resolute effort at an historic and impartial appreciation of the era and the contemporaries of Christ. The work and the spirit of your distinguished Principal and Vice-Principal will be to you a guide and an example. It will, I think, then become clear to your minds that, whatever other less valid or less adequate reasons there may have been, it was mainly because of the fundamental difference which separates you from orthodox Christianity that the Jews were soon separated for ever from the offshoot of their own faith. If this difference be a justification adequate for your own separateness, may we not reasonably believe that it was something more than prejudice or hardness of heart which maintained a separate Judaism even after all the labours of St. Paul? It is not possible to judge Judaism fairly until this simple proposition—that the Jews of the first century who remained Jews were neither knaves nor fools—has been either established or refuted.

Indeed upon your acceptance or denial of this proposition will depend your estimate, not only of the Judaism of the past, but equally of the Judaism of the present. If the Jews, either intellectually or morally, were unjustified in giving Christianity the go-by 1800 years ago, they are clearly unjustified to-day. If, on the other hand, they were justified then, it does not follow that they are justified in maintaining their religious separateness now; but the question, at any rate, is not prejudged and fore-

determined. It may even be that the good fruit of the old refusal is still only ripening for a harvest of the future. And one quite latter-day effect of the refusal, bearing issues of some little pith and moment for our common religious cause, may be a nearer and more sympathetic alliance between the Unitarian and the Jew. I am bound straightway to confess that the attainment of such an alliance would in this country be prevented by us rather than by you. It is more likely that a Jew may receive an invitation to preach in a Unitarian chapel than that a Unitarian would be asked to preach in a Jewish synagogue, and also, supposing either invitation given, it would be easier for the Unitarian to accept it than for the Jew.

Speaking as a reformed, liberal, or unorthodox Jew, whichever adjective one may choose to adopt, I speak doubtless with prepossessions that other people might call prejudice. But in order to explain my meaning, I must at once make an important limitation, and avow my conviction that it is only a liberal or reformed Judaism with which modern Unitarianism can have any closer alliance or affinity; just as, in my own belief, it is, in spite of any temporary obscuration, to reformed Judaism that the future of that religion belongs. For it is only reformed or liberal Judaism which, in my opinion (is it less dogmatic to insert the qualification or less egotistic to omit it?), can exercise any influence upon the religious thought or practice of the civilized world.

The truth is that the negative attitude of Unitarianism towards the dogma of the Incarnation has led in modern times to many developments. A Unitarianism which championed miracles while denying the divinity of Christ, or a Unitarianism which should not maintain the freest possible standpoint towards the "Higher Criticism" *both* of the Old *and* of the New Testament, does not seem to your present leading divines consistent with itself. Hence it is that though modern Unitarianism may agree with orthodox Judaism in the denial of a central dogma of

orthodox Christianity, the two creeds are widely separated off from each other by the fact that the one, having nothing to fear from ethnology or criticism, can freely accept their results both in the pulpit and the class-room, while the other still clings to forms and dogmas, the foundations of which have been undermined. The two religions are therefore out of harmony with each other. It is only in a Judaism that is at one with "criticism"—using that word in its widest and fullest sense to include comparative religion as well as biblical interpretation—that modern Unitarianism can feel much interest. Orthodox Judaism appeals to you, I take it, only so far as its capacity for martyrdom in the present and the past may show its capacity for development in the future.

When I used the word "alliance," I was primarily thinking of ourselves rather than of the world without, of an alliance for our own internal profit rather than for external issues. For looking in the first place to my own community only, I believe that we Jews have much to learn from you. We have to learn that the doctrine of the Unity has, if I might say so, somewhat different opposites and somewhat different implications to those of fifteen centuries ago. The Unity of God means more than that there is one God only. It means more than that there is, and has ever been, but a single divine self-consciousness. Take one of these additional meanings as an example. If the One God either is, or can be, subject to localized conditions of space, then to the modern mind he is still, in the highest sense of the word, not truly One. Therefore it is that with the modern Unitarian's conception of the *Unity* of God, the *literal* truth of the story of the revelation at Sinai would be no less inconsistent than the literal truth of the story of the Transfiguration or of the Virgin Birth. Many Jews have still to realize not only *that* this is so, but *why* it is so. They are still rather too apt to interpret or to emphasize the great doctrine of the Unity in a numerical rather than in a metaphysical sense, and perhaps their

conception of God has not yet shaken itself wholly free from the inadequacies of "Deism." But this limitation, when it exists, may have important issues. For our adult conception of God reacts not only upon our conception of the narratives of the Bible, but also upon our private and personal religious life. It is not, therefore, a mere question of philosophy. As we conceive God, so too may our relation to him in our soul's life be coloured or determined. And as the child's conception of a human Father sitting on a far and lofty throne, but with eyes and ears of wondrous keenness and interest to see and to know all things both small and great in heaven and on the earth—as *this* conception becomes dim and fades away, so is it urgently necessary that it should be replaced, ere it is yet too late, by another conception, more adequate and rational, but also admitting and sustaining a relation between man and God that shall be intimate, fervent, emotional.

Then, secondly, Jews might join hands with Unitarians in a common determination, to the advantage of us both, to find out the truth, so far as it can still be found, about Jesus and the New Testament. Jesus is not necessarily the greatest and most original religious teacher whom the world has ever seen, merely *because* millions of persons have said and thought so. The large majority of the millions are clearly of small account. Even as regards the myriad saints and thinkers who have exalted Jesus to this position of primacy, there would have to be considerable deductions made for custom, affection, and environment, and a hundred influences beside. At the same time, this immense concurrence of qualified opinion demands from any one who ventures to oppose it the most careful and patient consideration. There may be better reason to suppose that the judgment of the enormous majority of the civilized world is wrong as regards the greatness of Jesus in religion than as regards the greatness of Shakespeare in poetry; but there is surely a good deal to be said for the argument, that even as a low opinion of

Shakespeare shows a feeble poetic faculty in the critic of poetry, so a low opinion of Jesus must show a feeble religious faculty in the critic of religion.

Nevertheless, it must be confessed, on the other side, that most students of theology have begun the critical study of the New Testament with the conviction instilled into them from their childhood, that the teaching of Jesus was immaculate, and his life the noblest ever lived. As they bring this conviction with them to the facts, it is not surprising that these facts should appear to confirm it. It is a conviction which must strongly influence their interpretation, not only of the New Testament itself, but of all other Jewish literature. Now it seems to me that the liberal Jewish student and the liberal Unitarian student of to-day are in an excellent position of vantage from which to begin the effectual study of the origins of Christianity and the right appraisement of its Founder. Out of all sects and creeds, it is they who, with best chance of success, might make a strong effort to free their minds from all prepossession and prejudice, and to seek, in a right spirit of humility and independence, for the attainment of truth. Why I think that you and we (if I may for a moment join myself with my own sect) are best fitted for this great work is not, of course, because either of us are a bit cleverer or wiser than our fellows (if we think that, we shall probably arrive at crazy paradox instead of sober truth), but because the result, whatever it may be, makes presumably less difference to us than to the students of either orthodox Judaism or orthodox Christianity. If an orthodox Jew should come to the conclusion that any part of the religious teaching of Jesus or of Paul was both new and true, that conclusion must, I should imagine, give a direct negative to a cardinal dogma of his faith. And, similarly, if an orthodox Christian should perceive any gaps, flaws, or inconsistencies in that teaching, or if the authenticity of any part of it seemed doubtful, such a perception

would operate injuriously upon his secure attachment to Christianity. But so far as I can see, it makes but very little difference to liberal Judaism what the exact measure of greatness and originality which Truth assigns to these two illustrious men may actually be. It is a question of profound interest, but liberal Judaism would remain at bottom the same, whatever the decision. And you Unitarians would not need to modify the fundamentals of your present faith, whether these hypothetic gaps, flaws, and inconsistencies exist or no, but, whatever the issue, you could, if I may so express myself, afford to abide by it. Neither Unitarian nor liberal Jew is so eager for the facts to point to one particular direction that, even after any amount of study, it is almost impossible for them to point to any other. As I said just now, neither is bound to bar by anticipation any other result than one. Therefore, as the land lies at present, no students better tempered and attuned for the elucidation of the great problem could easily be found.

It were, indeed, much to be wished, both for the sake of knowledge and of religion, that there were more communion in study between Jew and Unitarian. It is one of my favourite day-dreams that the Jews should also erect and endow a theological training college at Oxford, fitted by the width and excellence of its teaching as well as by its outward appearance to rank with Manchester and Mansfield. I grieve to think that your men of wealth and power see the fundamental necessity of such a college, with adequate staff, endowment, and curriculum, more clearly and cogently than our own. Jewish students might attend, with infinite advantage to themselves, many of the lectures now given at Manchester; and at the same time it is possible that certain courses at a Jewish college, dealing with the inner side of what the Germans call *Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte*, might be profitable for yourselves. In this way a few chosen scholars from either wing of the common Unitarian camp might be so trained

as thereafter to accomplish new and valuable work on that most important and most mysterious of all periods of human history—the hundred years that precede, and the hundred years that follow, the crucifixion of Christ.

Then, in the third place, other reasons exist for a closer alliance between Unitarian and Jew than the desired attainment of fuller truth about the heroes of the New Testament. There are great forces and movements, both to the right and to the left, alike only in this, that they are antagonistic to ourselves. The reformed Jew and Unitarian are sometimes mocked for what critics are pleased to call the exiguous quantity of our faith. We have little to stand on, men say; our equilibrium is unstable. We are full of objections to any excess of faith; we are no less sensitive to any diminution from the little we still declare as valid. The poet's words are quoted against us:

> Oh, the little more, and how much it is!
> And the little less, and how far away!

To us, whose central dogma is faith in a living God, it can never seem as if our faith were small, even though this dogma were the only one in all our creed. It is not in its smallness, but in its greatness, that its difficulty lies. Arithmetical expressions which seek to translate faith into pounds and ounces are not merely inaccurate, but misleading. They may even mislead ourselves. But if we choose to employ such a popular figure for a moment—while recognizing its impropriety—we may admit that reformed Jews and Unitarians alike occupy a middle position, and are no less opposed to a dogmatic *too little* than to a dogmatic *too much*. The existence, then, of those antagonistic forces and movements, which we may roughly and readily denominate *too little* and *too much*, should tend to make us draw nearer together for the better sustainment of a common hope and cause. If each find something to learn from the other, there need be no loss of identity in the process. An alliance of this kind does not mean coalescence.

Speaking as guest to his hosts, it is perhaps more fitting that I should touch but lightly on those specific excellences of my own faith, the existence of which might make an alliance between us and you of no merely one-sided advantage. Yet liberal Judaism may fairly aver that it does possess certain distinctive merits and advantages of its own. It is, to begin with, not so much a breaking away or a protest as a development and a growth. Judaism, as my friend Mr. Simon has recently pointed out, is more concerned with assertion than with denial. To the outsider Unitarianism seems to some extent to bear the defect of being in its essence rather negative than positive; it seems to need the existence of orthodox or Trinitarian Christianity as its foil. It lives by its very protest against that which it repudiates as false. The existence of the false appears necessary for its keen and effective acceptance of the true. Judaism, on the other hand, persistently affirms; it is no dissenting branch of any other religion, but, so far as its own positive teaching goes, independent of the existence of every other faith. It did not gain and it need not preserve its distinctiveness so much by emphasizing what it dissents from as by maintaining what it affirms. In its reformed or liberal phase it does not stand or fall by the criticism that may be passed on the date of any one book or on the teaching of any one man. It can largely modify its outward embodiment without losing its essential connexion with the parent stem. Whatever may happen to it in the more distant future, it may justly put forward its plea to take its place as a religion which is no longer out of court in the modern world because it has not absorbed the universalism of St. Paul. It is not too closely connected with the prevailing religion of civilization to become entangled or mixed up in it. It is the left wing of a body which is itself Unitarian, and therefore clearly and fully marked off from every faith which in that respect is other than its own. It can be, and it will be, slowly and naturally recruited from the less advanced

members of the parent stock, who can pass without social or other difficulty into its ranks. It may, perchance, be not too much to say that it will either gradually so shape itself as to be capable of receiving adherents from without, or that it will contribute important elements to that larger and more comprehensive faith in which both Unitarianism and liberal Judaism shall ultimately be harmonized and resolved.

But we liberal Jews recognize with friendly admiration that you too have special excellences which deserve and demand your fealty and devotion. Your very relation to the dominant creed is an immense advantage so long as you are determined to remain true to your own particular denomination. For there is much in a name: it separates and distinguishes on the one hand, it binds and holds together on the other. Though your religion has an Asiatic origin, it is completely Europeanized. Unlike Judaism, it is involved in no practical difficulties with the everyday life and organization of modern society. And above all, you have a real title to that freedom the name of which is inscribed above your doors. The history of religion, the critical investigation of sources and documents, the comparison of creed with creed, and of dogma with dogma—to all these great studies of modern times you offer a welcome sincere and untroubled, because you face their results with confidence and serenity. You have no hidden fear that your cause or your creed can suffer from the conquests of Truth. You have no secret skeleton in the cupboard. You need not say to criticism "thus far and no farther," for your faith is not pervious to its knife. Your inward and outward religion, its teaching and its embodiment, are consistent and in harmony with each other. Such a religion as this should surely evoke and maintain the enthusiasm, the love, and the loyalty of its students and disciples.

You who are training for its ministry can enter on and continue in your work with unchecked and unchequered

feelings of hope and devotion. Remember especially that it is a work intimately associated with religion. Upon Unitarian and reformed Jew alike there lies this common obligation, to prove that the supposed meagreness of their religious belief is in truth adequate for the highest religious life. We must not be so carried away by any other aspect of our creed or our environment as to lead us on to ignore or lay less stress on the religious life itself, apart from its connexions and combinations with other things more perceptible to our touch or visible to our eyes. There may even be a time to remember that democracy, or University settlements, or poetry, or biblical criticism, or freedom from superstition, or unconventionality, are none of them in themselves religion. We too must have our saints as well as the orthodox, and let us remember — perhaps the modern reformed Jew needs to remember this more than yourselves—that no saint was ever satisfied to make Reason a perfect synonym for God. Our liberal forms of faith are on their trial: let us attempt to prove their power. Without an infallible Church, without an infallible Book, without an infallible Law, let us ardently proclaim in word, and humbly seek to show forth in deed, that men may still live and work, realizing God's presence, and loving him with all their heart, with all their soul, and with all their might.

C. G. MONTEFIORE.

ART IN THE SYNAGOGUE.

I.

The Lions under the Ark in Ascoli and Pesaro.

The fable of the hatred entertained by the Synagogue against all manner of art even in the middle ages and the new time should at last succumb to the evidence of facts, and of literary documents. The horror of plastic art gradually disappeared among Jews, along with the fear of idolatry, which was the most important motive of the Lawgiver. One would not consider Tertullian and Eusebius to have been barbarians on account of their deep-rooted aversion to art[1]; just as little may some Rabbinical utterances as to the removal of all likenesses from the synagogues be taken to denote an alleged aversion of the Jews to the world of the beautiful. In spite of the many interpretations attempted by commentators, the thirty-sixth canon of the Council of Elvira[2], expressly prohibiting pictures being affixed to the walls of the churches, cannot be explained away. But as in this case a local spirit of opposition to imagery, finding expression in this prohibition, may be assumed, so the Rabbinical condemnation of art in the synagogue, pronounced in the Middle Ages, and occasionally being pronounced even at the present time, must not at once be considered as general, but should be judged of from local and individual points of view.

As a matter of fact, both painting and sculpture were admitted into the synagogue. Representations of the

[1] Cf. F. X. Kraus, *Geschichte der christlichen Kunst*, I, 161 sqq.

[2] Ibid. 64 and Victor Schulze, *Archaeologie der altchristlichen Kunst*, 63.

human countenance were strictly prohibited and rigorously excluded everywhere; but the representation of the animals seen by Ezekiel in his visions of the carriage of the Divine throne were prohibited only when given as a whole, as a living unity; but not singly, not even in sculptured work. The reason why their admission into the synagogues was not more general, must be found in the circumstance that the Church made large use of those figures for the purpose of symbolization[1]. Only one of those figures of the carriage of the throne, the lion, the ancient heraldic animal of Juda, has at all times been admitted in Jewish synagogues, even in full plastic representation, and was found on the vestments and utensils used during the service.

For one of the most noteworthy evidences for this synagogal use of the lion as a symbol, which richly deserves to be preserved, we are indebted to the marginal notes made by Abraham Joseph Salomo Graziano to Joseph Karo's *Shulchan Aruch*[2]. The copy of the *Shulchan Aruch* was printed in Hanau in 1627–8 in four octavo volumes, and is covered all over by written notes from the hand of this eminent collector of books. I have been long in possession of the book, but the small characters and the age of the MS. made the notes almost illegible, and they could not, therefore, be made use of. But by the purchase of Marco Mostara's library a splendid copy of those valuable notes was placed in my hands, which rendered faithfully every word as it was written by Graziano, and which was evidently prepared with the assistance or under the direction of the author himself.

It is in consequence of this chance which placed both the original and copy of Graziano's marginal notes in my hands, that I am enabled, from the evidence derived therefrom, to give here the history of the shrine of lions in the Sephardic synagogue of Pesaro.

[1] Schulze, l. c., 357 sqq.

[2] Cf. Mortara, מזכרת חכמי אימאליא, VII, s. v. (שג"ר); Jona in *Revue des Études Juives*, IV, 113, n. 116.

This remarkable shrine, which served as a receptacle for the scrolls of the Law in the synagogue at Pesaro, has a history of its own. For a long time in the first half of the sixteenth century, and perhaps earlier, it stood in the synagogue of Ascoli, in the province of Lamarca, in Italy. It was made of carved walnut, gilt, and rested on two crouching lions fully carved out of the same wood, which, with their mouths open to roar, and with their faithful imitation of the mane, gave a true representation of real life. Four steps led up to the doors of the ark, which they held on the right and the left. It was tacitly approved by the pious and learned men of the community, and was destined to share the exile of the Jewish congregation of Ascoli. A new pope ascended the throne, in whose territory Ascoli was situated, and who hastened to make up for everything in the way of the persecution of the Jews that the mild rule of Pius IV had neglected to do. The fanatical spirit of Paul IV was again revived. The Bull of February 26, 1569, decreed that all Jews of the ecclesiastical state should be driven from their homes, except those living in the cities of Rome and Ancona[1]. As in the days of Paul IV, it was Pesaro again which hospitably opened its gates for the miserable fugitives; the Dukes of Pesaro are therefore always called "the pious," and their names mentioned with blessings, by the Jewish authors of Italy. The congregation of Ascoli determined to wander thither; and, although obliged to tear themselves away from their old sanctuary, their synagogue, they took at least their valuable and artistic Ark of the Law with them to their new abode. The care of the precious shrine was entrusted to no less a person than Azriel Trabot, the son of the not less famous Jechiel Trabot of Macerata[2]. He was highly

[1] Graetz, *History of the Jews*, IX[3], 372, n. 2.

[2] Graziano, in a marginal note to שלשלת הקבלה, ed. Venice, f. 64 a, which is in my possession, observes: הרב המובהק וחסיד כמ"ה"ור יחיאל מרבוט זצ"ל מציראנא הלז היה אביו של הגאון כמהו"ר עזריאל מרבוט זקני ז"ל המוזכר לקמן בדף ס"ה עמוד ב'.

revered for his learning and piety, and his opinion was on all occasions solicited by all Italian Rabbis, and adopted as an oracle. Azriel, who was Graziano's great-grandfather, was not destined to enjoy his new home for long. It may be that the shock, and the sufferings of the exile, hurried the old man into his grave; already on July 9 of the same year (1569) he was buried in the Jewish cemetery of Pesaro, mourned far and wide[1].

The Ark of the Law, which now had the additional associations of the new exile, and of the revered master who had carried it with him, was considered more precious than ever. It remained, a relic and curiosity, in use in the Sephardic synagogue of Pesaro. None objected to the lions, which, lifelike, crouched at its feet. A new generation arose. Men like Elia Recanate[2], Isaac Rafael b. Mose Ventura, Graziano's teacher[3], and Joab Finzi, a man of intense piety, who afterwards emigrated to the Holy Land, took over the inheritance of Azriel Trabot without uttering a doubt about the legal admissibility of the Ark. Abraham Joseph Salomo Graziano saw, when a child, the Ark still standing in its old place in the synagogue, and in use as heretofore, at a time when his uncles Jechiel Chanania and Sabbatai Rafael Chai, the sons of Samuel Mondolfo, the brothers of Graziano's mother Patience[4], belonged to the leaders of the congregation. It is true, after R. Sabbatai Mondolfo's death, the Ark was, as Graziano heard when grown up, removed, and another larger and wider one put in its place; but only for the reason that the old one was no

[1] Ibid., f. 65 b, Graziano observes: זכרון מפטירת הגאון הקדוש זקנו של מע' א"מ זצ"ל · כמה"ורר עוריאל מרבוט זצוק"ל ראש ישיבה בעיר אסקולי בארץ למוקא שהיה שם קהל גדול כדכתב הרב הגדול ר' יחיאל מרבוט בנו נ"ע · בשו"ת כ"י שלו סי' כ' · נפטר בפיסארו שהיא עיר במדינת ההסיד פראציסקו מאריא מלאווירא דוכוס מאורבינא האחרון בשנת שכ"ט לפ"ק מהאלף הששי—כך ראיתי בדרוש כ"י אשר דרש לכבודו בבית הגאון החסיד כמהורר עוריאל מרבוט זצ"ל הנ"ל הלמיר א' של מעלתו ה"ה כמהו"ר משה הלוי ו"ל מפיסארו שכתב שם ברדוש הנ"ל שנפטר הרב הגאון הלז ביום חמישי כ"ב תמוז שנת שכ"ט לפ"ק מהאלף הששי · ז' לולייו · בפ' פינחס בס' הנני נותן לו את בריתי שלום.

[2] Zunz, *Literaturgeschichte der synagogalen Poesie*, 440.

[3] Mortara, l. c., 68.

[4] Jona, l. c., 114, n. 2.

longer large enough to hold all the scrolls of the congregation; but the ancient relic had not been removed from any religious scruples. Even then it was not altogether put away, but was preserved in the women's gallery of the Sephardic synagogue of Pesaro.

In 1639 the legal responsa of R. Mose of Trani appeared in Venice, and in 1652 those of David Ibn Abi Zimra in Leghorn; according to their decisions it was forbidden to have representations of lions in the synagogue. They came under the notice of Abraham Joseph Salomo Graziano, who thereupon felt moved, for the sake of his own tranquillity of mind, to undertake the justification of the view taken up by his forefathers, who had tolerated the Ark of the lions both in Ascoli and Pesaro. He and a learned friend of his from Modena[1], the accomplished Isaac Levi b. Samuel Vali (died 1680), felt bound to prove that according to the unanimous opinion of the sources, as also of the authoritative older decisions and codes, even the plastic representation of lions was undoubtedly permitted in the Synagogue; and that men like Azriel Trabot and his pious successors had sufficient grounds to allow the use of the Ark with its carved supports during service, without raising any objections. Besides, Graziano was of opinion that the lion, which, as the crest of the donor, had been placed on the top of the Ark of the synagogue of Candia[2], and which was, for seven reasons, unconditionally condemned by R. David Ibn Abi Zimra, as also the one alluded to by R. Mose of Trani, was objectionable on account of its position over the Ark, where it was conspicuous, and therefore attracted all eyes and hindered devotion. That representation could not by any means be compared with the lions of Pesaro, which were placed at the bottom of the Ark.

Plastic representations of lions are found, for all that, conspicuously placed on the top of Arks in use in several

[1] Mortara, l. c., 67.

[2] Cf. R. Joseph Caro's *Resp.* אבקת רוכל, No. 65.

synagogues. An instance is known to me in the synagogue of the Moravian congregation of Tobitschau, where two crowned lions holding the imperial eagle were placed high above the carved Ark, the work of a Jewish artist of the beginning of the present century. We see thus that even at a period, and among people, of strict piety no objection was made against this plastic symbol in the synagogue.

[יורה דעה] סימן קמ"א סעיף ד' אסור לצייר צורות שבמדור השכינה כגון ד' פנים בהדי הדדי וכו' · חשבתי ימים מקדם מהרבה מעשים שראיתי בזמן ההוא בילדותי ובפרט ע"ד הפנים שבמדור השכינה והמרכבה העליונה · וזכורני שבעיר פיסאֶרו אשר במדינת דוכוס מאורבֶּינו מחסידי א"ה היה שם בב"ה של הק"ק ספרדים ארון הקדש אחד עשוי מעץ אגוז ומוזהב ותחת רגליו היו מונחים שתי אריות בולטות עשויות ג"כ מעץ אגוז וכדמות שערות היו חקוקות על גופן בצורת השערות של האריות ממש ופיהן היתה פתוחה ונראות כשואגות ועומדות א' מצד ימין של הארון והאחרת מצד שמאל עם ארבע מדריגות ומעלות לפני ארון הקדש ההוא ולא שמעתי אז פוצה פה ומצפצף על האריות ההן בהיותן בב"ה · ועל האמת היו נמצאים בימים ההם חסידים ואנשי מעשה וחכמים ורבנים גדולים ומובהקים במשנה ובגמרא ובקבלה · ועל ראשם החכם הכולל ועניו מאד כמוה"ר אליה מריקאנאטי זצ"ל והאלוף הנבון השלם כמוה"ר יצחק רפאל וינטורא זצ"ל מ"ו בב"מר משה וינטורי ממשפחת הסטראמֶאורי ממוּדוֶנא ומוה"ר יואב פינצי נ"ע שהלך לארץ הצבי תו"בב והרבנים הצדיקים כמוה"ר יחיאל חנניא מונדֶולפו וכמוה"ר שבתי רפאל חי מ"ע דודי זצו"ל ולא הרהרו שלא להעמיד האריות הנ"ל בארון הקדש הנ"ל מעולם · וטעמא הוא לפע"ד מהא דאיתא בפ"ב דר"ה[1] ובפ' פל הצלמים[2] תניא לא תעשון אתי אלקי כסף ואו' לא תעשו כדמות שמשי המשמשין לפני במרום ומוקי אביי הברייתא זאת התם דלא אסרה תורה אלא דמות ארבעה פנים בהדי הדדי ופיר"שי פני שור ואדם ואריה ונשר לחיה אחת דוגמת חיות הקדש כדכתיב לא תעשון אתי השרויות אצלי ע"כ · ואע"ג דהשתא אין דמות שור במרכבה כדארי' בחגיגה דף י"ג ע"ב שבא יחזקאל והפכו לכרוב אפ"ה בשעה שנא' המקרא דלא תעשון היה עדיין שור · והשתא ה"ה נמי כרוב אסור לעשותו עם ארבעה פנים בהדי הדדי ושור ביניהם וכתבו התוספות שם בשם ר"י

[1] Rosch Haschana, 24 b. [2] Aboda Zara, 43 b.

דכל אלו התירוצים של אביי בברייתא הנ״ל אמת הם מדלא קאמר בכל א׳ ואחד אלא[1] וה״ק לא אסרה תורה בשמשים של מטה אלא בית תבנית היכל וכו׳ באופן שלפ״ז כשאין עושי׳ חיה אחת מהארבע חיות של המרכבה עם ארבעה פנים בהדי הדדי כדכתבנו בשם רש״י אלא בְּפָן א׳ מותר שאין זה נקרא עובר על לא תעשון אתי שאין משמעות פסוק זה אליבא דאביי אלא שאסור לעשות כדמות אותן החיות השרויות אצלי היינו כל הארבעה פנים שלהן בכל חיה וחיה וזהו דאמרי׳ בהדי הדדי כנ״ל · וכן פסק בעל הטור בסי׳ זה[2] כדעת אביי שכתב כגון ד׳ פנים בהדי הדדי והכי פסק הרב ב״י בארוך שלו ובש״ע בסימן הלז סעיף ד׳ · ואתיא שפיר דרשת אביי דבהדי הדדי אסור לעשותן בכל חיה מדאמר קרא לא תעשון אתי · מפני שלכאורה נראה כמיותר דהא חזר וכתב בסוף הפסוק לא תעשון לכם[3] וזהו קאי על אלקי כסף ואלקי זהב · אלא ר״ל לא תעשון כאתי · כלומר דמות אותם שאתי · שהם שמשי שמששין אותי במרום · וכדכתב בעל הלבושים ג״כ בסי׳ וסעיף הנ״ל וכדעת בעל שפתי כהן כאן סעיף קטן ד׳ וכן משמע מדברי בעל ט״ז בסי׳ זה ס״ק ז׳ ותו גרסינן התם בפ׳ כל הצלמים תניא כל הפרצופים מותרים חוץ מפרצוף אדם · וכן כל הצורות חוץ מצורת דרקון ולפי תירוצו של אביי ברייתא אמצעיתא זו · דכל הפרצופים מותרים חוץ מפרצוף אדם איירי בעושה · וא״כ מותר לעשות כל הפרצופין חוץ מפרצוף אדם וכן כל הצורות חוץ מצורת דרקון · וא״כ איפה צורת אריח לבדו כנ״דד[4] ממעשה ארון הקדש מארץ מולדתי עיר פיסאֹרו הנ״ל למדנו מתירוצו של אביי הנ״ל שמותר לעשותו · וכן כל שאר הצורות מותר לעשותן חוץ מפרצוף אדם · והרמב״ם ג״כ בפ״ג מהל׳ ע״א כתב וז״ל צורת הבהמות ושאר נפש חיה חוץ מן האדם וכו׳ מותר לצור אותם אפי׳ היתה הצורה בולטת ע״כ · וכן נראה שהיא סברת הרי״אף ז״ל בפ׳ כל הצלמים שכתב הברייתא כצורתה משמע דבכל גונא שרי בין מוצא בין עושה בין שוקע בין בולט · וכך היא סברת הרשב״א ז״ל לענין רפואה דוקא כמ״ש בשמו בעל שלטי הגבורים בפ׳ הנ״ל בדף שס״ח עמוד א׳ גבי עשיית צורת ארי לרפואה דאין איסור עשייה בזה אפי׳ לא עשו לו אחרי׳ אלא שעשאו ישראל ואפי׳ בולט לפי שאין במשמשי מרום צורת ארי עומד לבדו · ולא נשר לבדו ולא שור לבדו אלא שפני רשות המרכבה דמות פנים אלו (יש לכל א׳ מהן) והעושה צורת פנים בצורת הרשות שעושה דמות ארבעה פנים אלו הרי זה אסור אפילו אחת

[1] Aboda Zara, s. v. לא אסרה.
[2] Tur Jore Dea, § 141. 4.
[3] 2 Mos. 20, 20.
[4] =כנדון דידן.

מהן בלבד אצלו וכו׳ והרואה בפוסקים אחרים ישמע ולבבו יבין שנמשכו אחר סברת כל הגאונים דלעיל · הא קמן שכל החכמים הנ״ל פסקו כתירוציה דאביי במקום רבא ואע״ג דקי״ל בכוליה תלמודא דכל היכי דפליגי אביי ורבא הלכתא כרבא בר מיעל קגם כבר כתבו המפרשים דזהו דוקא בדפליגי במימריה דנפשייהו אבל היכא דאפליגו בפירושא דמתניתא כי הכא אין למדין מן הכלל הזה את כל הדברים והאמת האלה העליתי על ספר כדי למצא דברי חפץ על מה אדני הקדמוני׳ שלנו ז״ל הוטבעו לעשות שתי אריות מעץ הנ״ל בארון הקדש ההוא · וק״ו שהובא את ארון הברית ההוא מן הגולה אשר גלו אחינו בית ישראל ממדינת למאוקא היינו מעיר אסקולי מקום כבודו של הגאון המופלא מופלג בחכמה ובזקנה וחסידות כמוה״ר עזריאל טרבוט זצוק״ל ר״מ ואב ב״ד בקרית אסקולי הנ״ל בן הרב הגדול ר׳ יחיאל מאסקולי זצ״ל ממציראטא וכאשר הגלה מופת הדור מע׳ זקני הנ״ל מאסקולי לעיר פיסארו עם הגולה אשר הגלתה מהקהלה גדולה וקדושה ההיא מגזירת האפיפיור שלחו בני הק״קי מלאמוקה הנ״ל ארון הקדש ההוא אתו בחברתו כפי מה שקבלתי ממע׳ א״א זצ״ל ומהיקרי׳ אחיו ובודאי הנמור שגאון גדול ומאור הגולה כזה אשר כל רז לא אנס ליה כמו שגלוי וידוע אצל חכמי ישראל שהוא היה המשביר בר התורה הקדושה בכל תפוצות יהודה וישראל והורה הוראות עד אין מספר בפסקיו המפורסמים · דהא ממארי חטייא [1] שהכל צריכים להם הוה בר אבהן ובר אוריין אם לא היה בריא למעלתו שהאריות שהיו בארון תקדש של הקהלות הקדושות שלו היו מותרות לעשותן או להניחן כך אם כבר היו עשויות היה גוזר להסירן מן הארון הקדש ההוא מלבד שבעיר ההיא היו ג״כ שאר חכמים גבונים וידועי׳ בקיאים בדינים הרבה ובדברי הש״ס במאד מאד ומהם יצאתה תורה בעולם כנודע · וליכא שום ספיקא לפע״ד שסמכו עלכל דברי הפוסקים המפורסמי׳ שכתבנו לעיל מעבר לדפים הנ״ל הרי״ף ורמ״בם והטור והרש״בא והר״ן וסיעתם מלבד כמה פוסקים אחרוני׳ שהבאנו למעלה המתירים לעשות דמות צורות המרכבות הגם שהן בולטות כשאין בצורה ההיא ד׳ פנים בהדי הדדי חוץ מצורת אדם כפי אוקמת אביי שכתבנו דאז אין בזה משום לא תעשון אתי כדמות שמשי המשמשין לפני במרום כדאיתא בברייתא בפ׳ כלהצלמים כל זה גליתי ונשאתי ונתתי באמונה עם החכם החסיד העניו כמוה״ר יצחק הלוי ואלי זצ״ל והודה לדברי מכל וכל · ואמר שכך היה מורה לפי׳ סברת כל הפוסקים הנ״ל ושאין להרהר אחרי דבריהם ומעשיהם (ע״ד האריות הללו בפרט) של הגאון כמוה״ר עזריאל טרבוט זקני הנ״ל ושל

[1] Horijoth, 14 a.

האלופום החכמים שהיו עמו · האמנם בינותי בספרים של האחרונים בזה ג״כ וראיתי מ״ש הפסקן הותיק בוצינא דנהורא הדיין המצויין ומפורסם בשערים המצויינים בהלכה כמוה״ר דוד ן׳ אבי זמרא זל״ה בתשובותיו הנדפסות בעיר ליוורנו בסי׳ ק״ז על מעשה שאירע בקנדיאה בראובן שבנה בית הכנסת אחת ורצה להשים למעלה מן ההיכל סי׳ דגל משפחתו הנקרא ארמא בלעז והוא צורת אריה וכתר בראשו ונשאל על זה ופסק שאסור מכמה טעמים הדא שעיקר הדין בעשיית שאר צורות חוץ מצורת אדם תלוי במחלוקת ושיש לחוש לאחרונים שעשו מעשה בהפך ושמקצת ראשונים לא התירו אלא לרפואה ושבא יסורי תורה נקטינן לחומרא · ושבב״ה מכוער הדבר · ושיש בזה משום ובחוק ותיהם לא תלכו · ושאסור להסתכל בדיוקנאות ושיש בדבר ביטול כונת התפלה וטעמי אחריני שכתב שם · וגם מהר״ם טראני כתב בתשובותיו ח״א ס״ל על אבן א׳ שהיתה מצויירת בה צורת ארי בולט שהונחה בהיכל הקדש שיש ליטלה · ואני הצעיר הכותב לא באתי חלילה לקנטר ולעשות מחלוקת על הגאון זקני כמוה״ר עזריאל טרבוט הנ״ל ולא על החכמים השלמים חביריו ז״ל כי חייב אני בכבודם ובמוראם וגם אחרי מותם וקי״ל דאין משיבי׳ על הארי המת · רק לומר שאם כמוה״ר דוד ן׳ אבי זמרא ומהר״ם טראני הנ״ל · היו מחמירי׳ בצורת האריה הנ״ל כדעת הרמב״ן ושאר האחרונים ז״ל מ״מ גם הרב זקני וסיעתיה נ״ע היה להם על מה להסמך להתיר צורות האריות הנ״ל מגברי רבריבה הראשונים ז״ל ראשי אל״פי ישראל הם ואין ראוי להוציא לעז על הרבנים הראשונים ז״ל הנ״ל · זאת ועוד כי על מה שכתבו הרב ן׳ זמרא והרב טראני הנ״ל · הארי היה בראש ההיכל · וזה היה דבר מכוער מטעמים הרבה שהאריך החכם ן׳ זמרא בתשובתו הנ״ל והיה נתון למעלה מס״ת ובמדינות ההן היו עובדים לצורה ההיא משא״כ בנד״ד של אותו ארון הקדש שהיה במדינת למארקא שהיי נתונות שתי האריות ההן בשוליו ותחתיו של אותו ארון הקדש ונושאות אותו כאמור · ואע״ג ששמעתי שקק״י פיסארו הסירו מב״ה ספרדית שלהם את הארון של שתי האריות הנ״ל ועשו במקומו ארון אחר · אחרי פטירת החכם מע׳ דודי סיני ועוקר הרים כמוה״ר שבתי רפאל חי מונדולפו ז״ל אולי עשו זה מפני שהארון של האריות הנ״ל היה קטן מהכיל הרבה ספרי תורה שהיו להם לבני הקק״י בארון ההוא אבל לא מפני שהיו סוברי׳ שהיה אסור להניחו כך עם אותן האריות והראיה שלא הסירו האריות והניחו הארון אלא עשו ארון חדש גדול ושמו הראשון בב״ה של הנשים · ודי בזה לעת עתה וה׳ אלקים אמת ינחנו בדרך אמת ונביט נפלאות מתורתו אכי״ר (אנ״י).

II.

Samuel Archevolti on Paintings and Sculpture in the Synagogue.

The ancient prohibition against the imitation of figures must not be made responsible for the fact that synagogues were only in a very moderate measure adorned with the products of art. The conviction, that an idolatrous worship of the imitated subjects, by the people among whom the Jews lived, was out of the question, had long since diminished the aversion felt by the latter against such artistic work. It had long since been pronounced by the codificators and other Rabbis that only human figures, or groups in which the animal figures of Ezekiel's vision of the carriage of the throne were combined, were to be banished unconditionally from the precincts of Jewish worship. All other ornaments, such as plants and animals, painted or sculptured, would have been admitted to the synagogues in an unlimited measure, were it not that other considerations opposed themselves to a profuse introduction of artistic representations; such as the regard for the attention and devotion of the worshippers, whose senses would be captivated by the pictures or sculptures in the synagogue. The opponents of artistic representations in the synagogue made particular use of a responsum of Maimûni, who narrates of himself that he was in the habit of closing his eyes whenever he happened, during prayer, to face a wall hung with textures bearing pictorial representations, for fear of his attention being diverted. This responsum was first referred to by Abudirhem, and taken notice of by R. Joseph Caro.

In vain the circumstance was called to mind that a man like Ephraim b. Joseph, a disciple of R. Tam [1], had been permitted to paint the walls of the synagogue with figures of animals, birds, and horses, in consideration of the fact that all fear of idolatrous worship by non-Jews was out of the

[1] Kohn, *Mardochai b. Hillel*, p. 115; Zunz, *Zur Geschichte*, p. 175 c.

question; and that his view had been established by all later authorities against that of Eliakim b. Joseph of Mayence, the father-in-law of Eliezer b. Nathan. Eliakim, who had arranged for the removal of the pictures of lions and serpents represented on stained glass in the windows of the synagogue of Cologne, did not stand alone in his opinion. Moses Or Sarua, when an old man, considered that the trees and birds, which he remembered seeing, as a boy, in the synagogue of Meissen[1], should not have been there. R. Meir of Rothenburg had even prohibited the illustration of the manuscripts of the Machzor, lest the attention of the worshipper might be diverted[2]. Such authorities, together with Maimûni's opinion which had become a canon, had continually the effect of inducing scrupulous minds, on inquiry, to discountenance, or to straightway prohibit the adornment of the synagogues with pictures borrowed from nature, although it was known that they had been tolerated in all parts.

This is also the reason that the rabbi of Padua, the grammarian and poet, Samuel Archevolti, who died in extreme old age in 1611[3], although versed in all branches of Italian culture, and fully acquainted with the arguments for allowing the practice, pronounced against it[4]. When asked whether it was allowed to paint the walls of a synagogue with plants, trees, and flowers, his decision was that it should not be done. It is true he saw that in his neighbourhood, namely, in the German synagogues of Venice, the practice was universally followed with the tacit consent of all Rabbinical authorities. But he thought that the usage had only been tolerated for about one generation, and that no judicious Rabbi would have given his consent if his opinion had been asked before these ornaments had been applied. In proof of this he points to the synagogues in the East,

[1] Vid. אור זרוע, 4, 55 b c (פסקי עבודה זרה), Hag. Asheri to Aboda Zara, 43 b.

[2] Tosafot, Joma, 54 a. Cf. Ziemlich, *Das Machsor von Nürnberg*, p. 5, n. 14.

[3] Zunz, *Synagogale Poesie*, p. 358; Mortara, מזכרת חכמי איטאליא, p. 4.

[4] The Responsum No. 6 in my MS. of his Responsa and Poems.

which had only bare, unadorned walls. It is true it was a universal habit to paint or artistically to adorn the Ark, or the place where it stood. This was prohibited nowhere, but could by no means imply a permission to allow pictures, because that spot was the place where the reader stood, who from the devotion and profound attention demanded by his office as representative of the congregation would not be liable to have his thoughts diverted, whereas a general painting of the walls with figures would so affect the worshippers. It would be idle to point to the example of such men as Rab, Samuel, and others, who did not even abstain from praying in the synagogue of Nehardea on account of a statue there, for these pious men, in their profound devotion, certainly closed their eyes when praying, so as not to look at the statue which was forced upon them by the government.

Still less a proof was the fact that the ancient sanctuary contained artistic adornments of figures, because those figures, ordained and, as it were, inspired by divine bequest, would rather enhance devotion and elevation of thought than serve to divert it; and this could not be said of figures produced by profane art. The aversion to figures was rather so general in Israel that on the door of the sanctuary, according to Josephus, the seal of the king even, which contained an eagle, was broken down by the Pharisees.

But Archevolti was sensible that mere literary grounds would not suffice. He, therefore, solves the knot by the authoritative dictum, that the prohibition of plastic adornments belonged to those things which would have to be invented if they did not exist already. Such external contrivances, calculated to affect the senses, like wall-paintings, were suitable in drinking-houses and in the theatres of comedians, but not in a Jewish place of worship, so full of earnest dignity and solemn spirit. Why, by the application of such adornments, give a handle to evil-thinking persons for slandering the Jews, as if in Jewish worship a reminiscence had been preserved of the worship of trees and plants?

Who knows whether it was not a preference for such unnecessary and prohibited plastic ornamentation on the walls of a synagogue of antiquity, which gave rise to Apion's astounding accusation that the Jews worshipped an ass's head? Here it was just the extensive and universal spread of art in the surroundings in which Archevolti lived which was accountable for Archevolti's hostility to plastic representations. He saw that the application of pictures as wall-ornaments in his home, where art flourished, was something so common that their trivialities seemed to exclude their use *a priori* from such holy places as houses of worship.

In spite of his conviction, he did not wish to give his prohibition binding power, before a number of Rabbis of recognized authority would have agreed therewith. But although his opinion obtained the consent of the Rabbinical court of justice of Safed, in which Mose Alsheich and Jacob Berab the younger had a vote, yet this brief declaration of consent sounds moderate enough; because it clearly intimated, that only fresh applications of such ornaments should be prohibited, but that they should be permitted to remain in places where they existed already.

D. KAUFMANN.

ו] פסק זה פסקתי לאסור הציורים בבית הכנסת ונתקיימו דברי בצפת תוב"ב

להשיב שואלי דבר אם יש לצייר כותל ב"ה אם לאו ואם בדשאי' ואלנות ופטורי צצים הנה זאת חקרנוה כן היא · לכאורה נראה דמותר כדכתב הרמבם ז"ל בפ"ג דע"א וז"ל צורות הבהמות ושאר נפש חיה חוץ מן האדם וצורות האילנו' ודשאי' וביוצא בהם מותר לצור אותם ואפי' היתה הצורה בולטת · ע"כ · וכ"ת ה"מ בשאר מקומו' אבל בה"כ שאני · ליתא דהא כבר כתב המרדכי ז"ל בפ' כל הצלמי' פלוגתא דרבינו אפרי' ורבינו אליק' דרבינו אפרים השיב על צורות עופות וסוסי' שציירו בבה"כ והתיר מטעמא דאין הכותי' עובדי' אותם ורבינו אליקי' חלק עליו וצוה להסיר צורות אריות ונחשי' שציירו

בבה״כ בקולניי׳ ומהרר״י קארו זלה״ה בטור י״ד סי׳ קמ״א הביא דברי שניהם והאריך בראיות להוכיח דמדחי רב׳ אליקי׳ מקמי׳ דרבי׳ אפרי׳ וסיים דבריו אבל כבר כתבתי שכל הפוסקי׳ חולקי׳ עליו ומתירי׳ לעשות כן לכתחלה · ותו מדחזינן בויניציא שציירו כנסיות האשכנזי׳ ולא מחו בידם חכמי׳ נראה דמותר למעבד הכי · אלא דכי ניזיל לאידך גיסא נראה ודאי דאסור דהא כתב הרב אבודרהם בפי׳ התפלות דף לה׳ עמוד א׳ ומייתי לה מהרר״י קארו בטור א״ח סי׳ צ׳ וז״ל נשאל להרמבם ז״ל מה הוא הדבר הנקרא חוצץ בינו ובין הקיר ולמה מנעוהו וכו׳ · עד והבגדי׳ המצויירי׳ אעפ״י שאינן בולטות אין נכון להתפלל כנגדם מהטעם שאמרנו כדי שלא יהיה מביט בציורי׳ ההם ולא יכוין בתפלתו ואנחנו רגילי׳ להעצים עינינו בתפלה בזמן שיקרה לנו להתפלל נגד בגד או כותל מצוייר · ע״כ לשון הרב ז״ל · מעתה מדקא יהיב טעמ׳ שלא יכוין בתפלתו שמעינן דליכא לאיפלוגי בין צורות ב״ח לדשאי׳ · ותו מדקא׳ בזמן שיקרה לנו וכו׳ משמע דחוץ לב״ה מיירי דאלו בב״ה כל אדם יש לו מקו׳ קבוע להתפלל ולא שייך למימר ביה בזמן שיקרה וכו׳ והא קמן דחוץ לב״ה דוקא הוא דמהניא עצימת העינים ואין הציור אסור כיון דאין דרך להתפלל שם בקביעות אבל בב״ה דהוי מקום קבוע לתפלה ולא דרך מקרה אסור לצייר משום ולפני עור לא תתן מכשול דדרשי׳ ביה בת״כ לפני סומא בדבר ובהכ שכיחי ביה רבי׳ ולאו כ״ע דינא גמירי להעצים העינים בשעת התפלה ונמצא הציור מבטל הכונה ומפריד בינינו לבין אלקינו ח״ו ותו במרדכי דפ׳ כל הצלמי׳ כתב וז״ל נשאלתי על אותם שמציירי׳ במחזורי׳ צורו׳ חיו׳ ועופו׳ אם יפה הם עושי׳ אם לאו והשבתי דנ״ל שלא יפה הם עושי׳ שמתוך שמסתכלים בצורות אין מכוני׳ את לבם לאביהם שבשמי׳ · הרי דכל היכא דאיכא למיחש להפסד הכונה אסור לצייר · והנהות אשרי כתבו בשם א״ז וז״ל ובשהיה אבא מארי נער היו מציירי׳ בבה״כ צורות אלנות ועופות ודן לאסור ע״כ · מכל הנז׳ משמע שאסור לצייר צורות בב״ה · ומעתה נאמר דע״כ לפ׳ רבי׳ אפרים ורבינו אליקי׳ על אותם ציורים שנעשו בבה״כ אלא אי הוי עובר על לאו דלא תעשון אתי אם לאו ולא אם מותר לצייר ב״ה לכתחלה · והכריע מהרר״י קארו דצורות שאין מנהג לעבדן אפי׳ בעושה לית בהו משום לא תעשון אתי · אבל כד נחתינן לטעמא דכונה ודאי אית בהו משום ולפני עור וגו׳ לכ״ע · והראיה דאע״ג דהכריע מהרר״י קארו כרבינו אפרי׳ חייש להא דתשובת הרמב״ם היא שהרי לא אסיק בשלחן ערוך שלו בי״ד סי׳ קמ״א דמותר לצייר בה״כ אע״ג דהכריע בבית יוסף כרבינו אפרי׳ משום דבבה״כ נחתי׳ ביה לטעמ׳ דכוונה · ואלו בשלחן ערוך של א״ח סי׳ צ׳ מסיק כתשו׳ הרמב״ם

כלעיל · ובלעדי זה הלא עינינו הרואות בכמה מקומו׳ ובפרט בכל ארץ המזרח שלא נהגו לצייר בתי כנסיות · ואם בקצת כנסיות ויניציא לא מחו בהם חכמי׳ מכ״ה או ל׳ שנה עברו · מסתמא לא נמלכו עמהם המציירי׳ דאלו נמלכו הוו חיישי לתשו׳ הרמב״ם ויתר ראיות דלעיל · אך זה נהגו ברוב מקומו׳ שישראל דרים בם לצייר ארון הקדש או לצייר במקומו כעין ארון הקרש וזה מפני שלא יעמוד נגדו כי אם הש״צ שהפלינו בתאריו זקן ופרקו נאה וביתו ריקן ומטופל ואין לו ועל הכל אימתא דצבורא עליה ולא מצי לאסתכולי חוץ למחזור שלפניו מפני יראתו לטעות ולהיות סימן רע לשולחיו ח״ו ומשום הכי לא חיישי׳ ביה שציור הארון או מקום הפרכת יבטלו כונתו כי היכי דלא חיישי׳ ביה מהאי טעמ׳ אם ארון הקדש או התיבה ומגדל שישים עליה׳ המחזור יהיו חוצצים בינו לקיר · ואי קשיוא לך מה שאמרו בפ׳ אם אינם מכירי׳[1] ההוא בי כנשתא דשף ויתיב בנהרדעא דהוה ביה אנדרטא והוו עיילי רב ושמואל ואבוה דשמואל ולוי ומצלי התם ולא חיישי לחשדא · ואמאי עבדו בי׳ אנדרטא אם אסור לצייר · ותו הני גברי רברבי אמאי מצלו ביה ולא חיישז לבטול הכונה · נשיב דההוא אנדרטא צלם דמות המלך הוה כדמפרש רש״י ומסתמא על כרחם של ישראל שמוהו שם וליכא למילף מיניה היתרא לצייר ב״ה ומאן לימא לן דלא חיישי רב ושמואל ואבוה ולוי לבטול הכונה ומעצמי עיניהו הא מדקאמ׳ ולא חיישי לחשדא משמע לחשדא הוא דלא חיישי הא לבטול הכונה חיישי ולולי יראת המלך היו מסירי׳ אותו משם · ואולם שמע נא דברי בעל הערוך[2] בערך אנדרטא וז״ל · וכתוב בתשובות שאלות אנדרטא דכנשת׳ צלם היה והיו עובדי׳ אותו הפרסיי׳ והקשה ליהמ פני מה מצוי בבה״כ גזר המלך העמידוה בע״כ של ישראל וכשבטלה הגזרה סלקוהו ע״כ · ונמצא בספר יוסיפון הארוך שא׳ דמלכי בית שני שם על פתח בית המקדש מבחוץ חותמו שהיה צורת נשר של זהב והפרושי׳ הפילוהו ארצה ולא נשאו פני המלך ובית הכנסת הוא לנו במקו׳ מקדש · ואם לחשך אדם לומר הלא בבית המקדש היו מצויירי׳ בו כרובי׳ ותמורות · אשיב שכתוב במלאכתו הכל מיד ה׳ עליו השכיל[3] ומפי עליון היו כל אלה להעיר הכונה לדברי׳ עליוני׳ מה שאין כן במעשה הדיוט ועוד הרי מניעת הציור מבה״כ היא מן הדברי׳ שאלו לא נכתבו הם ראוים להכתב כי למה לא נחוש לכבוד אלקינו ומדוע יהיו בתי כנסיותינו כמלונות האורחים השותים במזרקי יין בחדרים המצויירי׳ ואיך יהיו כותלי בה״כ ככותלי טאטראות של קומידיאנטי או למה יאמרו הגוים כי נעבוד לעשב

[1] Rosch Haschana, 24 b. [2] Aruch, ed. Kohat, I, 142.
[3] 1 Chron. xxviii. 19.

השדה ולצמח האדמה ולשאר ציורי׳ הלא כדי בזיון לנו ומי יודע אם איזה ציור בה״כ הביא אפיאון״י היוני לענות בנו סרה כי אמר שהיהודי׳ היו עובדי׳ לצורת חמור · זכינו אם כן להוכיח אסור הציורים בבתי כנסיות וראוי למנעם ולגזור על עושיהם שיחזרו בהם · אמנם תנאי שמתי בדברי הנ״ל אם יסכימו בהם קצת מחשובי חכמי דורנו ויהי נעם ה׳ אלקינו עלינו · נאם הצעיר שמואל ארקוולטי

קיום מע׳ חכמי צפת תוב״ב

לכתחלה ראוי לחוש לדברי המפקפקים לאסור לצייר ציורים בבה״כ מפני הבונה משה אלשיך ·

שלמה אבסבאן · יעקב בי רב

THE TREATISE ON ETERNAL BLISS ATTRIBUTED TO MOSES MAIMÛNI

(פרקי ההצלחה).

AMONG the writings of Maimûni, the study of which was particularly recommended by Joseph Salomo del Medigo in his letter to the Karaite Serach b. Nathan (1623), there is also named "the Chapters on Salvation"[1]. This treatise was already quoted, in the middle of the fourteenth century, by Joseph b. Eleazar, the super-commentator of Ibn Ezra, as "a short essay" by Maimûni (מאמר קצר שחבר), and towards the end of the same century, Don Benveniste b. Labi quotes it under the title of אגרת ההצלחה[2]. The treatise was printed for the first time in 1567 as appendix to a dictionary of terms, composed by Menachem b. Abraham of Perpignan, a work which was meant to serve as an aid in reading the More Nebuchim[3], and there it bore the title of פרקים בהצלחה. Mordechai Tama embodied it in the collection of Maimûni's responsa edited by him[4].

The Arabic original of the "two chapters on Bliss" has

[1] Vid. Geiger, *Melo Chofnaim*, Hebr. part, p. 18 . . . . ופירוש המשנה שחבר הרב ואגרותיו ופרקי ההצלחה. German part, pp. 24 and 73.

[2] Vid. Steinschneider, *Die Hebräischen Übersetzungen des Mittelalters*, p. 437.

[3] ס' הגדרים, entitled also מכלל יופי, Salonica, 1567. Vid. Steinschneider, *Catal. Bodl.*, cols. 1719 and 1917.

[4] שו"ת פאר הדור, Amst. 1765. The פרקי ההצלחה להרמ"בם ז"ל are placed between nos. 155 and 156, and thus separate the responsa of the collection that are not from Maimûni, from those of Maimûni. In the Lichtenberg collection of Maimûni's letters and smaller works (קובץ תשובות הרמ"בם, Leipzig, 1859), the ס' ההצלחה are to be found in the second volume, pp. 32–34. In the following I quote from this edition, with indication of column and line.

been preserved in a Code in the National Library at Paris[1]. In that code, after the original of Maimûni's response printed in פאר הדור, under No. 152, follows directly the original of these chapters with the mutilated heading: ולה פצל מן כתאב[2]. After the word כתאב a word is missing, which gave the real title of the essay, without doubt the word אלסעאדה[3]. The complete title of the little treatise was therefore: כתאב אלסעאדה. But perhaps it was called רסאלה אלסעאדה, of which the above-mentioned Hebrew title אגרת ההצלחה is a translation. The second chapter has the heading ופצל איצא (=ועוד פרק)[4]. By the word ולה, in the heading of the first chapter, the whole is vindicated to the author of the preceding response, i. e. to Maimûni. A later hand inserted in the small blank space between the response and the chapters on Salvation, the following words, as a heading to the latter essay: פרקי (ה)הצלחה להר"מבם ז"ל בל' ערבי ונדפסו בכלל תשובותיו בל' הקדש בספר פאר הדור סי' קנ"ה.

The beginning of the first chapter, quite identical in the Arabic original and the translation, shows that it has not been completely preserved. For it is evident that this beginning was severed from the midst of a larger phrase[5]. But besides this, other passages of the text before us also refer to matter previously dealt with[6], contained perhaps

[1] Vid. *Catalogues des Manuscrits hébreux et samaritains de la Bibliothèque Impériale* (Paris, 1866), p. 116, no. 719.

[2] For this item of information, as well as the one used in the following remarks, about the Arabic original of the ה'ההצלחה, I am indebted to the kindness of Prof. Mayer Lambert of Paris.

[3] Cf. Maimûni's *Guide*, III, 23, p. 48 b of the Arabic original (ed. Munk): אלסעאדה אלחקיקיה, which is translated by Ibn Tibbon by ההצלחה האמתית.

[4] In the edition : פרק ב'.

[5] The address at the beginning : התלמיד ה חשוב is missing in the original. The first sentence read in the translation : אולם באשר נודכך לבך ונבדלו ממני העניינים יתבאר לך מה שנתבאר לראשונים המוכנים להמצא בקהל השכלים. In the Arabic original : ועסי אוא צצא קלבך ואזתרקת ענה אלגיום יבאן לך מא באן ללאולין אלמתצלין פי גוקה אלצקול. We see that in the Hebrew translation three words have become corrupted so as to spoil the sense. Instead of אולם באשר, read אולי נאשר ; and instead of העניינים, read הענינים. The clouds of sensuality are meant, which interfere with the true knowledge of God.

[6] Vid. the beginning of the second chapter : כבר הודעתיך במה שקדם ממה

in a first chapter now lost. This explains also, why our treatise has not, at its beginning, some sort of indication of the subject with which it is going to deal[1]. Such indication must have been contained in the lost first chapter.

The treatise in its present form represents itself as an esoteric teaching to the disciple to whom it is directed[2]. At the end of the very diffuse allegorical interpretation of Ps. xlv, the author, pointing out Prov. xxvi. 8, exhorts his reader not to spread his interpretation among the public, but rather to belong to those to whom Isaiah's words (xxiii. 18) could be applied[3]. In another apostrophe, with which he interrupts the interpretation of the said Psalm, the author declares that he meant his present treatise to serve as "the conclusion of the More, since it comprised everything that the larger work contained in respect to its aim and to its end[4]." With this, our treatise designates

שביארתי לך מסברות הפילוסופים בהצלחה האחרונה. And at the end of the same chapter: וכבר קיבצתי לך מאמרים נבואיים ורבניים וסברות פילוסופיות מסכימות בהגעת ההצלחה האחרונה. But in our text this information about the opinions of the philosophers on eternal beatitude are missing. They must therefore have been contained in the lost chapter. Vid. also p. 32 b, l. 29 וכמו שהקדמתי (on Prov. xxx. 22), and p. 34 d, l. 15 וכבר קדם לך ביאור (on Isa. xl. 6, 8); the explanations alluded to are not to be found in the present text.

[1] The end of the second chapter (vid. the preceding note) gives an accurate description of the subject: Prophetic (Biblical) and Rabbinical statements on the attainment of eternal beatitude, and the philosophical opinions agreeing with them.

[2] The apostrophe is addressed to אחי (32 b, 24; ibid. 32; 32 d, 36; 34 a, 14); once אחי המציין (34 a. 14). On the latter mode of addressing, vid. e. g. in Maimûni's *Techijat Hammetim* (Kôbez, II, 9 a at the bottom).

[3] At the end of the first chapter: ולא תאציל מאמריה אצל אנשים הרבה ותהיה ממי שנאמר עליהם כצרור אבן במרגמה כן נותן לכסיל כבוד כי אינו טוב מי שישליך מרגליות בתל אבנים כי היא אבודה בזולת מקומה ותהיה ממי שנאמר עליהם ליושבים לפני ה' יהיה סחרה לאכול לשבעה ולמכסה עתיק. The explanation given here of Prov. xxvi. 8 is based on Saadiah (ed. Derenbourg-Lambert, p. 154). The application of Isa. xxiii. 18 is based on the interpretation of this verse in Pesachim, 119a. Maimûni, in the preface to the third part of the More, makes use of the same verse and its Talmudical interpretation.

[4] Col. 32 d, l. 36 sqq.: והטה אונך אתה אחי אל הבנת מה שנמשך אליו זה הענין לפי שאני שמתיו חותם המורה ויקיף בכל מה שכלל אותו בתכליתו וסופו. In the Arabic original, the passage reads: ומיל סמעך יא אכי אלי פהם מא אחבע בה הוא אלמצני לאנה געלתה כאתמה אלמקאלה יחוי כלמא תצמנתה פי גאיתהא ונהאיתהא. Thus, in the

itself as a homogeneous appendix to the "Guide," the last object of which was to teach how eternal salvation was to be obtained by the true knowledge of God. Maimûni had, according to this, composed this treatise on Salvation as a complement to the "Guide," perhaps for his beloved disciple Joseph b. Jehuda, to whom he had also dedicated the "Guide"[1]. In that case, we must suppose that the treatise, meant to convey only esoterical teaching, remained unknown in larger circles, and therefore emerged only in the fourteenth century again.

The mere testimony of the treatise itself would certainly not suffice to vindicate it as Maimûni's work, if the contents would compel us, for valid reasons, to number it among the spurious writings which were made under Maimûni's name. As a matter of fact, the opinion that the פ׳ ההצלחה cannot possibly have had Maimûni for their author, is at present generally adopted[2]. Steinschneider only, who already on a former occasion enumerated the treatise among Maimûni's genuine writings[3], has not been convinced by the grounds against its genuineness, and, in his latest work[4], he expresses himself about it in the following terms: "The mystical shadow which overspreads this rather theological and frequently rhetorical exposition, is not in direct contradiction with the spirit of Maimonides. There is nothing in it to prove a forgery." Such a judgment is of sufficient force to shake the belief in the spuriousness of our treatise. An analysis of the little book, such as

original, Maimûni's principal work is not cited by name, but only indicated as אלמקאלה. But the translator rendered this correctly with המורה, for אלמקאלה (=המאמר) is as much a denomination of the More, as החבור is of Maimûni's Mishne Torah. The latter himself calls his principal philosophical work in the preface, and everywhere else, הדה אלמקאלה (המאמר הזה).

[1] This is Rapoport's opinion. Vid. Steinschneider, article "Joseph Ibn Aknin," in the *Allgemeine Encyclopaedie*, sect. 2, vol. XXXI, p. 47, note 11.

[2] Vid. Grätz, *History of the Jews*, VII[3], 461; A. Schmiedl, *Studien über jüdische Religionsphilosophie*, p. 233.

[3] In the catalogue of the Bodleian Library, l.c.

[4] *Die Hebr. Übersetzungen des Mittelalters*, p. 437.

I propose giving in the following remarks, will contribute towards preparing a sure judgment as to the possibility of Maimûni's authorship; proving as it does the Maimûnic character of the greater part of the contents of the treatise on Bliss, by a comparison of authentic utterances of Maimûni. For the purpose of giving a better survey, I divide the whole into separate chapters according to the subjects dwelt on. I confine myself to essential points, and cannot deal with all particulars of the text, if it were only for this reason, that a minute understanding and eventual corrections can only be expected from a consideration of the Arabic original.

1. *Allegory of the Sanctuary, especially of the Candlestick. Perfecting the spirit.*

(Col. 32 a, b.)

The heart resembles the ark in which the tablets of the law were kept, as the law is fostered in the heart, and is inscribed in the tablets of the heart[1]. The "pure candlestick" is the soul, the "lamp of the Eternal" in man

[1] Col. 32 a, ll. 17-19 (instead of משכן לבך read משל לבך, in the Arabic original מהל קלבך). This passage is preceded by an allegorical interpretation of the two cherubim, which covered the ark with their wings. But the text of this passage is rather corrupt, so that it is impossible to understand what significance was ascribed to the cherubim. We adduce some points. Both wings of the lungs cover the heart, just as both wings of the cherubim covered the ark (cf. on this the apocryphal letter of Maimûni to his son, Kôbez, II, 39 d: ובאומרו והיו הכרובים פורשי כנפים למעלה וגו' המשל הזה בריאות). That which moves and vivifies the heart, is, physically, the breath, רוח; spiritually, the breath of God, likewise expressed by the word רוח. A remark follows about the homonym רוח, agreeing with More, I, 40. In the Arabic original the passage reads thus: ועכי יכון מהלכך מנך ובך והם אלכרובים אלדי מהאלהם פיך פי קולה והיו הכרובים פורשי כנפים למעלה ואוא כאן כמאב אללה תעאלי בואסטה אלכרובים ובכמאב אללה תחיא אלנפוס אלמיהה כמא חיאה אלקלב וצחתה ושפאה מן סימא אלחרכה אלמודיה אליה אלנפס והו אלרוח לפט משתרך והוא נשרחה נפס והוא נשרחה נבוה אוא כאן הוא אלנפס בה חיאה אלקלב אלמבדר ענה נארא ולהיבא פאוא פתר ענה לחינה כאן דלך סבב[א] למותה פכוא לעמרך אוא בטלת רוח הקדש ען הוא אלקלב פי אלחין ימות והוא הו מותה סוכנים בכנפיהם מהאלהא פי אללפט אלמשתרך תחת כנפי הריאה והמא הנתאן באלחקיקה.

(Prov. xx. 27)[1]. Devote thyself especially to the service of that candlestick. Its "seven lamps" are the five senses together with the two powers of the soul, thought and imagination[2], they must be all turned towards the candlestick (Num. viii. 2). Then thy house will be lit up by divine light[3], and "thy lamp will not be extinguished in the night" (Prov. xxxi. 18)[4]. But thou destroyest thy house and wrappest it in darkness when thou sufferest thyself to be drawn by thy daily affairs from the service of the Most Holy[5]. The soul, that has learned to know God, becomes itself the "holy spirit," v. Ps. li. 13. It is in this sense that the words were said, 2 Sam. xxiii. 2: רוח ה' דבר בי "the spirit of the Eternal spoke in me"; the intelligent soul itself is the angel, the organ of divine revelation[6]. The soul, having become perfect in this way,

[1] This is accompanied by the remark (l. 33): פעם יקראה נר אלהים ופעם נשמת אלהים ופעם צלם אלהים ודמותו ורוח הטובה ורוח נריבה וכבוד ונפש. There are eight Biblical expressions denoting the soul, in as far as it shows itself worthy of life after death. Maimûni, in the More, explains in this sense the expressions נפש (I, 41), צלם and דמות (I, 1), רוח (I, 40), which latter is here differentiated into two expressions, on the ground of Ps. cxliii. 10 and Ps. li. 14 (vid. also Mishne Torah, Yesode Torah, 4, 8). נר אלהים is the same as נר ה' in Prov. xx. 27, and נשמת שדי in Job xxxviii. 8 is thought of in the expression נשמת אלהים. The meaning of "soul" was not included by Maimûni among the meanings of כבוד in More, I, 64. See on this, Abulwalîd's *Dictionary*, art. כבד, end.

[2] On the functions of these two forces (כח המדבר והמדמה) in Maimûni's doctrine of prophecy, vid. More, II, 36, also ibid. I, 47.

[3] אורים רבניים (l. 30). רבנים (= Ar. רבّאני) means here "divine," vid. Munk's remark to More, I, p. 12 of the French translation, note 1. Infra (col. 32 d, l. 39) קנינים רבניים, "divine possessions," are mentioned. In reference to אורים, vid. the expression אנוארה, in More, III, 51, towards the end (p. 129 a, l. 10).

[4] On Maimûni's allegorical interpretation of Prov. xxxi. 10–31, vid. More, III, 8.

[5] Col. 32 a, l. 21, where, instead of הרחבת, read החרבת. This agrees essentially with Maimûni's exposition in More, III, 51. Vid. especially, the following passage: "He who recognizes God and gives himself entirely up to this subject of his thoughts, is placed, as it were, in the clear light of the sun; but he who allows himself to be diverted by his occupations, is, as it were, in the darkness of a cloudy day."

[6] Infra, in the allegory of Ps. xlv, this idea is worked out.

unites, after its severance from the body, with its source[1]; "the spirit returns to God" (Kohel. xii. 7)[2]. But the soul that is polluted by sins (Lev. xviii. 3), and which is called רוח טמאה (Zech. xiii. 2)[3], is referred to in the words of Ps. lxxviii. 39: רוח הולך ולא ישוב[4]. Such a soul cannot return to God. There it is said in Lev. xviii. 30: "Ye shall not defile yourselves, for I am the Eternal, your God"; which means that I am pure, and therefore ye must be pure. And immediately after, Lev. xix. 2, it says in the same sense: "Ye shall be holy, for I am holy[5]."

That which is indicated by the figure of the candlestick with its seven lamps, namely, that the five senses and the mental powers (thought and imagination) must be devoted to the perfecting of the soul and the service of God, the same is also expressed by the words of Isa. lvii. 16. We must understand the word רוח here to mean the soul destined to immortality, the image of God, and the word נשמות the senses and powers of the soul assigned to the service of that soul[6]. But he who makes his soul subservient to the senses, is referred to by the words (Prov.

[1] דבקה במחצבה הראשון. Cf. Maimûni's מאמר היחוד, ed. Steinschneider, p. 15: שבהפרדה תשוב אל ההחלתה ומחצבה הראשון.

[2] Vid. More, I, 40; Mishne Torah, Yesode Hattorah, 4, 9.

[3] רוח טמאה is the contrast of רוח הקדש.

[4] Maimûni, in More, I, 40, cites this passage from the Psalms, by the side of Gen. vii. 15, as an example of the meaning "vital spirit," for the word רוח, i. e. the principle of animal life, bound up with the body and perishing with it. Cf. Maimûni's *Techijat Hammetim*, Kôbez, II, 10 c.

[5] The opinion, to be found in More, III, 47 (cf. III, 33), about טומאה and קדושה, denoting the non-compliance and compliance with the divine commandments, fully accords with this interpretation of these consecutive verses.

[6] This ingenious interpretation of the verse of Isaiah, accords to some extent with Maimûni's exposition of the Talmudical passage (Chagiga, 12 b) נשמתן של צדיקים ונשמות ורוחות שעתידים להיבראות, in More, I, 70. Contrary to Saadiah and Ibn Ezra (vid. my essay: "Die Bibelexegese der Jüdischen Religionsphilosophen des Mittelalters vor Maimûni," p. 27, and Ibn Ezra's Commentary to Koheleth, 3, 21), Maimûni does not attribute to נשמה the meaning of the highest phase of the soul (the spirit), but the soul of life, bound up with the body, and perishing together with it. Vid. Mishne Torah, Yesode Hattorah, 4, 9; Teshuba, 8, 3.

xxx. 22), that "the servant becomes the king," and it is of him that David said (Ps. lxxxi. 12) "there shall be no strange god within thee"; i. e., according to the words of the sages, the evil inclination[1].

2. *Ceremonial commandments and prayer. Ecstasy.*

(Col. 32 b, c.)

Devote thyself to the service of God with thy external and internal senses[2]. For instance, on performing the commandment of blowing the Shofar at New Year, do it with all parts of thy body: be thy hands outstretched to take the Shofar, thy fingers shall hold it, thy ears hear, thy eyes be closed, thy other members tremble and shake. It is the same with the Tabernacle and the Lulab[3]. He who prays turns to God, standing on his feet, with joy in his heart, his hands outstretched, his organs of speech in action, trembling and shaking in all his members.

(Then follows a lengthy exposition about the ecstatic condition, removed from the sensual world, into which fervent prayer can place the soul. Some of the traits recall the description in More, II, 41, at the beginning, of those conditions, into which the prophets are placed during their visions when awake. Particular emphasis is given to, and a minute description furnished, of the *clairvoyance* of the person in ecstasy, whose imagination knows no difference between past and future, who has knowledge of future events in the world, such as war, famine, pestilence, death,

[1] Vid. Sabbath, 105 b. On Maimûni's idea about the יצר הרע, vid. More, III, 22.

[2] אי אחי בא בחושיך עליהם ונסתריהם לעבודתו יתברך. Instead of עליהם, read נגליהם. On internal and external senses, vid. Kaufmann, *Die Sinne*, p. 46 sq.

[3] וכן עשה הסכה והלולב (32 c, l. 4). These words are followed by: ונמשכי התורה. This seems to denote the remaining commandments. Cf. on the subject what Maimûni says, in More, III, 52, on the objects of the various religious practices; all of them are meant to promote the fear of God, and to be means to the perfection of the individual.

and life. He distinguishes friend from enemy, and nothing in the world is hidden from him. The soul, when in such a condition, is transferred into the world of intelligences (spirits)[1], and man belongs to the category of those beings who are described by the words: living, accomplished, intelligent[2].)

3. *Repentance. Isaiah* vi.

(Col. 32 c, d.)

Once man has become conscious of the insufficiency of his religious position[3], and understood that it precludes him from attaining eternal salvation, he is seized by the sensation of repentance[4], and he loudly and humbly confesses his guilt. Thus Isaiah did, saying (vi. 5): "Woe unto me . . . for I am a man of unclean lips." For the prophet had suffered fear to make him negligent in the exhortation of his people, which guilt made him unworthy of the prophetic mission. But he repented, and in consequence of his repentance, the guilt was taken from him (ver. 7), therefore he could again enter upon the mission (ver. 8). Henceforth, when tortured by man, he suffered patiently (Isa. l. 6)[5]. He became equal to the angels, who cause the knowledge of God to flow to each other[6]. Therefore he

[1] עד שימצא עצמו בעולם השכלים. Cf. from the beginning of our treatise (p. 271, note 5) להמצא בקהל השכלים; also col. 33 b, l. 17 הקדושים והם בעולם השכלים.

[2] והוא בכלל חי שלם משיג.

[3] This is closely connected with the description of the ecstatic condition of him who has arrived at perfection.

[4] On the significance of repentance for spiritual perfection, vid. More, III, 36, end.

[5] Cf. Rashi to Isa. l. 6; D. Kimchi to Isa. vi. 7. Maimûni, in the Iggeret Teman (p. 50, ed. Holub; Kôbez, II, 7 b), finds in Isa. l. 6 an exhortation to Israel to bear patiently, in the exile, the outrages of their tormentors.

[6] ונתרמה במלאכים אשר יקנו קצתם מקצתם וישגיע ק' על ק'. This seems to be an allusion to the words of the text וקרא זה אל זה, Isa. vi. 3, which infra, quite

who has reached perfection, must also make others perfect, and must cause to flow from himself to them, that which had flowed to him from God. In this sense we must understand Prov. v. 16[1] and Isa. lviii. 11; and it is said of the spiritually perfect man, who is subject to the constant influence of the divine emanation, that "he is like the spring that does not cease, and like a stream that flows on vigorously[2]."

4. *Allegorical interpretation of Psalm* xlv.

(Col. 32 d–33 b.)

Ver. 2[3]. רחש means really: to cause water to spring forth by means of digging; the word also means: the trickling of the water from the mountain; a sort of perspiration

at the end, are applied to the praise of God by the angels, quite in accordance with Maimûni's view on Ps. xix. 2 (vid. More, II, 5, at the beginning; Maamar Hajichud, p. 9 sq.). The words of the text are taken here in the sense of the idea of emanation, of which then, immediately after, is said: ולא יכור מהשתלשל מן העליון [אל התחתון] אשר הוא שכל הפועל הנקרא אישים והוא אשר ישפיע על הנביאים ויתן לכל צורה שלמותה האחרון כפי שיעור הכנות האישים. This is quite in accordance with the view of Maimûni; vid. Mishne Torah, Yesode Hattorah, 2, 7 and 4, 6 (M. Hajichud, c. 1); also More, II, 6.

[1] This application of Prov. v. 16 is based on the agreement of the word of the text יפוצו with פיץ, the Arabic expression for emanation (Hebr. שפע). Maimûni explains himself, in More, II, 12, this Arabic expression in this way, that emanation is like the source, into which the water flows from all parts, and which sheds itself on all sides. In the same passage he finds in the Biblical expressions for God: מקור מים חיים (Jer. ii. 13), and מקור חיים (Ps. xxxvi. 10), the idea of emanation. But it ought to be mentioned, that in More, III, 54 (134 a) the verse in Prov. v. 17 is interpreted in this way, that the highest perfection attainable by man, namely, the intellectual perfection, "is only for him and for no other besides him."

[2] Vid. Baraitha, Aboth, c. 6: ומגלין לו רזי תורה ונעשה כמעין שאינו פוסק וכנהר שמתגבר והולך. רזי תורה means here the profound knowledge of the contents of the Bible, the same that Maimûni is wont to call סתרי תורה.

[3] The transition from the preceding piece to this is formed by a passage which is corrupted in many instances, but the sense of which is, on the whole, that the degree of perfection, of which mention was made in the preceding remarks is attainable by man only in the way allegorically indicated in Ps. xlv.

issuing from stone [1]. The motion of the lips when praying which is compared with the springing forth of water, is indicated by the word רחש, v. Megilla 27 b: רחושי מרחשן שפתתיה [2]. In the same sense, the meditation of the inquirer for wisdom is designated as "digging" (Prov. ii. 4) [3]. But רחש means also the motion of the lips without sounds and words, v. Chagiga, 3 a: ומרחשן שפתתייהו [4]. The word רחש in our verse is therefore a suitable expression for the inspiration, which affects man only in thought, and not in words and sounds [5].

Ver. 4 contains a summons to restrain the senses, so that they do not divert from spiritual perfection; גבור is, according to Aboth 4, 1, one who restrains his inclination.

[1] Col. 32 d, l. 15: לפי שביאור רחש היא נביעות ר"ל הוציא המים בחפירה והנביעה והוא שיורדים מן ההרים כאלו הוא זיעה יוצאת מן הזלע (read מה) מים. This is based upon Abulwalîd's explanation, art. רחש, where the Hebrew verb רחש is translated by the Arabic אנבט, and compared with the Arabic רשח. Abulwalîd explained these two Arabic words thus: יקאל אנבט אלמא אי אלרגה באלחפר ואלנבט בפתח אלבא מא ירשח מן אלגבל כאנה ערק יכרג מן אלצכר. This interpretation, which was omitted by Ibn Tibbon in his translation (ס' השרשים, in my edition, p. 478), is directly transferred by our author to the Hebrew word, רחש.

[2] This also is taken literally from Abulwalîd, l. c.

[3] The author inserts here an interpretation of Prov. ii. 5, which verse he cites thus: או תבין יראת ה' ודעת קדושים תמצא. The verse, the changed form of which is evidently owing to Prov. xxx. 3, is explained thus: He who has attained the fear of God, which is the ultimate object of the Torah, will arrive at the knowledge that flows to him from the "Holy Ones," i. e. the angels (vid. Dan. viii. 13). That the fear of God is the ultimate object of the Torah, is expounded by Maimûni, More, III, 24.

[4] This also is taken from Abulwalîd.

[5] Cf. what Maimûni, in his letter to Chasdai Hallevi (Kôbez, II, 23 d), says about the inspiration vouchsafed to Moses: שנפש משה רבנו ע"ה היתה אחוזה בדעות העליונות השכליות ומבינה ושומעת על דרך דבור האמת שהוא הגיון הרעות העליונות מה שאין אנו יכולין לידע איך הוא. After the explanation of רחש follows the exhortation, mentioned above, p. 272, n. 4, which concludes with the application made of Prov. xxxi. 2 and Ps. cxix. 102 (שלל) to "the divine possessions" (vid. supra, p. 275, n. 3). Then the author takes up again the interpretation of the Psalm with the words ואשוב אל המאמר דראשון בהשלמת מאמר לשוני עט סופר מהיר, and explains the word מהיר from the Arabic (after Abulwalîd).

Ver. 5. רכב must be explained from רוכב, Deut. xxxiii. 26[1]. As God directs the universe, the spheres, thus the thinking soul directs the little world, the body, by means of its likeness to God[2].

Ver. 6. Kill the evil inclination, the enemy of the good inclination (the intellect).

Ver. 9 means the external, corporeal senses.

Ver. 10. The "daughters of the king" are the forces of the thinking soul; on the side of the latter stands in attendance "to the right hand" the animal soul "in Ophir's ornaments," i. e. adorned with good actions, with self-restraint, and with the endeavour to acquire moral and intellectual excellences (virtues)[3].

Ver. 11. Here the animal soul of man is addressed, to divest itself from its animal nature and to subject itself to the intellect in humility and obedience.

Ver. 12. The "king" is the intellect (שכל, עקל).

Ver. 13. בת צור, "the daughter of the Rock," is the thinking soul, which has its origin in the "Rock," the primary cause, i. e. God[4]. עשירי עם are the senses, and the forces of the soul, and the perishable aims of the man[5]. The sentence has the same meaning as Ps. xxxv. 10[6].

Ver. 14. "The daughter of the king is very glorious

[1] That which is said here in explanation of Deut. xxxiii. 26, accords completely with More, I, 70, at the beginning.

[2] The passage ought in reality to run thus: ולמה שיש בנפש המדברת דמות אל יוצרה על דרך ההעברה לזה אמר צלח רכב על דבר אמת וגו' על זה הגשם (like Arab. جسم) שהוא העולם הקטן. The idea of man as Microcosmus (עאלם צגיר) was largely discussed by Maimûni in More, I, 72.

[3] אלפצאיל אלכלקיה = המעלות המוחיות והדבריות. Cf. More, III, 54, at the beginning; Rosin, *Die Ethik des Maimonides*, p. 101. Sam. Ibn Tibbon has: מ' השכליות, מעלות המדות.

[4] Pointing to Deut. xxxii. 4, 18; Ex. xxxiii. 21. Cf. on this point More, I, 16.

[5] הבל is here the same as what is called by Maimûni, More, III, 51 (126 a), אמור אלרניא and—by a Talmudical expression—מילי דעלמא.

[6] This verse is differently applied by Maimûni in More, I, 64, towards the end.

within." This means that the intelligent soul becomes perfect only when she withdraws from the external world[1].

Ver. 15. לרקמות (cf. Ezek. xvi. 13) are those acquired excellences[2], through which the soul "is being led to the king," i. e. to God. The soul is worthy to go to God when she is completely purified, and her handmaids, i. e. the senses and all her powers, follow her and are subject to her dominion[3]. The soul, when thus purified, becomes from divine spirit, potentially, divine spirit in reality[4]; henceforth she belongs to the saints, i. e. to the world of intelligences (spirits)[5].

Ver. 17. "In the place of thy fathers shall be thy children," namely, when they make the virtues of the former, their own, whilst they become "lords over the world," i. e. over the material world and the senses (vid. Gen. ix. 2)[6].

5. חֻפָּה (Isa. iv. 5), *a symbol of the delights of eternal salvation.*

(Col. 33 b, c, d.)

The second chapter commences with the proposition, that according to the views of the philosophers[7], the

[1] שלימות הנפש המדברת אמנם ישלם בהפסק וההפשטה. Cf. with this More, III, 51, towards the end (129 a).

[2] אלפצאיל = המעלות. Cf. supra, p. 281, note 3.

[3] This is then further explained, and ver. 16 is referred to also.

[4] הנה היא תעתק מרוח אלהים בכח ושבה רוח אלהים בפעל. Cf. More, I, 70 (92 b): ואלשי אלמפארק בעד אלמות הו אלשי אלחאצל באלפעל.

[5] Vid. supra, p. 278, n. 1.

[6] At the end of the Chapter, the exhortation, alluded to above, p. 272, note 3, follows. The author further emphasizes the importance of the allegorical interpretation of Psalm xlv. by saying that he had obtained it from "God's divine table" (ממה שחלק לנו משלחנו השמיימי). Similarly, Maimûni, in his allegorical interpretation of the prologue of the book of Job, says that the ideas had come to him as it were through revelation, More, III, 22 (46 a) וארי כיף תחצלת לי הדה אלמעאני שבה אלוחי. Vid. my Essay: *Die Bibelexegese Moses Maimûni's*, p. 122, n. 4.

[7] Vid. supra, p. 271, note 6. Maimûni discusses the opinions of the philosophers on the Immortality of the Soul in *Techijat Hammetim* (Kôbez, II, 9 a). Vid. also More, I, 74, and Munk's notes, I, 432, 433.

eternal salvation, vouchsafed to man, is commensurate with the preparations and perfection, that made its subject worthy of it. This idea, that there are "degrees of salvation[1]," the author thinks to be expressed in an Agadic passage (Baba Bathra, 75 a) to Isa. iv. 5, עתיד הקדוש ברוך הוא לעשות לכל צדיק וצדיק ז' חופות. He connects with this sentence an interpretation of the word חֻפָּה, which makes it an allegorical expression denoting the eternal salvation. The latter, being denoted by a word that means "wedding chamber," is compared with that, which is, for the sensual man, the highest delight, and the look of which affords enjoyment to the soul and the eyes. Then follows the etymological explanation of the word[2], which—like חוף harbour—comes from the verb חפף, to protect, to hide. As the harbour affords security to the ship, so the sun, on its rising, which is also designated by the word חפה (Ps. xix. 6), gives a sense of security after the darkness of the night, which causes fear. Thus the bridal chamber, after the wedding has taken place therein, gives a sense of security against the danger of deceasing childless[3]. Then the adornment of the "Chuppa" is dealt with, and also the other "Chuppoth," which are prepared for the friends, for those who assist at the wedding, in accordance with the presents sent by them. Thus, in the "second world[4]," the souls arrived at those delights, are secure against perdition, and the share of salvation is vouchsafed to every one in measure to his preparation; this is expressed in Isaiah's words: כי על כל כבוד חפה.—After a parenthetical observation on גנוניתא, the Rabbinical synonym of חפה, in the explanation of Song of Sol. v. 1[5] the author interprets

[1] This idea is described most clearly at the end of the chapter (col. 33 d, l. 34): אחר ששם יובדלו המדרגות ויהיה יתרון האישים כפי שיעור הכנות כל איש ואיש ומה שהגיע אליו משלמות.

[2] This is altogether based on Abulwalîd's *Dictionary*, art. חפף.

[3] Jer. xxii. 10 is cited here according to the interpretation in Moed Katan, 27 a.

[4] העולם השני (דאר אלאכרה).

[5] This verse is interpreted thus: היתה או הנפש המדברת אצל הפרדה מזה העפר

the rest of the verse[1]. He quotes from Sabbath, 152 a the Agadic explanation of Kohel. xii. 5 (אל בית עולמו), and, to the word איש, an Agadic explanation of Baba Bathra, 75 a. In conclusion, the preparation of the soul for the life after death is compared with the preparation of the bride, and Prov. xxxi. 10 is referred to.

6. *Biblical evidences for the continuation of the soul after death*[2].

(Col. 34 a.)

Gen. v. 24 כי לקח אותו אלהים means, according to the Targum, "God caused him to die[3]." As this cannot be meant in a bad sense, it will have to be explained in this way: God caused Enoch to die, in reward for his excellence. He transferred him from this world, full of sorrow and pain, into the world of spiritual beings, into that world which—according to the traditional explanation—is announced in Deut. xxii. 7[4], and praised in Ps. xxxi. 20[5], the bliss of which is, according to Is. lxiv. 3, incomprehensible to the human mind[6]. The assumption that לקח אותו meant "he did not let him die[7]," and that Enoch continued

כלה הנתן (הַנְּתָנָה l.) לחתן ההולכת אליו בעדי קשוריה וכבר נברלו ממנה העננים המכסים עליה ונפסקו המסכים ונודכבו עבירות אותו הרוח וקנתה ההארה וההזרחה. In reference to העננים, vid. supra, p. 271, note 5.

[1] מקראיה, according to Abulwalîd, art. קרא. Of the verb ברא is said: תיבת ברא באה ביצירה על בריאת העולם מההעדר; cf. More, II, 30, at the end; III, 10, at the beginning; III, 13.

[2] In this piece, the introductory sentence is missing. Something must have been lost before the word אמרו, col. 34 a, l. 3.

[3] ארי אמית יתיה. This is the correct reading of that passage in the Targum, and not ארי לא אמית יתיה. Vid. Schefftel, *Biure Onkelos*, p. 14, Cf. my treatise, *Leben und Werke des Abulwalid*, p. 66, n. 37.

[4] Vid. More, I, 42, at the end (from Kiddushin, 39 b), Mishne Torah, Teshouba, 8, 1.

[5] Vid. Mishne Torah, Teshouba, 8.

[6] וזאת היא ההצלחה שאין לה דמיון ולא ערך. Cf. M. T., Teshouba, 8, 7: אבל טובת חיי העולם הבא אין לה ערך ודמיון.

[7] This is the explanation from which the common reading of the Targum לא אמית יתיה derived.

living on earth, is refuted by the information that he lived 365 years[1].

Song of Sol. i. 4, "The king caused me to come into his chambers." An allusion to the world to come[2].

Isa. lvii. 1, "The pious will be taken away from the judgment." God preserves the pious from the sight of the judgment destined for the world, by causing him to die[3].

Song of Sol. vi. 2, "My friend descended to his garden . . . in order to pluck lilies," i.e.—according to the explanation of the sages[4]—to gather the souls of the pious.

Gen. xv. 15[5], "Thou shalt come to thy fathers in peace," i. e. thou shalt come, after thy death, to thy pious fathers, like Noah, Enoch, Methuselah[6]. For the expression cannot mean: thou shalt be united with thy fathers in the grave, because Abraham was not buried with his forefathers; he rather shared the grave with his posterity.

Gen. xxv. 8 and Deut. xxxii. 50. The expression נאסף אל עמיו, used of Abraham, Moses, and Aaron, means that each of them was put with those that were like himself[7], with those whose souls were transferred into the world of everlasting continuity[8], when they had been purified after being severed from the body[9].

[1] The Biblical passage, Gen. v. 24, is adduced in proof of the continuity of the soul after death by Jehudah Halevi and Abraham Ibn Daûd. See my essay, *Die Bibelexegese der jüd. Religionsphilosophen*, pp. 130 and 149. See also Ibn Ezra, Jesod Mora, c. 10.

[2] Cf. Maimûni's allegorical interpretation of Song of Sol. i. 2, More, III, 51, end.

[3] Here is the place of the words, erroneously joined to the following passage (on Song of Sol. vi. 2): הלא תראה אומרו ברוחות הנקיים יבוא שלום ינוחו על משכבותם.

[4] Vid. Shir Rabba, ad loc.

[5] With the introductory words: ומעדיות ההצלחה האחרונה (= ומן שואהד אלסעאדה אלאכירה).

[6] In More, II, 39 Methuselah is mentioned with distinction.

[7] אל בני וילו.

[8] לעולם ההשארות התמידי.

[9] In the same manner Ibn Dâud. Vid. *Die Bibelexegese der jüd. Rel.*, p. 149.

Mal. iii. 10[1], "The sun of salvation will rise for you who fear my name."

Zech. iii. 7, "If you wander in my ways," then "I shall give you wanderings among those who stand," i. e. I give you continuity and eternity, like unto the eternity of the angels that stand before me[2].

7. *Miscellaneous remarks on eternal salvation*[3]. (Col. 34 b, c, d.)

That eternal salvation will fall to the share of each who has become worthy of it, in proportion to his worth[4], is admitted both by philosophers and religionists[5]. The difference in degree between the various pious men is made clear in the Agadic sentence about Moses and Joshua (Baba Bathra, 75 a) by the figure of sun and moon[6]. The teaching of Moses is the light (Prov. vi. 23) to which every one must turn who aspires after perfection. He who turns away from the teaching is liable to undergo the curse:

[1] With the introductory words: וכבר ביאר בזאת ההצלחה על ידי נביאיו.

[2] The passage is explained in the same manner by Bachja ben Pekuda, *Duties of the Heart*, IX, 1; Joseph Ibn Zaddik, *Microcosmus* (ed. Jellinek), p. 73 sq. Cf. *Die Bibelexegese der jüd. Rel.*, pp. 77, 105.

[3] A series of rather loosely connected observations and interpretations is introduced by the words לא אאריך עליך בכל מה שבא בכנוי ההצלחה האחרונה; of these the most important are produced here.

[4] Vid. Mishne Torah, Teshouba 9, 1: ולפי גודל מעשיו ורוב חכמתו הוא זכה.

[5] אין חילוק בזה בסברות הפילוסופים ובסברות מי שיאמין בתורה. The expression מי שיאמין בתורה accords with the Arabic אלמתשרּע. Cf. More, III, 20 (41 b): אלפלאספה . . . כל מתשרע (Ibn Tibbon: הפילוסופים . . . כל בעל התורה). Vid. *Die Bibelexegese Moses Maimûni's*, p. 32, n. 3.

[6] This Agadic sentence gives rise to a digression on Moses' exalted spiritual position, from which we reproduce the following points. Moses attained the degree of the angels, therefore "were they afraid to come near him" (Ex. xxxiv. 10). He becomes, as it were "the acting intelligence" (שכל הפועל), the knowledge emanates from his soul upon the elders and also upon the multitude of Israel. Cf. Maimûni's words on Moses in his Commentary to the Mishnah, Introduction to Chelek, 7. Article of Creed, at the beginning (Porta Mosis, ed. Pococke, p. 169): וצאר פי רתבה אנמלאיכה.

ורשעים בחשך ידמו, 1 Sam. ii. 9[1].—That the teaching of Moses conduces to the salvation of the world to come[2] is proved by Malachi's exhortation (iii. 22), in connexion with the promise following immediately after (ver. 23)[3].

Matter forms a partition between man and his God[4]. The power of matter (sensuality) effects separation from God, and prepares the greatest pain for him who yearns after communion with God. On the other hand, those who are spiritually blind, and understand only the delights of the senses, know no other pain, except the want of sensual enjoyments. Therefore, the Torah, which has regard to the trend of the thoughts of the great multitude, promises sensual rewards for the fulfilment of the commandments, and corresponding punishment for their breach, Deut. xi. 13 sqq., Lev. xxvi. 3 sqq.[5] But[6] the promises of terrestrial rewards and terrestrial punishments refer also to those who see in the perfecting of the spirit their highest enjoyment; for the removing of the impeding misfortunes, and the fullness of welfare, afford the worthy the leisure

[1] Maimûni applies the passage in a similar manner to the deflecting of the thoughts from God, More, III, 51 (127 b). Vid. also ibid. III, 18.

[2] Vid. Mishne Torah, Teshouba 9, 1 : . . . הק"בה נתן לנו תורה זו עץ חיים.

[3] A rather lengthy digression follows on the prophet Elijah, who will rise from death to fulfil the promise given in Mal. iii. 23, which is taken to be a clinching proof that the resurrection of the dead is connected with the Messianic period, which was also indicated by Dan. xii. 13. That Elijah had really died is proved, partly because otherwise a fundamental article of our faith, namely, the unequalled greatness of Moses, would be shaken; and partly, from the expression לקח in 2 Kings ii. 5, which in other places also means to die. (Vid. Abulwalîd's *Dictionary*, art. לקח, at the end). Maimûni, in *Techijat Hammetim*, expresses himself less categorically on the concurrence of the resurrection and the advent of the Messiah (see on this point, Saadiah, *Emunot*, chap. VII), but he does not deny either. Dan. xii. 13 is cited there also as a convincing proof for the doctrine of the resurrection.

[4] ודע שהחומר מבדיל בין האיש ואדוניו. Cf. More, III, 9 : אלמאדה האגב עבים ען אדראך אלמפארק.

[5] Cf. *Die Bibelexegese der jüd. Religionsphilosophen*, p. 149 (Abraham Ibn Daûd).

[6] Before לפי (34 c, l. 34) some introductory word is missing in the text.

to work for perfection and the knowledge of truth[1], as expressed is Pss. xxii. 27 and xxxvii. 11.

That which the prophets say of the future world, and the sages of Paradise and Hell, is the allegorical expression to denote the delight of the soul in the proximity of her Creator (Ps. xvii. 15), and her pain caused by her distance from him. Reward and punishment after death cannot be corporeal, for the body is dissolved after death, and grass sprouts forth from its terrestrial remains, according to Isaiah's words (li. 12) ובן אדם חציר ינתן[2]. Therefore it is said in Ps. cxv. 17 : "The dead do not praise God," because the dead bodies are annihilated ; "but we will praise God to all eternity." These words, as well as those in Ps. xxx. 13, denote that the souls that have attained perfection will, after being severed from their terrestrial existence, praise God in all eternities, like the spheres and intelligences, of which Ps. xix. 2 and Is. vi. 3 say that they proclaim God's praise[3].

The foregoing analysis shows that the treatise on Eternal Salvation, bearing Maimûni's name, harmonizes, both in its leading thought and in a number of details, with ideas and utterances that are undoubtedly Maimûni's. Essential portions of the treatise, e.g. the allegorical interpretation of Ps. xlv, are, it is true, not otherwise attested ; yet do they not contain anything which would contradict Maimûni's authorship. Maimûni, who allegorically explained the Song of Solomon and the Proverbs, could also have made the said Psalm, which, in respect to its contents, approaches the Song of Solomon, the subject of an allegory. Even the remarkable explanation of צור, ver. 13, like צור, rock,

[1] This is the opinion expounded by Maimûni in M. T., Teshouba, 9, 1. Cf. *Die Bibelexegese Moses Maimûni's*, p. 96.

[2] To this he observes, that Isa. xl. 6, 8 had thus been interpreted before. Cf. on the subject, Mishne Torah, Teshouba, 8, 3–5 ; and *Tech. Hammetim* (Kôbez, II, 8 d).

[3] Vid. supra, p. 278, note 6.

has its analogy in the allegorical interpretation, given by Maimûni, of the prologue of the book of Job, in which he connects the proper noun עוץ with עוצו, Is. viii. 10, and finds in it an expression that Job's narrative must be well considered[1]. The contents of the second chapter (ceremonial commandments, prayer, ecstasy) deviate somewhat strongly from Maimûni's mode of thought; and, as to several details of the other sections, I could point to divergences from Maimûni's opinions expressed elsewhere. But, taking it all in all, it appears as unjustifiable to pronounce on our treatise the harsh judgment of Grätz[2], as to exclude it, without further cause, from the list of Maimûni's works. The rather uncouth form in which the work has been handed down to us, induces the belief that we have here an unfinished work of Maimûni's, into which, besides, foreign matter has been interpolated. A closer examination of the Arabic original will perhaps shed some more light over single points of this treatise, which, in view of the greater part of its contents, is by no means unworthy of Maimûni.

W. BACHER.

Budapest, May, 1896.

[1] More, III. 22. On the allegory in Maimûni's exegesis, vid. *Die Bibelexegese Moses Maimûni's*, ch. II.

[2] *History of the Jews*, VI[3], 389: "It contains so many trivialities, and such a shallow moral doctrine, interspersed with a symbolic interpretation of the temple, and of the Agada, that it is impossible for such inane matter to have emanated from a sage."

LOVED OF MY SOUL.

Attributed by some to Jehudah Halevi (born 1086), and by others to Israel Nagara (16th century).

LOVED of my soul! Father of grace!
Lead on thy servant to thy favouring sight;
He, fleetly as the hart, shall speed his pace
To bow him low before thy glorious might.
Sweet is thy love to him beyond compare,
Sweeter than honey, fairer than things fair.

Splendour of worlds! honoured, adored!
My soul is sick with pining love of thee;
My God! I pray thee, heal her: be implored;
And o'er her let thy holy sweetness be
A soothing strength to stay her yearning sore,
And joy shall be for her for evermore.

Source of all good! pity thou me!
And be thou moved for thy belovèd son.
Ah! would that I could rise aloft and see
The beauty of thy strength, thou Mighty One.
These things my soul desireth: Lord, I pray,
Grant me thy mercy; turn thee not away.

Be thou revealed, Dearest of mine!
And spread o'er me thy canopy of peace;
Lo! with thy glory all the earth shall shine,
And we shall know a joy that shall not cease.
Hasten, Belovèd, for the time is nigh,
And have compassion as in days gone by.

NINA DAVIS.

THE PROPHET JEREMIAH AND THE PERSONIFICATION OF ISRAEL.

ATTRIBUTED TO KALIR (ABOUT 950 A. D.).

FULL in her glory, she as Tirzah[1] fair
Hath sinned and fallen; lo! the angels weep
There at the threshold of her sanctuary.
Forth from the Temple, over Zion's mount
Wandered Hilkiah's son[2], and chanced to meet
A woman, beauteous, but with grief distraught.
Appalled I ask, in name of God and man!
"Art thou dread phantom? Art thou human form?
For while thy beauty mouldeth woman fair,
Awe shadoweth spirit from the vast unknown!"

"I am not phantom nor vile clay of earth;
I shall be known when I return in rest[3].
Lo! of the one am I! of three am I!
Lo! of six hundred thousand and of twelve!
Yea, and behold me of the seventy-one!
O prophet! know: the 'one' is Abraham;
Three be the fathers; verily in me
Behold the third[4], God's messenger of peace;
The 'twelve' I show thee, be the tribes of God[5]
Six hundred thousand of redeemèd men[6];
And their Sanhedrin, wrought of seventy-one."

"List to my counsel: Oh return! repent!
Since thou art thus endowed, so proud in state,

[1] Song of Songs, vi. 4. [2] Jeremiah. [3] Isa. xxx. 15.
[4] Isa. xix. 24. [5] Ps. cxxii. 4.
[6] The 600,000 redeemed from Egypt.

'Tis fitting that thou should'st exultant rise,
To glory in the mission of thy race;
'Backsliding daughter'[1]! cast that brand of shame!"

"Can I rejoice, or lift my voice in song?
Behold my children given to the foe!
My prophets martyred, yea, their life-blood spilt!
My kings, my princes, and my holy priests
Borne into distant exile, fetter-bound.
Far from mine House, the Sacred Presence fled,
Shunning the place of mine iniquity;
Yea, thence did my Belovèd flee away,
And left the beauty of my tent to wane
And set in darkness nevermore to rise.
'How doth the city, once with heroes thronged,
Great 'mid the nations, now sit solitary![2]'"
Pausing, she glided to the Prophet's side,
And with imploring utterance whispering spake:
"Plead to thy God for this my bitter wound;
Beseech him for the tempest-stricken soul!
Until he softened say: 'It is enough!'
And save my sons from exile and the sword."

With suppliant's plea he prayed before his Lord:
"O God of mercy! let compassion flow,
E'en as a father pitieth his son."
And cried: "Doth not a father mourn his child
Carried away to harsh captivity?
And woe unto the son in exile chained,
When at his father's board his place is void!"
"Prophet! arise, depart!" the vision bade:
"Call now the sleeping fathers from their rest;
And Moses, yea, and Aaron shall awake;
O let the shepherds peal to Heaven a wail,
For lo! the wolves of night have torn the lamb!"

[1] Jer. xxxi. 22. [2] Lam. i. 1.

The Prophet's voice with mighty yearning swelled,
And shook with heaving sobs Machpelah's cave:
"O glorious sires! lift up your voice and weep!
Your sons have erred; behold them captives bound!
If they, weak mortals, have transgressed the bond,
Where, fathers, doth your merit slumber now,
That sanctified of old the covenant?"
"What crave ye, sons, from me? the doom is fixed!
This is my judgment; this is my decree!
The shrine is desolate, bereft of men;
None cometh in upon the solemn day;
Behold, the steps of my belovèd fail."

"But thou wilt yet restore them as of old,
O thou Sustainer! thou that givest strength!
And pity Zion; for the time is come."

NINA DAVIS.

ANOTHER WORD ON THE DIETARY LAWS.

In the form of a Critical Notice of the late Dr. Wiener's *Die jüdischen Speisegesetze*, there appeared in the April Number of the Jewish Quarterly Review a truculent attack on the Jewish Dietary Laws by Mr. C. G. Montefiore. The writer's active participation in philanthropic and social movements within and without the Jewish community, his zealous pursuit and generous encouragement of Jewish science and the not-to-be-despised gift of a graceful style confer a title to consideration upon everything that proceeds from his pen. The article in question demands especial notice. For the topic it discusses is not of an academic character — the elucidation of an obscure point in philology or archaeology—but one fraught with living interest to every son and daughter of Israel. The Dietary Laws form an important and considerable section of that Institutional element which constitutes at present the main difference between Judaism and other creeds, and which must be justified if the maintenance of Judaism as a separate creed is to be defended. The Monotheistic dogma has been assimilated by Islam completely, and by Christendom in a modified form. The maligned Schulchan Aruch regards the doctrine of the Trinity in the Christian faith, not as Polytheism, but as qualified Unitarianism. The morality of Israel's prophets has long since become the common property of all civilized peoples. As missionaries of doctrine and ethical teachers the Jews have been outstripped in the race by the Moslem and Christian. The latter are the bearers of the light to the heathens. If the Hebrew has resisted absorption, and Israel is still "a people dwelling alone and not to be

counted among the nations," it is because of the strong hold Institutionalism has upon him [1]. The preservation of his distinct individuality is largely due to the observance of the Dietary Laws. By his onslaught on these, Mr. Montefiore has incurred a heavy responsibility. He has played into the hands of the anti-Semites who have in recent years made the Schechita a *Tagesfrage* in France, Prussia, Bohemia, Moravia, and Switzerland. He has provided weak-kneed adherents with a salve for their conscience, a lame excuse for ridding themselves of the last encumbering shreds of the faith in which they were born.

It would be too sanguine to expect that Mr. Montefiore will surrender his views. The modest object of this Reply is to defend the logical character of the traditional interpretation of the Dietary Laws and at the same time to point out to the assailants how untenable is their own position, that they either go too far or not far enough.

[1] To avoid misapprehension, I should like to say that the purpose of the above remarks is not to disparage the importance of the Monotheistic dogma in Judaism, but to save the rest of that system from being overshadowed by its single creed or swamped by mere *Schwärmerei.* Abstract theological propositions are, by themselves, sterile and futile. Their value consists in their furnishing either a firm basis for conduct or a powerful spring to action. Belief has been well defined as *readiness to act.* If the duties of the intellect and heart are the vital force of Judaism, "practical duties" are its backbone. The Jewish, like other Oriental religions, regulates the whole of life, not one side of it, and disciplines all the faculties of mind—the will, the emotions, and the intellect. The *Shemang* accordingly opens with the declaration of the Unity of God, addressed to the reason. The next verse is an appeal to the heart for love and devotion to the Almighty. The emphasis of the paragraph, however, is to be found in the weighty peroration which enjoins practical instruction in the Torah and such ceremonials as Tephillin and Mezuzah. Those who advocate the abrogation of ceremonies in Judaism ignore Israel's character as a kingdom of priests with priestly duties and obligations. What they term the spiritualization of the creed resolves itself for many into vague emotions and morals divorced from the discipline of the Law. Their efforts, if generally successful, would reduce the religion of Israel to an impalpable, indefinite entity, bearing a close analogy to those gaseous products of the chemist's retort, which may be exceedingly aromatic, but which rapidly exhale and evaporate.

Mr. Montefiore remarks that "it is impossible for persons of culture to keep the Dietary Laws." "The Jewish Dietary Laws are a bit of Asia in Europe which can never prosper in their new environment. They belong to a stage of religious custom which, for all civilized persons, has passed away" (p. 393). According to this statement, then, not only must millions of Jews in past centuries who faithfully observed the Dietary Laws, and their equally numerous descendants who follow in their footsteps, be excluded from the pale of civilization, but the great Jewish thinkers, exegetists and grammarians, poets and philosophers, must also be denied the claim to culture. Maimonides, the brilliant jurist, physician, and psychologist; Ibn Ezra, astronomer, mathematician, and commentator; Jehuda Halevi, the Poet of Castile; Solomon ibn Gebirol, universally admired in the middle ages under the name of Avicebron, must all have been devoid of culture. For these lights and leaders, in spite of the wide sweep and freedom of their bold speculations, and the lofty flights of their soaring imaginations, were, in practice, respecters of the authority of tradition, and scrupulously observed the Dietary Laws, as also did Moses Mendelssohn, pioneer and representative of the Renaissance of secular learning among the Jews of Germany at the close of the eighteenth century.

It is not the Biblical enactments but their Rabbinical interpretations against which the writer directs his fiercest diatribes. "It is a crying necessity of the times that the Rabbinic developments of the Dietary Laws should be authoritatively removed" (p. 395). The reason given for the alleged necessity is passing strange. These regulations are to be abrogated not because otherwise conscientious and sincere Israelites have complained of their difficulty and burdensomeness, but "because they are disobeyed from carelessness or indifference or convenience." Can any ratiocination be more inept? Accept the laxity of the indifferent as a standard of conduct and not a single religious observance will survive. The Sabbath is violated by

jobbers and brokers who prefer the boisterous excitement of the Kaffir and Westralian markets, with their chances of profit, to the decorous calm of the synagogue and home services. The transgression of the fourth commandment is due, in their case, to nothing but carelessness, indifference, and convenience. Hence it is the clear duty of the ecclesiastical authorities to abrogate the institution of the seventh-day Sabbath, or at least its Rabbinical development, and authoritatively to sanction Saturday attendance to business by Jews. The Abrahamic rite is a strange oriental custom; it should, therefore, be dropped as out of harmony with European culture. In this way, every institution of Judaism would go by the board. The truth is that the experiment of making concessions to the indifferentists has not hitherto been attended with brilliant success. This class of nominal Jews neither experience the need of authoritative abrogation, nor do they wait for it. Mr. Montefiore dolefully asks, "How long is Judaism to contain strange customs which its own adherents, as soon as they are Europeanized, begin to throw aside?" (p. 396). The assertion, made in good faith, is based on too limited an experience. For Mr. Montefiore's hundreds or even thousands of indifferentists, there are millions who cling with heart and soul and might to the traditional observances. The hope and future of Judaism rest not on that inconsiderable section who rebel against the discipline of their creed as a galling yoke and who, sooner or later, leave the community, but on the bulk of Israel who cheerfully make sacrifices for their faith. For them the Law of God is perfect, enduring for ever, and certainly of higher account than European culture. They obey the precepts of the Law because they regard them as orders of the Great Captain issued to His hosts, whose business it is not to argue about them, but to learn and understand and do them. Theirs not to reason why, theirs but to do—and live. The motive for obedience is the Divine origin of these laws. Their ultimate purpose is man's

welfare here and hereafter. And this distinction between motive and purpose sufficiently disposes, I think, of the contention that "the Dietary Laws in their origin, and probably in their development, had nothing to do (except unconsciously) with self-control or with sanitation" (pp. 394, 395)—a statement, which, as it stands, is easily refuted. The answer to its first half may be given in a single text. "Only be strong and firm not to eat blood," is surely an injunction to self-restraint. Every religious restriction obviously fosters the virtue of self-control. The second half, reiterated later on in a more general form,—"The founders and developers of the Dietary Laws did not confound religion with hygiene" (p. 395),—flies in the face of the numerous hygienic regulations of the Pentateuch, the religious character of which is undeniable. The reward promised for obedience to God's commandments is physical health and material prosperity. "If thou wilt listen to my commandments, it will be well with thee and thou wilt live long." "If thou wilt listen to the voice of the Lord thy God, all the diseases which I have sent upon the Egyptians, I will not send upon thee, for I, the Lord, am thy physician." In a theocratic constitution regulations to secure public health are necessarily a part of religion. It argues ignorance of the spirit of Judaism to speak of a confusion between hygiene and religion when the former is subsumed under the latter. Of the close connexion between the two the Rabbis were fully conscious when they laid down the principle חמירא סכנתא מאסורא.

A remark of the writer's to which objection may properly be taken is one like the following: "A determining superstition was this, that certain kinds of physical cleanliness and uncleanliness are of vast importance from the point of view of religion and personal safety" (p. 394). The sentence is quoted *in extenso*, because it is so astounding that condensation would not have done justice to it. That personal cleanliness plays an important part in the economy

of Judaism is readily conceded. Baptism is a Jewish rite; washing of the hands and feet and entire body, scrupulous cleanliness of person, clothing, dwelling, and all utensils, are frequently enjoined in Bible, Talmud, and Schulchan Aruch.

Physical cleanliness is an essential of moral purity of which it is a type. The saying, "Cleanliness is next to godliness," has been anticipated in the memorable aphorism (end of Kiddushin), "R. Pinchas b. Jair, says physical cleanliness leads to purity of mind and soul, and these are necessary antecedents to fitness for the reception of the Holy Spirit." The Essenes, according to Graetz, derive their name from their practice of frequent ablutions. A Jewish sect is termed טובלי שחרית, *Hemerobaptistai*, because one of their religious exercises was daily baptism. No further illustrations are needed of the supreme importance Judaism attaches to cleanliness. But why should this passion for physical purity be branded as a superstition? Is the mediaeval anchorite's penchant for dirt a nobler trait? One might almost suspect that the condemnation of cleanliness was influenced by a semi-conscious reminiscence of Jesus' defence of his disciples who neglected to wash their hands (Matt. xv. 2–20). But Jesus is not accepted as an exponent of Judaism. And Christian theologians have been at pains to explain away that episode in the life of their Master[1].

Another passage that must arouse considerable astonish-

[1] The writer's remark might possibly refer to the separation in ancient times from unclean people that this scrupulous regard to cleanliness inevitably involves. The value and justification of these rules of separation is demonstrated in an article by an English army doctor on a similar system that obtains in India at the present day (see the *Nineteenth Century* for October, 1896: "The Cholera Goddess"). The objectionable feature that plays so large a part in the Indian system of hygiene, viz. caste of birth, was unknown among the Jews. The Chaberim, who formed voluntary associations for the scrupulous observance of the biblical laws of purity, belonged to all sections of the people, learned and unlearned, rich and poor. Every one could become a Chaber, if he consented to conform to the rules of the association.

ment is the following: "The Dietary Laws were a part and parcel of the popular religion to which the prophets were opposed. The people could only be won over to the doctrines of the prophets 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" (p. 395).

Here, there are two propositions for which not a shred of evidence is adduced. First, that the Dietary Laws, like the rest of the Ceremonial Law in the Pentateuch, are a mass of superstition. Second, that the prophets, at first opposed to them, at length adopted them to win adherents for their own religious principles.

Samuel angry with Saul and the people for eating the flesh of sheep "with the blood[1]"; Isaiah inveighing against those who "eat the flesh of the swine, the abominable thing, and the mouse[2]"; Ezekiel, who claims that he never violated the Dietary Laws[3], were all forsooth merely playing a part. They spread the aegis of orthodoxy over superstitions which in time became so firmly rooted in the conscience of the nation that for their sake Daniel and the three children refused to partake of the king's banquet in the Babylonian Court[4]; the Maccabean heroes revolted against Antiochus' tyranny, and Eleazar, the old man of ninety, voluntarily suffered a martyr's death. This superstition is so universally respected that even the Karaite, who has discarded the authority of tradition, still scrupulously observes the minutiae of *Schechitah* and *Melichah*! Is it credible that the prophets were, in their hearts, opposed to these observances? Will any one believe that the fiery and fearless men of God who, in the cause of justice and truth, spared neither priest nor prince nor people, who denounced the grasping greed of the rich oppressor that ground the face of the poor, and "added

[1] 1 Sam. xiv. 32.
[2] Isa. lxvi. 17.
[3] Ezek. iv. 14.
[4] Dan. i. 8–20.

house to house till there was no room in the land," who derided formalism devoid of righteousness: will any one believe that these men were so mealy-mouthed and poor-spirited, such cowards and hypocrites, as to compound with their consciences and compromise with what they were convinced was wrong. An Elijah who perilled his life in his life-long fight against Jezebel's idolatry, and would tolerate no "trimming" in religion, who cried out to the nation "How long halt ye between two opinions? if the Lord is God, serve him; but if Baal, then serve him[1];" a Jeremiah who was lowered into the dungeon because he was not afraid to utter truths unpalatable to the court, and who asked: "What has straw to do with wheat?"—were these and their colleagues the men to mix up the precious grain, after it had been laboriously winnowed, with the worthless chaff, deliberately to mingle truth and falsehood? The supposition is an absurd self-contradiction.

The prophets attacked lapses from the high standard of Mosaic ethics. But they never treated Mosaic ceremonials with levity. They came to confirm the Law, not to destroy it. The last of the prophets concludes his exhortation with the monition: "Remember ye the law of Moses, my servant, which I commanded unto him in Horeb[2]." In the Pentateuch no division is drawn between ethics and ceremonials. The nineteenth chapter of Leviticus mingles the loftiest ethical rules with the minutest ceremonial details of the most heterogeneous description, and the heading of the whole chapter is: "Be ye holy, for I the Lord your God am holy."

The sneers about the Almighty revealing to Moses the proper mode of slaughtering sheep and oxen, and the strictures on the Rabbinical interpretation of *Nevelah* and *Terefah*, are spent arrows, that fall harmlessly. To the Infinite and All-Compassionate the health and happiness of his creatures, whether human beings or brutes, is

[1] 1 Kings xviii. 21. [2] Mal. iv. 4.

certainly not trivial. If Schechitah is the most humane mode of slaughtering cattle [1], and the Jewish Bedikah the most thorough and efficient system of examination of carcasses, ensuring to the observant Jew wholesome food, there is nothing derogatory in the conception that Schechitah and Bedikah are ordained by Divine appointment. The doctrine of Monotheism, the ordinance of the Sabbath, the sanctity of the life, honour, property, and good repute of our neighbours, in fine, the entire Moral Law did not need a specific Revelation. The human intellect was equal to the task of discovering these necessary foundations of a stable society. If revelation were at all required, it was to teach us ceremonials and rites which lie outside ordinary experience, and the knowledge of which the finite human mind could never have independently attained to instruct us in the duty of man to God, to himself, and to our dumb friends.

That the Dietary Laws are neglected in some quarters need not fill our souls with alarm for the continuance of Judaism. To live up to a high standard of religion is difficult. In the days of the Judges and Kings, the abandonment, by many, of the service of God for the worship of Baal and Ashtaroth, and Chemosh, did not destroy Judaism; and it will certainly not perish because their descendants at the present day mingle among the nations and copy their ways. Every effort should be made to retain and reclaim the indifferent, but not at the sacrifice of principle. The best interests of the Jewish religion are certainly not served by trimming our sails to catch each passing breeze of opinion, and sanctioning the laxity of those who do not wait for and do not require Rabbinical authority to do what seems good in their own eyes.

"We can 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

[1] There is a vast literature on this subject. Reference may be made most profitably to Dembo's *Jewish Method of Slaughter*, pp. 98, 99.

religious wrapping" (p. 396). This sounds extremely plausible. But it is nevertheless fallacious. The fallacy lurks in the little word *mere*, in the first of the sentences quoted. A religious precept is a complex and not a simple fact. In as far as it is accepted as of Divine origin, and obeyed as such, it has a religious character. Where it promotes physical health, it serves a hygienic purpose. If it further trains in temperance and self-restraint, it is disciplinary [1].

The fact that the Dietary prohibitions of the Pentateuch have counterparts in other creeds does not weaken their obligatory character any more than the general prohibition of murder among the nations destroys the binding force of the sixth commandment. Accept the Pentateuch as a Divine revelation and its laws are entitled to obedience, whether parallels are found in other codes or not. Reject this belief, then Judaism, as a separate religion, loses its *raison d'être*, and it is absurd to discriminate between the more authoritative Biblical and less authoritative Rabbinical enactments. The term "authority," when applied to the former is as much a misnomer as when applied to the latter. Reason becomes then sole arbiter in all things. What it approves may be retained. Everything else should be remorselessly swept away as useless lumber, encumbering the ground. The ardent reformer ought certainly not weakly to allow himself to be swayed by mere sentiment. It therefore surprises one to read Mr. Montefiore's confession that though the Dietary Laws are to him senseless, he observes a class of them out of respect for a relative. The following may not unfairly be assumed to be the reason of his discrimination between Biblical and Rabbinical ordinances. The Bible is so firmly seated in the consciences of Jews and Gentiles,

[1] The Midrash Tanchuma on שמיני indicates this view with special application to the Dietary Laws: וכי מה איכפת לו להקב"ה בין ששחט הבהמה ואוכל או אם נוחר ואוכל כלום אתה מועילו או אתה מזיקו . . . הא לא ניתנו המצות אלא לצרף בהן את בריות וישראל.

that to repudiate its teachings would cause a shock, and provoke reaction. It is safer far to gird at the Rabbinical developments which have already served as a target for attack. Demolish the latter and the former will crumble away of their own accord. But the plan is fore-doomed to failure. The so-called reformers of Judaism who have repudiated the authority of tradition are not a disciplined army, but a confused rabble without cohesion or solidarity. They do not keep in line. Each of them is a law to himself and frames his own religious code. The attempt to throw over Rabbinism has been repeatedly made — and with what result? Let history speak. The Sadducees who seceded from the main body have perished, and left no trace behind them. The Karaites have survived. But what a sorry spectacle does their ritualism—rigid to absurdity—present? Their interpretation of the commandment "Ye shall kindle no fire throughout your habitation on the Sabbath day[1]," forces them to sit in the cold and dark on the long winter evenings. It has, however, to be remembered, as has already been noted, that the Karaites observe the laws of Schechitah as strictly as the Rabbinites. It is not my province to enter upon a set defence and detailed justification of the Rabbinical interpretations of the Dietary Laws. To do justice to them would require the profound and varied acquirements of a Dembo. Only one as versed as he is in Talmud and Medicine could expound scientifically the Hilchot Terefoth in the masterly manner in which he has demonstrated the utility and wisdom of the Hilchot Schechitah[2]. But the fallacies in some of Mr. Montefiore's strictures lie so obviously on the surface that the most ordinary intelligence cannot miss them. He attacks, for example, the Jewish mode of washing and salting the meat, which, he says, deprives it of a large proportion of

[1] Exod. xxxv. 3.

[2] See Dembo's *Jewish Method of Slaughter* (Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co., 1894), passim.

its nutrient value. We would request Mr. Montefiore to visit a slaughter-house and examine the cloth with which the interiors of the carcasses are rubbed down; to visit butchers' shops in poor neighbourhoods, where the air reeks with foul fumes, and where the raw, bleeding surface of beef and mutton is exposed for hours to miasmatic influences,—and he will appreciate the wise regulation that, before being prepared for human consumption, meat must be washed and salted,—not as Mr. Montefiore alleges, "to deprive it of every driblet of blood," but merely to remove the stagnant, impure, diseased, germ-laden, surface blood. Nor is it absolutely essential that meat should be soaked in water for half-an-hour and salted for an hour; grilling on the live coals for a few minutes serves the same purpose, and is sufficient.

Wiener quotes an opinion that the excessive washing and salting of the meat leads to diseases of the intestines among the Jews. I have been at some pains to obtain confirmation of this allegation, but, up to the present, without success. No medical man whom I have consulted has heard of the special prevalence of this class of maladies among his Jewish patients. It was, moreover, pointed out to me that sailors and marines in our royal and merchant navies live for months at a time on salt junket. And yet intestinal diseases are not markedly noticeable among this class of our population. That salt extracts a portion of nourishment is undeniable. But it acts as a powerful antiseptic, destroying disease-germs and rendering the flesh on which it is sprinkled sweet and wholesome. The gain in the immunity it secures the Jewish people from disease far more than counterbalances the loss of nutrient elements [1].

[1] On the superior vitality of the Jews, admittedly due, to a large extent, to the observance of the Dietary Laws, there is a large number of Articles in the Medical Press, here and abroad, which may be traced in Neale's *Medical Digest*. Mr. Marcus Adler's paper on the *Health Laws of the Bible and their influence upon the life condition of the Jews*, is valuable for its statistics.

"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" (p. 400). I will only pause for a moment to note that, as Dr. Phillipson did not belong to the orthodox party, his statement as to the inadequacy of the Rabbinical regulations for the examination of carcasses is not the admission of a friend but the assertion of an opponent, which ought not to be accepted without proof. But even granting for the sake of argument that he is right, surely an inadequate examination is better than none at all. It secures the rejection of a large proportion of diseased meat, while all the efforts of the official inspectors cannot prevent the sale and consumption of meat which, on the testimony of unbiassed experts, ought to have been condemned as carrion[1]. It would be an excellent thing for the health of the general community if the "inadequate" Jewish mode of examination were universally adopted. The risk of the communication of tuberculosis and other diseases from brutes to human beings would be considerably diminished.

"In any case, should a minister of religion decide whether meat is fit or unfit for human food? The relegation of such questions to a minister, as a part of his religious duties, would be farcical, were it not so sad" (p. 400). This is a question which admits of discussion. What holier function can any individual exercise than that of ministering to the health of the community? Did not the priests in ancient times decide as to the symptoms of leprosy? Were not those shining lights of Judaism, the Aristotelian Maimonides and the Cabbalist Nachmanides, practising physicians? The duty of slaughtering animals has a tendency to brutalize those who take part in it. Who are more likely to discharge this function with humanity and consideration—coarse, callous yokels

[1] Behrend, "Diseases caught from Butchers' Meat," in the *Nineteenth Century Magazine*, 1889, p. 411, quotation from the *Glasgow Herald*.

or men of knowledge and refinement? The examination of carcasses for disease is a delicate and responsible duty, on which the health of an entire community depends, and not to be lightly entrusted to any one.

"The words of Scripture are twisted to find Biblical authority for the Talmudic enactments" (p. 400). The first example of this "bouleversement" is the prohibition of the sinew of the hind quarters. Mr. Montefiore renders the text in Genesis "Therefore the children of Israel *eat* not of the sinew of the hip." They *shall not* eat is, to his mind, a grammatical impossibility. I should like to know why. In Hebrew, as in English, the future is used in an imperative sense, as every tyro who reads the Decalogue knows. And even if the text does not enunciate a rule but simply recites a custom, a scholar like Mr. Montefiore need not be reminded of the legal principle "Inveterata consuetudo pro lege non immerito custoditur[1]." Where a uniform usage commends itself to the consciousness of the people, it is law. "Mos legis vicem sustinet." It is nowhere recorded that at any period in Jewish history the custom in question has been abrogated.

"Salting and Schechita are pure figments and inventions of the Rabbis, without any Scriptural basis" (p. 401). A bold statement, unsupported by a shadow of proof. All the weight of evidence runs counter to it. The radicals שחט and הרג are not synonymous. The exclusive use of the former term in connexion with sacrifices surely points to a definite and prescribed mode of slaughter. As early as the times of the New Testament a beast not slaughtered in the lawful mode was termed *πνικτός*, "strangled." If the Rock of the Church was vouchsafed a vision which he interpreted as a permission to Christians to partake of what had been previously forbidden, surely the Jews have not the right to avail themselves of this dispensation.

[1] Digest I. 3. 32; Dig. xxi. 1. 31. 20; Cod. 8. 53. 2; cp. the strong expression of Aristotle in Pol. II, 5: *ὁ γὰρ νόμος ἰσχὺν οὐδεμίαν ἔχει πρὸς τὸ πείθεσθαι πλὴν παρὰ τὸ ἔθος*, quoted in Moyle's *Justinian*, Notes, pp. 98, 99.

The writer falls foul of the Talmud for its extension of the terms Nevelah and Terefah to include animals that had been slaughtered without Schechitah or were found to have suffered from mortal disease. This he calls an "absolute inversion of the meaning of the text" (p. 401). Here, again, I take leave to join issue. Where only one definite mode of slaughter is recognized, animals that have come to their death in any other way may, I think, legitimately be regarded as coming under the category of Nevelah.

Again, as to the connotation of Terefah. Does it make the slightest difference whether an ox has had its vitals torn by a wild beast or whether it was mortally injured by fire or poison? In each of these cases we have a lesion sufficient to cause death, and render the flesh unfit for food. On the other hand, an animal about to succumb to old age may have perfectly healthy organs. Its flesh will possibly be tough but not necessarily unwholesome. A person with a nice taste would not care to partake of it, but there is no reason why it should be prohibited if the animal has been properly slaughtered and found free from disease. This disposes of the strange case which excites Mr. Montefiore's natural astonishment (end of second paragraph, p. 402). The Biblical peg on which the traditional Law of Schechitah is hung is the text: "*Thou shalt slaughter as I commanded thee.*" The phrase "as I commanded thee," implies an oral law, contemporaneous with the written law. Analogy with ancient and modern legislations proves that contemporaneously with the Lex Scripta the Lex Non-Scripta must have developed. Early Roman Law was preserved in the Pontifical College by means of oral traditions which the Twelve Tables only codified. The bulk of the English Common Law consists of customs and Judges' oral decisions —"Precedents broadening down in the process of the suns." Even the precise force and application of a new statute depends ultimately on its interpretation by the Courts. The necessity of tradition to elucidate, develop, and apply to the needs

of practical life, the brief notes, pithy statements, and leading cases of which the Pentateuchal legislation mainly consists, is an obvious truism. The definition of "work" forbidden on the Sabbath, the selection of plants "with which to rejoice on the feast of Tabernacles," the precise connotation of the "affliction of the soul," enjoined for the Day of Atonement, are all fixed by tradition. Mr. Montefiore will probably dissent from this line of reasoning. How then does he explain "And thou shalt slaughter as I commanded thee"? This phrase, he says, refers to the previous permission to eat meat without a sacrifice. So permission is expressed in Hebrew by the verb צוה, "to command"! Further comment is needless.

The traditional prohibition of milk and meat, of course, comes in for rough handling. But assuming that the text is to be taken in its absolute literal sense; could the law have been carried out without the legitimate extensive interpretation that the Rabbis have given it? Will any one venture to assert that a kid must not be boiled in its dam's milk, but may be boiled in the milk of a she-goat not its dam; that this prohibition is exclusively restricted to the *kids of the goats*, while calves may be boiled in goats' or cows' milk? Obviously, if the Pentateuchal rule had not been extended to all boiled mixtures of milk and meat, it would have remained a dead letter.

That the Dietary Laws, as we know them at present, can be traced to the days of Moses is a startling assertion. But a moment's consideration will show its intrinsic probability. If external blemishes of a slight character rendered, according to the Priestly Code[1], an animal unfit to be brought on God's altar, would tuberculous lungs not have proved a fatal disqualification? From the earliest times there must surely have been a regular system of examination of the carcass as well as a prescribed mode of slaughter[2],—the progenitors of the modern systems of

[1] Lev. xxii. 19–24.

[2] That the mode of slaughter now practised by the Jews by a transverse

Schechitah and Bedikah. It is not pretended that the tree of Judaism has not in the course of ages increased in height and breadth, but one may fairly claim that the growth has been natural, the branches are of the same fibre as the stock and the root. The impulse to development has always been an anxious solicitude to safeguard the Divine Law. The Jewish traditions and the Jewish scriptures are both words of the living God.

M. HYAMSON.

horizontal section was ancient may derive some support from the biblical expressions חץ שחוט, an arrow shot forth horizontally (see Rashi and Kimchi); וחוט שחוט, "threads of gold drawn out."

THE SOURCES OF JOSEPHUS FOR THE HISTORY OF SYRIA

(*In "Antiquities,"* XII, 3—XIII, 14).

WHEN Josephus was about to write the history of the Jews under the reign of the Seleucides, he was not only obliged to look for information dealing with the events of his own native country, but also to have regard to such sources as had the general affairs of the Syrian empire for their object. For the fortunes of the little states of Asia anterior were intimately connected with the conditions of the land of the Seleucides, and the Judaeans also felt the effects of the uninterrupted contentions for the throne and of the troubles of war. Palestine had no rest, from the death of Alexander the Great, when the struggle about his heritage commenced between his generals, till the decisive victories of John Hyrcanus (128 before the common Era) which brought about the independence of the Jews. If Josephus intended to make his exposition of the particularly Jewish history clear and intelligible, it was indispensable for him to relate, however briefly, the incidents of the Syrian empire, in as far as they affected, and exercised an influence on, Judaea. It was therefore to be expected that he would give a complete narrative of everything that had happened in Judaea since Alexander's death, and give, in the course of his report, a short account of the wars of the *Diadochi*, inasmuch as they influenced the configuration of the conditions of Jerusalem. Yet, he produces for the whole period up to Antiochus the Great only very scanty reports, and hardly any of such a nature, that even the skeleton of

a history could be formed from them; and, in the place of reliable traditions, he communicates extracts from Hellenistic writings of doubtful value [1]. It is only in chapter XII, 3 that the *Antiquities* again contain matter of historical value, mainly obtained by Josephus by an ample use of the first book of the Maccabees, and continued to any length only as long as the same work gave assistance. It is remarkable that the information about the events in Syria, drawn from the works of pagan Greek historians, also commences at the same passage of the *Antiquities*, where the extracts from the first book of the Maccabaeans begin, and they continue in every chapter up to XIII, 14, so that we may conjecture at the outset, that the authority, from which Josephus drew, commenced its narrative with Antiochus the Great. It must further be observed that the relation between the Jewish source and the Greek in several portions of the *Antiquities* is different, inasmuch as the communication of Syrian events, which are rarely, and then very briefly only, given in those cases where the first book of the Maccabees offers ample material, becomes more loquacious and more frequent in XIII, 7, 1, where the Jewish narrative is at an end [2]. The scantier the descriptions of the affairs of Judaea become in book XIII, the more copious and ample does the narrative, drawn from non-Jewish sources, become.

The latter, so valuable for the history of Syria, were thoroughly investigated by Bloch [3], Nussbaum [4], and Destinon [5]. The two first scholars have come to the conclusion that Josephus drew these particulars from Polybius and Posidonius, who had written on the history of Syria. Destinon, on the other hand, is of opinion that

[1] Cf. Gutschmid, *Kleine Schriften*, IV, 350; Schürer, I, 138 sqq.; Willrich, *Juden und Griechen*, p. 6.

[2] Vide Destinon, *Die Quellen des Flavius Josephus*, pp. 40 sqq., 46; Niese, in *Hermes*, XI, 468.

[3] *Die Quellen des Flavius Josephus.*

[4] *Observationes in Flavii Josephi Antiquitatum libros XII, 3—XIII, 14.*

[5] l. c.

Josephus, although acquainted with the works of these historians, had not made any direct use of them, but had found them blended already with Jewish sources, to which he added only a few abstracts, for the most part without value, from Jewish legendary works. As to the authors that are quoted by Josephus by name, Bloch and Destinon prove that he knew them from their works, from which he took the passages produced by him. Without, for the present, deciding in favour of the one or the other opinion, I will take for my starting-point some separate citations, and arrive at a general judgment on the source of Josephus' information on Syria, after we have been led by them to a recognition of their constituent parts.

1. *Nicholas of Damascus in "Antiquities,"* XIII, 8, 4.

In this chapter, Josephus describes the relation between John Hyrcanus and the Seleucidean king Antiochus VII Sidetes, after the conclusion of the peace between them, and relates that Hyrcanus accompanied Antiochus, whose ally he was, in his war with the Parthians, and supported him with his troops. He then adds: *μάρτυς δὲ τούτων ἡμῖν ἐστιν καὶ Νικόλαος ὁ Δαμασκηνὸς οὕτως ἱστορῶν*, "my evidence is here also Nicholas of Damascus." These words would imply that Josephus had yet another source for his narrative of the participation of Hyrcanus in the campaign against the Parthians, besides Nicholas, since he quotes the latter only as evidence for that which had been told already. But Bloch[1] and Destinon[2] have shown that in reference to Josephus' allegations the course taken by him probably consisted in this. Josephus read the reports of the historians, and copied, for his use, those which he thought to be of service for his own work. In writing the *Antiquities* he utilized the notes he had made in such a way, that, wherever they agreed with his principal source, he added them with a mere mention of the author. But when this

[1] *Die Quellen des Flavius Josephus*, p. 99.

[2] Ibid., p. 59.

was not the case, he first added the contents of his note in his own words, and then confirmed by a verbal citation that which was apparently the information of his principal source, but in reality his own abstract from the contents. This was also found to be the case by Niese[1], when he investigated the documents and decrees inserted by Josephus in the *Antiquities*, and he observes on this point: "On noticing the mode in which they are inserted, it appears that Josephus, when occupied with inserting them, had nothing to assist him, except the documents themselves; that he could take the leading points, the chronological and material indications of their arrangement, from themselves, in order to connect them with his principal source. . . . . For even the introductions, by means of which he connects the documents with that which precedes them, are not independent information, but have themselves been derived from the documents, with little trouble." It is thus that the sentence dealing with Hyrcanus's expedition in the Parthian war, which precedes the quotation from Nicholas, has also been taken from this historian, Josephus first excerpting the contents from Nicholas' description, and then verbally reproducing the passage itself.

From this it follows that Nicholas had written the history of Antiochus VII Sidetes; for it is impossible to assume that he had only described the war of that king against the Parthians. Besides, if Josephus had not taken this passage out of the principal work of Nicholas, but out of some special book on the subject, he would have said so. We can even prove that Nicholas had written the whole history of the Seleucidean empire, for Josephus quotes him in his narrative on the plundering of the temple in Jerusalem by Antiochus IV Epiphanes (*Contra Apionem*, II, 7), and in the information he gives about the victory of Ptolemy Lathyrus over Alexander Jannaeus (*Antiquities*, XIII, 12, 6). It is true, these two pieces of information might have occurred in a history of the Jews written by

[1] *Hermes*, XI, 472.

Nicholas, for they deal with events which had an immediate effect upon the Jews. Nevertheless, although Josephus quotes Nicholas several times, and even goes into particulars about them, yet he does not say anywhere that the latter had written a history of the Jews under the rule of the Seleucides. He only mentions his great, general history [1], and to this he constantly refers.

In the passage just quoted, *Antiquities*, XIII, 12, 6, in which the cruel treatment of the Jews on the part of Ptolemy Lathyrus is described, Josephus' observation follows, that Strabo and Nicholas mentioned these inhuman proceedings in the same way. This again is followed by the sentence: "He also took Ptolemais by force, as we explained already in another place." It is not distinctly said which is the subject of this sentence, and the last words not only presuppose the narrative that precedes them, but they are also nothing but the continuation and a portion of the narrative of Ptolemy Lathyrus. We need only strike out Josephus' observation about Strabo and Nicholas, as not belonging to the narrative, and we have the abstract he made from his source, before our eyes. But as Josephus adds, that the two historians mentioned narrated the event in the same way as he did, without saying from whom he had taken his own narrative, it is clear to me that he had taken it either from Strabo or from Nicholas. We shall see later on that it belongs to the latter author, but we can already here notice which of the two was really his authority for this passage. For if we compare here the quotation from Nicholas about the part John Hyrcanus took in the Parthian war—which we took for our point of issue—with the description about Ptolemy Lathyrus, we shall find that in both cases the description as given by his informant is followed by an observation of Josephus about the passage quoted; after this the narrative of the Parthian war proceeds, just as if there had been no interruption. It is only necessary to disregard Josephus'

[1] Vide Schürer, I, 43.

note, in order to gain the original shape in which the information of Nicholas lay before him. But this similarity only proves that Josephus, in *Antiquities*, XIII, 8, 4, proceeded with the information before him, in the same way as in XIII, 12, 6; but it does not prove the identity of the authors of both passages. But, on comparing both descriptions, another remarkable peculiarity strikes us, which is also common to both. They both conclude their report with the words, ὡς καὶ πρότερον ἐν ἄλλοις δεδήλωται, ὡς καὶ ἐν ἄλλοις φανερὸν πεποιήκαμεν respectively, and since, as we shall show directly, this remark belongs to Josephus' source, the peculiarity just observed proves that both passages belong to one and the same source. Now, in *Antiquities*, XIII, 8, 4, in the narrative of the Parthian war Nicholas alone is named as the authority; therefore XIII, 12, 6 must also have been taken from the same author only. We shall presently notice Strabo's relation to the *Antiquities*, and also the mode in which he is quoted by the side of Nicholas.

We have thus come to the conclusion that Josephus took his short description of the Parthian war under Antiochus VII Sidetes entirely from Nicholas of Damascus, without making use of any other sources. This is contradicted by the terms of his allegation, μάρτυς δὲ τούτων ἡμῖν ἐστιν καὶ Νικόλαος ὁ Δαμασκηνός, which, as we said above, seems to imply that Nicholas was just mentioned by the way, but that somebody else was his chief authority[1]. But the expression loses its strength when we remember that the passage quoted from Nicholas plainly shows that this historian in his description of the events of Syrian history, in which of course the conditions of the Syrian empire formed the centre of interest, mentioned the Jews only by the way. He mentions the high priest and prince of Judaea only as Ὑρκανὸς ὁ Ἰουδαῖος[2]; he considers it

[1] Cf. Bloch, p. 92; Destinon, p. 53.

[2] Just as also Strabo, in Josephus, *Antiquities*, XV, 1, 1, mentions Antigonos the king as Ἀντίγονον τὸν Ἰουδαῖον.

unnecessary to give the name of the festival, on account of Hyrcanus asking the King Antiochus for a rest of two days, although it required only one word to do so, and Nicholas could have easily made it out from the season of the year in which the expedition took place. He did not trouble because it was of no interest to the readers of a history of Syria. But it was one of the principal objects of Josephus in writing his history, to show the Romans and Greeks that the Jews had taken part in the great campaigns of other nations; in this case, in the war of the Seleucides with the Parthians. If he had embodied in his work Nicholas' information without any comment, his pagan readers would have carelessly passed over the passage which it particularly concerned him to be noticed. He was therefore obliged to point it out specially, and this he did by singling out, and placing at the beginning of Nicholas' narrative, the one sentence only about Hyrcan's participation in the campaign, and following it up by a verbatim reproduction of the whole passage in which Nicholas mentioned the event only incidentally[1]. Thus, notwithstanding the term μάρτυς, the whole section, which contains nothing except the prefatory table of contents, the quotation from Nicholas, and the description of the Parthian war, was taken from Nicholas alone, and Josephus used no other source for this, because, probably, no other historical work treating on this expedition had mentioned Hyrcanus's presence and co-operation[2].

[1] Whenever no reference to the warlike achievements of the Jews could be found in Nicholas, Josephus looked for other authorities, whom he quotes then after the same fashion. Thus, in *Antiquities*, XIV, 8, 3, he refers to the participation of Hyrcan II in Caesar's campaign in Egypt, and names Strabo the Cappadocian as a witness for information solely drawn from him. Vide below.

[2] Schürer also observes, I, 64: "Josephus took all his matter from Nicholas and Strabo, but, in some passages which are of importance to him, he mentions them as saying *the same* as he." I will only add, that he quotes his principal source, Nicholas, also when he wants to controvert his statement, and gives a different opinion. Thus we find that in *Antiquities*, XIV, 1, 3, he copies Nicholas verbatim without naming him; but at the beginning of the account he names him in order to say

2. *The reference formula* ὡς καὶ ἐν ἄλλοις δεδηλώκαμεν [1].

We have already noticed that the two passages examined by us, *Antiquities*, XIII, 8, 4 and 12, 6, conclude with a reference to another account of the events described here. Apparently it is Josephus himself who refers to his own work in the first person of the verb. But we know from his own accounts the extent of his achievements as an author, and know that he never wrote about the liberation of Demetrius II Nicator from the captivity of the Parthians, nor about the conquest of Ptolemais by Ptolemy Lathyrus. The reference belongs therefore, as was already convincingly shown by Destinon [2], to the source from which Josephus had copied the whole account. Now we have found that, in both cases, Nicholas has been the source, so that the concluding sentence, referring to another book, was also his property. Since Nicholas had written the whole history of the Syrian empire, this result is not only not improbable in itself, but is of such a nature that we should have arrived at it also by other considerations. For it is obvious that Josephus, when proceeding to write the Jewish history during the rule of the Seleucides, in the first instance made use of the work of the very man, who dealt with the same period of the Syrian empire, and who was readiest at hand.

But in order to place the inferences drawn from only two passages on a firm basis, it is necessary to show that the remaining references of Josephus, of which there is

that Nicholas described Herod's father, Antipater, as the descendant of one of the first Jews who had returned from Babylonia; that he had done so for the purpose of flattering Herod, whereas Antipater had been in reality an Idumean by birth. In the same way he quotes Nicholas in *Antiquities*, XVI, 7, 1, only with the object of reproaching him, that out of regard for Herod he had omitted every mention of the plundering of David's grave; although it is certain from other passages that Josephus had taken his whole account of Herod from Nicholas. Cf. also Destinon, p. 94.

[1] Cf. also Gutschmid, *Kleine Schriften*, IV, 372.

[2] Cf. *Die Quellen des Flavius Josephus*, p. 27.

a great number, may also allude to the work of Nicholas. In the first instance we meet with them several times in the form of references to a history of Syria. In *Antiquities*, XII, 5, 2 we are told that the Romans had ordered Antiochus IV Epiphanes out of Egypt in the midst of his victories; this information is accompanied by Josephus with the remark: καθὼς ἤδη που καὶ πρότερον ἐν ἄλλοις δεδηλώκαμεν. Now we know that Nicholas had described the pollution of the temple of Jerusalem, committed by Antiochus during his retreat from Egypt, and that Josephus had made use of this one account only; consequently, this reference also tallies with our assumption [1].

In XIII, 10, 1 he describes the reign and death of Antiochus V Eupator, and concludes the sketch of the character of Demetrius I, his successor, with the words: καθὼς ἤδη που καὶ ἐν ἄλλοις δεδηλώκαμεν. In XIII, 2, 4 he puts the phrase, ὡς καὶ ἐν ἄλλοις δεδηλώκαμεν, after the description of the struggle between Demetrius I and Alexander Balas and the death of the former. In XIII, 4, 6 we find, καθὼς ἐν ἄλλοις δεδηλώκαμεν after the mention of the death of Ammonius; in XIII, 4, 8, καθὼς καὶ ἐν ἄλλοις δεδηλώκαμεν after the recapitulation of the reign of Alexander Balas;

[1] Nussbaum and Bloch, as already mentioned above, referred these accounts to Polybius. Against this Destinon rightly observes, p. 48, that all that can be proved is this, that there is nothing to contradict the possibility of its having been taken from Polybius, but it was not proved also that it had been taken from that author. Bloch, p. 97, quotes as a proof the fact that Polybius had made Antiochus' expedition to Egypt the subject of an exhaustive description, and has dealt with Antiochus in detail. Against this I only observe that exactly the same can be shown to have been the case with Nicholas, whilst other circumstances point to the use Josephus had made of this author. Nor does the fact, which Bloch considers to be so convincing, oppose our assumption. For Josephus says that Antiochus was ordered by the Romans to leave Egypt after he had already possession of the country, which shows that this account intends to emphasize the interference of the Romans, which, according to Bloch, corresponds with the tendency of Polybius' description. Against this we observe, that Nicholas cannot have omitted either to mention in his history the interference of the Romans, even if he had felt no particular interest for the Romans and their universal supremacy.

and ὡς καὶ πρότερον ἐν ἄλλοις δεδήλωται after a short statement about the liberation of Demetrius II from Parthian captivity. Nothing confirms our argumentation more than the last passage, which was also the one from which we started. Even in the absence of all information, we may suppose that the historian, who describes the liberation of Demetrius II from captivity, and the events that led up to it, had also mentioned that he was taken captive. The latter incident is, in fact, mentioned in *Antiquities*, XIII, 5, 11 with the words, αὐτὸς ζῶν ἐλήφθη καθὼς καὶ ἐν ἄλλοις δεδήλωται; and in connexion with the same sentence occurring in the section in which the liberation of Demetrius is described, and Nicholas of Damascus expressly named as the authority. Besides these passages the following also must be noted: XIII, 10, 1, ὡς καὶ ἐν ἄλλοις ἱστορήκαμεν, after the remark that Cleopatra became the wife of two kings of Syria who were brothers; and XIII, 13, 4, καθὼς ἐν ἄλλοις δεδήλωται, in reference to the reign of Demetrius and Philippus; all which passages can refer to Nicholas' history of Syria.

But our proposition can be proved not only from the Syrian history, but also from other parts of the *Antiquities*. In X, 2, 2 Josephus says, δηλώσω δὲ περὶ τούτων ἐν ἑτέροις, that he would speak in another place of the annihilation of the Assyrian empire by the Medes; but he did not fulfil his promise. Nor can all through his work a single passage be found in which he might have endeavoured to carry out his intention, and not one of his narratives would have been better suited for such information than this very one, in which he promises to give further explanations. Now, we possess numerous and lengthy fragments of Nicholas that bear reference to the most ancient history of the Assyrians, Medes, Greeks, Lydians, and Persians, up to the time of Croesus and Cyrus[1]; and they testify that he had dealt with the history of the Assyrian kingdom till its downfall. Josephus' reference alludes, therefore, to the information

[1] Vide Schürer, I, 43.

contained in a later book of Nicholas, and the allegation belongs to this historian. This would show that other references by Josephus, in respect to the period and the nations that were dealt with by Nicholas, were also taken over from this author; for instance, καθὼς ἐν ἄλλοις δεδήλωται in *Antiquities*, XI, 8, 1, in respect to Philip and Alexander of Macedonia.

This result is still more completely confirmed by statements in respect to Roman history. We find in *Antiquities*, XIV, 6, 2, where Gabinius' expedition to Egypt is mentioned, the phrase καὶ ταῦτα μὲν καὶ ἐν ἄλλοις δεδήλωται; on the other hand, Josephus himself mentions (XIV, 6, 4) that Nicholas and Strabo had treated Gabinius' campaigns against Judaea in the same way; therefore, as in the previously mentioned cases, the allegation belongs to the former author. In *Antiquities*, XIV, 7, 3 Josephus mentions the death of Crassus in the war against the Parthians, and, in concluding his account, says: ὡς καὶ ἐν ἄλλοις δεδήλωται; similarly, in respect to the battle of Philippi in XIV, 11, 1, τοῦτο μὲν οὖν καὶ ἐν ἄλλοις δεδήλωται, and of the death of Cassius in the battle against the Parthians in XIV, 7, 3, ὡς καὶ ὑπ' ἄλλων δεδήλωται.

Lastly, the fact that all these allegations belong to Nicholas is proved by another consideration. Destinon, on examining the sources of the fourteenth book, says, in reference to XIV, 1, 1–6, 4, as follows[1]: "The account concludes with the words: 'Nicholas of Damascus and Strabo the Cappadocian agreed completely on the campaigns of Pompey and Gabinius against the Jews.'" To this, I think, we may add: and the identical account of both has been reproduced by me. Accordingly, the greater part of the contents of this chapter would have to be attributed to Nicholas and Strabo conjointly. For the expression περὶ δὲ τῆς Πομπηίου καὶ Γαβινίου στρατείας comprises all that is narrated there with the exception of XIV, 1, and 2, 1. But nobody will want to separate this chapter from the subsequent narrative except

[1] *Die Quellen des Flavius Josephus*, p. 102.

the account of the fate of the pious Onias. Besides this interpolation Josephus can have altered his source but little[1]. Now within the chapter, convincingly proved to form one whole, in XIV, 6, 2, in the same passage where Josephus says that Nicholas and Strabo had described the campaigns of Pompey and Gabinius, the remark occurs: "Gabinius changed his plan, in order to march to Egypt and reinstal Ptolemy on the throne, καὶ ταῦτα μὲν καὶ ἐν ἄλλοις δεδήλωται." It must further be mentioned that Gabinius' enterprise, which was only one part of the whole expedition, could certainly not have been written by anybody except by one who had dealt with all the campaigns; and it is beyond doubt that the whole, allegation and all, was taken from Nicholas. Destinon (p. 103) says of *Antiquities*, XIV, 7, 1–11, 4: "This section is altogether without any external testimony as to its origin, we are therefore altogether confined to internal evidence. The latter shows beyond doubt that Nicholas was the source." Now in XIV, 7, 3 the following account occurs: "As to Cassius, he arranged everything as he thought fit, then he marched into the land of the Parthians, but there he perished with his whole army, ὡς καὶ ἐν ἄλλοις δεδήλωται;" and again: "Cassius started soon after and marched towards the Euphrates, to meet there the attacks of the enemies, ὡς καὶ ὑπ' ἄλλων δεδήλωται." If a whole section in all its parts is recognized as the property of Nicholas, must not the references to passages it contains, and for which there is no reason whatever why they should be separated from the whole description, also belong to the same author? Destinon (p. 106) expresses the following opinion on XIV, 11, 4–16, 4: "The narrative is uniformly of a piece .... and I do not doubt but that the piece has been taken over from Nicholas in its entirety." Now in XIV, 12, 2 we meet with the communication: "In the meanwhile Cassius, ὡς καὶ παρ' ἄλλοις δεδήλωται, had been defeated at Philippi by Antonius and Caesar." There is

[1] Cf also Schürer, I, 44.

nothing to justify us in striking out that clause from the whole sentence; therefore, it belongs to Nicholas. Thus we have recognized the reference formula in four passages of that portion of the *Antiquities*, of which it is beyond doubt that it was copied from Nicholas; and this, in conjunction with the results gained above, sufficiently confirms the assumption that Josephus' references originated in the history of Nicholas, and direct the reader to certain portions of that work. But this further proves that the thorough and comprehensive information about events in the Syrian kingdom, as contained in Josephus' *Antiquities*, XII—XIV, was taken, as far as the reference formulae go, from the history of Nicholas, which was based on primary and reliable sources.

Before concluding this inquiry, I should like to draw attention to the change in the form of the references, which makes it uncertain whether Nicholas of Damascus quotes only his own work, or whether he alludes also to information given by other authors. Destinon, who has paid particular attention to these reference formulae, attributes to the passive form of the sentence a different meaning to the active. He says (p. 27) that the author, when using the first person δεδηλώκαμεν, thinks of his own work, but, when using the term δεδήλωται, alludes to any book dealing with the events narrated in that section. Taking his issue from this distinction which is based upon the form of the verb, he arrives at a conclusion in reference to these formulae which is as artificial as it is improbable. He says: "Gabinius' expedition to Egypt for the instalment of Ptolemy Auletes, the destruction of the Roman army in Parthia under Crassus, Cassius' war with the Parthians, Caesar's assassination, the battle of Philippi, do not belong to a detailed description of the history of the Jewish people; a simple mention of these events would suffice; if the reader wanted to know more, he could turn for information to some work on Roman history. Those words in the fourteenth book of the *Antiquities* are meant

as a warning to that effect. It is different with the preceding books. There the formulae are used promiscuously. Sections, entirely similar as to their contents, terminated at one time with one, and at another time with the other formula, and—which is of particular importance—a section ending with one of the two formulae is later continued without any gap. They do not, therefore, serve here to direct the reader to a more detailed description, but mainly to form a transition from one source to another, from the description of foreign events to those that are specially Jewish. It would be unsuitable to treat them there in a different manner." As Destinon admits the identity of significance of both reference formulae in the eleventh, twelfth, and thirteenth books of the *Antiquities*, it is incomprehensible how he could be content with such a violent distinction. How unjustifiable it is will appear on comparing the few passages of the *Wars of the Jews*, in which the reference formulae occur, with the corresponding passages of the *Antiquities*[1]. We read in *Wars*, I, 8, 9: "Cassius returned to the Euphrates in order to prevent the Parthians from crossing it, περὶ ὧν ἐν ἑτέροις ἐροῦμεν," where Josephus' prototype promises, in the first person, to give a more detailed description of the campaign; in *Antiquities*, XIV, 7, 3 we find, in connexion with the same information, ὡς καὶ ὑπ' ἄλλων δεδήλωται[2], which shows that no distinction can be made between the active and the passive form. *Wars*, I, 1, 8 we read: "Crassus crossed the Euphrates and perished with his whole army, περὶ ὧν οὐ νῦν καιρὸς λέγειν;" but—thus we may safely complete the phrase—later on; in *Antiquities*, XIV, 7, 3 we read, in the same sense, ὡς καὶ ἐν ἄλλοις δεδήλωται, in the passive. Thus both phrases refer, without any distinction, to the work of

[1] Cf. Destinon, *Die Quellen*, p. 19, n. 1; Niese, in *Hermes*, XI, 469; Schürer, I, 71.

[2] This form of reference is certainly an alteration by Josephus of the stereotyped ἐν ἄλλοις, just as παρ' ἄλλοις in XIV, 11, 1 and 12, 2, as shown by the parallel passage. He seems here to have become conscious of the unsuitability of ἐν ἄλλοις in his book.

Nicholas. I rather think that a distinction in accordance with the change of tense ought to be observed, and that the perfect δεδηλώκαμεν points to the description of the event which precedes the passage, but that the present tense of the passive refers to later information in a passage to come. This is shown in the first instance by a comparison of *Antiquities*, XIV, 7, 3, ὡς καὶ ἐν ἄλλοις δελήλωται, with *Wars*, I, 8, 8, περὶ ὧν οὐ νῦν καιρὸς λέγειν; *Antiquities*, XIV, 7, 3, ὡς καὶ ὑπ' ἄλλων δελήλωται, and *Wars*, I, 8, 9, περὶ ὧν ἐν ἑτέροις ἐροῦμεν; and secondly, by the circumstance also, that whenever the passive form does not refer to a following, but to a previous description, the word πρότερον is added, e. g. *Antiquities*, XIII, 8, 4 [1].

3. *The historical work of Nicholas of Damascus.*

If the fact is established that Josephus took his information about the kingdom of the Seleucides from the exhaustive work of Nicholas, and that the references occurring in the copied passages are those by which the latter directs his readers to different sections of his book, it follows that Nicholas had dealt with many incidents in two different passages. Is this really so, and is this at all probable? It is only necessary to take Polybius for an example, and to turn to any passage, no matter which, to see that he refers the reader to some other section, in order to avoid repeating what he had described before, and so as not to be under the necessity of anticipating what he intended to narrate in a more fitting place. We must assume Nicholas to have used the same method, even if there were no trace left to show it. When we further have regard to the distinction alluded to above in the meaning

[1] Wherever the future tense of the verb is used, we recognize at once Josephus' hand, who had not observed this intentional use of the tenses; thus δηλώσομεν in *Antiquities*, III, 4, 2; VI, 13, 10; *Contra Apionem*, I, 14, all which passages are Josephus' property. In the same manner does ἐν τούτοις for ἐν ἄλλοις in IX, 7, 5 betray the authorship of Josephus.

of the reference formulae, namely, that they point at one time to preceding matter and at another time to information to come, we recognize the mode of description common to ancient works, and which it was not first necessary to establish. But we have also gained some hints as to the sequence of the different descriptions in the history of Syria by Nicholas, which, conjointly with the fragments preserved by Josephus, give the possibility of casting a glance into that portion of his large historical work. But we are also in a position to obtain some notions about other chapters and books of the same.

Josephus, in *Antiquities*, I, 7, 2, quotes the following from the fourth book of the history of Nicholas: "Abram reigned at Damascus, who, being a foreigner, came with an army out of the land above Babylon, called the land of the Chaldeans. But after a short time he removed with his people from that country and went into the land of Canaan, which is now called Judaea, where his family increased exceedingly, *περὶ ὧν ἐν ἑτέρῳ λόγῳ διέξειμι τὰ ἱστορούμενα.*" Whether the concluding phrase belongs to the fragment from Nicholas and indicates his intention of writing about Abraham, or whether they are words of Josephus[1], the passage itself clearly shows that Nicholas had spoken about that patriarch in his work. Is it, perhaps, a small part from a large book on the Jews? C. Müller[2] attempted to reconstruct the plan of Nicholas' large work, which comprised all peoples; but he had to give it up as impossible on account of the too small number of fragments, which in many cases cannot be even characterized, especially as we have no information whatever about books 8–95. But the manner in which Nicholas divided the material of the history of a period can be recognized notwithstanding. The preserved fragments show that the first and second

[1] This form of reference has no parallel among those ascribed above to Nicholas; and as the others are standing formulae, this one may belong to Josephus.

[2] *Fragmenta historicorum Graecorum*, III, 345.

books dealt with the history of the Assyrians and Medes till Astyages, but the downfall of the Median kingdom was only described in the seventh. The fourth book contained the older history of the Lydians till the Heraclide kings, but the sixth book only contains its continuation till Candaules, and the seventh the further part till the downfall of the empire. The existing fragments show that in the same book other peoples were also described; therefore, as is the case with other historical books also, the narrative dealing with one people is interrupted, and taken up again only after the history of another nation during the same period had been finished. There is no need for pointing out, that with such a method of dealing with the events, references to information previously given or still to come were not only possible, but altogether indispensable. If this was the case with the rather summary information about the most ancient nations, it was still more so in the history of Syria and Rome, which was treated in detail, and, it seems, took up in Nicholas' work ten times the space occupied by the nations he had enumerated before. For every event of more or less importance was described together with all its secondary circumstances, and the names of all participating persons were severally given [1]; it formed a chapter of its own, as is proved by the frequent references in those portions of the *Antiquities* that were drawn from Nicholas. If Josephus had said in each section from which book of Nicholas' history he had taken it, as he did in *Antiquities*, I, 3, 6 and XII, 3, 2, we should be acquainted not only with the extent of his descriptions of Syrian events, but also with the divisions of the books, as indicated by the reference formulae of Josephus.

As to the question whether Nicholas' remark about Abraham occurred in a book on the Jews, we do not possess the slightest indications that he had given a connected description of the history of ancient Israel in the midst of that of the other nations. For, if he had,

[1] Vide Destinon, *Die Quellen*, p. 46, n. 1.

Josephus would certainly not have failed to refer to that part of Nicholas' work to complete or to rectify his statements. It would be rather difficult to assume that Nicholas' treatment, though known by Josephus, would have given him no opportunities to do so, especially as we learn from a comparison of the first half of the *Antiquities* with the Bible and the Jewish-Hellenistic literature, that Josephus did not here elaborate anything which he could have taken from Nicholas. The passage about Abraham formed, as Müller conjectures [1], a part of his information about Damascus, equally with the description of the wars of King Adad of Damascus against David, which also occurred in the fourth book [2]. On the other hand, it is beyond doubt that Nicholas had devoted at least two books, the 123rd and 124th, exclusively to the history of Herod. For, in Josephus' *Antiquities*, XV—XVII, we do not meet with a single reference to other chapters, which could show that Nicholas had treated the events under Herod in the same way as those of the history of the Seleucidean empire; that is to say, in separate sections, which were interrupted by the description of other non-Syrian lands and incidents. The history of Herod formed rather a consecutive and uninterrupted narrative of all that happened under this king, the minuteness of which was only called forth by the author's relations with Herod and his active participation in the events themselves, but was not based on the general plan of the whole work. Whether Nicholas had given in his work space and attention to the history of the Jews in post-biblical times up to Herod, must be deferred to a later inquiry.

In connexion with the last inquiry a second question,

[1] *Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum*, III, 345, col. 2.

[2] The circumstance that Nicholas had not only dealt with Adad, but also with ten successors of his (*Antiquities*, VII, 5, 2), shows also with certainty that the fourth book was devoted to the history of the Damascene kingdom, although not exclusively so, for the Lydians are also dealt with in that book.

not less important for our subject, has to be dealt with, namely that of Josephus' quotations from other writings besides those of Nicholas; whether he used and excerpted such works for his *Antiquities*, in the same way as that of the latter; or, whether he perhaps borrowed the passages cited by him from some secondary source. We have already seen that on writing the *Antiquities* he had before him the comprehensive work of Nicholas of Damascus, which dealt with the history of all peoples; and that he could make use of it, not only for the history of Syria, but also for that of the other Asiatic peoples. Did he really use it for this latter purpose? In *Antiquities*, I, 3, 6 he relates as follows: "The flood and the ark are made mention of by all the writers of barbarian histories, among whom is Berosus the Chaldean; for when he is describing the circumstances of the flood, he goes on thus:— 'It is said there is still some part of this ship in Armenia, at the mountains of the Cordyaeans, and that some people carry off pieces of the bitumen, which they take away, and use as means for the averting of mischiefs.' Hieronymus the Egyptian also, who wrote the Phoenician history, and Mnaseas, and a great many more, make mention of the same. Nay, Nicholas of Damascus, in the ninety-sixth book of his history, thus relates about it:—'There is a great mountain in Armenia, over the district of Milyas, called Baris, upon which it is reported that many who fled at the time of the deluge were saved; and that one who was carried in an ark came on shore upon the top of it; and that the remains of the timber were a long time preserved. This is perhaps the man about whom Moses, the legislator of the Jews, wrote.'" It strikes one directly that Nicholas' statement was only a reproduction of Berosus' words; but there is nothing surprising in this, because it is only a matter of course that Nicholas, when about to write the Chaldean history, made use of Berosus, "who had published a book on astronomy and on the philosophy of the Chaldeans for the use of the Greeks" (*Contra Apionem*, I, 19). There-

fore, when dealing with the flood, and mentioning Armenia, which the legend has made the seat of the tale, he may be assumed to have had regard not only to Berosus, but also such Jewish and Egyptian historical works as had been written in Greek ; and, from the juxtaposition by Josephus, I gain the impression that we have here before us the statements of other authors collected by Nicholas, which were simply copied by Josephus, one and all, just as he found them ; after which he named the author Nicholas as the last in the series [1]. According to his wont, he gave here also first an extract from the book used as source, quite identical with Nicholas' statement, which he then confirms by the quotation from Nicholas itself.

This assumption is strengthened also by other passages in which Josephus names Nicholas by the side of a number of older historians, and of which we also become convinced that all these had been quoted by Nicholas, and that Josephus enumerated them all by name in order to impress his pagan readers by the imposing series of ancient authors. Thus, in *Antiquities*, I, 3, 9, he says: "Now I have for witnesses, that our ancestors lived very long, all those that have written histories, both among the Greeks and barbarians [2]; for even Manetho, who wrote the Egyptian

[1] It would be of great interest to find out in what connexion Nicholas came to speak of Noah's ark. The most obvious conjecture would be that he mentioned it when treating on the great deluge in the primitive history of the human race. But this is opposed by the circumstance that Josephus observes that the passage quoted by him occurred in the ninety-sixth book of Nicholas' work, whilst the origins of the various peoples have been described in the first books. The last words in Nicholas' fragment appear to me to show that the object of the whole passage was to explain the description of the Bible, and that the other historical works were only cited as proofs. On the other hand, the word ἀποβατήριον, used by Josephus in the extract that precedes the allegations, shows that this was the motive to these observations of Nicholas. Josephus must also have found in Nicholas' work the statement that the Armenians called the spot on which the ark rested ἐπιβατήριον, as he mentions this in his extract which precedes the quotation. Did the ninety-sixth book contain a part of the history of the Jews ?

[2] Both in the passage quoted before, and in the present one, the

history, and Berosus, the author of the Chaldean history, and Mochus, and Hestiaeus, and besides these, Hieronymus the Egyptian, who composed the Phoenician history, agree to what I here say. Hesiod also, and Hecataeus, Hellanicus, and Acusilaus, and besides, Ephorus and Nicholas relate that the ancients lived a thousand years."

Here also, as in the passage dealt with before, we find the names of Berosus and Hieronymus, to whom Nicholas is added as the last; but besides these, other famous authors of great historical works are also enumerated, such as an historian like Nicholas is sure to have made use of, when writing a work comprising an account of all peoples, whilst Josephus, when writing his *Antiquities*, could have had no motive for studying them. Again, in *Antiquities*, X, 1, 4 we read: "Berosus also, who wrote of the affairs of Chaldea, makes mention of the King Sennacherib, and that he ruled over the Assyrians, and that he made an expedition against all Asia and Egypt." This sentence is preceded by the remark that Herodotus also reported this, and by two different reports of why Sennacherib was unable to do any harm to Hezekiah and to the kingdom of Judah. Josephus, after having given the narrative contained in the Bible about this event, proceeds to give a circumstantial account of how the king of the Assyrians besieged Pelusium and how, although the high banks had already been completed, he was prevented from conquering the city because of the approach of the Ethiopian army. Since Josephus, after the second account, says at the end that Herodotus also had related the same, and points out that the latter had contra-

distinction made between Greek and barbarous authors is noteworthy, for it proves that the statement had a Greek for its author. Such distinction we also find in *Antiquities*, IV, 2, 1; VIII, 11, 3; XI, 7, 1; XVI, 6, 8; XVIII, 1, 20; *Contra Apionem*, I, 18, 22; II, 39; *Wars*, V, 1, 3; VI, 3, 3; but all these passages are Josephus' own, and he had adopted this mode of expression as a genuine Hellene. Only *Contra Apionem*, I, 22 is a fragment from pseudo-Hecataeus; for the expression used there testifies to the Egyptian origin of the author. Cf. also Willrich, *Juden und Griechen*, p. 89.

dicted himself in some detail in both descriptions, we may confidently assume that the whole passage belongs to this author, and we may further conjecture that Josephus had met with this passage, as also that of Berosus, ready at hand in his prototype Nicholas. There are two more circumstances which prove that he did not himself take from Herodotus' history either the first passage or the second fragment reproduced in the same chapter. In the first place, the second passage lay before him in such a form that he could not clearly understand its contents, but he found contradictions between details of Herodotus' account within the space of two lines; this can only be accounted for in this way, that the reports lay before him in an extract, from which the special relations to each other could no longer be made out. In the second place, the comparison of Josephus' account of Sennacherib's retreat with that of the Bible discloses another fact. Josephus, in X, 1, 4, follows closely the narrative of the Bible, 2 Kings xviii and xix, till chap. xix. ver. 29, and concludes with the words *οὐδὲν φοβουμένους*. Then he interrupts it, and takes it up again in X, 1, 5 with the words *τοῦ Θεοῦ λοιμικὴν ἐνσκήψαντος*, guided by 2 Kings xix. 35–37, the contents of which verses he reproduces. Between these two portions of the narrative there are the citations of Herodotus and Berosus, which are meant to describe the motive of Sennacherib's hurried return from Egypt, but which, in reality, say something quite different from what Josephus wanted to establish. For the Biblical narrative tells us, 2 Kings xix. 9, that Sennacherib was prevented from conquering Jerusalem because Tirhaka was marching against him. Josephus reproduces this verse in X, 1, 4. The Greek sources, on the other hand, tell of an Arabic king who besieged Pelusium, but was unable to take the city in consequence of an event which had the same effect as that described in the Bible. Josephus thought that both accounts described the same event, he therefore made use of Herodotus, with whose narrative he amplified the

Biblical account. His reason for doing so is not apparent from his description, but will be understood, if we assume that he found both passages ready at hand in Nicholas, and he sought to harmonize them with the Bible for the purpose of impressing his readers.

But there is still another passage taken from Berosus, which supports our assumption about Josephus' source. In *Antiquities*, X, 11, 1 he reproduces a comprehensive fragment from this historian; he cites, besides the Indian history of Megasthenes, the Persian of Diocles, and the Indian and Phoenician history of Philostratus, and then proceeds: "This is all that is reported by all authors concerning this king." This sentence obviously presupposes the author's intention to communicate everything, whatever had been said, and could possibly be found, in the various histories concerning Nebuchadnezzar. But this could not have been his real intention; for Josephus collects from the Greek authors only such material as refers to the Jews and confirms the Biblical account. But, on the other hand, it is evident that Nicholas of Damascus had made use, for his work, of all the histories written by his predecessors, and all the special works on the various countries, and that he had quoted his sources by name, and that Josephus borrowed from him. Thus only it becomes intelligible why the latter commences his chapter on Nebuchadnezzar in X, 11, 1 with the words: "Now when the king had reigned forty-three years, he ended his life. He was an energetic man, and more fortunate than all his predecessors." For this there was no indication whatever either in the Bible or in the passage he quotes from Berosus, but he had borrowed it from Nicholas' description of Nebuchadnezzar's character.

A further proof of the correctness of this assumption, namely, that Josephus obtained the whole collection of ancient historians, as given in *Antiquities*, I, 3, 9, only from second-hand sources, is afforded by a comparison of the passages quoted from the same works in *Contra*

Apionem with those used in the *Antiquities*. For we find that Josephus, in *Antiquities*, VIII, 5, 3 and *Contra Ap.* I, 17, quotes the same passage from Dios, but for different purposes and with different words, although it is in both cases alleged that the author's words were quoted. Is it merely accidental that he quotes them twice, but not quite in the same form? We find in *Antiquities*, VIII, 5, 3, a rather larger fragment from Menander of Ephesus, who had translated the Tyrian annals, that had been written in the Phoenician language, into Greek. But we find the same passage also in *Contra Ap.* I, 18, to its full extent; and the parallel accounts again bear the same relation to each other as those previously mentioned. We see the same thing in the long description of Berosus in *Antiquities*, X, 11, 1 [1], which is again met with in *Contra Ap.* I, 19; both here and there the reports of the Phoenician historian and those of Megasthenes are named to confirm the statements, which proves beyond doubt that Josephus found all these authors already collected and named

[1] It cannot be expected that all passages quoted from Greek historians in Josephus' works should be repeated, because not all of them can be used for the purposes for which *Contra Apionem* was written, and there was consequently no motive for such repetition. Thus, in Josephus I, 7, 2, Josephus quotes Berosus as evidence in reference to Abraham: "In the tenth generation after the flood, there was among the Chaldeans a man righteous and great, and skilful in the celestial science"; which quotation does not occur again. Josephus could certainly have proved from this passage the age of the Israelite nation and Berosus' knowledge of that people, if this had spoken of Abraham at all, or if this passage had stated the least thing about Abraham. Vide Willrich, *Juden und Griechen*, p. 57. The quotation from Nicholas, which follows immediately, shows that the latter had quoted the passage, without, however, alluding to Abraham. Bloch, *Die Quellen des Josephus*, p. 64, observes rightly Berosus' influence in *Antiquities*, I, 3, 9, where Josephus says that God had given the ancient men a longer time of life in order to enable them to accomplish themselves in astrology and mathematics. But Bloch's observation finds its simple explanation in the circumstance that the whole section is nothing else but the account of the contents of a fragment from Berosus found by Josephus in Nicholas' work, and preceding the quotation itself, according to Josephus' usual method.

together, and that, when he studied them in his prototype for the second time, he borrowed them in the same way as the first time. Thus it came about that he quoted the same fragments twice, because his source did not contain anything beyond what he had already taken up in his *Antiquities*. For we meet with this mode of treatment not only in reference to Berosus and the Phoenician historians, but also in respect to Herodotus (*Antiquities*, VIII, 10, 3; *Contra Ap.* I, 22), and Agatharchides (*Antiquities*, XII, 1, 1; *Contra Ap.* I, 22), from which it is clear that he did not derive his quotations from the works of the authors themselves, but from some book in which they were quoted. Now Josephus had composed his controversy against Apion independently from the *Antiquities*, and thus it came about that the extract which he made in the latter work from Berosus and others did not quite agree with the one occurring in the other book, a circumstance which can also be observed on comparing the corresponding parts of the *Wars* and the *Antiquities*[1]. This is in perfect harmony with that which Niebuhr[2] proves from the passages from Berosus as quoted by Josephus, namely, that Josephus could not possibly have made use of that historical work, because his allegations do not look like the original description by that author, but like extracts[3]. According to our argument they occurred in Nicholas' work, and he did not, in all probability, reproduce them verbatim either.

It may be noticed that Josephus quotes the passages of Berosus which he repeats in *Contra Apionem*, in connexion with the Phoenician histories, and even when speaking of Nebuchadnezzar, cites from Philostratus the fact that this king had besieged the city of Tyre for thirteen years. I believe we may conclude from this, that these fragments

[1] Vide Destinon, *Die Quellen*, p. 10 sqq.

[2] *Geschichte Assurs und Babylons*, p. 13; against this, vide Freudenthal, *Alexander Polyhistor*, p. 28 sqq.; Bloch, p. 63.

[3] Cf. Gutschmid, *Kleine Schriften*, IV, 462, 526, 562.

belonged to Nicholas' book on Phoenicia. The same work may also have contained the passages referred to by Josephus as taken from the works of Dios and Menander[1]; also Mochus, Hestiaeus, and the Egyptian Hieronymus, who are named as authors of Phoenician histories in *Antiquities*, I, 3, 9, may have been referred to in that work as authorities. Unfortunately, not the slightest portion of that part of Nicholas' work has come down to us, so that we are without the material necessary for the verification of our view. On the other side the extracts from Herodotus and Manetho belong to Nicholas' description of Egyptian history[2], of which nothing has been preserved either, whilst a few quotations from Berosus were taken from the Chaldean history. The result of all this would be that Nicholas' comprehensive work was constantly before Josephus when writing his *Antiquities*, and that it served him as a mine from which to draw the passages from ancient writers. But whilst the first ten books of the *Antiquities* owe all their contents to the Bible, and Josephus only rarely borrowed from Nicholas, when he wished to confirm the Biblical account from statements by non-Jewish historians, he took in the twelfth, thirteenth, and fourteenth

[1] Menander is also quoted in *Antiquities*, IX, 14, 2, in connexion with King Salmanassar; there Josephus cites a long piece from his chronicle, which clearly shows that he knew all these reports only from a history of the Phoenicians, where also other nations in their relation to Tyre have been shortly treated.

[2] In reference to this I should like to point out the following data: Josephus, in *Antiquities*, VIII, 6, 2, when mentioning Pharaoh, Solomon's father-in-law, discusses the question why all the kings of ancient Egypt were called Pharaoh. The circumstance that in this small piece Minaeos is named twice, and that Egyptian words are interpreted, makes one suppose a work about Egypt as source. Now, Herodotus is expressly named, and Josephus quotes him with the remark that all Egyptian queens had been called Nicaule. On the other hand, Josephus, in *Antiquities*, VII, 5, 2, reports from Nicholas' work: "When Hadad was dead, his posterity reigned for ten generations, each of his successors receiving from his father his dominion and his name, as did the Ptolemies in Egypt." May not Nicholas have pointed out here also the Pharaohs and the Caesars, although Josephus gives the explanation in his own name?

books of his work the whole material referring to the kingdom of the Seleucides from Nicholas' history, and filled a considerable space with it. But since the first book of the Maccabees, which is so rich in information, and some other Jewish sources, offered him material for the history of some decades of Jewish history, he intentionally divided the extent of his description between these and Nicholas of Damascus. On the other hand, the latter only is copied in books XIV—XVII of the *Antiquities*, and it is only here and there that Josephus interrupted his continuous description with information from Jewish authors.

But all these arguments and proofs would fall to the ground, if it could be proved that Josephus knew and made use of Berosus either directly from the work of that author, or from Alexander Polyhistor, and from no other source. This view was brought forward by Gutschmid [1]—who holds that it was likely that Josephus made use of him in either way—and by C. Müller [2]. In order to refute the assumption that Josephus borrowed from Alexander Polyhistor, it will suffice to produce Freudenthal's arguments which oppose this view [3]. He says: "Josephus expressly names Berosus, and repeats his words, as his immediate source; it is not apparent why these allegations must be false, why he should not have known his Chaldean history, in the same way as he was acquainted with Manetho's Egyptian history. That he had, besides, also read Alexander's *Chaldaica*, as appears from his quotation of the *Sibyl*, does not prove that he could not have made direct use of Berosus in other passages. If Josephus had merely copied his quotations from Berosus from Alexander, why should Eusebius cite at one time from Josephus, and another time from Alexander's extracts? Why should he, in his *Chronography*, first copy all excerpta from Alexander which refer to Nebuchadnezzar and his successors, and then

[1] *Kleine Schriften*, IV, 492, 495.

[2] *Fragmenta Histor. Graecorum*, II, 496.

[3] *Alexander Polyhistor*, p. 27.

place by the side of them the much more diffuse excerpta of Josephus? Does this not prove that Eusebius found in Alexander's *Chaldaica*, the source from which he drew, much missing which Josephus afforded him, and that it is therefore impossible that Josephus should have merely excerpted Alexander? And finally, it is not a small proof of Josephus' genuineness that his excerpta are always given in the *oratio recta*, but that Alexander—and consequently also Eusebius and Syncellus, whenever they report him verbatim—always gives his extracts in the *oratio obliqua*. We must therefore consider Josephus' extracts as the words of Berosus himself." These keen and subtle arguments sufficiently show that Josephus and Eusebius took their corresponding extracts from different sources, and, since it is certain that Eusebius had taken his from Alexander Polyhistor, Josephus must have drawn from another source. But it is not proved that this latter was Berosus himself. The other circumstance also, pointed out by Gutschmid, that Josephus' two lengthy passages on Nebuchadnezzar had been compressed by Alexander Polyhistor into a few words, and that they had been preserved by Eusebius in this form, only shows that Josephus had not copied Alexander, but some other epitomizer, whose extracts were much lengthier, but not necessarily that he had copied Berosus himself. Everything brought forward by Freudenthal as characteristic of Josephus' pattern, in contrast with Alexander Polyhistor, can be found in Nicholas of Damascus. The latter had, of course, made his extracts much more carefully than Alexander, and the allegation of passages from other authors in the *oratio recta* has many parallels in other quotations from Nicholas in Josephus. In fact, Josephus had made as little direct use of Manetho as of Berosus, so that this objection of Freudenthal's speaks for the excerpta not having been made directly from their works. For the rest, Freudenthal arrived himself at the conclusion that "the possibility exists, that the copy of Berosus which lay before Josephus had

already been just as much interpolated as that of Manetho, but that the revision had not been made by Polyhistor." We add: but by Nicholas.

4. *The authors quoted by name in "Antiquities" XII—XIV.*

The conclusions arrived at from the quotations out of the first part of the *Antiquities*, namely, that the quotations were taken from Nicholas' work and not from the works of the authors themselves, apply in all probability also to the historians quoted in the second part of the *Antiquities*. But the latter stood much nearer to him in point of time than the former, and it was very easy for him to obtain their works in Rome; it must therefore be first specially proved in what relations he stood to them when writing his work. We have seen that he had taken everything relating to Syria, which was not mentioned in the first book of the Maccabees, from Nicholas. The latter had doubtless made use of Polybius and Posidonius[1]; we must therefore try to find out, in the first instance, how Josephus is related to these two authors. Not a single point can be adduced to show with certainty that he had known Polybius from that author's own work[2], for everything he quotes in the latter's name may have occurred in Nicholas' books[3]. In respect to Posidonius, the circumstance that

[1] Müller, *Fragmenta*, III, 415, frag. 79; Schürer, I, 35.

[2] Cf. my essay in *Revue des Études Juives*, XXXII, p. 186.

[3] This seems to me to be proved also by the passage in which he controverts Polybius. Namely, in *Antiquities*, XII, 9, 1, after the lengthy abstract from 1 Macc. vi. 1–16, he produces Polybius' account, according to which Antiochus IV Epiphanes died because he wanted to despoil the sanctuary of Artemis in Persia. Against this Josephus observes, that it was much more certain that Antiochus lost his life because of the spoliation of the temple of Jerusalem, which crime he had actually committed. "But I will not contend about this with those who think that the cause assigned by Polybius is nearer the truth than that assigned by me." A work must therefore have lain before Josephus in which the cause as assigned by Polybius occurred; the narrative itself must also have been there, and this may have been Josephus' source.

Josephus does not name that author in the *Antiquities* cannot be taken to prove that he had not been acquainted with the latter's important historical work, for the reason that he did not name it may have been that he had made use of it as his principal source. But the fact that he found nowhere in the *Antiquities* any opportunity of controverting or correcting a single statement of his, as is the case with Polybius and Nicholas, and that, in his book *Contra Apionem,* he exhibits no direct knowledge of that author's attacks against Judaism—although both Strabo and Diodorus had taken them over from Posidonius—this fact shows that Josephus had not known his book, and also that Nicholas had not quoted it by name, because it served the latter for the principal source for those Syrian events which were reported by Josephus [1]. Josephus would otherwise have made use of the opportunity afforded him, either in his description of the pollution of the temple by Antiochus, or on dwelling on the counsels given by Antiochus VII Sidetes, in *Antiquities*, XIII, 8, 3, to discuss Posidonius' odious attacks, in the same way as he discussed in the book *Contra Apionem* those made by other authors.

But the most important point seems to me this: to decide whether Josephus made use of Strabo's account by the side of the parallel description of Nicholas of Damascus, or whether he found it also in Nicholas' work—not at all an impossible thing. This doubt is the more justified, in as far as Strabo is quoted in those very portions of the *Antiquities* in which Nicholas' Syrian and Roman history has served as source—quoted, indeed, more frequently than Nicholas himself. Let us consider one of the passages in which Josephus points out the complete unanimity of these two historians. He says in *Antiquities*, XIV, 6, 4: "Now Nicholas of Damascus, and Strabo of Cappadocia, both describe the expeditions of Pompey and Gabinius against the Jews, while neither of them says anything new which is not in the other." It might have

[1] Vide Bloch, *Die Quellen des Josephus*, p. 94, n. 4; Destinon, p. 53.

been expected accordingly that neither of these two authors would have been mentioned by name in Josephus' account of these events (*Antiquities*, XIV, 2, 3–6, 4), since he followed the unanimous narrative of both. But in XIV, 3, 1 he produces a fragment from Strabo, in which it is related that Pompey received in Damascus a costly present from a Jewish embassy, without bearing in mind that he related Pompey's arrival at Damascus in a subsequent passage only, and that order of relation was quite incongruous. The subsequent narrative, however, runs on without any interruption ; it is therefore clear that Strabo's fragment did not occur in Nicholas, his principal authority, but that Josephus had found it somewhere else, and inserted it in a place by no means suitable for it. Josephus gives, in the same way, in *Antiquities*, XIV, 8, 3, two fragments of Strabo which deal with Caesar's Alexandrine wars ; but they are inserted only in the passage in which Caesar's presence in Syria, after the completion of the war, is being related. Besides, Josephus did not notice at all that neither account of Strabo's agreed with the description given by him in *Antiquities*, XIV, 8, 1 ; for whilst Strabo's fragment mentions Hyrcanus' presence in Egypt, this latter incident is impossible if Josephus' account, that Hyrcanus' ambassadors presented letters, is true [1]. It is therefore beyond doubt that Josephus added these fragments of Strabo subsequently, after he had embodied in his work an extract from Nicholas' description [2].

[1] Vide Niese in *Hermes*, XI, 470.

[2] Strabo was a very conscientious scholar, and he always quotes his authorities (cf. Schürer, I, 39) ; Josephus copied the latter from Strabo whenever they referred to the Jews, e. g. *Antiquities*, XIV, 8, 3, he quotes Asinius Pollio, and XIII, 11, 3 and 12, 5, Timagenes. These references show that Strabo had also taken notice of Roman authors ; I believe, therefore, that Josephus had also copied from Strabo the only passage he quotes from Livy in *Antiquities*, XIV, 4, 3 : "That this is the real truth, I appeal to those that have written of the acts of Pompey ; and among them to Strabo and Nicholas of Damascus ; and besides these to Titus Livy, the writer of the Roman history." It is true, Josephus could have

A comparison between *Antiquities*, XIV, 16, 4 and XV, 1, 2 would lead to the same result. In both passages the execution of the King Antigonus by Antonius is related, but they differ as to details. In the former we read that the reason why Herod had induced Antonius to kill Antigonus was, because he feared that the latter might be spared by Antonius, and be brought to Rome for the purpose of accounting to the senate for his actions, in which case it might have been possible that he would be re-instated as king on account of his noble descent. But in the other passage he reports from Strabo: "Antony ordered Antigonus the Jew to be brought to Antioch, and there to be beheaded, as supposing he could no other way bend the minds of the Jews so as to receive Herod, whom he had made king in his stead." Although the first account is most probably not taken from Nicholas [1], it shows nevertheless that Strabo's fragment was inserted only subsequently, after Josephus had already narrated Antigonus' death. This method is still more obvious in *Antiquities*, XIV, 7, 2, where Josephus makes a digression about the wealth of the sanctuary of Jerusalem, in connexion with his narrative of the spoliation of that temple by Crassus, and quotes in evidence two passages from Strabo. One of them is without doubt taken from the latter's description of the war of Mithridates, and has nothing whatever to do with the narrative into which it was thrust in by Josephus. The other belongs, as we learn from Josephus' remark, to the description of the revolt of the Jews of Cyrene, which Sulla despatched Lucullus to quench; and it is impossible to see what motive Josephus had to insert that passage there, unless it was a desire to preserve everything that Strabo had written about the Jews [2]. All these fragments

read Livy in Rome, and he might have quoted him for the purpose of showing the Romans from their own great historian how thoroughly he had treated his subject; but there was no special motive to do so.

[1] Cf. Destinon, *Die Quellen des Flavius Josephus*, p. 107.

[2] Vide Destinon, p. 106, n. 2.

show therefore, for certain, that Josephus had not copied Strabo from Nicholas [1].

But these passages refer, all of them, to Roman history, no certain proof can therefore be derived from them in respect to the fragments quoted by Josephus from Strabo on Syrian history. In regard to the latter, we shall also start our observations with a passage in which Josephus records Strabo's unanimity with Nicholas. He says in *Antiquities*, XIII, 12, 6: "Both Strabo and Nicholas affirm that Ptolemy used the Jews after this manner, as I also have declared." To which of the two does the preceding description belong? As it is a matter of course that Strabo had not only described the termination of the war, but also all the incidents connected therewith, it is possible that the whole description as given by Josephus was borrowed from that author. We may conclude for certain that

[1] Cf. Schürer, I, 39. Another passage has to be considered here also. Josephus, *Contra Apionem*, II, 7, says as follows: "But for Antiochus Epiphanes, he had no just cause for that ravage in our temple that he made; he only came to it because he wanted money, without declaring himself our enemy, and attacked us while we were his associates and friends; nor did he find anything there that was ridiculous. This is attested by many worthy writers: Polybius of Megalopolis, Strabo of Cappadocia, Nicholas of Damascus, Timagenes, Castor the Chronologer, and Apollodorus, who all say that it was out of Antiochus' want of money that he broke his league with the Jews, and despoiled their temple when it was full of gold and silver." The question arises here how Josephus came to know these authors and their accounts. Since Nicholas is named, we may assume that the information afforded by Polybius occurred in his work, in the same way as in the instances discussed above, although it may also have been reproduced by Strabo. Timagenes, we have just seen, was quoted by Strabo; there only remain Castor and Apollodorus, who, without doubt, were quoted either by Nicholas or by Strabo. No decision can be given (vide Schürer, I, 55 sqq.). The order in which Josephus names the authors, and which is dictated by no principle whatever, cannot be adduced in proof of the connexion of the authors with one another. It can only be explained in this way, that Josephus had found a reference to Castor in one of his authorities, and to Apollodorus in another; or that Josephus' authority first discussed the one and then the other, which induced him to conceive the erroneous notion that they were quoted according to the age in which they lived.

Josephus was acquainted with Strabo's account from XIII, 10, 4, where he quotes Strabo's words: "The greater part, both those that came to Cyprus with Ptolemy, and those that were sent afterward thither, revolted to Ptolemy immediately; only those that were called Onias' party, being Jews, continued faithful, because their countrymen, Chelkias and Ananias, were in chief favour with the queen." *Antiquities*, XIV, 7, 2 also attests that Josephus knew and made use of Strabo's description of the war between Cleopatra and Ptolemy. In XIII, 12, 5 the number is given of the Jews that fell in the struggle against Ptolemy; there were thirty thousand; according to Timagenes fifty thousand; on the other hand, we learn from XIII, 11, 3: *μαρτυρεῖ τοῦτο καὶ Στράβων ἐκ τοῦ Τιμαγένους ὀνόματος λέγων οὕτως*, that Josephus knew Timagenes through Strabo, so that it may be assumed that the whole passage had been taken from Strabo; especially so, as Strabo is named in the same connexion a few lines lower [1]. To the same source we shall then have to ascribe also the other passage quoted in exactly the same manner as Timagenes, of the *ἔνιοι συγγραφεῖς*, who give a number different from that of the main description, and under which designation he most likely understands Timagenes himself. As Josephus names this author and not Strabo, we might be led to assume that we have here Strabo's original account, as we have elsewhere that of Nicholas, and that it extended from XIII, 12, 2 to 13, 3. But against this we have Josephus' remark that Nicholas and Strabo had written about it, whereas, if our last assumption were true, he had only made use of the latter's description. But if we call to memory the result arrived at from the previous consideration of the fragments from Strabo, namely, that the description, without any mention being made of the author's name, was borrowed from Nicholas, to which Josephus subsequently added his extracts from Strabo, everything becomes clear. The description of the war between Ptolemy and Cleopatra,

[1] Vide Schürer, I, 37 and 64.

from the beginning to the end, like all the sections referring to Syria, belong to Nicholas. Only after he had embodied them in the *Antiquities*, he compared them with Strabo, and whenever he found a discrepancy to exist between his first authority and the latter, he recorded it in the text. But in Strabo he found the account given in the name of Timagenes, he therefore communicates it under the same name, for the purpose of making prominent the great antiquity of his sources and the reliance that his accounts deserved. *Antiquities*, XIII, 10, 4 also proves that in this part of the work in which Syrian history is taken notice of, Strabo was inserted only subsequently, in the same way in which it was done in the history of the Roman age. For in that passage Josephus gives a fragment from Strabo, in which mention is made of the faithlessness of Cleopatra's soldiers and the loyalty of the Jews during the war of that queen against her son Ptolemy. It is inserted there among matter that has no real connexion with the contents of the fragment, and, in fact, interrupts the flow of the narrative. It seems that Josephus had first finished his description of the events under John Hyrcan, and subsequently looked for a place where to insert Strabo's report.

The result of this inquiry is therefore that Josephus had borrowed the whole material of the first seventeen books of his *Antiquities* from Nicholas of Damascus, except those data which were taken from the Bible, the letter of Aristaeas, the first book of the Maccabees, and some other source that dealt with the high priests. From the same comprehensive work, which contained the history of all peoples, he took also the references to such authors as are quoted by name, and the passages cited from their works, with the exception of Strabo. The very formulae used in referring to a history of Syria are Nicholas' property. Josephus had however, as we have seen, only sparingly used those portions which bear upon the ancient peoples, because Nicholas had touched upon a few points

of contact only between those peoples and the Jews. On the other hand, Josephus has made ample use of the description devoted to the kingdom of the Seleucides, because there had been intimate relations between Jews and Syrians for a period of two centuries. This portion of Nicholas' work having engaged our attention in the first instance, it would be interesting to learn the nature and compass of this prototype of the *Antiquities*. It would not be difficult to form a judgment on the character of the work from the numerous fragments contained in Josephus, for their compressed form points to a detailed description, and they must therefore be considered as abbreviated excerpta, and not as verbatim copies. The original must consequently have been comprehensive and exhaustive, and rich in references. This last must have been particularly the case in those books that were devoted to the history of ancient peoples. But in the Syrian history Polybius and Posidonius were the principal authorities, and their names are only given when the different opinions of other authors are contrasted with theirs. It is difficult to establish the point from which Nicholas started his history of the Syrian kingdom ; the most appropriate point of issue was evidently the death of Alexander the Great and the war of the *diadochi,* and the history concluded with the annihilation of the rule of the Seleucides by the Romans. Natural and plausible as this assumption in reference to a work on universal history may be, it is subverted by the remarkable fact that Josephus was not able to produce, for the whole period from Alexander till Antiochus Epiphanes, any material except such as he had taken from Jewish-Hellenistic works, and which was of little historical value. If he had found in Nicholas' work any information, however indirect, about the events connected with the Jews of Palestine, he would have made ample use of it, especially in the absence of information from Jewish source ; he would have utilized it, in the same way as he gave, in the thirteenth book of his

Antiquities, detailed descriptions of Syrian events, although these latter often had no connexion with the Jews. There is only one way out of this difficulty, namely, to compare the authors referred to in the *Antiquities* and those quoted in the book against Apion, whose names were taken from Nicholas' work.

Such comparison makes us acquainted with two distinct facts. In the first place, we learn that in the book *Contra Apionem* neither Nicholas, nor Strabo, nor Polybius, nor Posidonius is quoted, but only such historians as are not generally known, with the exception of the single passage about Antiochus in II, 7, in which they are all mentioned, with the addition of Apollodorus and Castor. Secondly, from the time of the *diadochi* till Antiochus the Great, Polybius is only named once in *Antiquities*, XII, 4, 2; besides, Agatharchides is mentioned in both books in reference to the conquest of Jerusalem by Ptolemy I, and the fact that Josephus refers to his history of the *diadochi* shows that he had found it quoted by Nicholas. Nevertheless, these scanty data are not of sufficient weight for the assumption that Nicholas had described that period. It appears rather, and this is confirmed by the first fact, that Nicholas had, like Polybius, commenced his descriptions of the kingdom of the Seleucides with Antiochus the Great[1], but that he had treated the history of the preceding kings only very briefly and summarily. Otherwise it would be incomprehensible why Josephus should have been able, from information given by Castor, to fix so accurately in the book *Contra Apionem*, I, 22, the time of Alexander's death, and of the battle of Gaza, in which Ptolemy the son of Lagus defeated Demetrius Poliorketes, or to refer in the *Antiquities*, X, 8, 1, with his usual reference formula, to a history of Philippus and Alexander of Macedonia, and yet not to name a single one of these authors for the subsequent times. And even that which he quotes in

[1] Cf. Stark, *Gaza und die philistäische Küste*, p. 336 sqq.

several passages of his work against Apion from Pseudo-Hecataeus belongs to the period of Alexander and Ptolemy the First, as the genuine Hecataeus, who is quoted by Josephus in *Antiquities*, I, 3, 9, among the large number of authors who testified to the longevity of the patriarchs, but who otherwise seems to have been unknown to him [1], also was a contemporary of Ptolemy, the son of Lagus [2].

But it is possible, although not very probable, that the same incident is common to the eleventh book of the *Antiquities*, and to XII, 5, 3—XIII, 7 of the same work, namely, that the information taken from the first book of the Maccabees took the place of almost everything that Nicholas had said about the relations between the Jews and the Seleucides. Josephus' object was to give the heathens a description of the greatness of his fathers. But the latter was much more amply exhibited, and illustrated by many more details, in the first book of the Maccabees than in the work of Nicholas, who, as the fragments show, hardly mentions the deeds performed by the Jews. For the period from Alexander till Antiochus the Great also, Josephus found the description of Jewish history, as given by the Jewish Hellenists, quite sufficient for the object he had in view, and even going beyond it. He therefore disregarded Nicholas and kept to the former, but he failed to notice that he neglected Judaea entirely, and transferred the central point of his history to Alexandria and the court of the Ptolemies. This assumption is, for all that, improbable; for in the *Antiquities* from XII, 5, 3 to XIII, 7, in spite of the servile adherence to the first book of the Maccabees, a good many sentences have been

[1] He nowhere betrays any knowledge of the fragment preserved by Diodorus, XL, 3. If he had known it, he would not have omitted to controvert the statements contained in the latter as to the residence of the Jews in Egypt and their exodus from that country. I believe—in spite of Willrich's remarks, *Juden und Griechen*, p. 51—with Schürer, II, 818, that the supposititious work of Hecataeus is based also upon passages from the real Hecataeus.

[2] Schürer, II, 816; *Contra Apionem*, I, 22.

taken from Nicholas' Syrian history, whereas we do not find the long gap from Ptolemy the son of Lagus till Antiochus the Great interrupted by a single event from the universal history of Syria and Egypt. If there had been a history by Nicholas or if Josephus had read Strabo's work, he would have found there many remarks about that period.

ADOLF BÜCHLER.

CRITICAL NOTICE.

THE LITERARY STUDY OF THE BIBLE.

The Literary Study of the Bible, an account of the leading forms of literature represented in the Sacred writings, intended for English readers. By RICHARD G. MOULTON, M.A., Ph.D. London, Isbister & Co., 1896.

The Modern Reader's Bible. A Series of works from the Sacred Scriptures, presented in modern literary form. By R. G. MOULTON, M.A. (Camb.), Ph.D. (Penn.). New York and London, Macmillan & Co., 1896. *The Proverbs; The book of Job; Ecclesiasticus; Ecclesiastes and the Wisdom of Solomon; Deuteronomy.*

THE Bible has been terribly maltreated in the various translations of the Churches. Divided into chapters, which often split up a book quite wrongly, and into verses, which always spoil the continuous text of the narratives, printed so that every verse begins with another line, the books of the Bible are sadly disfigured. As a consequence of this unfortunate method of editing, "the vast majority of those who read the Bible have never shaken off the mediaeval tendency to look upon it as a collection of isolated sentences, isolated texts, isolated verses. Their intention is nothing but reverent, but the effect of their imperfect reading is to degrade a sacred literature into a pious scrap-book." This is how Prof. Moulton expresses his indignation at such misusage (*Lit. Stud.* 82). He is not the first to feel an irritation on this score, nor is the Revised Version, which he praises, because there at least a proper distinction is drawn between prose and poetry, the first attempt to do away to some extent with this evil. As English seems to be the only modern literature with which Moulton is acquainted, he probably did not know of *Die Heilige Schrift des Alten Testaments*, edited by E. Kautzsch, nor C. Weizsäcker's *Das Neue Testament*, nor the French and German translations of the Bible by E. Reuss, nor numerous translations of single books, in which the distinction between prose and poetry is made clear, just as in the Revised Version. In Holland, too, this has also been done, e.g. in the so-called Synodical translation of the New Testament of 1866.

It is not the rabbis who are to blame for the mutilation of most of the older translations, as Moulton supposes, but the Christians. Though the Jews were aware of the division into verses, at least as regards the Law, in the synagogue scrolls the division is not indicated, and in their manuscripts the verses do not each begin with a fresh line. The division into chapters, moreover, first arose, about 1200, among the Christians, and was imported into the Hebrew Bible from the Vulgate.

But whoever be to blame for these mutilations, they are unquestionably ugly, and an obstacle to the right understanding of the text. He who would appreciate the Bible from a literary point of view must set aside this mistaken division into chapters and verses (and even that of Samuel, Kings, and Chronicles into two books), and since we need *some* divisions, in order to get a survey of the whole, we must substitute a better system in its place. This is what Moulton attempts to do. He seeks, moreover, to describe the different literary forms found in the various books of the Bible, as far as he can, making them the more apparent by artifices of printing. An oration, he maintains, must be immediately recognized as such, a sonnet must wear its own form, and a drama must be exhibited as such to the eye. He is a professor of English literature, and knows no Hebrew. He is no theologian by profession, not even a dilettante in theology, and though he has used the works of Driver and Cheyne as well as several other commentaries on the Old and New Testament, he is in reality a stranger in the domain of theological problems, even in so far as they have reference to the Bible. But this does not in any way deter him. For his book is not intended to be either edifying or theological, but purely literary, and literary in the most limited sense. For even in a "literary" work it is not sufficient to treat solely of the form. The treatment of the subject-matter too belongs to literature. Moulton, it is true, does not wholly omit a discussion of the contents. Filled with admiration for the beautiful form of the books of the Old and New Testament, and of a few of the apocryphal books, he again and again tries to show how this form is in perfect harmony with the rich and varied subject-matter. But he does his best to avoid all theological, and especially all critical, questions. His aim is to teach us to appreciate the Bible as it now exists. And to this end what can it matter to whom a particular writing is ascribed, and from what period it dates? It is beautiful, effective, and well constructed. It is this which is not generally recognized, and this is what Moulton desires to demonstrate.

With this object he points to the book of Job as an example of varied literary forms: dramatic interest of background, dramatic

movements in the dialogues, epic character, importance from a philosophical point of view, scientific value (the land question is discussed in Job!), prophecy, rhetoric, versification—there is something of all this in Job. The discussion then turns upon the classes into which the sacred writings fall when considered from a literary point of view. Lyric and epic poetry, philosophical and prophetical literature are in turn examined. Moulton includes The Wisdom of Solomon and Ecclesiasticus in the Bible. That he should take just these two from the apocryphal books, and leave the others even unmentioned is, in my opinion, entirely arbitrary. He knows well enough that besides these there exists a Jewish literature, but he supposes it to be all contained in the books of the rabbis. That there is also extant besides a rich Jewish literature handed down to us in different languages he evidently has not the least suspicion.

The five little books, the contents of which are sufficiently indicated by their titles, are closely connected with the principal work. They are examples of the treatment of entire books, according to the principles which in *The Literary Study* are applied to fragments only. But Moulton does more than merely edit these books. Ardent student of form as he is, he knows well enough that a book is read for the contents, and that for their adequate appreciation introduction and commentary are required. So he edits the books with introductions and notes. The text is that of the Revised Version, to which Moulton thinks it necessary to adhere, but the marginal renderings of the Revised Version are occasionally adopted. He regards any departure either from the Revised Version or the existing Hebrew as an extremely dubious proceeding, but in all that relates to the divisions, the external arrangement, and the stage-directions, not only in the Revised Version, but also in the Hebrew text, but little reliance is to be placed. In these matters the modern edition is wholly free. If the text has "Job said," where it is obvious that the words which follow are not from his mouth, but are spoken by one of his friends, then the editor simply emendates to "Zophar." The "Job said" of the text is merely a stage-direction without authority.

The mere mention of these things leads me on naturally to the task of criticism. It is impossible indeed to read thus far without immediately observing that in this respect Moulton's method is purely arbitrary. If it be permitted in a traditional text to change the speaker at will, then to that text, so handled, no authority is ascribed. Such a change is surely no matter of subordinate importance. Insert before one of the prophecies such a direction as

"God speaks," "the prophet speaks," "the repentant people speaks," "the adversaries of the Lord speak," and you probably alter the meaning of the whole. And even if these directions are correct, that is to say, true to the meaning of the prophet, yet the passage is not presented in the form in which it has been handed down to us. It is altered, whether it be for better or for worse.

I quote one example of the insertion of "stage-directions." In Job xxxviii. 1 (immediately after the speeches of Elihu), the text has: "Then the Lord answered Job out of the whirlwind, and said." This is omitted by Moulton, who goes on immediately to what follows. In xxxvi. 21 (to introduce presumably the words, "Behold, God doth loftily in his power") we read, "From this point the signs of an approaching storm become visible in the sky." After the words, "the cattle also concerning the storm that cometh up" (xxxvi. 33), Moulton adds, "a loud peal of thunder; the storm steadily increases." He inserts these remarks because it is apparently a storm which is being spoken of, but pays no heed to the fact that the words "the storm" are printed in italics, and that in the margin is put "it." Had he known Hebrew, he would have known that the verse is a *crux interpretum*. Then at xxxvii. 14, before the words, "Hearken unto this, O Job," he puts, "The storm has become a whirlwind; the whole scene is wrapped in thick darkness broken by flashes of lightning." By this "direction" the object of the verb "hearken" becomes the roar of the thunder, whereas it is really, in the intention of the poet, the arguments of Elihu. Before xxxvii. 21 we are told that "supernatural brightness mingles strangely with the darkness of the storm," and at the end of Elihu's speech that "the roar of the whirlwind gives place to a *Voice*." This voice then speaks out of the whirlwind. After xl. 2 "a lull in the storm" takes place. After Job has spoken the whirlwind begins anew, and from out of it there speaks again a Voice. At xli. 34 the storm begins to abate; then the Voice "retreating" utters again one line, which in the traditional text is spoken by Job (xli. 3 *a*). The Voice, "more distant," speaks again (xli. 4–6), and after Job has answered "the storm ceases."

Of all this there was undoubtedly nothing before the mind of the poet. He would never, for instance, have distinguished between the storm and the supernatural brightness. Moulton himself knows that the authenticity of Elihu's speeches is seriously doubted. He refuses to enter on that discussion, and professes to take the book as it stands. So he says, at least, but his actions belie his words. As a matter of fact he suffers his phantasy to play upon the text. Till now there was only one book of the Bible, which most of the

commentators treated in this manner, the Song of Solomon. In their despairing attempts to find some unity in this collection of bridal songs, they invented all sorts of stage-directions. Moulton does this too, and he does it with all these writings or passages, where he can find an opportunity.

In the same way his imagination leads him astray whenever he desires to indicate the various "forms" of the Biblical poems. He wants to have the psalms, prophecies, and other passages printed in different types, with indented and projecting lines of all possible kinds and variations. This is all very well, provided he presents the matter as the authors meant it. But is he able to judge? Has he even made a serious attempt to discover their meaning? He says, and rightly I think, that in Hebrew poetry the exact number of syllables is comparatively disregarded, and its character reveals itself especially in the parallelism of ideas. This, in my opinion, is correct; but he has, properly speaking, no right to judge on the point, nor to pronounce the attempts of Bickell and others to take into account the number of syllables as wrong. The attitude which he adopts towards the special rhythmical form of the Hebrew Lamentation or Elegy, so ably developed and maintained by Budde, is very characteristic. He knows of it, for it was explained in *The New World*, and he alludes to it (p. 157). But it is a mere allusion, and is put to no use whatever. And yet this is almost the only form of Hebrew poetry, concerning which experts are now agreed! But while he neglects it, he sets about dividing the text of the Revised Version into stanzas, and subdivisions of stanzas, without any knowledge of the Hebrew text, and often without even paying sufficient regard to the meaning. What reason has he for printing the simple first Psalm in the following manner?

Blessed is the man
that walketh not
in the counsel
of the wicked,
Nor standeth
in the way
of sinners,
Nor sitteth
in the seat
of the scornful.
But his delight
is in the law of the Lord:
And in his law

doth he meditate day and night.
And he shall be like a Tree
Planted
by the streams of water,
That bringeth forth its fruit
in its season;
Whose leaf also
doth not wither,
And whatsoever he doeth
shall prosper.
The wicked are not so,
But are like the chaff which the wind driveth away.
Therefore the wicked shall not stand
in the judgment,
Nor sinners
in the congregation of the righteous.
For the LORD knoweth
the way of the righteous,
But the way of the wicked
shall perish.

Moulton sees much "lyric beauty" in this. Concerning questions of taste it is difficult to dispute. To my mind it is tasteless, artificial, and false. But however this may be, could any one maintain that it represents the intention of the poet? And yet Moulton makes bold to say (p. 192), "The first psalm may be said to bestow a blessing on the literary study of the Bible."

Other passages he treats in a manner equally fantastic. To explain Psalm cxviii, he says (p. 162), "The worshipper and his escort approach the Temple," and the psalm is then portioned out between chorus, worshipper, and escort, who occasionally even take turns line by line. At ver. 20, "the Temple gates open," and "disclose a chorus of priests," who sing a few lines, and are answered by the worshipper and escort. At ver. 26 "the worshipper enters the Temple, the escort prepares to retire," which they accordingly do, after listening to one line from the priests. Then the chorus sing the closing verse. Prof. Moulton does not seem to know that laymen were not allowed to enter the temple, and that this whole theatrical performance is therefore impossible. His imagination not only misleads him to the extent of dividing the Book of Proverbs into five parts, on p. 284 he even says, "the fivefold division of this work (and of *Ecclesiasticus*) is as well marked as in the *Book of Psalms*." I had never perceived it myself. He even ventures to

give the etymology of the word "prophecy" (p. 327). *Ne sutor ultra crepidam!*

When any one allows himself to be guided by his imagination, his traditional opinions and personal sympathies are a matter of prime importance. Now Prof. Moulton has very strong sympathies with all that is good and pure, and to this he adds a strong affection for the Bible. One passage, he owns, is more beautiful than another, but in his book we pass from one expression of admiration to the other. All is fair, both as regards the form and as regards the contents. Even Psalm cxix. is beautiful, and so far as *Ecclesiastes* is concerned, "I say boldly that there is nothing unwholesome in Ecclesiastes" (p. xxii, *Introduction to Ecclesiastes and Wisdom*). That is bold in truth; too bold.

Though I am unable therefore, to my regret, to say much in favour of *The Literary Study of the Bible*, yet the five small books, which are offered to us under the title of *The Modern Reader's Bible*, may certainly with some reservation be recommended. What has been said of the chief work with regard to the introductions and subdivisions, applies to these in equal measure. This is obvious, for they are but examples of the method which the author has explained he wishes to see adopted in all the Biblical books. But they present the Revised Version in a tasteful form and setting. And this is of some importance. In the first place there is much that is beautiful in these books, and they are far too little known. Educated readers look upon the books of the Bible in quite a different light from any others. Many an educated Englishman or Englishwoman will read a play of Shakespeare's, and make an effort to understand Browning, but how few are willing to do their best to understand the Book of Job, or to read portions of the Proverbs? The Bible is regarded as literature *sui generis*, which belongs to the Church, and to the Sabbath or Sunday. When we want something to read on a journey, or seek a book to study, either alone or with others, it never occurs to us to turn to the Bible. Now here are five nice little books, well bound in cloth, and daintily printed on good paper. They can be read as though they were secular books. Of course they require a serious frame of mind, but neither can Hamlet nor Browning's Saul be read thoughtlessly. They are edited with introductions, divided into parts with headings, just like a book of our own day, and with a certain amount of commentary. There is much in them that is fantastical, it is true. But the editor is a serious, warm-hearted, and poetical man. The Biblical books become alive under his treatment of them. Does it represent the meaning of the original authors? Not always, and yet in many cases perhaps it does. The

Hebrew writer did not separate off a few verses from the rest in order to put them as introduction on the first page; he wrote straight on, parchment was dear, and he left no space unfilled. But in their present form, as they stand out distinctly on the white page, these "introductions" and "title-pages" do indubitably attract the eye! We linger over their perusal, and read what follows in quite a different frame of mind. In this way we learn to know some of the most precious works of literature, but precious rather from a religious than a literary point of view. There are, it is true, many fine narratives, songs, orations, and sayings in the Bible, and it is worthy of praise to draw attention to their beauty, but most of the Biblical writers were no masters of literary form. What they give us is spiritual food for earnest, thoughtful minds. And this food Moulton's edition, it is to be hoped, will help to put within the reach of many.

H. Oort.

MISCELLANEA.

NOTES ON *J. Q. R.*, No. 33.

(*a*) By Dr. Harkavy:—

P. 28, l. 4 יניימטש read הנימטש, the German.—P. 30, l. 1 צרה read צדה = בצד.—P. 32, l. 6 חובה read חיבה; l. 2 from below מלנו read מלתנו.—P. 36, l. 24 אישטומיאתי read אישלו טמיאתי, Isle Damiatte.

(*b*) By Herr Halberstam:—

P. 30, l. 3 ופתח read ופסח; l. 10 עלם read עולם; l. 15 מתפרי; l. 23 להתים read לכתת.—P. 31, l. 2 מכטרים read מכתרים.—P. 32, l. 14 תעבה read תנובה; l. 31 צובם read צורם.—P. 33, l. 8 אוביו read אויביו.—P. 34, l. 27 ותיבותי read נתיבותי.—P. 35, l. 29 ביום read בידי; l. 31 והנא read וטמא.—P. 37, l. 16 עין יומן read עיני זמן.

(*c*) By Prof. W. Bacher:—

i. *Ebjathar Hakkohen.*

Page 28, line 8, ראש ישיבה רב אביתר הכהן. A son of this Ebjathar was אליהו הכהן ביר׳ אביתר הכהן for whom the Mushtamil, composed by the so-called "anonymous" Grammarian of Jerusalem (i. e. Abulfarag-Harûn), was copied in the year 1423 of the Seleucide Era (1112 C. E.). See my Essay on the latter in the *Revue des Études Juives*, vol. XXX, p. 225. Abraham Epstein, of Vienna, called my attention to the fact that the Sefer Chassidim (§ 630, p. 169 of the Wistinetzki edition) mentions a ר׳ אביתר כהן צדק, who met Hai Gaon in Jerusalem. As this Ebjathar must have lived in the first decades of the eleventh century, while the Ebjathar mentioned in Neubauer's publications lived at the First Crusade, i. e. the end of the eleventh century, which corresponds with the time of Elijah, the son of Ebjathar, we must assume that the Ebjathar referred to in the Sefer Chassidim was the grandson of the first Elijathar. An אביתר גאון is also mentioned in the *Pardes*, § 161 (edition Constantinople, 47 c); for knowledge of this fact I am also indebted to Epstein; but the same scholar tells me that in an old MS. of the *Pardes*, which is in this hand, instead of אביתר he found the reading אביו.

ii. *Abraham b. Schemaja and Isaac b. Samuel.*

P. 115, sixth line from end of the page. In the same series with the document dated 1098, discussed by Schechter, we must place the source, quoted by Merx in his *Document de paléographie hébraïque et arabe* (Leyden, 1894), and noticed by D. Kaufmann in the *Monatsschrift*, 1895, XXXIX, p. 147. This document was written in 1115, seventeen years later than the former, and also in Fostat. Of those mentioned in Schechter's MS. as ecclesiastical assessors, it only refers to two. First, אברהם ב"ר שמעיה החבר נין שמעיה נאון, and second יצחק ב"ר שמואל הספרדי, also designated הספרדי, and identical with Isaac b. Samuel in Schechter's source. On the former of these Rabbis, see *Revue des Études Juives*, ibid.

iii. תמנע. Genesis xxxvi. 12.

P. 141, note. The earliest traceable authority for the hypothesis that ותמנע should be joined to the previous verse, thus removing the discrepancy between Gen. xxxvi. 11 and 1 Chron. i. 36, is a commentary on Chronicles, dating from the tenth century, and edited by Kirchheim (Frankfurt-am-Main, 1874). The writer commences with the remark: ותמנע זה הוא אחד מן הכתובים שאין להם הכרע בתורה (page 6), and presents us with a most interesting excursus, in which other examples are cited where the end of one verse ought to be read as the beginning of the next verse. The author of that commentary was a pupil of Saadiah Gaon. In this excursus, which is of great interest for textual criticism of the Scriptures, he refers to the well-known rule of R. Eliezer b. Jose Hagelili סדור שנחלק (the thirteen of the thirty-two Principles for Hagadic Exegesis) in order to justify his explanation of ותמנע in Gen. xxxvi. 11. This same principle Ibn Ezra later on takes as a basis for his defence of Saadiah Gaon against Dunash, (שפת יתר, No. 155.) The anonymous writer (יש לפרש) from whom Tobia b. Eliezer (Lekach Tob on Gen. xxxvi. 12) quotes the explanation is probably no other than the unknown commentator of Chronicles.

CORRECTIONS.

P. 27, note 3. באן is correct. Both words תכלמו באן are Arabic. "They said that" (*takallamû bian*). Arabic phrases in the document are also the designation of Constantinople as אלקוסטנטנייה and the Chosars as אלכזריה &c.

P. 32, l. 5. For הרום read הדום, a designation of the sanctuary and Jerusalem (Lam. ii. 1, 1 Chron. xxviii. 2, etc.). It is used because it rhymes with אדום.

P. 116, l. 13. For Yason read Sason.

P. 133, note 1. See the *Agada der Palaestinensischen Amoräer*, ii. 400.

P. 149, l. 19. For השזוני read השזורי.

P. 151, l. 12. For festem read festum.

DEDICATORY POEM TO JEHUDAH HA-NAGID.

A FURTHER examination of the poem to Jehudah ha-Nagid, kindly lent me for that purpose by Mr. Elkan N. Adler (*J. Q. R.* VIII, 556), has resulted in some completions and corrections of the text. I communicate them herewith, because of the importance of the piece, which is up to this day the only poem left to us, written in honour of an Egyptian Nagid on the occasion of his acceptance of office.

In the first line of the poem, which is an acrostic on the words יהודה הנגיד חזק, the words מעולם ועד עולם—words inapplicable to a human being—must be deleted; the word מעולה is still clearly recognizable; and, since the lines of this strophe all rhyme in ־דים, we must insert either ביחידים or בידידים. Instead of בחסידות, the word בחסידים is clearly legible in the copy, and is correct according to the rhyme. The א of אל can still be read, and the strophe reads: ידיד האל מעולה ביחידים · אדיר הדור מפואר בחסידים · אשר עלה עלי כל כבדים[ות](ונ) · ביראת אל ומעשים מאושרים. I believe that I am still able to recognize the reading אדיר הדור in the faint traces of the MS.

It appears to me that the second line also can be completely restored. Only נוד[ע] must be corrected into נודה. The second word I can *only conjecture* to read למעדהו. The poet says therefore: "Truly we must praise God, who wrapped him up in wisdom." But in the space left empty by Dr. Neubauer I recognize with certainty הלא גבר ונחכם, which disposes of ליתחכם, which gives no sense.

In the fourth line, the MS. gives plainly יחיה. This agrees with the metre, and the meaning is: "he, the Nagid, gives life to God's word, so that it does not become old."

In the sixth line, the traces in the MS. show merely that the completion [ואח]ריו is impossible. But the third line of the stanza is quite clear and reads: וכי הוא שר וצדיק הוא משלך, i. e. "and is

there a prince or a pious man like thou?" As to the concluding portion, I think the first word must be completed into לנחל [א]ה, and the last word into ועברים. The middle remains illegible.

I am, on the other hand, able to restore with certainty the two first lines of the seventh strophe, from the outlines in the MS. They read: נפשי בו קשורה ומתאוה, היותו רב ונגיד לכל גויה, i.e. "my soul is bound up with him, and wishes that he might become the teacher and ruler of every creature." Over the word שאילה, which, in the MS., has a line on the top [=שאילה], the word נאוה, which agrees with the rhyme, is plainly visible. Between אלוה and שאילה the letters וי or לוי remain.

If we further consider that the eighth strophe is incomplete, the end being wanting, without, however, the MS. being indistinct or injured, it is evident that the latter only contains the draft of the poem, and not the text in its final form. The same conclusion is offered by an investigation of the metrical value of the poem. The poet had evidently in his mind a poem of eleven stanzas of four lines each, with a perpetual concluding rhyme, the three first portions or lines of the stanzas rhyming separately. The metre of the four lines of each stanza was to be יתד ושתי תנועות יתד ושתי תנועות יתד ותנועה. This metre is almost faultlessly carried through in several stanzas, and in all of them it can easily be restored by small insignificant corrections; this shows that only the draft of the poem has been preserved, and that the small inaccuracies were all corrected in the clean copy.

DAVID KAUFMANN.

ANGLO-JUDAICA.

IN the list of Tosaphists formulated by Zunz[1], a certain unknown Rabbi is introduced in the following words "I טרוטי (הר"י) dem der Verfasser von Tosaf. Taanit 3 a gehört, ist wahrscheinlich ר"י טרושין, ein Schüler von R. Perez und R. Ascher, der in Anmerkungen zu Schaare Dura (4, 5, 8, 24, 30, &c.) vorkommt."

The letter I in this extract may equally be the letter J; and ר"י may be Isaac, Jacob, Joseph, Jehuda, &c. There is no certainty about it. What we principally have to note is that here is a Rabbi presented to our notice, coeval in time with Rabbenu Perez and Rabbenu Ascher (Rosh), both of whom lived and flourished at the

[1] *Zur Geschichte und Literatur*, p. 53.

end of the thirteenth century. Was this Rabbi an Englishman? Apparently, yes. On the Exchequer Plea Roll, Jews, No. 39, membrane 2, is found a list of Winchester Jews, among whom Joce, son of Troyt, finds a place. The year 1281, when he is introduced, is just the period likely to have brought him into contact with the two eminent teachers, one in Paris, the other in Toledo. Nothing is known of him. The ר״י of Zunz may now be extended into רבינו יוסף.

Troyt and its variant Truyte is an unusual name. It is borne by one other person only. Rosa Troyt, a London Jewess, whose property escheated to the crown at the expulsion in 1290[1]. Mr. Loftie, the historian of London[2], says: "In or about 1287 there was a conveyance to Hugh de Vienne of the rent of the holdings of Cresse, son of Cresse the Jew, of Roesia Douceman, and of Roesia Truyte, all in Milk St., and described as the houses of certain Jews." The connexion between Rabbenu Joseph Troyt and Rosa Troyt, if there be any, is nowhere apparent.

M. D. DAVIS.

[1] Mr. Joseph Jacobs, in his *London Jewry* plan, page 20, localizes her rightly; but on the next page, curiously enough, he fails to include her among his Jewish owners of property.

[2] *Historic Towns*, p. 98.

THE

JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW

APRIL, 1897

DAVID LEVI, POET AND PATRIOT.

IT would lead me too far afield to confute the untruthful taunt that the modern Jew is incapable of patriotism, that he is a degenerate, and concentrates in himself all the faults of degeneracy. Still, it often happens that one human being may so focus in himself all qualities as by his life and his example to disprove the charges brought against his class. And such a man lives to-day, in the Italian city of Turin, in the shape of David Levi, poet and patriot; a man who, like Robert Browning, may boast that he "was ever a fighter," and who, even in his old age, still champions the rights of his double fatherland, Italy and Zion; a man who has fought and suffered for his country and his faith; a truly venerable and estimable figure, too little known even by the present generation of Italians, and far too much ignored outside the confines of the Peninsula, although he is a man of whom Israel may well be proud; and though she may have her quiver full of men with whom she may justly plume herself, every new star added to her diadem of glory and martyrdom adds new strength to her ancient grandeur.

It is rare to meet with a life and career so homogeneous as that of David Levi. It presents itself to us as a unity in which every act corresponds to every written word, and every spoken word to every action. This heroic figure was

born at Chieri, a little town not far from Turin, in the year 1816, of an opulent and eminently worthy Hebrew family, who had been the first to introduce the cotton industry into Piedmont, in return for which the Government had accorded to them many privileges and concessions, so that they enjoyed an excellent social position. The grandfather, David, had been the representative of the Piedmontese Jews at the great Synhedrion called to Paris by Napoleon I, and during the French occupation of Italy had held the post of mayor of Chieri. The family life was of the good old patriarchal kind, in which there reigned respect for social and religious tradition, and in which feasts and fasts were observed with all due veneration. The younger David's mother above all was a woman who combined in herself all the Hebrew female virtues, and it was at her knee that her son learnt his first lessons in religion, led by her hand that he first entered into the homes of the poor, and learnt to relieve their misery. He was a high-spirited lad, whose mad tricks had earned for him the name of "Little Demon," but though others could not manage him, he obeyed his mother's look or word. Those were the times when in Piedmont the public schools were closed to all non-Catholics, and hence David received his early instruction from a rabbi who conducted a small private school. This school could not hold him long. His lively temperament, and his innate detestation of all tyranny, brought him into conflict with his stern and rather brutal master, and his parents saw themselves obliged to withdraw him from the rabbi's care, and to confide him to private teachers, but what knowledge these could supply did not suffice to satisfy his hot thirst for learning. Fortunately the family library was well stocked, and fortunately also for him the Levi house was the centre of a small intellectual coterie, who would meet there at stated intervals to discuss current events, literary and political, as well as the inner affairs of the synagogue. These were bad days for the Jews in Piedmont, for the reaction that had followed the events of 1815,

and had abrogated the Code of Napoleon, with its religious equality, had taken a crude and pedantic form in that kingdom, reviving all the mediaeval prejudices of rank and class-spirit and clerical obscurantism. The conversation of the Levis' guests was calculated to awaken reflection in the mind of a naturally thoughtful youth, and already, as a mere boy, there was evoked in David Levi the conviction that the troubles of his co-religionists and those of his fatherland flowed from the same source, and thus, with natural hatred against tyranny, there sprang up in his heart a twofold love for Israel and Italy, which was destined to affect his whole life, career, and labours.

It was after little David had attained his thirteenth year, and had read his portion of the Thora in the synagogue, that he was sent to Vercelli to complete his education. At Vercelli there reigned a more modern spirit that at the school in Chieri. It was while here that David wrote his first Hebrew poem, an elegy on the death of his grandfather, and his first Italian poem, a glorification of a young man condemned to death on account of his revolutionary ideas. The aspirations of young Italy, as they were then preached by men like Mazzini, Berchet, and others, were beginning to ferment throughout the Peninsula; no wonder then that even unripe schoolboys were affected thereby. And in David Levi the soil was already prepared to accept the new ideas with enthusiasm. He tells how one memorable day in his school-life there arrived at Vercelli from France a Piedmontese lad, from whom the police had taken at the frontier all his books and papers; what they could not take from him, however, were the poems of Giovanni Berchet, which the young man had learnt by heart; these he repeated to an eager crowd of boys who gathered around him, caught them up, copied them, committed them to memory, and diffused them among their relatives and friends, and no one listened more attentively than the fourteen-year-old David. Later on these recitations also included the tragedies of Niccolini, the writings of Silvio

Pellico and Mazzoni, all calculated to inflame the fantasy of the boy, and to fan to fiery excitement his own enthusiasm for the unity of Italy, an enthusiasm which, at that time, was already secretly pervading all classes of the inhabitants of the Peninsula. It was while at Vercelli, too, that there fell into the hands of David Levi, for the first time, the works of Giordano Bruno. The character and mental temperament of the great thinker and martyr of Nola was specially calculated to appeal to Levi's nature, and the influence of this study was of life-long duration, making itself manifest, while quite a young man, in a series of articles he wrote for an Italian newspaper, and culminating, in his maturer years, in his great work on Giordano Bruno, which embodies all the results of his studies and researches.

After three such fecund years spent at Vercelli, Levi returned to Chieri at the desire of his parents, who wished that he should enter into the family business. And he duly entered it, but his thoughts and interests were elsewhere. The mysteries of debit and credit had no charms for him, his strong bent was towards poetry, his restless and unquiet spirit led him in search of the higher culture, he longed to help on the emancipation of his countrymen from the foreign yoke. When he found that he could bear the confinement of office life no longer, and that his prayers to be absolved from the family career were all in vain, he one day secretly fled from home, much to the consternation of his parents. He did not long leave them in anxiety, a letter speedily arrived, in which he not only confessed his sin, but also his inability, his inaptitude, to bow to the mechanical career they had chosen for him. His parents wisely recognized that it would be useless to thwart so marked a bent, and consented to his request that he might attend a University, making it a condition, however, that he should fit himself to be a lawyer. To this Levi gratefully consented, and set out for Parma, the University of Turin being closed to him on account of his Hebrew birth.

But Parma did not hold him long, he sighed for Tuscany, where at this epoch there reigned a more genial spirit, and which by tradition was cultured and classic.

To Pisa, in 1836, he turned his steps, and he might have completed his studies there had he not become involved in a duel with a young Swiss, who publicly insulted the Jews. On this account Levi challenged him, and wounded him so severely that he had to fly from the city, and find his way home to Chieri, with the help of friends, who passed on to him their passports. A year afterwards he resumed his studies at Siena. All this while, though nominally studying arid and dry-as-dust law-books, he was browsing with keen ardour among all the works that dealt with the higher problems of life and creation. The everlasting riddles of life and death tormented his brain, and already as a student found vent in many a poetic utterance. The origin of religions especially attracted him; he searched his own Scriptures, the Vedas, the Ramayana, the works of Zoroaster and Confucius for the key to life's mystery, and the more he read the more he learned to understand and appreciate anew the belief of his own forefathers. With ever-growing love for his fatherland was coupled an ever-increasing love and respect for Judaism; his study of the history of Israel caused him to see a certain parallel between the futures of Italy and those of Palestine, and the misfortunes of both awoke a deep echo in his nature.

> The child of two Zions in exile I wander,
> I look on both Zions and mournfully ponder,
> Night, silence, and squalor, alone meet my eyes,
> For Jordan, slow, sad, through his grey valley creeping,
> Moans out as he goes only "Sorrow and weeping,"
> And "Terror" the wave of the Tiber replies.

But David Levi was not made of the stuff that spends its strength in fruitless lamentations and poetical sentimentalities. He wished to act as well as to inspire, he would be a factor in the march of events. Manzoni's gentle resignation was not to his mind, his heroes were rather Mazzini

and Berchet, those mighty voices which were making themselves heard from across the Alps, and admonishing young Italy to awake from its century-long slumber.

As he once expressed it, "Manzoni's hymns were fitted to educate a nation of seminarists, Berchet's songs created a nation of heroes."

Levi's views of life, and his principles at this epoch, are best described in his own words, as written in a species of autobiography, called *Vita di Pensiero*, published in 1875:—

Those who observe the Piedmont of 1873 can with difficulty form an idea of what that province was before the great liberal movement of 1848. It was pervaded with a closeness that asphyxiated every breath of life. It was in fact the Middle Ages—not brave, honourable, and chivalrous, full of power and youth amid all its errors, but stupid, senile, frozen, powdered, bewigged. After fifteen years of a Jesuitical reign, Carlo Alberto at last comprehended this, and aroused by the clamour that awoke on every side, began cautiously to concede a few necessary reforms. Meanwhile the times were growing stormy; the Piedmontese people, young, clear-headed, bold, and conscientious, felt that they might accomplish some higher act before they perished beneath the weight of big hats and powdered wigs, and that they were called upon to open a way for other things. One fine day they rose, shook off their fetters, put to flight Jesuits, friars, rancid and corrupt police crows, big-wigs, resuscitated aristocrats, and opened a path to the throne. And once there they proudly confronted the monarch with this dilemma, to live with popular liberty, or to go. The monarch preferred to live with the liberty and to remain, and not only did they remain, but they gained, into the bargain, Italy, glory, and the gratitude of the people.

Now before this epoch, the beginning of the new era, Piedmont was divided not only into classes, but almost into castes. An iron barrier separated the aristocracy from the bourgeoise, the middle class from the workman and the peasant, the soldier from the citizen, the clergy from the laity, the Catholic from the Protestant and from the Hebrew. To excite rancour, to feed fierce superstitions and ferocious hatred, to divide, in order to reign with greater security, appeared to be the secret of the state. Woe to them on the day when all should join hands, recognize their equality, and, united, strike for justice and liberty to be enjoyed by all. They would be lost. Therefore they strove to keep the classes apart, divided like

Hindu castes, where each had their own statutes, privileges, prohibitions, proscriptions, and prescriptions. The heretic, the Protestant, the Jew, in this promised land of Holy Church was under the ban of society, was exposed to insult. He was not denied bread and water, like the excommunicate of the Middle Ages, but land to own and cultivate, civil rights, instruction, the schools were prohibited to him. He was betrayed through his family, his wife, his children. Of this nature was respect for the family professed by these sentinels of order. As a child born of a family proud of old and exalted traditions, of great wealth and high character, I felt my blood boil at such an accumulation of injustice. When still a lad I bent my whole mind and every power of my soul to fight, to combat, to struggle, and rebel against destiny. All peaceful reform seemed to me an impossible and derisive dream. Conspiracy seemed to me the holiest of rights, in revolution there was safety. Wounded in the most sacred affections and rights, in honour, in conscience, in the family, everything appeared permissible that reacted against the oppression so disloyal, undeserved, and infamous. Gazing around I perceived that we, the oppressed, were worth more than our numerous oppressors. In despised and isolated abodes there dwelt domestic virtues, religious reverence for age, respect for women, for the mother, considered always as the light-bearer of the house. *There* were found honesty and nobility of character, elsewhere unknown or rare; *there* were hidden treasures of industry; *there* was a love of knowledge, of culture, of letters, qualities which might have been sought in vain among the dominant classes[1]. Among vigorous races, the individual scorned, oppressed, may yield to brute force, and to numbers, but in solitude he rises, and wrapped like Queritus in the folds of his mantle, enclosed in his stoical dignity, he is free in thought, in labour, in his family; and the scorn of the mob, patrician or plebeian, renders him greater in his own eyes. Against this rock the darts of the adversary are broken. This is the casket in which the family is preserved, the mould in which character is cast.

Such was the Hebrew—scorned and weak to all exterior appearance, but great and unconquerable in the bosom of his family, unconquerable in thought, unattainable in the depth of his conscience. Inferior races, unpossessed of high ideals, succumb—trodden under foot, absorbed by strains more numerous and more valiant in the battle of life, they yield to the stronger species, but those who keep alive in the abysses of servitude; the love of labour, of family,

[1] For a picture of life among the Piedmontese nobility see Alfieri's *Memoirs*.

of science, may fall vanquished, overpowered, scourged, derided, but is never destroyed. Superior to the common herd, these people outlive the rest, because in them there is the principle of higher evolution, in them reside the germs of moral force ever ready to arouse and resuscitate the race.

Moral power, concentrated in an individual, in the heart of a conquered people, is the secret of its duration, the germ of resurrection. This is the arm with which is initiated a silent, ceaseless struggle that is the true holy war. Such was the arm with which the philosophy and art of Greece ended by subduing the hard Latin roughness, with which Athens overpowered Rome, little Jerusalem conquered pagan society, Christianity vanquished the barbarians. With this the principles of the French and American revolutions conquered the brutality of the Middle Ages. In the weak one, who has on his side justice, morality, and an ideal, dwells and ferments durable and fertile strength.

And in me this angry and vulgar persecution, this growing violence of brutality, against one of the most ancient races of the world excited a more lively sentiment in favour of the liberties of Italy, and kindled a more intense love for her. Without entirely sharing the opinions of my co-religionists, professing, on the contrary, liberty of thought, I nevertheless felt that honour, duty, persecution attached me to them. It was better to be with the unjustly oppressed than with the oppressors, and the emancipation of the Hebrew appeared to me no isolated question, but as the knot of the weightiest political, economical, and social questions which agitated the period, the thermometer of the civilization to which a people had attained in the present, the symbol and synthesis which contained within itself the most arduous question of the religious future of the peoples of the earth.

Such was the profession of faith of this Hebrew youth, who, in place of self-absorption, reached out from the depth of oppression in which he found his own people to the emancipation of the whole human race, and, according to his method of regarding the question, the first thing was to get a free Italy. Hence David Levi became a very apostle of conspiracy, a link, a mouthpiece, a telephone. From Siena, the very centre of Italy, ere he was twenty years old, he joined Mazzini's secret society of Giovane Italia, and corresponded with a legion of young and aspiring spirits, who were making straight the paths of the new generation. He

was in turn conspirator, soldier, volunteer, journalist, poet; but despite his enthusiasm, he never lost the clear insight as to actual things that so markedly pertains to his race.

In 1841, David Levi returned to his native Piedmont, but he could not live in that heavy atmosphere of oppression and hypocrisy, he could not feel himself happy under the weight of that triple tyranny of Jesuitism, aristocracy, and militarism. He longed to go to Paris, at that time the headquarters of Italian patriots, the centre to which the eyes of all oppressed peoples were turned. His good economic position putting no obstacles in the way of any desires, he was able to gratify his wish, and was soon welcomed by his compatriots at the French capital as a valuable co-worker in the sacred cause of liberty. Here he made personal acquaintance with Mazzini, who often came thither from London; here he made friends with Terenzio Marinani, Giuseppe La Farina, Giovanni Berchet, and with Giorgio Pallavicino and the *élite* of the Italian exiles. A Piedmontese, French was already almost his native speech, and he soon mastered it well enough to collaborate in French newspapers, advocating openly the cause of his oppressed country, as he advocated it secretly in the numberless pamphlets and broadsheets, printed by private printing presses, and dispersed broadcast throughout the Peninsula. Levi was a party in the foolhardy plot, arranged with the two brothers Bandiera, sons of Admiral Bandiera, an Italian in the service of the Austrian navy, in which there was much disaffection. It was hoped that in this way an uprising could be effected, it being believed that Italy was ready to strike the first blow for freedom. Levi was charged to return to Piedmont, and to proceed thence to Venice, inflaming the spirits of his compatriots and helping on the course of events. Alas! there had been traitors in the camp. The conspiracy was divulged, the two noble, patriotic youths were betrayed to the police, tried for high treason, and shot at Cosenza in 1844.

When Levi heard of their sad fate he dedicated a stirring

elegy to their memory, in which he poured forth all his concentrated rage and grief; an elegy that betrays manifest echoes of his profound biblical studies, when he evokes the scattering of their bones, and craves that every city, from the sea to the Alps, may preserve a portion, that they may swear upon them in the face of high Heaven to avenge their martyrdom. He begs his countrymen not to be discouraged or to abandon themselves to tears or to complaints, but to act and to resolve even more firmly to be a free and a united people. But discouraged they were. This failure on the part of the Bandiera brothers to fulfil their aim depressed the easily downcast spirits of the Italians, more easily downcast in those days of tyranny and oppression than now in the days of their freedom. Levi did not, however, lose heart or acknowledge himself vanquished, he professed to be enamoured of Venice as a residence, and indeed the poetic charm of that sea-city held him in its magic thrall, but he also used this thraldom as a convenient shelter and a blind. Under cover of a careless life of worldly pleasure and love-making, with a certain dabbling in poetry and literature, he was in reality continuing his political propaganda. His poem on the death of the brothers Bandiera had of course been issued anonymously. It spread like wildfire through political circles, and electrified its readers. Needless to say its author was at once proscribed by the Austrian police, but they searched for him in vain, for they little suspected him to be the elegant youth who wandered about the Piazza San Marco, or was rowed by moonlight through Venetian canals, dreaming or enjoying himself with boon companions. It was while in Venice that Levi resumed his deeper philosophical and religious studies, and it was here that were written his three great poems that have reference to Judaism, *The Three Pilgrims, The Wandering Jew*, and *The Bible*, and that he sketched the first rough idea of his drama, *Il Profeta*. Here, too, he wrote that splendid *Intermezzo* in which we listen to the heart-beats of his patriotic soul, and which

resumes in itself the history of Italy, and was to see the light much later. In this poem Levi prophesies concerning Italy's future, and foretells with wonderful clearness in 1849 events that were to occur from 1860 to 1870.

The *Three Pilgrims* is a fine poem, of which the following is the central conception. Three pilgrims, by different paths, ascend the incline of a mountain. One has wreathed his brow with vines and roses, another is clad in sackcloth and beats his contrite breast. The third, alone and thoughtful, but serene, treads his path resolutely, embracing with his gaze the most distant horizon. These pilgrims are three civilizations, three religions. Each one seats himself beside a spring and pours forth a song. To the first—Greece—the universe appears a smile and an exultation, and he sings of the joy and the voluptuousness of life. To the second—Christianity—the earth is a vale of tears full of sterile wastes, his cult is Woe and his god is Death. The third, while he pushes his gaze to the most distant horizon, sings how human life is interwoven of laughter and tears tempered with wisdom, and how the spirit is no less holy than the body; this, too, is an offshoot of the eternal.

The "Wandering Jew" has been sung in many ages and under many diverse significations. Shelley, in *Queen Mab*, used him as the symbol of negation and blasphemy. Edgar Quinet, in his poetic drama, used him as adumbrating humanity. For Hamerling he represents hatred, rancour, and rage; others see in him the representation of remorse and doubt. But what does Ahasuerus mean to Israel who is the true Wandering Jew? Levi treats Ahasuerus as symbolic of his race, and condenses in his verse its struggles, aspirations, and martyrdoms of 3,000 years, showing forth the nobility, the invincible power of Hebrew thought, its pride of origin, its just disdain of all oppression, its imperishable faith in the future of its race as identified with the most splendid destinies that await mankind. The

following translation gives but a pallid reflection of the fire, the pathos of the original [1].

THE WANDERING JEW.

Seek not what I am to know,
What my name is, never crave,
God records it, Earth and Woe,
It may radiate the grave,
If at last my tears' long flow
Should melt the stones to hear.

Wandering ever——I, forlorn,
Refuge seek for this poor frame.
Thinking, suffering;—Man, base-born,
Spurns my right, ignores my claim—
I pass his tortures, scorn
His piety and his jeers.

Wandering ever—storms and ire
Burst with fury on my brow,
Adam's curse I bore entire,
Wretched, yet too proud to bow;
Victim ever, on the pyre
I laved in grief each sin.

Midst the whirlwind raging round,
Vanished lands, seas disappeared,
Crumbled all, mere dust I found,
Empires, temples, shrines revered;
But immortal lived Thought bound
My heart's sad depths within.

From life's dawn that thought upgrew,
Ever present to my mind,
Vast, sublime, it shone and grew,
All to it,—a setless sun.
Glory o'er the Past it threw
And o'er the Future—Light.

Thought that rends Earth's mystic veil
Opens to me hidden things,
Doth illume the future's trail,
March of races, fate of Kings.
Visions throng—I do not quail;
'Tis martyrdom—but might.

[1] Translated by Lady Sofia Rutherford.

Hear me, one most fatal day,
Never will its memory die,
Rose a mortal; he did say,
"Up, thy wish, thine aim is nigh;
Day breaks—chase the night away
And hail the brightening skies."

As on man who scoffs at woe,
Smiled I—in most sad disdain,
He died, but all lands did glow
With his life, his deeds and reign;
Other errors did upgrow
New altars—victims—lies.

But my path I followed still,
Wrapped me in my grief sublime,
Turned from groans of pain that thrill,
Tears of victims, cries of crime,
Through oppression and through ill,
Awaiting one great hour.

As when Abel slain by Cain,
Down was trod till, dead and low,
Blood then flowed in sea and plain,
So 'tis now—onward I go
The man of my delirium vain,
Was not the coming Power.

Longing for the Infinite
Moved me ever, spurs me now,
But the end has not dawned yet,
Hope unripe hangs on the bough,
Ages do I wait and fret
For that which comes not nigh.

Years to me are moments brief,
Small the Universe appears,
Deep in thought, immersed in grief,
Weighing tyrants with men's fears,
Sweep I Hope's harp for relief
And raise wild terror's cry.

Every suffering has been mine—
Outrage, insult, struggle, pain,
Strong in sovereign thought divine,
All I challenge, all disdain.
Foes will fail—not my faith's shrine,
No time has that uptorn.

Seek not what I am to know,
What my name is rests in gloom,
God records it, Earth and Woe,
But 'tis hidden from the Tomb;
Torture me, contempt I show
For pity as for scorn.

Such was the cry of challenge and scorn which the young poet threw into the face of his oppressors. A challenge as well as a programme, as is shown by the works he was still to issue. A worthy successor to this poem was:—

THE BIBLE.

"Behold, I have taught you statutes and judgments. Keep therefore and do them, for this shall be your wisdom and your understanding in the sight of the nations."—Deut. iv. 5, 6.

As to an ancient temple
Whose vast proportions tower
With summit inaccessible
Among the stars of Heaven;
While the resistless Ocean
Of peoples and of cities
Breaks at its feet in foam
Work that a hundred ages
Hallow; I bow to Thee.

From out thy mighty bosom
Rise hymns sublime, and melodies
Like to the Heavens singing
Praises to their Creator;
While at the sound, an Ecstasy,
A trance, fills all my being
With terror and with awe—
I feel my proud heart thrilling
With throbs of holy pride.

Oh! come, Thou high, beneficent
Heritage of my fathers,
Our country, altar, prophet!
Thou art our all, Thou only
Through doubt, through pain, through outrage,
Through pangs of dissolution
Wringing our tortured hearts;
Come, open the rosy portals
Of hope to us once more!

Nature, immense and splendid,
With force and life and glory
Fills all the Earth, the Heavens
With forms of beauty infinite;
But if man seek for wisdom,
For voice, or for direction
Amid her forms unresting,
The spirit flies before him
Hidden by fatal veil.

Like a broad flood the centuries
Bring up the newer ages;
Their children, lost and scattered,
Break on the rocks of history.
Awed by the roar unceasing,
Thought pauses, questions, listens;
Mute is the dark abyss.
Man gazes on the vortex;
No daylight shows the way.

Now, half-confused with Nature,
Victim of adverse forces,
Man half-unconscious ponders
The secret of creation.
Seduced by floating images
He seeks in silent musings
For liberty and truth,
But finds but arid beauty
That leaves him still alone.

Thou, noble, great, resistless,
Breaking the forms that bound Thee,
Bore up above creation
The liberating spirit;
Yet, always wrapped in silence,
Thou didst await the moment,
The signal from the Lord,
To speak the word, life-giving,
That burned within Thy heart.

Discouraged, weak, immovable,
Plunged deep in mournful musings,
With desperate wordless groanings
Groaned all the lost creation,
Like to a vampire gnawing;

To the sad hearts of victims
Clung care and bitter pain,
While drop by drop the life-blood
Was slowly drained away.

Then spakest Thou in thunder,
Thou shalt arise, O Solima!
Flinging at Rome defiance,
Shalt fall, but still unconquered
Shalt fight, though overpowered,
Till from thy smoking ashes
There falls a tiny stone,
Down goes the mighty fabric,
The eagle flies the dove.

Then spakest Thou in thunder,
"Tell me O Earth! O Heaven!
O People, say what Caesar,
What hosts have shown more power?"
Swift as the forkèd lightning,
Calling the lands, the ocean,
Didst pass from shore to shore
With strong new voice compelling
Wakening two worlds anew.

Here, soft as dew at morning,
The thirsty soil restoring;
There, flashing like a scimitar,
All flaming and devouring,
Like dew on Calvary falling,
Flashing like flame at Medina;
The crescent and the cross,
Before Thy glory heading,
With Thy pure radiance shine.

While in glowing vertex
Thy light goes on expanding,
Our hearts within are burning
With life more new, more noble;
The ever-rolling ages
Repeat Thy word for ever.
All things before Thee lie—
The sun, the stars of Heaven,
Like dust beneath Thy feet.

In Thee, eternal, limitless,
The Earth is bound to Heaven;
The ages in immensity
Are one in Thine infinity;
Rapt by Thy power, the Spirit
Springs ever high and higher
Through care and grief and love,
Groans in mysterious ecstasy,
Exults in bitter pain.

Idylls of love and tenderness,
Home joys and pure affections,
Voices of Hope unconquered
By torture or by agony,
Austere and fruitful suffering,
Terror and doubt and faith,
Oh! for the whole Creation
A voice is found in Thee.

Like an inspired Sibyl
Thou thunderest in anger,
Tyre, Babylon, demolished,
Vanish with throne and altar;
Thou singest, Heaven lets open,
Mankind awakes to harmony
And holy truth and peace;
Like blessed springs descending
Thou fillest all the world.

Ah me! what countless miseries,
What tears all unregarded
Hast Thou consoled and softened
With gentle voice and holy!
How many hearts that struggle
With doubt, remorse, anxiety,
With all the woes of ages,
Dost Thou, on ample pinions,
Lift purified to Heaven!

Oh! come, Thou high beneficent
Heritage of my fathers;
Our country, altar, prophet,
Our life, our all, art Thou!
In doubt, in woe, in outrage,

In pangs of dissolution
That wring our tortured hearts,
Come ope the rosy portals
Of Hope to us once more.

Hidden in lurid caverns,
A mark for senseless fury,
How oft my fathers listened
To augury, shouts and curses
Invoking wrath on Judah,
To the eternal infamy
Of fierce delirious crowds,
Of noble kings and peoples
Thirsting for Israel's blood.

The wife, the pallid daughter,
Through nights of woe and terror
Have clung around the father
Moaning in agony;
While he bowed o'er Thy pages
Calm, mute in meditation
Rapt far from earthly things,
In silent hope intrepid,
Smiling, forgot his fears.

Thou, Zion, old and suffering
Victim of long oppression,
Sublime in woe and patience,
Witness for truth immortal!
Thou, with thy Bible only,
Of all men scorned and hated,
Wandering from shore to shore
Amid the cruel tempests
That sweep thine all away,

That precious freight from shipwreck
Didst keep inviolate,
Didst lift up unto Heaven.
It drew the eyes of all men.
What matter if the peoples
Denied the faith and freedom,
Asylum, pity, peace?—
Thy Bible is thy refuge,
With that thou hast all things.

Throughout the world rejected,
From every corner hunted,
Thy Book shall be thy banner,
Thy country and thy watchword
Into remotest regions.
Thy Bible shalt thou bear,
Hoping and waiting ever;
The glory of Its triumphs
Has never ceased to glow.

Listen! the world is rising,
Seeking, unquiet, thrilling,
Awakens the new Century
To new hopes and new visions.
Men hear upon the mountains
Strange and life-giving voices;
Every soul seems to wait,
And from that Book the Signal
For the new day shall come.

Born with the Sun, It follows
His course throughout Creation;
The Old is roused, transfigured,
The New gains life and vigour.
In thee shall meet all races,
As stars sought for their centre,
And when their Sun arose,
Peacefully round him circling,
Pursued their Heavenly way.

Besides the potent and profound historical intuition that resides in these poems, there is noteworthy a deep feeling for Nature which is rarely found in Italian poets, and which Levi no doubt derived from his Hebrew ancestors. For him, who tended toward a Pantheistic view of life, Nature is one vast entity which ever rises from step to step up to the Infinite, as he sings in his poem entitled *Aspiration*. If to thought he sometimes sacrifices form, this is almost a merit nowadays, when thought in poetry is too frequently subordinated to minute and pedantic research after metre and technical subtleties. His aim is to write poetry that shall provoke thought, that shall speak to the

soul, that shall awaken and create; in a word it may be said that his poetic art may be summed up in the celebrated line—

"Odio il verso che suona e non crea."

And hand in hand with Levi's poetic life marched his political. When he was bewailing beside the Lido the sad fate of Zion and Italy in the spring of 1846 a ray of hope suddenly dawned upon the horizon. Pius the Ninth has ascended the pontifical throne, reversing the reactionary policy of his papal predecessor, and placing himself at the head of the Liberal movement. In a moment the new Pontiff became the most popular and beloved man in all Italy, cries of "Viva Pio Nono" rang through the whole peninsula. No wonder that Levi was carried away by the stream, making himself the mouthpiece of the hopes placed on the unlooked-for champion, in an ode addressed to Pius IX. He headed it with the lines, 1 Corinthians vi. 5, and Colossians iii. 2. This ode fell into the hands of Gino Capponi, the leader of the Tuscan liberals, who read it to his friend Niccolo Tommaseo, and the two resolved to show it to the Pope. Pius IX read the ode most graciously, and sent the author his thanks and apostolic blessing. It is more than probable that this Pope's milder attitude toward the Jews and the fact that shortly after the walls of the Roman Ghetto were razed was due to the impression made on him by this ode quite as much as to the reigning liberal current. This current also affected Charles Albert of Savoy, that Hamlet of monarchs, and caused him to grant the constitution which gave political equality to all his subjects, regardless of creed, a decree which caused David Levi to return to Piedmont in the hope that he could now defend the hopes and aspirations of Italy. He threw himself with ardour into journalism, and helped with his patrimony to found a number of journals destined to advocate the sacred cause of liberty. Meantime there dawned that year of high hope and grievous disappointment, the year 1848, noteworthy in the annals of Europe as the great year in which

the tide of freedom swept up from all sides with tempestuous strength, overturning thrones and altars in its course. The moment seemed favourable, and Lombardy and Venice took up the cry, hoping to shake off the detested Austrian yoke. Among the soldier volunteers that sprang into existence like magic from all parts of Italy was David Levi. Like Theodore Körner, he fought with sword and lyre. A rousing appeal to arms for freedom, hearth and home, called *L'Italiana*, written by him and set to music by Toroni, became the Marseillaise of the movement, and words and music ran like wildfire up and down the peninsula, and were sung and recited till Italy was free from Alps to Sea. It was in these days of glad expectancy that David Levi wrote his first book, *Patria ed Affetti*. Its preface is characteristic of the time in which it was written and of the poet's point of view. After greeting the dawn of the new era with enthusiasm, regarding it as the realization of his youthful dreams, his keen clear Hebrew vision is nevertheless not obscured by excitement that surges around him. That victory, even if delayed a while, must follow effort, that he admits, for if a nation is determined to succeed no might on earth can check it. But will its desire be realized exactly in the manner in which it has imagined it? For this much time will be required, a much longer time than the present generation believes, which imagines that Italy can be made in a day. For rarely or never is an idea realized in the most direct and straightforward way. Reality makes its demands, practical life requires its sacrifices, success must compromise, but nevertheless the ultimate aim must never be lost to view. So clear-sighted was this Tyrtaeus! If his countrymen had but had an equally lucid vision, matters would have gone better for the making of Italy, and much that is to-day deplored might never have ensued. But the Latin has not the Hebrew's cool calm outlook over events, he does not see beyond the immediate moment, he cannot judge calmly when his blood is up. Yet even Levi hoped that there

was staying power in the revolutionary movement initiated in those March days. Instead, as all the world knows, the Italian hopes were still for a time cruelly deluded, and political reaction drew its reins tighter than ever about their necks. The defeat of Novara, the flight of Carlo Alberto and Pius IX, the return of the French occupancy of Rome, all dashed the aspirations of young Italy. Fortunately, the young Victor Emanuel, who had now ascended the Piedmontese throne, did not revoke the liberal constitution granted by his predecessor, and hence the conspirators could continue freely to conspire within his domain. David Levi, in order to fire his countrymen to persist in the sacred cause, wrote a drama called the *Martyrs of Naples in 1799*, which was repeatedly played in Turin with great success, and which still holds the boards. Indeed, his persistence was indefatigable in the Italian cause, and his purse seemed as bottomless as his energy in helping all and when he could, founding clubs, periodicals, and aiding in every possible manner the Unionist propaganda. After the defeat of Custoza he proclaimed the necessity of re-opening hostilities, affirming that even a material defeat would have been a moral victory. He combated the Ministry then in power, inditing a pamphlet against it entitled the *Ministry of Opportunism*, a phrase which thirty years later and in another land was to be revived, and has now become a part of common speech to label a section of the world of politicians. He also tried to enter the Sardinian Parliament, but his election was frustrated by the reactionists and the Catholics. When the Crimean war broke out, he advocated the adhesion of Sardinia to the Allied cause, recognizing with statesmanlike insight the importance of this adhesion for Italy's ultimate international position. When the war of Liberation at last broke out in real earnest, in 1859, and Italy had found a powerful ally against Austria in France, Levi published his *Patria e Redenzione*, a collection of patriotic songs, which he dedicated to Garibaldi, the hero of that dawning

hour, in which in flaming words he incited the young men of the nation to fight their arch enemy and oppressor. One of these songs was sung always by Garibaldi's Redshirts as they marched to battle.

After the battle of Magenta, Levi was elected to sit in the first Italian Parliament by a Lombard constituency. In those days the Italian Parliament was a vastly different assembly from the apathetic, unpatriotic, and corrupt concern that it is to-day. That was the epoch when Italy still had great men to defend her, instead of selfish politicians. Levi seated himself among the Liberal party, known as the Left, and became a friend of Ratazzi's, but he was equally friendly with Cavour who led the Right wing, and that eminent statesmen confided to him more than one important secret mission. Levi became a member of the council for the unification of the Public Debt, and for the reorganization of the Chamber of Commerce. It was he who presented a project for the forming of Agrarian colonies, a project talked of but unrealized to this day, which he considered the only efficient means of combating brigandage. He was opposed to the Cavourian formula of "a free Church in a free State," advocating the rule of the State over the Churches. On this subject he published an important study entitled *Modern Unity and Catholic Unity*. He hotly combated the papal pretensions to temporal power, thereby increasing the hatred felt against him by the clerical party; he strove to show that the temporal power was as mischievous for the Church itself as for the State. He was a convinced opponent of the September Convention, according to which it was agreed that Rome should remain papal, and Florence be made the political capital of Italy. The whole truth is not even yet known about the September Convention, and it is therefore difficult to say whether Levi did right or not to oppose it. Some of the astuter minds of the times regarded it as a great step toward gaining Rome, and perhaps the fact that Rome ultimately was gained proves that they were right. However this may be, Levi's opposition

procured him many enemies and the loss of his seat as deputy, but that he was sincere in his opposition there can be no question. He hated all compromise, and to his mind this agreement was of that nature. "Compromise," he once wrote, "is the last word spoken by an age fundamentally weak and sceptical. Whosoever comprehends this word and is content to accept it, he will receive testimonials and honorary distinctions of all kinds from his contemporaries. For those who cannot, there only remains the future." Excluded from the Chamber, Levi once more returned to literary and journalistic labours. The leisure thus acquired enabled him to finish his *Profeta*, begun many years before in Venice, for it was not until 1877 that he was again elected to Parliament, and then he only sat there a short while, being so violently combated by the clerical party that he had to retire. To enumerate everything that Levi wrote in these years that followed would lead us too far, we can but name some of the most important, reserving quite the most important of all for the last. Noteworthy is his polemical pamphlet, *Democracy and Papism*, which deals with the Roman question, in which he opposes the two principles and elucidates the educational advantages offered by the State in opposition to those offered by the Church. He also published a work, half in prose and half in verse, a favourite method with him, modelled on the *Vita Nuova* and Giordani Bruno's *Eroici Furori*, called *Demeter*, in which he exposed his ideal of womanhood. The book was inspired by the true story of a poor woman from the Abruzzi whose children had been stolen from her, and who wandered on foot through the whole of Italy, and who even made her way to America, in her vain search for them. I reproduce a few pages that give some idea of Levi's originality of thought and method.

THE ORIGIN OF GODS.

The religious type or ideal of a people is not to be sought for so much in a more or less probable historical fact, as in the habits,

tendencies, or passions of that people. These are the true makers or modifiers of Gods (Numi). This is the truth, though not the actual and historical, certainly the psychological truth with regard to their origin. Now among the many gods who were born on or passed over the Italian soil, one of the types which has prevailed in every age and which has formed and crystallized in the bosom of our people was the feminine type, the woman-god. To seek this ideal in its origin, to note the various fantasies barely sketched or shadowed forth, to study that which prevailed and to follow it in its evolutions and transformations across the ages, might offer one of the most singular studies imaginable regarding the psychology and the religiosity of the Italian people. It is not true that the Italian is impervious to the religious sentiment, as has been said by those who infer the sterility of a whole people from that of their own minds. On the contrary, imaginative and artistic as the Italian is, he formed for himself in every age an ideal or archetype of virtue, beauty, strength, heroism, and purity which, corresponding to a civil or social need of the epoch, was elevated into a worship. However, the gods do not spring forth already adult and armed like Minerva from the brain of Jove. They are not instantaneously created by the breath of God, like Adam in Genesis. Their historic reality is always, not only problematical, but fabulous and mendacious. Yet there exists a reality still more potent and more concrete than historic fact. Like the productions of Nature, deities are formed slowly. They become, they are the result of intimate and profound labour of a society or of the tendencies, needs, and fancies of an age. The instincts, the tendencies of an epoch sow the first germs, and sketch confusedly and indistinctly the general outlines—the profile. Events, or rather some one event, at times a person, often an ordinary one, adumbrates some of these leading features and incarnates the general character. Tendency, fantasy, sentiment, wonder begin to animate it, to attract attention towards it. The people, that eternal artist, adorns it, embellishes it, surrounds it with the aureole of the marvellous. Then comes the wandering bard, the inspired sibyl, the poet, to gather up the facts, the legends scattered among the people, adding prestige to the supposed deity, hero, saviour. The philosopher, the sage employs himself in discovering and revealing in them, in their words, often confused, indeterminate, sibylline, a hidden mystery and wisdom. Meanwhile, the priest behind the curtains of the temple is studying, applying, and refashioning mysterious symbols, preparing for the worship which shall startle the mind and surprise the intellectual senses. And when the time is ready for the new god, and the old one no longer inspires either respect or terror, then the priest, arrayed in purple, advances to the threshold of the temple and cries

to the prostrate people, "Behold your new God." And the people, who already see in their mind's eye the image of their idol and feel its diffused breath pervading the air, fall down and worship.

He then goes on to show how the ideal of ancient Italy was the mother, for Italy, as Robert Browning has already said, is "a woman country," hence there was originated here the cultus of the Virgin, with all its after-effects of Mariolatry and the gross superstitions, such as that of the Immaculate Conception, which grouped themselves around it.

This work was followed by another, half prose and half poetry, called *Il Femminile Eterno*, bearing for its motto Goethe's words, "Das Ewig Weibliche zieht uns hinan." The poems sung the praises of Woman under the different names in which she has appeared in history, Venus in all her transformations, and the Shunamite, Rachel, Santa Teresa, and the Mater Dolorosa. In the prose section, which helps to elucidate and complete the poetical synthesis, Levi traces the history of Woman in the history of the civilizations of the peoples, and studies the reasons why the epic of Woman has not yet been completely written, although she plays so efficacious and continuous a part on the theatre of history as an important protagonist, and as the most potent energy in the midst of a nation, the creator of the family, the inspirer of legends, and the founder of all the arts of peace and culture. Well argued and thought out are the pages in which he compares the diverse action of man and woman on civilization, and the varied methods adopted by each to attain their ends. The book was not without its use in Italy, where in Levi's youth Eastern ideas still prevailed in regard to women, and where the emancipation of women from their slavish subjection to men has barely commenced.

His ideas on religion, as might be supposed, are marked by the same breadth of view which characterizes his political outlook. *Vita di Pensiero* and *Vita di Azione*

are a species of autobiography, also part prose and part verse, in which Levi has studied various phases of his individual development, and has given us his ideas concerning many social and religious questions. Indeed, the question of religion has interested him all his life, for he holds religion to be a necessary as well as a beneficent power in the existence of the individual as well as of the community. It was obvious that a man interested in religion could not fail to be interested in the most ancient, that of Egypt. On this theme Levi wrote a pamphlet, entitled *The Symbolism of Ancient Egypt and the Hebrew Ideas.* It is thus that he treats of the Sphinx :—

The Sphinx, with the man's head and the lion's body, is the most ancient and august of symbols. Over the ample trunk, white and clearly designed in the meridian sun, the sand of the desert steadily advances like a rising tide striving to envelop and cover it, but the head emerges colossal above the movement of the burning waves. The extended paws clasp a small temple, the nose is flattened, the proud arch of the eyebrows gives to the whole face a singular expression of majestic melancholy.

The signification which the form conveys, the lapidary texts sculptured on its flanks, declare that it personifies the young light which drives out the darkness and hails the sun in the fullness of his glory. The Sphinx has her face turned to the east, crowned with a disc of gold. She was called the sentinel of the sun, and when the greatest of stars rushed from the Arabian mountains, he struck the Sphinx's face, which blazed, confusing the human visage with the divine in an aureole flame ; then sounds of cymbals, flutes, and harps saluted the dawn in the temples of granite and alabaster, and the priests in white, mounting the Sphinx's back, raised their hymn to the sun. The Sphinx prefigured what science has now begun to affirm—the evolution of species, terrestrial origin, nature which develops from the heart of animality and conceives and forms man. The outstretched legs, the ferocious claws, the strong and virile body, which, crouching, sits like a bird on her eggs, half-buried in the marine sand whence all beings have emerged, gives an image of the immense forces of Nature which cause the head of a god to grow and arise from the bust of a lion. Darwin, after six thousand years with his theory of evolution of the struggle for life, of the selection of the fittest, says, "The fatality of the strongest gives the key to the enigma that the Sphinx has flung in among the peoples." But

the Egyptian Isis goes further, rises to conceptions which science has not yet pronounced, affirms the soul of the world, which, one in its essence, breathes into Nature, into genius, into species, into the individuals, the breath of life and the intellectual germs which make for perfection.

The Sphinx shivers, moves, goes forth from Egypt, and becomes the symbol which dominated all the ancient cults and civilizations. In Assyria two colossal wings spring from its sides, blazing like metal pouring from a fiery furnace; in Judea it changes into two cherubim with outspread wings, who cover their faces and protect the sacred ark. In the vision of Ezekiel it is one of the beasts with a face as a man, shining like a live coal which moves beneath the glory of the Eternal, and shows forth the four orders which guide the wheels of the world. In Phoenicia she appears with prominent and alluring breasts, with outstretched paws emerging from palpitating and voluptuous flesh, image of the eternal feminine, in her double nature, hellish and heavenly. At last she crosses the sea, rises gigantic before the walls of Thebes, and puts to Oedipus the fearful riddle which ends in her despair and death.

And now many centuries must pass before the enigma, flung before the world of old by the Sphinx, shall be gathered up and shall illuminate the intellect of the peoples, before the cloth that muffles her lips shall be loosed, and the veil that wraps her head around shall become Revelation and Science.

Levi deeply deplores the religious indifference of his Italian countrymen, and ascribes it, no doubt correctly, to the clerical party, who are so preoccupied with their desire to rule that they do not attend to duties that more properly pertain to their mission. But man is, above all, a moral entity, and his ethical desires must be gratified before all else, though perchance they are the most difficult to satisfy; but this alone makes him a man. Necessarily these interests led Levi to study the Jewish question. Happily, when he wrote his autobiography, this question seemed to have only a practical, juridic side. Persecution seemed banished from the civilized world for ever. When the disgusting flood-tide of Anti-Semitism and the agitation of the infamous Stoecker was raging in Germany—Italy, to her honour be it remarked, remained, and remains, untouched by the antedeluvian movement—Levi in his deep ire and

disgust penned a book, called *Il Semitismo*, in which he admits with profound regret that the struggle which he deemed settled for ever was by no means defunct. As its motto he chose the words of St. Paul, Romans xi. 18. He points out how Anti-Semitism was, and is at all times, a forerunner of reaction portending the moral decay of a nation. Reaction ever begins with a Hep! Hep! against the Jews, the most industrious and intelligent class of the population. Hence Anti-Semitism results in damage to the State in which it is tolerated or protected, as though to prove the truth of the covenant made with Abraham, "Whosoever blesseth thee shall be blessed, and whosoever curseth thee shall be cursed." The ideas of which Israel is the standard-bearer are for Levi three-fold and simple, like all that is truly great. They are God, Law, and People. Out of the antagonism in which Israel stood to all the rest of the world, owing to these ideas, and the struggle that resulted therefrom, we learn to know all its history, from the most ancient to the most modern.

We have not space to follow in detail the ideas, closely packed and carefully argued, contained in this little volume, which merits translation and wide diffusion throughout Christendom and Judaism. So modern is it that Levi not only treats of the Christian persecution of the Jews, but he foresees a persecution arising from a new source, that of the Anarchists, who hate and persecute the Jews as the expression of all those principles of law and order, of religious sentiment as well as of commerce and industry, on which are based the weal of a State. In conclusion he points out how Israel's material history is ended, but its moral and intellectual history continues, its social and ethical mission is by no means finished. The book closes with the words of St. Paul, that Hebrew who was the true maker of Christianity, in his Epistle to the Romans, xi. 15, "For if the casting away of them be the reconciling of the world, what shall the receiving of them be?"

In *Vita di Pensiero* are embodied many of Levi's first

and shortest poems. That entitled *The Crows of the Coliseum* is worth translating, but is too long for insertion here. A few lines, however, may give some idea of its strength and beauty. The translation can give but a faint shadow of the original, which is full of that wonderful answering of sound and sense that gives so great a charm to Italian verse.

I sat alone
  Upon a mass of stone,
Forgotten by the Ages,
  Despite their rages,
The Arch of Titus near,
  When hark! a sound I hear,
A cry that sometimes seems almost a groan,
  Sometimes a sneer.

"Cra, cra, crae," the crows, the crow,
  Shrieking they go,
Sweeping around
The Coliseum proud
With echoes rough and loud,
  And waking with harsh cry
The rock Tarpeian high.
  "We were here, you and I,"
They seem to croak,
  "Through all Rome's struggles, glories, and decay—
The ages pass us by.
  Where Brutus spoke,
Where the red sunlight saw the legions die,
  They all are gone;
The crow, the king of all, is left alone."

I have reserved to the last mention of the three really great works which constitute a species of trilogy, where are traced the road that must be traversed by those main factors of human culture, Religion, Art, and Science, in order to help them to reach their goal. These are the *Life of Giordano Bruno*, a work which marks an epoch in the history of philosophic literature; the dramatic poem, *Il Profeta o la Passione di un Popolo*, in which are embodied his religious sentiments; and *La mente di Michael*

Angelo, the prophet-artist, who painted and carved in riddles, condemning in canvas and marble the false Christianity of the Middle Ages, and predicting the coming of that new and purer religion of which Giordano Bruno was the prophet, a religion that should have no rites, no personalities, no authormorphism, a religion of pure intellect, working upward on purely philosophic lines.

An interval of almost twenty years separated the first part of *Il Profeta, The Orient,* from the second part, *The Occident,* and there is as little real cohesion between them as between the first and second parts of Goethe's *Faust,* to which *Il Profeta* has been compared, as well as to the *Prometheus* of Aeschylus; and indeed it resembles these dramas in the vastness of its conception, the grandeur of the sentiment with which it deals. But in Levi's poem it is not one man who struggles against adverse fate or tries to arrive at truth; it is the life struggle of an idea, of a passionate craving for liberty and justice incarnated in a people, a race, which goes on from age to age amplifying its sphere of action as the ages revolve. The apostles of this idea are the Hebrew prophets, synthesized in the prophet of Israel's adversity, Jeremiah. In the fourteenth canto of the *Inferno,* Virgil tells Dante that in the island of Crete there dwells an ancient sage "who holds his shoulders turned towards Damietta, and looks at Rome as if it were his mirror." This old man, according to some commentators, adumbrates the genius of Time, behind whom lies the East, or the past, while before him stretches the Occident, or the future. This parable elucidates the character and the tendencies of Levi's prophet. Its theme is taken from Israel's past, and its scene of action is old Palestine, but the ideas, which are the ultimate goal at which its creator aims, refer to the future of Italy in the first place, and then to that of all mankind. The drama is preceded by a Prologue. A dead man called forth from his tomb in each successive century inquires concerning the dominant idea of each, asking, "What hour is it now on Earth?" And each age replies.

One tells him how man is the slave of the brute forces of Nature, and worships them in his fear; one other narrates how the brute force of warriors predominates; and a third, how the frauds of priests reign supreme, shielding lies under the cloak of truth. Each time the buried man falls back into his tomb, saying, "The hour is not yet come." At last there dawns an age in which the oppressed has shaken off his bonds and stands forth as a man, the age of the great avengement, but his struggles are vain, and he once more succumbs. Discouraged, the dead man sinks back into his tomb again, saying, "He thinks, he dares, he struggles still." The drama itself consists of five acts, in which all the history of humanity is passed in review through the mouth of its prophets. Renan has said that "prophetism has created the religion of the future and the religion of humanity," but Levi before Renan points out what prophetism really was as a humanitarian and civil institution. The prophet, despoiled of his theological and mystical aureole, was the tribune of the people, the journalist, taken in the highest sense of the word, and the propagator and diffuser of all new ideas, the reformer, the defender of the rights of the Hebrew nation, which Michelet has called "the only democracy of antiquity." The theories concerning prophetism, which Levi has exposed from the historical and rational point of view in his preface, are represented in the ardent and passionate action of the drama. The second and third acts constitute a poem on the philosophy of religion, in which all the human cults are passed in review and due justice is done to that of Israel. The fourth act, entitled The Peoples, presents us with a series of pictures of the antique peoples, with frequent allusions to modern nations. The last act, entitled The Temple, ends with the destruction of that edifice and the captivity of the children of Israel. Amid the plains appears Jeremiah, who weeps with his countrymen, but in the end addresses to them words of hope and encouragement, concluding with this speech, that finishes the drama:—

Go forth, O people,
Sacred to thought, to labour and to sorrow,
And through the centuries pursue thy way.
God of Infinity, He is thy God,
And measureless alike 'mid alien fanes,
Along the sea and lands that thou shalt tread,
Pilgrim of endless years, thy path shall be.
The road is dark, is long and full of pain;
Beside thee still shall go, at God's behest,
Like to the fiery column, quenchless Hope.
As winnowed grain is flung into the air,
So, 'midst all peoples God shall scatter thee,
And thou shall bear, as well as thine own griefs,
The griefs and burdens of all other races.
Peoples shall rise, shall shine, shall pass away,
But thou, sacred to life, beside the graves
Of all shall pass immortal, vaster far than time
Or than this earth, no tomb can hold
Thy thoughts immeasurable.

Sorrowful and grand,
Thou to the rush confused of years to come,
And in the wreck of peoples and of empires,
Thou in all ages, living, speaking witness,
Shalt say to all—"I am." And to the past
The future thou shalt bind, and race to race,
People to people, and the scattered limbs
Of Adam drawing into thine own self,
In thee, new Adam, one mankind shall grow
Like unto God, and holy on the earth.
Thou the reviving universe shalt fill
With truth and peace.

In that day, wonder of centuries,
All who behold thee shall exclaim, "Behold,
The people who for ages were hewn down
Upon a thousand altars, burnt on hundreds,
Arising from the wrecks of shattered fanes
Unhurt and pure."
And now, Lord of the ages, all these tears,
The tears of Israel, that o'er all the Earth
Shall stream a quickening shower,
Thou shalt accept as a propitiation for the rights.

The second part of this great epic consists of a dialogue

between Emanuel, the prototype of prophetism and of the thinker, and Ahasuerus, th representative of humanity. Its scene of action and chief subject is modern Rome, the new Rome conquered by Italy. For Levi, the world has two centres of civilization, Zion and Rome. In the second part, which deals with the latter centre, he traces out the religious, artistic, and ethical movements of modern society. The erudition displayed in both sections of the great poem is immense, its diction magnificent, its aim high and noble. A few lines taken from the second part may give some idea of its spirit.

> The wise, among the peoples of the past,
> Worshipped the mountain peaks. But if sublime,
> One on another, all the hills of Earth
> Were piled together in gigantic heaps,
> They would be but an atom, set against
> Thy Lord and King. They are but depths, not heights,
> Confronted with thy mind, that without rest
> Cries out within thee, with unmeasured breath,
> "Higher and higher yet!" They bowed down in the past
> To strange yet gentle beasts and the grey bear
> Of the dark wood. But thy soul cries aloud—
> "Aspire to life! to life!"
> Of all the peoples for triumphant truth,
> And for the eternal glory of thy Name,
> And then shall come the era, long desired,
> Of liberty, of justice, and of light.

Higher and higher ever mounts the keynote of the whole poem, which also ably contrasts the struggles and passions endured by Israel during centuries with the brief passion suffered by Jesus.

Some critics have found fault with Levi's poetical style, reproaching him with lengthiness, with a tendency to declamation and rhetoric, and with a use of rhythms not suited to the Italian tongue. Such criticisms addressed to a great work that is dense with great thoughts and sublime aspirations, is hypercriticism indeed. Levi's aim is not to write poetry for poetry's sake, he does not belong to

the art for art school, he seeks only to propagate his ideas, to upraise a song full of hope and courage for struggling man, to help him to new life, strength, and happiness. Indeed the keynote words of all his writings are "Excelsior" and "Forward." The *Occident* was preceded by a sad preface, whose title alone suffices to indicate its contents, "The Italy we hoped for and the Italy we have." It contains the sad wail that has been echoed and re-echoed often since by those who spent their lives and strength and substance on Italy's behalf, grieved to their souls to see how little their hopes have been fulfilled, how the Italy of to-day has fallen into the hands of professional, self-seeking politicians, and a greedy and corrupt bureaucracy. A reaction, a new Risorgimento may come, but for the moment the outlook is sombre and discouraging, above all for those who expended themselves on the making of the land which has so grievously betrayed their high hopes.

Giordano Bruno had early attracted David Levi—

> I was but a child, he says, when I accidentally heard Bruno's name and read a brief account of him; from that hour I seemed to see him, to know him. It seemed as though our spirits communed with each other, that they had been related since centuries. Is this elective affinity or intellectual atavism? Was it a mere delusion, or my fancy, that from my earliest youth I strove after sensation, heroism, and truth? I passed from poetry to philosophy, and then back again to poetry without finding rest. Surely it was Providence, or divine justice, or, to speak theologically, the finger of God, which destined me, the descendant of an old and noble race, which since 1800 years suffers from the absurd as well as impious charge of having killed a God, to become the agent of avenging justice, to refute the accusations of our accusers, and fling the same into their faces. It was the *lex talionis*, the historical law of retaliation.

And truly the Dominican monk's mental calibre might well attract a cultured Jew, for Giordano Bruno, like Levi, is at the same time an idealist and a realist. His ideas are rooted in the reality of created things, and from these he rises to speculation. It is the Jacob's ladder that rests with its feet upon the earth, but whose uppermost rungs

touch high Heaven. The affinity between the ultimate aims of Israel and Giordano Bruno are marked, and the end of this man's influence has come as little as the end of Israel's upon the nations, indeed in both cases it may be said to have barely begun.

A series of articles on Giordano Bruno were the first-fruits of Levi's attraction, then in his *Lyrical Intermezzo* Bruno is made from his scaffold to foretell the re-awakening and revival of Italy. Levi regards Bruno as the impersonation of the Italian conscience, the modern conscience as opposed to the perverted conscience of the Middle Ages, a man born before his time, a prophet great, not merely because of his great mind and his divining genius, but by the potency of character which made him the most eminent, the most enlightened and thoughtful of philosophers and reformers, in short, together with Michael Angelo, the most wonderful figure of that wonderful epoch, the Renaissance.

Giordano Bruno's works, full of cryptic allusions purposely veiled from the comprehension of the vulgar herd of his epoch, are lucidly explained and set forth by his biographer, who reveals him to us as *semper unum* in whatever he does, writes or thinks. Levi has entitled his great work on Giordano Bruno *The Religion of Thought*, and has divided it into two sections, the Man, and the Apostle and Martyr. The first part is entirely biographical and historical; the second doctrinal and philosophical. Levi spared no pains to make his work complete, visiting London, Oxford, Geneva, Paris, and Frankfort, for the purpose. In conclusion he points out how Italy should be proud of this son, in whose soul it should recognize, incandescent, the stamp of its own genius. Indeed, throughout Levi's book it is manifest that he uses Giordano Bruno for polemical ends, in order to raise the ethical thinking, the courage of his countrymen. Indeed, he openly admits this in a letter to me, in which he writes:—

> I felt that after the temporal power had fallen it was needful to continue to battle against the spiritual, against that mean and lying

crowd with its harmful errors which is the plague-spot of the Latin world, and above all of Italy. I began my crusade in the name of Giordano Bruno, and after a ceaseless combat fought with open visor; for over twenty years I published my work on the great philosopher martyr, and thanks to me his statue now rises in a retaliating attitude on the spot on which he was burnt alive. To-day it is merely his statue which rises up, but the twentieth century will not have set before his spirit will have been diffused over the future Rome, endowing it with the spirit of the new religion of Thought and Science, of the *Dio Uno* and Infinite. After Science, Art, great and redeeming Art, after Dante and Bruno, the third of the Italian Titans, Michael Angelo. And I put my hand to the work *La Mente di Michael Angelo.* And the mystery that envelopes the masterpieces of this grandest of artists, who taught and graved rather than painted in his divine and cyclopean poem of the Sistine, whose meaning until now only a few adepts dared to reveal, I ventured to draw into the light of day, in order that Italy and the whole world might admire the doctrines hidden. "Sotto il velame dei dipinti strani," as Dante sings.

This work on Michael Angelo is almost better known in France than in Italy. A French translation was accepted by the Minister of Public Instruction, on account of its many new and original ideas, as a class-book, and in France it is still widely and deeply studied. Levi calls Michael Angelo the Florentine Sphinx, for according to him the works of Michael Angelo are cryptic like those of Giordano Bruno, and hide a profound allegorical significance. At the Court of Lorenzo il Magnifico Michael Angelo came in contact with the greatest spirits of the epoch, he was early inoculated with the leading ideas of the Renaissance, and he made it his life-task to clothe these ideas in beautiful forms, and thus pass them on to posterity.

What Dante had done by means of verse, Michael Angelo strove to do by means of painting and sculpture. According to Levi his first work, *The Combat of Hercules and the Centaurs*, already contains an allusion to the combat of intellect with brute force, truth with falsehood and superstition. The world-famed frescoes of the Sistine he regards as a connected philosophical poem which he elucidates with original and profound insight. For his aim was not

merely to write the life of this mighty genius, that had been done before, but to impress on his countrymen the grandeur and force of character, the secret lofty aspiration that dominated the existence and pervaded the whole work of the artist. Very different is his book from that of J. A. Symonds on the same theme, with its needlessly unclean suggestions. Michael Angelo's works, according to Levi, attest the remarkable independence of spirit he succeeded in preserving throughout his life; although he lived in courts and amid servile surroundings, his art never suffered corruption to bring it down to the level of the prevailing taste. His enlightened religious views would not bend, even to the demands of Pontiffs. "Michael Angelo," says Levi, "was the herald, the pioneer, the prophet, of the new Christianity of the true reformation, that was more truly advanced, more truly liberal than that of Luther, a reformation not even yet fully comprehended, and whose keynote was written by himself in one of the lunettes of the Sistine, 'Loqui prohibetur et tacere non possum.'" And of the new dogma, or rather thought, Michael Angelo strove to create the new Art and to initiate and formulate the symbolism of the future. He endeavoured to subjugate the old used-up formulas and to substitute in their place others which should be more virile, simple, and true, to combat conventionalism and to put in its place sincerity, frankness, and reality. Michael Angelo, according to Levi, was the incarnation of the humanist ideas of the Italian Renaissance. His religious ideals were those of Giordano Bruno and of the great thinkers of the age. In his works he incarnated the religious and social conception of the unity of the universe that made that period so glorious and remarkable. His Christ, his Virgin, are no divinities removed from Earth, they are simple mothers and babes. He painted the modern Christ, the Christ of reality, the man and teacher despoiled of all sacerdotal attributes and superstitious addenda. In the Biblical tales he eagerly sought after the inner meaning of what often seemed

childish fables. The central figure of the vault he declares to be Jonah, typical of the people escaping from the chains of tyranny, superstition, and prejudice, into the pure light of Science, which is the new revelation.

I have exceeded my space, but by no means my subject, which is so vast, embracing all aspirations, all religions, all ideals, that a volume would be required to do it justice. But I hope I have said enough to induce my readers to go to the fountain-head themselves and study the works of David Levi. It is shameworthy for Israel to confess that even in Italy, where he still lives and works indefatigably in the cause of his Jewish co-religionists and his Italian countrymen, his name and fame are almost unknown to the younger generation, and we fear that in England he is quite ignored. Nor are his labours ended. Though old, but happily not decrepit, he is still at work, combating for his high ideals. I cannot do better than close this article by allowing him to speak for himself. He writes to me, under date of February, 1897 :—

I am now occupied with keen interest in seeking the means to reprint the famous commentary on Dante by Gabriele Rossetti, and for this end I entered into correspondence with his son, William Rossetti, the brother of the famous poet and artist, Dante Gabriele Rossetti. The commentary of the father is the only one among the multitude of commentaries to the *Divina Commedia* which, dictated in a wide and liberal spirit, and based on vast erudition, has explained in its true significance the Sacred Poem, and thrown a penetrating light on the religious and political movements that agitated Italy in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. But since it was an anti-papal movement, and of this Rossetti gives evident and irrefutable proof, his commentary was combated with every weapon by the Jesuits and neo-Catholics, who are still trying to suppress and disperse the copies. It is our duty to make it known, to diffuse and to propagate it, if only for the purpose of arousing Italy from her inertia, recalling her to her anti-papal and free traditions. Italy to-day is free politically, but from the spiritual point of view she is still enslaved by the priest, the Jesuit, and the Madonna. Such are her gods.

After a rapid review of his works and political action, he thus concludes :—

Such, my dear lady, in a few words, is the synthesis of my life. The thought that guided me, that illuminated me for over seventy years, which I developed amid unspeakable struggles, privations, pain, and obstacles, but throughout more than half a century of labour and discouragement, the thought that sustained me, was that of fulfilling a duty. The voice of old shook me as it shook Moses when it spoke from out of the burning bush on Mount Horeb, saying, "In hoc signo vinces." Meanwhile a new generation succeeds to mine, it marches on and will continue the battle in more compact files and in greater numbers; it advances in the name of Liberty, Labour, and Science, and I, who have one foot in the grave, do not halt, as do the anaemic and flaccid who bow their heads like pessimistic eunuchs, who deny our great mother Nature, Life, and God; I uprise out of the sepulchre that awaits me and attracts me, and cry,—Forward always and hope: to Science, Justice, and Truth, remains the last word.

HELEN ZIMMERN.

NOTE. Except where otherwise indicated, the translations in this article are by Miss MARY A. CRAIG.

THE MISSION OF JUDAISM: A REPLY.

THE twenty-one opinions published in the last number of this REVIEW upon the presentation which I had made of the Mission of Judaism in the *Fortnightly Review* of October, 1896, are of value as much on account of their objections as for their acquiescence. Every one of those writers has approached the subject in a spirit which seems to realize that the time is ripe for discussing it. Even those who are most opposed to any immediate declaration to the outer world of the Faith of Israel, admit that that faith was never designed to be for all time the exclusive possession of a single race. Such opponents to my scheme as Mr. Lucien Wolf, the Rev. S. Singer and Lady Magnus, and Mr. Zangwill (I mention them in the degree, as it appears to me, of their opposition to my views) almost apologize for their reluctance or hesitation to see the faith which they hold disseminated among people who are not Jews. Their criticisms are, from my own point of view, most helpful, just because they are (unconsciously to the writers perhaps) frank admissions that some explanation is required for the extreme reticence which the Jews in emancipated countries still preserve in regard to the secret of their religious faith. Mr. Lucien Wolf is afraid lest in breaking this silence some of the Jewish ritual will be sacrificed. He fears lest it be discovered that the universal elements in the Jewish faith have already entered into some Christian prayers. He apprehends that some such form of public worship as I have proposed might involve what he so pathetically dreads, and what he would not "care to see,"

namely, "ever so small a mantle of Judaism thrown over it." And he adds: "We must either propagate Judaism in its entirety or not at all." The "entirety of Judaism," in Mr. Wolf's view and that of multitudes of Jews, of course includes rites of so exclusive a character as to render them impracticable for adaptation beyond the confined limits of a single group of families. Here one is face to face with a difficulty that lies outside the real problem. Briefly it is this: The Jews themselves, before they begin to teach their faith to non-Jews, must disentangle it from the cobwebs of ritual with which centuries of enforced isolation have well-nigh submerged it. I quite realized that this task would confront any Jew who believed in the propagation of his faith. But I never believed that the work of disentanglement would be begun until individual Jews were able to demonstrate to their own people that their religious faith was acceptable to non-Jews. One of the first most satisfactory results of such a movement as I have foreshadowed will be to lead Jews of the type of Mr. Wolf to distinguish between the faith of Israel and its outer shell—the ritual. So long as a Jew regards the "entirety" as consisting of a ritual and of a faith both of equal value—he is *ipso facto* disqualified from becoming an active missionary to non-Jews. And nothing can be more certain than that no missionary can succeed in teaching the faith which is in him, if that faith be not of a character to render it independent of the elaborate network of ritual grown up in the course of ages around a small group of people who have been for so long isolated in their religious life.

I recognize at once that I am here speaking of two kinds of ritual as though they were only one. And I shall be told that there was a ritual identified with Judaism in the earliest stages of its history, which therefore cannot be called an aftergrowth. True! But it is just this element of the Jewish ritual which has undergone within the Jewish fold, and under the fullest sanction of authority, both Biblical and rabbinical, the greatest possible change.

The earliest Jewish sacrificial ritual was that established for the temple, and abrogated when the second temple fell. The most orthodox and exclusive teachers of the Synagogue have never suggested that Judaism was impaired by a hair's breadth in consequence of the total abolition of the sacrificial rite. From the point of view of the Reform schools of thought we have not only lost nothing but gained unspeakably by the fact that that ancient rite has disappeared. One of the most astounding features in the history of the development of Judaism is the fact that the sacrificial rite, which holds so conspicuous a place in the Pentateuch, has been for two thousand years completely abolished, and that Judaism has continued to develop from that day to this. The tradition has in no way been broken. The period of captivity has witnessed the production of Jewish luminaries who cannot be said to hold an inferior rank to those who lived when the temple was securely established. If we can survive so great a revolution as the abolition of the temple and the cessation of the Hebrew national polity, much more likely are we to survive the extinction of minor customs, which, as I have said, are nothing more than the common-place badges of an enforced and artificial separateness. But I have not even suggested that the Jewish people as a whole need part with these observances. All I have indicated is that whoever makes the first attempt to let the Jewish faith be embraced by non-Jews and to recommend the acceptance of it by them, will not be called upon to invite them to adopt all the special customs peculiar to the Jewish people. The rite of circumcision has no direct connexion with the conception of and the worship of God which it is the mission of Israel to spread. To identify in an inseparable manner the great spiritual needs of human nature with any special rite whatever is a philosophical blunder, and involves the gravest misapprehension of spiritual truths. Even St. Paul recognized this fact, at a period in the history of mankind when there would have

been a greater show of reason if he had accompanied his religious teaching with a recommendation to the pagan peoples to adopt certain Hebrew practices.

Mr. Lucien Wolf is pleading not for the faith but for the crust of the faith.

The Rev. S. Singer, who is recognized as a champion of the faith as well as of its crust, raises a different issue. He apprehends that such a Church of Israel as I desire to see in the midst of English society would increase or create afresh a "din and tumult" of rival missionary efforts. Here it is logically convenient to connect the grounds of his opposition with those of Mr. Lucien Wolf, for they seem to neutralize one another. Mr. Wolf objects to the proposed church of Israel because it might be like other churches. Mr. Singer objects to it because it will increase the number of missionary efforts in this country. Mr. Wolf says that if a certain prayer already in use by Christians presented an idea in common between Jews and Christians I could not exclude it. Indeed he continues that I have already admitted as much by proposing a few selections from *Hymns Ancient and Modern.* This criticism has a peculiar value, for it enables me to say at once that those elements of the Divine Faith of Israel which have already penetrated beyond the limits of our race, in spite of the studied religious reserve of Jews for centuries, would be instantly and gladly recognized as the outcome of the revelation which the people of Israel have inherited. If persons who have been estranged from one another for a long period of time discover at their meeting that there are fragments and relics and other possessions which belonged originally to some ancestors of either of them, would they not rejoice at the discovery? One of the greatest facts in regard to the genius of Israel's faith is that through his sons there have come down to multitudes who are not Israelites precious heirlooms of the ancient faith and of the ancient spiritual culture. The one thing in Christianity which breathes into it the elements of truly

ethical and spiritual life is its Jewish ancestry. Its founder —whatever he was not—was undoubtedly a Jew of the highest order of spirituality—charity of heart and love of the human race were his most endearing characteristics—and they were in his time, beyond doubt, the special and characteristic products of the Jewish religion. Some of the prayers to be found in Catholic missals and in the Book of Common Prayer belonging to the Church of England do unquestionably contain sentiments which belong to the genius of Israel's faith, and which have been composed by those who had caught the spirit of the Old Testament. The language of them is only marred in such places where Almighty God is represented as being invisible except through an intermediary. I should pity any Jew who would be unable to offer such a prayer as the following: "O Lord, who hast taught us that all our doings without charity are nothing worth, pour into our hearts that most excellent gift of charity, the very bond of peace and of all virtues, without which whosoever liveth is counted dead before thee." Again, what Jew, who is something more than a mere race Jew, would deny the religious value of such a prayer as this: "Almighty God, unto whom all hearts be open, all desires known, and from whom no secrets are hid; cleanse the thoughts of our hearts by the inspiration of thy Holy Spirit, that we may perfectly love thee and worthily magnify thy holy name"? To find in common with the non-Jew such prayers as these would be, to quote one of my commentators, Miss Sylvie D'Avigdor, "a recognition, not a reconciliation." And if I linger on this point raised by Mr. Wolf, it is because it raises a question so vital to the movement which I am advocating that it touches the very root of the question. If it be supposed that the spread of Judaism means the founding of a new sect, which shall be in conflict with all existing sects, the scheme which I cherish has been misconceived by my critics. The object is not, as Mr. Singer supposes, to raise new barriers and to create fresh issues, but the con-

trary ; it is to heal and to bind and to unite in a common worship of the Universal Father those who have been hitherto rent asunder. One of the very first problems which it would be the purpose of such a communion to face is to exhume as it were the kernel of the religious idea now buried beneath the sand of legalism, and to bring up to the surface of the earth that which has lain buried for generations below the crust of sectarianism and human strife. Not only would I not hesitate to adopt any prayer which expressed my ideas, but I should rejoice at every fresh relic that might be discovered of the ancient faith which had been imbedded beneath the trappings of ages. The early centuries of the Christian churches have enveloped the faith which the great Jew of Nazareth had by his life and his example bequeathed.

Mr. Wolf's contention about non-Jewish prayers involves the question of the Jewish origin of that aspect of Christianity which is distinct from the Hellenism with which it made a compromise. And this question of its Jewish origin inevitably brings me into conflict with the warning which Mr. Charles Voysey offers to me in regard to what I may have to say about Jesus of Nazareth. It will save endless misunderstanding, if I endeavour to make it clear to Mr. Voysey and his followers that it is impossible for me to approach that subject from his point of view. To Mr. Voysey, and those who owe their Theism to his influence, the name of Jesus represents something from which they have dissented and broken away. In their mental perspective Jesus is the one figure in religious history which has come to typify ideas, the opposition to which has caused them to form their separate communion. To their minds Jesus means the doctrine of the Incarnation which they are established for the purpose of refuting, and the name is, moreover, identified in their view with questions of literary criticism and interpretation which do not affect the scheme which I am propounding. To a Jew who desires the spread of his faith the name of Jesus has

a totally different import. It is identified with nothing from which we have ever had occasion to part company. On the other hand it holds a place in the religious history of the Jewish faith which no Israelite with a spark of the scientific spirit can possibly ignore. It might be, in the view of some people, an easier course to ignore it. It might be more convenient, in the interest of avoiding any fresh misunderstandings or disagreement, if the Jew who believes in the spread of Judaism were in this matter to assume the same attitude of silence which the Jew who does not believe in the spread of Judaism is able to maintain. But it would not be frank on my part if I were for one moment to shirk all the consequences, or any one of them, which I know to be involved in the mere discussion of a scheme for the active propagation of the Jewish faith. And there is, beyond all question, here involved the question of the attitude which I, as the very humble proposer of this scheme, am prepared to assume and do assume in regard to the position of Jesus of Nazareth in the history of the Jewish faith. I approach the question without fear or hesitation. The name of Jesus represents to my mind a distinct and definite stage in the history of that development of Judaism to which I referred in the *Fortnightly* of October. Admitting the discrepancies of the Gospel narratives, and the uncertainty attaching even to those fragments of them which are more or less reliable, there is a broad fact which no historical student and no philosophical mind can possibly overlook. Whatever be the causes and the origin of the circumstance, there does stand out before mankind a certain figure, or a personality which for the purpose of my argument might even have been a creature of imagination—but nevertheless there has stood out, and there remains in the imagination of Western nations, the personality of one who lived and died in a sense in which few other individuals before him had lived and died—to teach mankind God and to exhibit the beauty of holiness. That one figure, whom so many nations

in various ways have grasped, was the figure of a Jew—a man who lived and taught and died within the Jewish fold. Whether his following was great or small, whether his contemporaries understood him or understood him not, the figure remains with a strength, a force of character, a personal magnetism, which none can gainsay. Why is a Jew of all people, especially the Jew who believes in the spread of his faith, to ignore so striking and noble a figure? The answer of course would be what it always was, namely, that because this figure has been deified, and continues to be deified, we Jews, who are forbidden to form any corporeal conception of God, are best advised by treating the idea of his existence as though it had never been. It is contended that as a matter of safety and expediency it is wise and discreet to preserve an unbroken silence about him; though we may discourse as much as we like about the figures mentioned in the Pentateuch, not one of which, except that of Moses, presents anything like the charm and interest which attaches to the name of Jesus, while no more certainty belongs to the historical value of the records about them than to the records about him. This is a position which I understand, and which may be justified in so far as regards the history of the Jews in the Middle Ages. But it cannot, in my most humble and prayerful judgment be maintained any longer. The mere belief that an ideal Jew has influenced the world by his genius for the God idea is a fact of tremendous consequence to the very proposition which I am enunciating, namely, that the race and the inspiration of Israel are the means of divine teaching to the world. The bitterest fanatic or Jew-hater that the dark ages have produced has never yet dared to assert that God, in his inscrutable judgment, had elected or permitted that an ideal Greek or Roman or a great Assyrian should teach God's ways to men. The greatest opponents of the Jews since their Dispersion have based their opposition on the hypothesis—uncritical

though it was—that this greatest "Light of the Gentiles" was a Jew whom his own people rejected.

These facts have entered deeply into the analysis of religious history, and no Jew can be justified in inviting his non-Jewish neighbours to accept his faith if he is unprepared to tell them how he regards the Founder of Christianity.

Mr. Voysey finds it difficult to give a place in the history of religion to any single figure. But the Jews do not find that difficulty. We are quite accustomed to a hierarchy of religious figures in our history. Mr. Voysey does not perhaps realize that in orthodox traditional Judaism Moses, and Abraham, and David occupy very distinguished places in that hierarchy. Their names are even introduced into the Jewish prayers. And some of the most important prayers in the so-called statutory liturgy describe the Deity as the God of particular persons. Indeed in some older forms of prayer we have, what to some of us is highly objectionable, "Do this for the sake of so and so." I should say incidentally that I would omit all such phrases from the compilation of Jewish prayers which I am contemplating. I mention these things merely to assure Mr. Voysey and others that Jewish history is quite habituated to single out groups of persons who have lived for and taught the religious idea, and that the omission of the name of Jesus is not due to the absence of such a habit, but to quite other reasons—reasons which I submit may now be disposed of. Expediency is a motive which has determined many movements of thought as well as a great many courses of action. And I contend that the long silence in the Jewish pulpit and in Jewish religious literature in respect to the personality of Jesus has been due to the motive of expediency. It was an overcaution—not in the Middle Ages unjustifiable—to prevent the Jews adopting Christian theology and to prevent the diffusion of false reports as to the attitude of Judaism to the subject of monotheism. This reticence and reserve in relation

to a subject which so manifestly concerns the Jewish race is probably the most remarkable instance of self-possession that can be met in the high road or the byways of history. Again, to say nothing on a given subject is often a more expedient course that to say something which is likely to be misconceived. And the reserve on this subject may not unfairly be described as a policy of silence. That silence could easily be maintained so long as there was no religious intercourse between Jews and non-Jews. But the moment we open our portals to those whose religious ideas have come to them only in connexion with the name of Jesus, that silence must be broken.

My friend Mr. C. G. Montefiore asks for a statement of the "attitude of the new Judaism," as he elects to call it, towards four important subjects with which I shall endeavour to deal presently. Of these four subjects one of them relates to the personality and teaching of Jesus, and another "towards the New Testament as a whole," and therefore may be referred to in this place. I trust that Mr. Montefiore and other critics who, like him, sympathize in the main with my proposals, and do indeed share to a large extent those convictions to which I have given faltering utterance, will perceive from what is here written that I am not unprepared to meet this particular question. The ideal Jesus, detached as he is in the mind of an Israelite from that theological confusion with which his name has become entangled in the thoughts of such non-Jewish theists as Mr. Voysey, is a type and representative of a fullness of faith and a purity of worship which stands out as a brilliant example of the life with God. The subject can only be lightly touched upon in this place, for it is sufficiently comprehensive to be treated in a separate essay or series of essays. But the inception of the movement for the spread of the Jewish faith shall never be marred so far as I am concerned by any hesitation upon this question. One of the distinguishing features between the kind of preaching which I contemplate and that of Mr. Voysey's Theistic

Church, is that we as Jews have nothing to say against the personality and the teaching of Jesus so far as anything is known about it. We have not to dissociate our thoughts from previous ideas on the doctrine of the Incarnation, because we have never held them. Nor would it be required to spend such missionary strength as might be vouchsafed to us in explaining that Jesus was not the Incarnation of the Deity, or the Mediator between God and humanity, for the reason that throughout Jewish history it has never been supposed that he was. What Jews preaching to non-Jews might say about Jesus would be much the same as what they might have to say about other illustrious exponents of their faith. It is my own earnest conviction that if the contemporaries of Jesus had recognized him as the true Jewish reformer which I believe him to have been, they would have rallied around him and would have seriously considered his claim to rescue the spirit of religion from the deadening influences of excessive legalism and ritualism by which in his time that spirit was being obscured. If the priests and the educated classes of Jews of that period had so rallied around him they would have probably prevented the religious movement in which he was engaged assuming political aspects, which it did in consequence of the folly and the ignorance of well-meaning but illiterate followers. There need have been no trial before Pontius Pilate and no execution. One sighs to contemplate the loss of those greater blessings which would have ensued to the people of Israel, and indeed to other peoples, if that horrible execution had been averted. Throughout the history of the Jews, even to our own day, there has been a disposition to meet with distrust and suspicion any tendency which an individual may show to elevate the spiritual aspects of Judaism above the letter of the Law. On a much smaller scale within the present century, and in London, there was a small group of fine spirits in the Spanish and Portuguese synagogue of London who were possessed of a deep sense of the necessity to

improve the conditions of public worship and of religious instruction. They were met with stern rebuke and obstinate resistance. The result was the formation of a seceding body of Jews, now known as the West London Synagogue of British Jews. They were of course excommunicated, and there is some dead letter to that effect still extant in regard to them.

Any one who has carefully considered the history of Judaism from within is not at all surprised at the consequences which followed the teaching about Jesus after his death.

Mr. Zangwill, in his criticism of my plea for the spread of the Jewish faith, writes in this REVIEW in a tone which leaves it uncertain whether he is with me or against me. A pathetic story which he contributed to the last Christmas number of the *English Illustrated Magazine,* entitled "The Conciliator of Christendom," leads me to suppose that he is one of those critics who is subject to moods when dealing with religious or philosophical problems. And I cannot escape the reflection that Mr. Zangwill is not quite at rest in his own mind, at the present moment, upon the question, whether the religion of Israel is really a Catholic faith or one only adapted to a particular group of persons. Mr. Wolf is clearly of opinion that the Jewish religion is not suitable for any but Jews. Mr. Zangwill, on the other hand, seems to preserve an open mind on the problem. Both of these writers appear to my own mind to approach the subject of the Jewish religion from points of view which seem to ignore the very essence of the Faith, namely, its apprehension and its adoration of the "God of the spirits of all flesh." And like most Jews who have been brought up under the influence of legalism and outward observances from which they have emancipated themselves, they have unconsciously permitted their view of the Jewish religion to be veiled by its excessive elaboration of outward observances.

In a former number of this REVIEW I contributed an essay upon Reformed Judaism, in which I submitted that the spread of Judaism was not likely to be initiated except by such Jews as were at heart reformers. And here it is necessary to observe that the popular notion of Judaism being divided into two camps, namely orthodox and reformed, is an error. There are in truth not less than three camps. Besides the reformers and the orthodox, there are many Jews of striking individuality and of ardent attachment to their race who are neither orthodox nor reformers. I am not alluding to the class which might be called renegades, because the men I refer to are sincerely devoted to their people and do possess a certain, though undefined, affection for the ceremonial observances of Judaism. And such people are not agnostics, but believers in the one God. Yet they are intellectually estranged from orthodox Judaism, and never have associated themselves with any reform movement within the Jewish fold. They are critics towards every school of thought which is presented to them. But they stand outside these schools. Their early education having been conducted under the immediate influence of orthodox Judaism, the balance of their affections leans on the side of orthodox Judaism rather than with any species of reform. I know several individuals of my race whose negative attitude towards any direct effort in favour of religious revival can only be explained in this way.

Mr. H. S. Lewis, on the other hand, represents in the symposium an attitude of philosophic orthodox Judaism. And it is singularly gratifying to observe that his opposition to my scheme is not based upon the allegation that the Jewish faith is inherently a non-Catholic faith. Quite the contrary. He pleads that Judaism is meant for the world, and insists that it should be presented in the exact form and outer garb with which the Jewish people have possessed it. And he supplies historical evidence of the fact that orthodox Judaism is consistent with the idea of a universal faith and worship.

Lady Magnus has assumed a position which I must frankly admit I am unable to comprehend. She quotes the words of the second Isaiah which I had referred to as the expression of the missionary obligation of Israel as though they meant the exact opposite of what is expressed by them. "Ye are my witnesses," Lady Magnus informs us, has no conceivable connexion with the idea of missionary work. And she goes so far as to compare the idea of a witness with that of a mountain. I accept the analogy so far as the mountain is seen by those who visit it, and so far as its stately pre-eminence might be likened to that very rare form of silence which is actually golden. But if she means that a witness is to be like a mountain, for ever silent and always in the same place, I fear that our difference resolves itself into a disagreement about the use of the English language rather than about the destiny of Israel. If a witness is not to give evidence, I know not what a witness is. And how it is possible to give evidence, except of mere existence, by an unbroken silence to be extended through the span of human history, is beyond my understanding. There are two other points in Lady Magnus's contribution, one of which need only be stated to be refuted. First she observes that "God in his own good time will see to it that his earth is filled with the knowledge of him, but he needs no Procrustean methods." I can only assure Lady Magnus and any who may think as she does that I should consider any attempt to suggest that the time has come for the spread of our faith unwarrantable if I were not most solemnly convinced that it is the Divine Will that this matter should be considered now in our own generation. And equally certain is it to my own mind that no word would have been uttered on this momentous question until and unless it was plainly the Will of God that we should speak what was in our hearts.

Lady Magnus's suggestion that my proposals are "a hurried ideal" is comparatively unimportant because it is quite personal. But as she has thought it necessary

to make the remark, it seems right to say that the conception of Judaism which I had learnt from my parents at the early age at which religious teaching is imparted was always identified with the belief that Judaism was intended to be the faith of all people, and the spread of it was only suspended through external and artificial circumstances. When I was taught the Shemang Yisrael as soon as I could speak, I was also taught that this was a doctrine specially revealed to Israel for the purpose of Israel teaching it to the world. And when I was in my teens I distinctly acquired the conviction that the seclusion of the Faith of Israel was merely a temporary condition, but that soon, even when I grew to manhood, it might be possible to teach that faith to others who were not Jews.

I come now to the consideration of the objections raised by the Chief Rabbi, and I desire to acknowledge his kind personal references. The Chief Rabbi appears to have approached the subject from a point of view which must be considered as distinctly apart from the philosophical contemplation of the subject. One of his objections, I venture to think, I have already anticipated in the preface to the symposium. "Would not half-hearted Jews eagerly welcome such a religion, freed from the, to them, irksome encumbrance, ritual, but which they would still view as some form of Judaism?" My answer is that if the spread of Judaism shall incidentally be the means of bringing back to the fold of Israel "half-hearted Jews," I should be most grateful to welcome them. I am aware that the habit of thought, to which, in another connexion, I have already alluded, that strange preference in the orthodox Jewish mind for extinction rather than reform, induces ardent orthodox Jews to close their eyes with mild regret when they see their brethren lapsing into religious apathy, but to open them in horror when they perceive that the apathy is exchanged for some definite religious faith which may deviate from the orthodox. I know full well

that some earnest orthodox Jews would rather that members of their fold should exist as nominal Jews who observe no religious practice, and who bring up their children as agnostics, than that they should see them drawn to God by any means which deviated in the slightest degree from the orthodox position. From these I do most profoundly differ. This notion has been repeated in many forms and may be expressed by the common phrase, "the whole or nothing." But the fact that so many elect nothing rather than the whole of orthodox Judaism is no shock to the religious consciousness of the orthodox schools of thought, compared with the resentment which it feels by the adoption of a mitigated form of outward observances. But Dr. Adler is mistaken in assuming that the Judaism which I would desire preached to the outer world is simply a belief in the Unity of God, and the observance of the Moral Law. I have nowhere written any words which are open to this construction. So far from it, in all my writings upon the subject I have expressly and emphatically declared that one of the causes that would give to a Jewish Theistic Church a force and an attraction which other non-Jewish Theistic movements lack is that it would be inseparable from the great historic backbone of the Jewish religion, with its ritual observances —limited only so far as would be indispensable to prevent them from acting as deterrents. I have said that the rite of circumcision, presented as an essential condition of joining the communion which I have foreshadowed, would be an immediate and an impassable barrier. So too would be the Saturday observance of the Sabbath. But I have stated that the Day of Atonement, the Passover, and several other Jewish observances should be maintained. But supposing I had not taken this course, and had even offered to the "half-hearted Jew" in express terms a reconciliation with his ancestral faith by means solely of "a belief in the Unity of God and the observance of the Moral Law, to be recognized by him" as

some form of Judaism "preached," as Dr. Adler writes, "permissu superiorum," the proposal would have in it more than has ever been offered to that type of Jew by the unbending and unconciliating yoke of orthodoxy. Would it be no gain to the ideals of our race and faith if the so-called "half-hearted Jew," who is at present an utter stranger to the synagogue, and to all its rites and to all its faith, were brought back through "a belief in the unity of God and the observance of the Moral Law" to the faith and to the ideal of his race? Is not the very question an admission of the allegations which I have made in regard to the pretensions and claims of Orthodoxy?

The Chief Rabbi proceeds to point out the dangers to the Jews themselves of actively propagating their faith. This is the argument of expediency, which cannot be entertained from any philosophical standpoint. But in regard to it I am bound to utter an emphatic protest from the depth of my own soul. Would to God, I will say, that Anti-Semitism could base its case against us Jews upon any active attempt on our part to fulfil the purpose for which we are Jews. I for one am willing, and would gladly face any Anti-Semitism which might be founded on this specific charge. But alas! our experience of latter day Anti-Semitism in Berlin, and in Vienna, and in Paris is not founded on the allegation that the emancipated Jews of those cities have conceived the idea of spreading broadcast the doctrine of the Unity of God and the claims of perfect righteousness. Jealousy and envy of their success in material walks of life is given as the reason for this Anti-Semitism. And my belief is that so soon as it could be shown that the energies of the Jewish race were concentrated upon the spiritual mission which in my view alone justifies their separateness, the voice of Anti-Semitism would be silenced for ever. But should it happen in the mysterious scheme of Divine Providence that the active propagation of the faith of Israel is to bring upon Israel fresh visitations of the enmity of

mankind, I should implore any one of my brethren who contemplated joining in such a work to stand back, and to abstain, unless he were possessed of the spirit that can face all risks and all dangers. I repeat again, that no Jew could be of any service in such a work whose heart was not stout enough to face the dangers of the situation, if dangers there be. But it appears to me that to hold out such a threat or such a fear to a community of emancipated, prosperous, English Jews, whose ancestors have not shrunk from any form of tribulation and suffering which the preservation of their trust involved, is a species of rhetoric which may be dismissed as rhetoric and as possessing nothing whatever to alarm any philosophical temperament.

My personal esteem for the Chief Rabbi is so great, and my appreciation of the exalted nature of the office which he holds is so complete, that I can only assume that he has put forth these arguments in defence of defenceless people abroad whom he has persuaded himself might be affected by what is done in England. And I feel sure that such arguments could never have presented themselves to his view if, out of the abundance of his learning, he could have produced some cogent reasons or authorities for the logical alternative to my scheme, an alternative which could only consist of a dogma that Judaism is *not* a religion for the world, but only for the Jews.

If I were to refer to the objections of the Rev. S. Friederburg, the minister of the chief synagogue in Liverpool, I should have to repeat the reply which I have ventured to make to the Chief Rabbi, because he has taken precisely the same ground.

The Rev. L. M. Simmons, the minister of the Reform synagogue in Manchester, claims that the Jewish religion is already penetrating into non-Jewish quarters. The prophet Malachi's words, Mr. Simmons reminds us, are nearer fulfilment than they were—"All Christians, from Catholics to Unitarians, would call themselves Monotheists." In

other words the special work of Israel in making God known to mankind is being carried out by those who are not Israelites, namely, Christians whose spirits have already been touched by the inspiration of Israel's prophets in the past. And the logical inference of this process of thought is that because our work, the work of Jews, is being advanced by others, we may rest content. This argument is repeated by others, and it amounts to a curious assumption which, if carried into other spheres of action, would be dangerously like saying the following: Suppose you are appointed to do certain duties in life, and to your great delight and relief you discover that those duties are being done more or less by other people, you can consider yourself absolved. If I find myself in a situation in which my help is required I might wait to see whether somebody else will not volunteer to do what I ought to do. Such an attitude of mind is not only reprehensible in itself, but if carried to its logical result would leave many noble deeds undone. But Mr. Simmons's illustration of the way that monotheism is being taught by Christians is not a satisfactory illustration, for from the light which has shone upon Israel it is clear that a monotheism which is reconcilable with the doctrine of three persons in one God is not the monotheism to which Israel was called to witness and to teach.

I may perhaps be pardoned on the ground of want of space, as well as from the fear of wearying my readers, if I abstain from further comment on the present occasion of other criticisms which have been offered in this REVIEW, and I may be permitted to pass on to the consideration of what has been written by those who are fundamentally agreed with me.

My friends Mr. Israel Abrahams, the Rev. Morris Joseph, and Colonel Goldsmid have powerfully maintained the cause which I am advocating. And Mr. Abrahams understands me aright when he points out that the sense of truth rather than the assurance of success is the hope

which sustains my belief in the Divine and Universal destiny of our race.

Miss Sylvie D'Avigdor raises a question which is cognate to the subject when she points out the reviving influence upon Jews themselves, which will inevitably arise so soon as they perceive that their faith is the need of others besides their own people.

The sympathetic support which is given to the scheme by such valiant non-Jewish Unitarians as my venerated and greatly-loved friend Dr. Martineau, by Miss Anna Swanwick, by the Rev. Dr. Drummond (the Principal of the Unitarian College at Oxford), and by so profound a thinker as the Rev. J. Estlin Carpenter, are tokens of very true encouragement. No apology was needed from Dr. Drummond or Mr. Carpenter for their inquiries as to the potentialities of Reformed Judaism in regard to the problems of sin and of unsectarian philanthropy. The spirit in which Dr. Drummond contemplates the possibility of Jews teaching Theism is parallel to that which I would hope animates all Jews when they observe the efforts of non-Jews to teach the very faith for which we are consecrated. I would answer him at once, that no attempt could possibly be made to win proselytes in the sense in which it was understood under the constitution of the ancient polity now defunct. What we should offer to non-Jews is not the empty badges of a nationality which has long since been suspended, but the living faith of the second Isaiah, "without price," "without baptism." "Ho, every one that is thirsty, come ye to the waters," would be the missionary call of Reformed Judaism.

Mr. Estlin Carpenter raises two questions, the first of which coincides with that of my friend Mr. C. G. Montefiore. I will take the second first, as Mr. Carpenter alone raises it. He observes: "Any fresh teaching which Judaism may have to offer will be likely to be tested by its applicability to new social ideals in which no race limitations can be recognized." This is a proposition with which I entirely

concur. The barrier of race will be passed by the message which shall be given to those who stand beyond it. A "universal," and "not a national philanthropy," may reasonably be expected to be taught by those Jews who can realize that their religion is a Universal one. Mr. Carpenter, not unnaturally, adopts the error of persons who are unacquainted, as he says, with "the spiritual life of Judaism," when he supposes that the "generosity of rich Jews" is confined "to their own people." A mere cursory glance at lists of contributions to the Indian Famine Fund, and indeed of every non-sectarian public fund, is enough to prove beyond a doubt that Judaism, in its own confined area has not been inconsistent with a spirit of philanthropy so broad and so catholic as almost to put into the shade by comparison the generosity of the wealthiest members of other denominations. The proportion of Jews who always contribute to the Hospital Sunday Fund, and to other general charitable objects is, both in the number of contributors and in amount, proportionately larger than the offerings which flow from any other religious sect even in England.

As to the problem of sin which Mr. Carpenter touches, there is perhaps no aspect of religious thought upon which Judaism can speak so freshly and so vigorously as upon this vital question. The optimism which is so characteristic of Judaism in all ages is itself an assurance that this particular subject will be approached in a manner that will render it free from the exaggeration and gloom with which the pessimism of other systems has hampered it. The teaching even of the much criticized Pentateuch, and still more of the prophet Ezekiel in regard to sin and deliverance from sin, will certainly be available in the communion of the Church of Israel. Mr. Carpenter will, for reasons I have already mentioned, permit me to reserve for some other occasion what I have to say on this large question, and what non-Jews have a right to demand from a missionary Jew on so grave an issue. It will be seen that the

reserve force which the Jewish race "must have laid up," as Mr. Carpenter truly imagines, "of an immense store of moral achievement" *can* be utilized in the moral and spiritual teaching before us.

Mr. Carpenter and Mr. Montefiore, as would be expected from two such scholars as they are in the field of Higher Criticism, take for granted that, in proposing to make others share the faith which is in me, that faith must in some critical way depend upon the attitude which I hold towards the authority of the Scriptures. Mr. Montefiore asks categorically, (1) "What is to be the *exact* position towards the Pentateuch and the Law?" (2) "The *exact* position towards the miracles of the Old Testament?" (the italics are my own), and (3) "What is to be the relation to the personality of Jesus and to the New Testament?" The third question I have already dealt with. As to the first two, which are practically the same as Mr. Carpenter puts to me, I must frankly reply that the conception of the faith and of the mission in the teaching of that faith which I personally hold, is one which does not involve any necessity whatever to hold an *exact* attitude, either towards the Pentateuch and the Law or towards the miracles of the Old Testament. And, as a matter of fact, I neither hold any exact attitude towards these subjects, nor would it ever enter my mind to recommend to any human soul to whom I would desire to impart my faith, that it was essential that he should hold an exact attitude towards the Pentateuch, the Law, or the miracles of the Old Testament. And here it is necessary to observe that faith in God, and in the ultimate triumph of eternal righteousness as the expression of his Divine Will, is a gift from God himself direct to each individual soul which can be possessed of such consciousness. Nothing that was ever written in any book, nor anything which can be written in commentary of any book, will convey this supreme revelation to the individual mind. The claim which I have put forth for the people of Israel, as a people, is that they of all nations of antiquity, and of all groups of living descendants

of an ancient people, have received, in a larger measure and in a more emphatic sense than any other people, the possession of this gift. The footprints of that gift are found throughout the literature of their race, and their tradition. The consciousness of this gift of the knowledge of God has leaked out here and there in the processes of the ages, and has never, for two thousand years, been able quite to hide itself. The consciousness of God and of his infinite love has been, and is to this day, so intense in the Jewish mind that it can scarcely contain itself. It oozes out in all directions, and it is discovered, though not always recognized, here, there, and everywhere. The Pentateuch is a compilation of which no Jew is justified in speaking without a profound reverence, because it represents and it records the consciousness of God in the mind of Israel, not only at the time when it was compiled and edited, but it reflects the spiritual consciousness of generations much earlier than the age of historic records. So, too, the fragments as we have them—for they are only fragments—of the writings of the Hebrew prophets, and psalmists, and other writers who were contributors to that elaborate and incomparable Body of Literature which is called the Bible, do represent, each and all, so many illustrations and types of the spiritual genius of this exceptional people. It is no reply to these statements to assert, what we all know, that because many Jews have a very slender sense of the Divine gifts to their race, and comparatively few of them are filled to overflowing with the absorbing consciousness of their Divine mission, therefore the race has not been called for the purpose which is here claimed for it. It is no reply to taunt an individual Jew with claiming to spread the religion of his race whilst he is only expounding his private personal opinions. No one who is not a Jew has ever claimed that the religion which he seeks to spread was specially revealed to his own particular race. Every Christian missionary, on the contrary, proclaims that this revelation was given to the people of Israel. In saying this it is far from my

intention to reflect upon the earnestness and the purity of purpose which I am fully aware has ever engaged the true missionaries who were Christians. But the claim which they put forth is different in kind from that which alone would justify a Jew in summoning to the service of his mission all the spiritual or racial authority which does attach to the name of an Israelite. Dr. Martineau suggests that Mr. Montefiore and I have emerged from the Judaism of the Pentateuch and the Law. I can only answer that we stand on a certain rung of the same ladder, on which every teacher in Israel has ever stood. It is not for me to measure the distance or the length of that ladder, which constitutes the ever ascending religious development of Jewish history, but I will say that the claim for the universality of the Jewish faith could not stand if it were supposed that any one epoch in the history of our people had fully contained it and sealed it. If it be true that the scheme of Divine Providence permits and ordains the perpetual evolution in the affairs of his creatures, it is equally true that moral perceptions and spiritual insight must grow from age to age.

Mrs. Nathaniel Cohen admits, as do many who have not written in the symposium, that the spread of Judaism beyond our race is the ideal of Judaism and its true destiny, but she counsels those who think with me to missionize our own people first. God grant that it were in my power or that of any living Jew to do so. That power, if it exists anywhere, will be quickened by the very act of presenting the faith to those who stand at present outside the fold of Israel.

Mr. Montefiore's question as to my attitude towards the New Testament as a whole must receive the answer which, if not identical with that which I have given to his first two questions, must stand on parallel lines. I have no attitude towards the New Testament as a whole, but I am not unable to recognize the message of Israel despite its dilution wherever it is to be found in the pages of those strange

records. My friend Mr. F. C. Conybeare has made some critical observations about the New Testament, but he has recognized that it does contain elements of Jewish religious thought which are not out of harmony with other Jewish writings.

Mr. Estlin Carpenter has asked whether Judaism has produced any figures like those of Francis of Assisi, or Wesley. I need only refer him to the twelfth-century Jewish mystics and to Akiba. For saintliness of life, for martyrdom, and heroic devotion to a divine ideal, I challenge any scholar to produce the superiors, if indeed the equals, of those who laid down their worldly goods and their lives at the Spanish Inquisition.

In conclusion I would say that the message which Judaism has to convey differs from all other forms of Theism—less on the theological aspect of what it has to tell than upon its purely spiritual and religious side. We have the testimony, not of a book or of a million of books merely, but the testimony of a vast human tragedy—a long personal tale which has been told from father to son through two hundred generations of men, women, and children—people who have lived and loved and suffered and died and have never lost their faith. That faith has realized for them the most personal, intimate, and tender relation with the Divine Being which it is possible to conceive. The love which they have borne to him, and the love which they felt radiating upon their souls from him, is a story which has never yet been told since the Canon of Scripture was compiled. It was a love so transcendent, so imperishable, that it cannot be measured by the story of any other faith, just because it was independent throughout of that which outside the Jewish family is still believed to be indispensable to it, namely mediation. There is no inherent estrangement between God and man. There is no ransom due, but personal individual love and worship. Almighty God is close to each individual soul separately and distinctly, without mediation of any kind

whatever. There is nothing between us and our Maker—no intercessor, for every human being is his very own child. This wonderful and mysterious nearness to the great God, who is as infinite in his love as he is in his power, is the message upon which the Jew, as a Jew, has no need to speculate. With him it is absolute knowledge and certainty. Why are we to keep this secret to ourselves when the world around us is pining for a God who may be realized without terror and without a labyrinth of intellectual obstacles? It is a faith, I repeat; something to be seen, to be imbibed—never to be demonstrated. It is a gift which will be shared by the very contagion of a common worship. In God's name let Theists who are not Jews teach it if they can; but shall we who have for the longest period possessed it conceal our experience of it? "Let not the stranger think that the Lord hath utterly separated me from his people, for I will give unto the stranger which joineth himself to the Lord a place within my house and within my walls better than of sons and of daughters, for my house shall be called a house of prayer for all people."

OSWALD JOHN SIMON.

IBN AL-HĪTĪ'S ARABIC CHRONICLE OF KARAITE DOCTORS.

I.

THE text of Ibn al-Hītī's Chronicle is taken from the Brit. Mus. MS. Or. 2402, where it is appended to Yefeth's Commentary on the Book of Proverbs. The scribe was Moses ben Abraham, who occupied the post of precentor or "Ḥazzan" at Cairo within the memory of the present generation, for his copy of Yefeth's Commentary was finished at no earlier date than the 21st of Tebeth, A.M. 5627 (A.D. 1867), and the appended Chronicle was probably written within a few days after the completion of the Commentary. The document, however, from which the modern scribe made his copy of Ibn al-Hītī's work was of considerable antiquity, as the following note, which is found on fol. 187 b—that is, immediately before the Chronicle—clearly shows:—

והדא ממא וגדתה פה מצרים יע"א בקהלתינו הק' פי אלגניזה פי ורק קדים מקטע אסמא אלחכמים בני מקרא יצ"ו אלסאדאת אלעטאם רחמהם אללה תעאלי אנמעין ורצי ענהם ברצואנה אמן והא אנא נאקלה האהנא עלי קדר אלאמכאן כלמה בכלמה וחרף בחרף מן גיר נקצאן ולא זיאדה ען מא וגדתה מכתוב פי אלורק אלקדים ונקלתה האהנא כופא" מן אלתצייע ואנתסאך כלאם מרחבה רח' א"ת ולאגל אלאנתפאע ללאגיאל אלאתיה מן בעדנא ושלום:

i.e. "And this is one of the texts which I have found here in Cairo, in the 'Genizah' of our holy congregation, on an ancient leaf, containing a brief record of the names of Karaite Doctors, may their Rock and their Redeemer preserve them: namely, the great Masters, may God, the

exalted One, have mercy on them all, and bestow his favour upon them, Amen. And behold, I copy it down as well as possible, word for word, and letter by letter, without leaving anything out, and without adding anything to what I have found written on the ancient leaf. And I copy it here for fear lest the composition of the author should perish and be lost altogether, and on account of the benefit which the coming generations may derive from it. And for the rest, peace."

But who was the Ibn al-Hītī whose Chronicle of Karaite Doctors has thus come down to us? The approximate date of his activity is supplied to us in the text itself. The "last of the learned and wise men" whom Ibn al-Hītī mentions is the famous Samuel ha-Rōfē ben Moses al-Maghrebī who was "Dayyān" at Cairo during the latter part of the fourteenth and the earlier years of the fifteenth century. From the mention of al-Maghrebī's great work, the "Sefer Miṣwōth," known by the Arabic title of "Al-Murshid," besides two other important compositions of his, we may safely conclude that the present Chronicle was written during the latter part of al-Maghrebī's busy life, that is, probably between the years 1410 and 1420. With this date in our mind we are naturally led to identify our author with the scribe דוד בן סעדאל בן יוסף · · · בן אלהיתי[1] whom Pinsker (Liḳ. Ḳad. p. 64) mentions as the writer of a MS. which bears the date A.H. 811[2], answering to 1408–9 A.D. It is also tempting to assume that the Ibn al-Hītī thus identified as David ben Saʿdal (or Saʿdēl) is a scion of Yeshuʿah Ibn Saʿdal Ibn al-Hītī, who is already quoted by Salmon ben Yesoḥim, the well-known Karaite controversialist of the Saadyanic period. This view is considerably weakened by the fact that no ישועה occurs in David ben Saʿdal's genealogy as given by Pinsker, but it may on the other hand be held that the absence of the name Yeshuʿah

[1] Firkowicz, in fact, refers to our author (see note 9 on p. 433) under the name of ד׳ דוד אלהיתי.

[2] The year קכמ A.M. in Pinsker, *loc. cit.*, is evidently a misprint for קכמ.

is merely due to the insufficient length of the genealogy, extending though it does over nine generations. One may take it for granted, however, that our Chronicler's family originally came from Hīt, "a town situated on the Euphrates, about thirty leagues to the west of Bagdad, inhabited by Arabs and Karaite Jews[1]," and from his knowledge of the writings of Samuel al-Maghrebī during this author's lifetime it appears further to follow that David Ibn al-Hītī was either settled in Egypt or in one of the surrounding countries, such as Syria or Palestine.

From the notes which I have added to the translation it will be seen that, thanks chiefly to the labours of Pinsker, Steinschneider, Neubauer, Harkavy, Bacher, and Poznański, I have been able to illustrate several of Ibn al-Hītī's statements, and also occasionally to show in what particular points the Chronicler was misled by the comparatively scanty material which he had before him. Modern scholars have in many respects an advantage over Ibn al-Hītī, who had to arrive at his facts by means of references found scattered here and there in the works which he read or copied. But the profit which we are enabled to derive from his Chronicle is undoubtedly considerable. On some well-known writers he imparts to us fresh, and sometimes interesting, information, and he besides brings before us a number of names which have not been known before. The great feature of the Chronicle is no doubt the prominence which is given in it to Yusuf ben Noah, and scholars will probably not be slow to seize on the fresh "data" now presented to us on the life and activity of this Karaite Doctor, who appears to have been the centre of a very influential and earnest band of scholars.

I need only add that the names which I have passed by without a remark in my notes belong partly to authors concerning whom I could find nothing elsewhere, and partly to well-known men, like Yūsuf al-Basīr, Yefeth Ibn

[1] See R. Hoerning, *British Museum Karaite MSS.*, p. v.

Ṣa'īr, and others, on whose life and literary labours Ibn al-Hītī has nothing fresh to tell us.

II.

[1]בשם יי אל עולם נעשה ונצליח

נבתדי אלאן בתרתיב אלשיך אלרשיד אבן אלהיתי רצי אתּ ענה[2]: פדכר[3] אסמא מן ידכר מן אלעלמא אלקראיין רצי אתּ ענהם אלדי ונדת להם דכרא" אוולהם אלסייד ענן מנוחתו כבוד אוול מן נהא בכשף אלחק בעד תנטייתה ואקאמה והערה למות נפשו וקיל אנה כאן פי זמאן אבי נעפר אלמנצור אלדי תולא[4] אלכלאפה סנת דיז ללהנרה וכאן ראש גליות כל בית ישראל פי בגדאד ורדּ נמאעה מן אלרבאנין אלי אלחק והו מדהב בני מקרא יצ"ו ובעדה דניאל אלקומצי ודוד אלמקמאץ[5] ולהו כתאב פי אצול אלדין והאולאי קבל אלקרקסאני רחמה אתּ לאנה דכרהם פי כתאב אלאנואר ודכר גמאעה איצא והם אסמאעיל ואלעכבאריין ואלדסתריין[6] ואלבגדאדיין ואלבצריין ואלפארסיין ואלכרסאיין ואהל אלגבל ואלשאמיין ולם דכר אסמאיהם בל דכר אכתלאפהם פי אראהם: אלשיך אלעאלם יעקב בן יצחק אלקרקסאני רח' אתּ תאריך תצניפה אלאנוואר סנה אלף ומאיתין תמאנייה וסבעין לשטרות פיכון דלך פי סנה ס"ו ללהגרה ואלסייד דוד בן בועז רח' אתּ תצניפה קהלת פי סנה תתס ללהנרה ולה תפסיר אלתורה וכתאב אלאצול: ואלמעלם אבו אלסרי רח' אתּ כאן בעד סעדיה הפתומי לאנה רדּ עלי[7] אלקרקסאני פי תפסיר אלתורה ופי ספר מצות וכאן אלפיומי קבל אלקרקסאני לאנה רדּ עליה ישראל בן דניאל[8] רח' אתּ ודכרה שלמה אלנשיא פי כתאב אלעריות קבל[9] אלקרקסאני ואלמעלם אבו אלסרי ואלאקרב אנה למא דכר אלעלמא[10] זל דכרהם עלי אלתרתיב לאנה דכר אוולא" ענן תם בנימין תם דניאל תם אלקרקסאני תם אבו אלסרי תם אבו עלי אלבצרי

[1] Or. 2402, fol. 188 a. [2] MS. עגה. [3] Probably for פאוכר.

[4] For תולי, MS. חוולא.

[5] The usual form of this word is אלמקמס or אלמקמץ.

[6] The original form is אלחסתריין.

[7] MS. עליה; see note 3, p. 437.

[8] One should expect דניאל instead of ישראל בן דניאל; see the note on the translation.

[9] MS. בעד; see the note on the translation, *loc. cit.*

[10] Fol. 188 b.

וולדה תם דוד בן בועז אלנשיא תם אלמעלם אבו עלי רחמה אֹת עליהם
אנמעין ואלאקרב אנה כאן מעאצר אלשיך[1] אבו יעקב יוסף בן נח לאנה
נאקצה פי אלאביב מנאקצה טווילה וכאן אלשיך אבו יעקב אלבציר ואלשיך
אבו אלפרג הארון מן גמלה מן כאן ורד ללשיך אבו יעקב והאולאי עלי
נסכה תצניפה תאריכהא סנה ש״ח ודכר אלמעלם אבו עלי פי נקצה עלי בן
נח אסמא עלמא דכרנאהם אנשי מלחמה אנשי חיל יראי אלהים והם אבו
סעדאן בן אברהם ואבו יצחק אברהם בן אלאצפהאני ואלמעלם סלמן בן
ירוחם ואבו אברהם בן עלאן ואבו עזרא בן אבונה ואלשיך אבו יעקב בן
אברהם בן גלס ורבמא אנה אלבציר וכל האולאי כאנו קבלה לאנה קאל
ענהם ירחמם האל ויזכרם ברצון עמו וסלמון בן ירוחם נעד כאן מעאצר
אלפיומי ואלמעלם אבו סעיד בן אלמעלם אבו עלי הו כאן מעלם אלשיך
אבו אלפרג בן אסד רח׳ אֹת לאנה דכר ענה וקאל מעלמנא פלאן וכאן פי
זמאן אלמעלם אבו אלסרי[2] לאנה אכתצר תפסירה ורד עליה[3] פי ספר
מצות אלדי לה ואלערישי רח׳ אֹת דכר אלמעלם אבו סעיד פי ספר
מצות פי מקאלה אלאביב ואלשיך אבו יעקב בן נח נעד קד תקדם דכרה
אנה כאן לה דאר פי אלקדם אלשריף ללעלם וכאן פיהא עלי מא יקאל
ע״ו עאלמא״ מן גמלתהם אלשיכאן אבו יעקב אלבציר ואלשיך אבו אלפרג
הארון ואסתמרת בעדה עלי הדה אלצורה וכאן[4] מן גמלה מן כאן פיהא אבו
אלפרג הארון וגירה:[5] פי כניסת אלקראיין בדמשק ראו גזו מן תפסיר
ספר ויקרא רקא״ ומן גמלה מא קאל אלמעלם אבו אלסרי פי מנאקצתה
לבן נח לה סנה ש״ח פי אלקדם אלשריף (מא כרנת כשפת עלי אלאביב
פכיף אכבר צורתה)[6] פדל דלך עלי אסתמראר חאלה עלי הדה אלצורה
אלמדה אלטווילה רחמהם אֹת ועטם אגרהם: אלשיכין אבו יעקב אלבצרי[7]
ואבו הארון אלמקדסי כאנא[8] מן גמלה מן קרא עלי בן נח כמא תקדם
לאנהמא יקולאן ענה פי תצניפהמא קאל שיכנא פלאן[9] [ואלשיך אבו יעקב

[1] MS. אלישך.

[2] The MS. has אבו אלסרי עלי ולא אנה, which does not make sense. עלי was probably written down as an alternative to אלסרי.

[3] MS. עלי. [4] Fol. 189 a. [5] The MS. has no stop here.

[6] The exact bearing of the words enclosed in () is difficult to understand; see note 10, p. 439.

[7] Read אלבציר. [8] MS. כאנה.

[9] The passage enclosed in [ ] is quoted, in a faulty form, by Firkowicz, בני רשף, p. 22.

תופּא אלי רצוּאן אֹת קבל אלשיך אבו אלפרג הארון לאן אלשיך אבו אלפרג ידכרה ויתרצא ענה וגדת שי מן אלאסתבצאר אלדי לה תאריכה פי סנה ٤٣٨] והו יקול אדאם עזה תם וגדת לה פי אלרד עלי אלקולין אֻמלא פי סנה ٤٥٨ ואלאקרב אן האדאן אלשיכין מע אלמעלם אבו סעיד כאנו כלהם פי עצר ואחד ואנהם כאנו יקרון גמיעהם פי דאר בן נח ואלשיך אבו אלפרג אבן אסד קאל מעלמנא פלאן רח׳ אֹת וקיל אנה כאן יקרא עלי אלשיך אבו אלפרג ואבתדי בתפסיר אלתורה יג׳ ויא׳ אלדי הו גיר מבצוט[1] כטה בידה אלכרימה פי שהר רביע אוול סנה ٤٤٤ ומן גמלה דלך תפסיר ואלה שמות פי גזוין בכטה מדה תצניף כמא ינקלהם פי סבעה אשהר והו פאצי ...[2] ופי אלרמלה אלשיך עלי בן אברהם אלטויל רח׳ אֹת וכאן בעד אלשיך אבו אלפרג בן אסד לאנה דכרה פי כתאבה ותרצא ענה ופסר אלארבע ועשרין ספר ואלנשיא שלמה אלמערוף באלריים אבו אלפצל רח׳ אֹת[3] וכאן מן אלעלמא אלכבאר ואלצדור וכאן ריים אלקראיין במצר וכאן אמרה ופתאוויה נאפדין אלי אלשרק ואלגרב ואלשאם ולם ישתהר ענה תצניף סוא כתאב אלעריות[4] פכאן פאיקא״ פי אלעלם מע אלפקה ולה כתאב מא לא יסע אלמכלף קרבה פי אצול אלדין ותופּא אלי רצוּאן אֹת סנה ..ד:

עלמא בגדאד ואלעראק רחמהם אֹת אלשיכין אבו[5] אלחסן בן משיח וסלמון בן ירוחם כאנא פי זמאן אלפיומי וכאן בן משיח נאקצה מנאקצאת כתירה פי בגדאד ובן ירוחם נאקצה פי חלב ותופּא בהא רח׳ אֹת פי זמאן אלפיומי וכרג פי גנאזתהא משקוק אלתיאב מדאר אלשראבה חאפיא״ ועתב פי דלך וקאל אן כאן לי ולה פי מנאקצתנא פואיד עטימה ולא שך פי עלמה פלדלך פעלת מא פעלת ויוערף אליום פי חלב קבר סלמון בן ירוחם ובין אלגוים וגירהם[6] בקבר אלצדיק וינדרו[7] לה אלנדור[7] אלי אלאן: ואבו עיסי בן סרעה[8] פי רסאלתה אלתם סבעין[9] רד פיהא עלי אליהוד תם אנה באבן משיח אלמדכור ותנאדרא[10] הו והו ואלרסאלה אלמדכורה תאריכה עמלהא סנה ٤٨٧ ואברהם אלהרזלאני רח׳ אֹת רד עלי אלרבאנין ובטל כלאמהם ומן גמלה מן דכר מן אלעלמא יוסף בן צבתייא וגדת כתאבין

[1] For מבסוט.
[2] A lacuna in the MS.
[3] Fol. 189 b.
[4] MS. אלעוות.
[5] MS. אבי.
[6] MS. וגירה.
[7] The MS. has ד (without a dot) for the Arabic ذ.
[8] The Arab writers spell the name زرعة (זרעה).
[9] See note 6, p. 441.
[10] The ר stands here for ظ (وتناظرا).

פי עלם אלכלאם לעלי בן יוסף סמייה תאריכה סנה ׳פס וכאתבה יתרצא ענה ולצדקה בן שומרון רח׳ אתּ ואלשיך חנניה בן יעקב רח׳ אתּ כאן מן אלצדור אלכבאר וכאן פאיקא״ פי אלפקה ועלם אלכלאם ולה כלאם אלתצפח כתאב אלאסראר כמם מנלדאת והי פי גאיה אלחסן ולם יגד מנה סווא מנלדין אלאוול ואלתאני והו יד׳כר עז ואלדה רח׳ אתּ ארא כאנת תדל עלי אנה פי אלעלם וקיל אנה כאן יברי אלאקלאם ללכליפה וכאן גליל אלקדר ענדה וכאן פי אלעלם [1] פי טבקת אלבציר ובן אסד רח׳ אתּ אלנמיע ובן סקויה רח׳ אתּ רד עלי אלרבאנין ועלי אלפיומי פי אלהלאל ואלאביב ואלענצרה ואלאליה ואלשחם ואלתקליד ואבטל נקלהם ואלשיך אבו ענן יצחק בן עלי בן יצחק רח׳ אתּ כאן צדרא״ כבירא״ ורדּ עלי אלפיומי בכתאב כאלסראנ ולה כתאב פי אלאעתדאל ואלאקרב אנה כאן מן משאיך אלעלם ואלצדור אלכבאר ואלשיך שמואל בן אשר בן מנצור אלמערוף באבו אלטייב אלנבלי כאן פי זמאן אלשיך אבר אלפרנ הארון ותנאצרא פי אלאביב ואלסנה אלשרעיה וכאן עלי ראי אלמולי אבו עלי רח׳ אתּ ולה מקאלה פי אפסאד אלמחזור וחסאב אלמולד ורדּ [2] עלי מנחם ראש מתיבא ענד וקופה עלי רקעה בן מנחם אלי אביתאבת אייּדה אתּ ואלשיך אבו [3] סעיד כלף מנחם עלי אלכלאם ולה כתאב נייד ואלשיך ישר בן חסד בן ישר אלדסתרי רח׳ אתּ כאן מן אלעלמא אלכבאר ולה כתאב אלתלויח פי עלם אלכלאם פי אלפאצהם ובראהינהם ורדּ עלי אלפיומי איצא ולה כתאב פי אלאעתדאל וכתב כתירא״ מן אלפקה אלמדכל תם אלשיך שלמה בן מברך בן צעיר צאבח או צאחב [4] אלתייסיר תם אלשיך עלי בן שלמה צאחב אלאגרון אלמכתצר תם מר׳ אהרן בן אליהו אלקסטנטיני תם מר׳ ור׳ יהודה האבל בן אליהו הדסי תם מר׳ ישראל הדיין תם מר׳ יפת בן צעיר הנודע באלחכים אלצפי תם מר׳ ישעיהו בן עזיהו הכהן הנודע המלמד פאצל תם מר׳ שמואל המלמד בן משה הנודע באלסני תם מר׳ שמואל בן משה הרופא המערבי צאחב אלמסאלה ואלנואב וספר מצות ואיצא מקדמאת עלי אלמסאלה ואלנואב והו אכר אלעלמא ואלחכמא ואלמרשדין אלי אלחק והמשכילים יזהירו וגו׳ ותם אן ללקראיין מן אלעלמא אלדי לם ערפנאהם ולא וקפנא עלי כתבהם:

ושלום על ישראל:

[1] Fol. 190 a. [2] MS. וורדה. [3] MS. אבי.

[4] The copyist thus correcting himself.

III.—Translation.

In the name of the Lord, the God of eternity, shall we labour and succeed.

We shall now begin the Chronicle of the righteous Sheikh Ibn al-Hītī, may God, the exalted One, favour him :—

I will now mention the names of famous Karaite Doctors—may God, the exalted One, favour them—of whom I have found a record. First, the Sayyid ʿAnan, may his rest be in glory. He was the first who succeeded in unveiling the truth after it had been shrouded over, and he resuscitated it, and he poured out his soul unto death. It is said that he lived in the time of Abu Jaʿfar al-Manṣūr[1] who succeeded to the throne of the Khalifs in the year 136 of the Hijrah. He was the chief of the whole house of captive Israel in Bagdad, and he converted many of the Rabbanites to the truth, that is to the tenets of the Karaites, may their Rock and their Redeemer preserve them. After him were Daniel al-Ḳumisi[2] and David al-Muḳammas[2], and he wrote a book on the fundamental principles of the law. These [two] were before Ḳirḳisānī—may God, the exalted One, have mercy on him—for he has mentioned them in the "Book of Lights," and he has also mentioned bodies of people, namely the followers of Ismaʿil[3], and the Okbarites[3], and the people of Tustar, and Bagdad, and Baṣrah, and the Persians, and the people of Khurāsān, and the people of the mountain, and the Syrians[4]. He has not mentioned individual names, but only the difference in their opinions.

With regard to the learned Sheikh Yaʿḳūb ben Yiṣḥāk al-Ḳirḳisānī, it is to be noted that the date at which he composed the "Book of

[1] By using the term וקיל "and it is said," Ibn al-Hītī betrays uncertainty on a point which is now established beyond a doubt.

[2] The exact time of Daniel al-Ḳumisi's activity is not quite certain; comp. Fürst, *Geschichte des Karäerthums*, i. 78, and Hamburger, *Die Jüdische Literatur*, ii. 72, with S. Poznański, Jewish Quarterly Review, vol. VIII, p. 681. Ibn al-Hītī's collocation of Daniel al-Ḳumisi and David al-Muḳammas favours Poznański's statement that the former flourished at the beginning of the tenth century, for the latter was certainly famous in the earlier part of the same century.

[3] Ismaʿil himself is styled אלעכברי, and it, therefore, seems that by the Okbarites named after him are meant the followers of מישויה, who was a townsman of Ismaʿil (see Harkavy, *Transactions of the Imperial Russian Archaeological Society*, vol. VIII, pp. 314–16; also Bacher, Jewish Quarterly Review, vol. VII, pp. 706–708).

[4] All the bodies of people mentioned here are spoken of in Hark., *op. cit.*, pp. 314–19.

Lights" was the year one thousand two hundred and seventy-eight[1] of the era of contracts, or in the year 315 of the Hijrah. As for the Sayyid David ben Boaz[2]—may the Lord, the exalted One, have mercy on him—the composition of his work on Ecclesiastes took place in the year 383 of the Hijrah, and he also wrote a commentary on the Pentateuch and a book on [its] fundamental principles. And the Doctor Abu al-Sarī—may God, the exalted One, have mercy on him—lived before Saadyah the Pithomite, for he argued against[3] Ḳirḳisānī in his commentary on the Pentateuch and in his "Book on the

[1] The year 1278 of contracts answers to 967 A. D., but the greater part of 315 A. H. coincides with 927 A. D. The date 937, which has been assigned to the composition of the "Kitāb ul-Anwār" by several writers (see Bacher, JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, vol. VII, p. 687; Poznański, *Steinschn. Festschrift*, p. 196), really belongs to Ḳirḳisānī's Commentary on the Pentateuch (see the passage given by Neubauer, in *Mediaeval Jewish Chronicles*, vol. II, p. 249, which, according to p. xiv in the same volume, is taken from the above-mentioned Commentary). In the Introduction to his longer Commentary on the Pentateuch, Ḳirḳisānī's says:—

ونشرح معانيها التى هى غير الفرايض والوصايا اذ كن قد تكلمنا على الفرايض وافردنا لها كتاب مجرد (Brit. Mus. MS. Or. 2557, fol. 1 b)

The "Ḳitāb ul-Anwār," which deals with the commandments contained in the Pentateuch, was accordingly composed before the Commentary which treats on the rest of its contents, and if the latter was written in the year 937 A. D., it is not unlikely that the date 927 is the correct one for the composition of the former. The collocation of 1278 A. G. with 315 A. H. is a serious mistake, and is probably due to a blunder of the scribe.

[2] דוד בן בעז is reported to have been the fifth in the line of descent from Anan (see Pinsker קדמוניות לק', pp. קיא, 53), and, therefore, much earlier than A. H. 383 (A. D. 993). See, however, Harkavy, *Stade's Zeitschrift*, vol. I, p. 157. On the works of this Karaite doctor we obtain here fresh information.

[3] The argument in proof of Abu al-Sarī having lived after Saadyah is as follows: Abu al-Sarī argues against Ḳirḳisānī. The latter is, therefore, prior to the former. But Saadyah was prior to Ḳirḳisānī, the senior of Abu al-Sarī, and it, therefore, follows that Saadyah was certainly prior to Abu al-Sarī. The priority of Saadyah to Ḳirḳisānī is similarly established by the fact that Israel ben Daniel (or rather Daniel) who was prior to Ḳirḳisānī, already argues against Saadyah. It will be seen that unless the emendations עלי for עליה, and קבל for בצר, are made in the text, the passage is without logical sense. Ibn al-Hītī's effort to establish a chronology was most praiseworthy; but we now know for certain that Abu al-Sarī (סהל בן מצליח) lived about the time of Saadyah, as was also the case with Ḳirḳisānī.

Commandments," but Fayyami was before Ḳirḳisānī, for Israel ben Daniel[1]—may God, the exalted One, have mercy on him—argued against him, and Solomon han-Nāsī mentions him in his "Book on forbidden marriages," before[2] Ḳirḳisānī and the Doctor Abu al-Sarī; and the likelihood is that when he mentioned the learned, may their memory be blessed, he recorded them in their chronological order, for he mentions first ʿAnan, then Benjamin, then Daniel[3], then Ḳirḳisānī, then Abu al-Sarī, then Abu ʿAli al-Baṣrī and his son[4], then David ben Boaz[5] the Nāsī, then the Doctor Abu ʿAli[6]—may God, the exalted One, have mercy on them all. It is likely that he[7] was a contemporary of the Sheikh Abu Yaʿḳūb Yūsuf ben Noah[8], for he has argued against him extensively[9] with regard to ʿAbīb, and the Sheikhs Abu Yaʿḳūb al-Baṣīr and Abu al-Faraj Hārūn were of those who came down[10] to the Sheikh Abu Yaʿḳūb, and these [are mentioned] on a copy of his composition which is dated in the year 393[11]. And Abu ʿAlī, in his refutations of Ben Noah, has mentioned the names of learned men whose memory is that of men of battle, men of might, god-fearing men; these are Abu Saʿdān ben Abraham, and Abu Yiṣḥāḳ Abraham ben al-Ispahānī, and the Doctor Salomon ben Yerōḥim, and Abraham

[1] Israel ben Daniel אלאסכנדרי lived about 100 years after Ḳirḳisānī (see Pinsker, *op. cit.*, pp. מה, רטז). One should probably substitute דניאל for ישראל בן דניאל (vide *infra*).

[2] See note [3] on preceding page.

[3] On הניאל בן משה הקומסי, who has already been mentioned, see Pinsker, *op. cit.*, p. מה.

[4] i. e. Abu Saʿīd (ר׳ לוי הלוי המלמד) son of Yefeth ben ʿAlī, here called Abu ʿAlī al-Baṣrī (see Pinsker, *op. cit.*, p. קסב).

[5] On David ben Boaz, see above.

[6] This Abu ʿAlī is known as an opponent of Abu al-Sarī in legal interpretations of the Pentateuch (see Brit. Mus. MSS., Or. 2573, 2574), but it does not yet appear certain what other name or names he bore. He may have been Abu ʿAlī Ḥasan al-Levi al-Baṣrī, grandfather of Yefeth. As Ibn al-Hītī has already failed in his chronology on other points, it would be no wrong to him to imagine that he is here guilty of another chronological error.

[7] i. e. (apparently) Abu al-Sarī.

[8] Ibn al-Hītī has, as will be seen in what follows, much to tell us about this Karaite doctor, who has hitherto not been much more than an unknown quantity. See e. g. Pinsker, *op. cit.*, pp. כה, 74, 75; Harkavy, *op. cit.*, p. 156.

[9] This does not appear an entirely conclusive argument, for extensive refutations may be written of works whose authors have died long since.

[10] i. e. to attend his lectures. [11] A. D. 1002-3.

ben ʿIlān[1], and Abu Ezra ben Abūnah, and the Sheikh Abu Yaʿḳūb ben Abraham ben Jils who is, perhaps, identical with Al-Baṣīr. And all these were before him[2], for in speaking of them, he says: "May God have mercy on them, and remember them in the acceptance of His people." And Salomon ben Yerōḥim—may his soul be in Eden—was a contemporary of al-Fayyūmī, and the Doctor Abu Saʿīd, son of the Doctor Abu ʿAlī[3], was the teacher of the Sheikh Abu al-Faraj ben Asad[4]—may God, the exalted One, have mercy on him; for in mentioning him, he says: "Our teacher N. N." He[5] was in the time of Abu al-Sarī, for he made an abridgement of his commentary, and argued against him in his "Book on the Commandments." And ʿArīshī[6]—may God, the exalted One, have mercy on him—mentioned the Doctor Abu Saʿīd in his "Book on the Commandments," in the chapter on "Abīb."

The Sheikh Abu Yaʿḳūb ben Noah, of whom mention has already been made, had a college in Jerusalem, and there were there, according to report, seventy learned men. Of their number were the two Sheikhs Abu Yaʿḳūb al-Baṣīr and Abu al-Faraj Hārūn, and it continued after him in the same condition[7], and of the number who lived there were Abu al-Faraj Hārūn[8], and others. In the Synagogue of the Karaites in Damascus has been seen a part of the commentary on Leviticus[9], written on parchment, and among the things which the Doctor Abu al-Sarī said in his refutation of Ben Noah [is contained the statement that] he lived thirty years in Jerusalem ....[10]. This testifies to his continuance for a long time in the same condition—may God, the exalted One, have mercy on them, and give them a good reward.

[1] A יוסף אברהם בן עלאן הבבלי is mentioned in דוד מרדכי.

[2] Apparently before Abu ʿAlī, who records their names.

[3] i. e. Yefeth ben Alī, 'Abu Saʿīd being his best known son; vide *supra*.

[4] Full name: Abu al-Faraj Furḳān ibn Asad, or ישועה בן יהודה. The British Museum possesses several volumes of his Commentary (existing in a longer and shorter recension) on the Pentateuch; see Hark., *loc. cit.*, p. 159; Neubauer, *Aus der Petersb. Bibliothek*, pp. 19, 20.

[5] i. e. Abu Saʿīd? [6] To be identified with יהודה בן קריש?

[7] i. e. as a seat of learning.

[8] Ibn al-Hītī apparently means that Abu al-Faraj Hārūn who already resided in Jerusalem in the lifetime of Abu Yaʿḳūb Yusuf ben Noah continued to live there after that doctor's death.

[9] By Abu al-Sarī, who is mentioned immediately after.

[10] The words: כרגת כשזה עלי אלאביב פכיף אכבר צורתה כיא "what I have brought out and revealed concerning *'Abīb*, and how shall I make known its shape or condition," make no sense in the context. Something has probably dropped out from the text.

The two Sheikhs Abu Yaʿḳūb al-Baṣīr[1] and Abu Hārūn al-Muḳaddasī[2] were of the number of those who attended the lectures of Ben Noah, as has already been said, for they refer to him in their compositions by saying: "Our Sheik N. N. has said." And the Sheikh Abu Yaʿḳūb passed away before the Sheikh Abu al-Faraj Hārūn, for the Sheikh Abu al-Faraj in mentioning him, uses the phrase: "May He favour him"; and I have found a portion of the "Istibṣār[3]," which he has composed, its date being 428[4], where he says: "May He prolong his dignity[5]." I have also found a composition of his on the refutation of the two utterances[6], which was dictated in the year 458[7]. It is likely that these two Sheikhs, together with the Doctor Abu Saʿīd, were all in the same generation, and that they all studied in the College of Ben Noah. The Sheikh Abu al-Faraj ibn Asad said [in speaking of them]: "Our teachers N. N., may God, the exalted One, have mercy on them," and it is said that he attended the lectures of the Sheikh Abu al-Faraj[8], and he began his shorter Commentary on the "Torah"—may He make it great and full of glory—which he wrote with his own honoured hand, in the month Rabīʿ I, of the year 446[9]. To this belongs the commentary on Exodus, in two parts, in his own writing, the copying whereof occupied seven months . . .[10]

In Ramlah there was the Sheikh ʿAli ben Abraham aṭ-Ṭawīl—may God, the exalted One, have mercy on him. He lived after the Sheikh Abu al-Faraj ibn Asad, for he mentions him in his book, using the phrase: "May He favour him;" and he wrote a commentary on the whole Bible. And the Nāsī Solomon, who is known by the title ar-Rāʾis abu al-Faḍl—may God, the exalted One, have mercy on him—was one of the most eminent and foremost scholars. He was the chief of the Karaites in Egypt, and his command and decisions went

[1] See the text. [2] The same as Abu al-Faraj Hārūn.

[3] Of Yūsuf al-Baṣīr. The Brit. Mus. MS., Or. 2576, contains a work entitled כתאב אלאסתבצאר פי אלפראיץ, which is possibly the composition referred to in this place.

[4] A. D. 1036–7.

[5] Of Abu al-Faraj Hārūn (?), showing that the latter was alive when Yusuf al-Baṣīr wrote the work in question.

[6] A very vague reference indeed. [7] A. D. 1065–6.

[8] i. e. Abu al-Faraj Hārūn.

[9] A. D. 1054–5. The date of the longer Commentary, as given in Or. 2495 (fol. 75 b), is A. D. 1050. It will be seen that Ibn al-Hītī is here in a correct chronological line.

[10] The MS. has a lacuna here; סאצי, as a complete word, cannot be correct in this place.

forth into the east, and the west, and into Syria; but no other work by him, except the book on forbidden marriages, is known to us. He was most distinguished in scholarship, and also in jurisprudence. He also wrote a book entitled, "Things which the person on whom the obligation rests cannot approach[1]," which is a treatise on the fundamental principles of the Law[2]. He passed away in the year 600.

Of the learned of Bagdad and 'Irāḳ are to be mentioned the two Sheikhs Abu al-Ḥasan ben Mashiaḥ and Salomon ben Yerōḥim, who lived in the time of al-Fayyūmī. Ben Mashiaḥ argued much against him in Bagdad, and Ben Yerōḥim argued against him in Aleppo, and he died there—may God, the exalted One, have mercy on him—in the time of al-Fayyūmī, who attended his funeral with his garments torn, girded with a rope, and barefoot; and when he was blamed for it, he said: "We both derived much profit from our controversies, and there is no doubt about his learning, and, therefore, have I acted as I have done[3]." And the grave of Salomon ben Yerōḥim is known to this day in Aleppo, and among the Gentiles and others[4] as the grave of the righteous one, and vows are made to him to the present day.

Abu 'Isā ben Zar'ah[5] in his epistle entitled "Ilthām Sab'īn[6]" (?) argued against the Jews; then came the above-mentioned Ibn Mashiaḥ, and they controverted each other, and the date of the composition of this epistle is the year 387[7]. Abraham al-Harselani[8] —may God, the exalted One, have mercy on him—argued against the Rabbanites, and refuted their opinions. Among the number

[1] The phrase is a difficult one. Two similar titles of books are found in Ḥaji Khalfa, v. 354. See Dozy, *Supplém. aux Dict. Arabes*, iii. 485.

[2] Fürst's remark that Solomon the Nāsī wrote a *Sefer Miṣwōth* (*Gesch. d. Kar.* ii. 192) is, therefore, a correct one.

[3] A fine feature in Saadyah character. The incident is evidently narrated as a testimony to the worth of Salomon ben Yeroḥim. It cannot be doubted, however, that it *may* be true in substance.

[4] It is difficult to see who are meant here by "the others"; hardly the Rabbanite Jews.

[5] See Steinsch., *Polemische u. apologetische Literatur*, pp. 148, 149. Ibn Abi Usaibi'ah makes express mention of the Risālah (vol. II, p. 236).

[6] סבעין may possibly be a corruption of שעיב, for it was the Jewish mathematician, Ibn Shu'aib, to whom the "Risālah" was addressed (see Steinsch., *loc. cit.*). The reading "Ilthām" (אלתאם for אלתם) is a conjecture of Dr. Rieu, whom I have had the privilege of consulting on this and several other points. The meaning would be "the striking of Sab'īn."

[7] A. D. 997. [8] This Karaite is mentioned in דוד מרדני.

of the learned men whom he mentions is Yūsuf ben Ṣabtiyya[1], and I have found two books on dogmatic theology by ʿAli ben Yūsuf Samiyyah, dated in the year 459[2], and the scribe [of the copy] uses of him and of Ṣadaḳah ben Shomron—may God, the exalted One, have mercy on him—the phrase "May God favour them." And the Sheikh Ḥananyah ben Yaʿḳūb—may God, the exalted One, have mercy on him—was one of the foremost and great ones. He was most distinguished in jurisprudence and dogmatic theology, and he wrote a work entitled, "A treatise of minute investigation," which is a book of "secrets," in five volumes, and it is exceedingly beautiful, but there are only extant of it two volumes, the first and the second. He quotes opinions of his father—may God, the exalted One, have mercy on him—which show that he was also a learned man. It is said that he used to cut the Khalif's pen for him, and he had much power at his court. He belonged to the learned group of al-Baṣīr and Ben Asad—may God, the exalted One, have mercy on them all. Ben Saḳuyah[3]—may God, the exalted One, have mercy on him—argued against the Rabbanites and [especially] against al-Fayyūmī with regard to the new moon, and Abīb, and Pentecost, [and the laws relating to] the fat tail and the fat, as well as regards tradition; and he refuted their tradition. And the Sheikh Abu ʿAnan Yiṣḥāḳ ben Ali ben Yiṣḥāḳ—may God, the exalted One, have mercy on him—was a great and foremost scholar, and he argued against al-Fayyūmī in a book like the "Sirāj[4]," and he wrote a book on "Equalization[5]." The likelihood is that he was one of the chief scholars and the foremost men [of his time]. The Sheikh Samuel ben Asher ben Manṣūr, who is known by the name of Abu al-Ṭayyib al-Jabali[6], was in the time of the Sheikh Abu al-Faraj Hārūn, and they controverted each other with regard to "Abīb" and the legal year. He held the opinion of the Master Abu ʿAlī—may God, the exalted One, have mercy on him—and he wrote a treatise on the refutation of the calendar[7], and the calculation of the new moon. He also argued against Menaḥem, the head of the Academy[8], after having studied the epistle of Ben Menaḥem to Abu Thābīt—may God,

[1] Is צבתיא a corruption of שבתי?

[2] A. D. 1066–67.

[3] See e. g. Pinsker, *op. cit.*, p. מג.

[4] i. e. like the ספר המאור or "Kitāb ul-Sirāj" of Yusuf al-Baṣīr.

[5] The title is vague enough. [6] See Pinsker, *op. cit.*, pp. קסב, 37.

[7] מחזור, lit. "cycle," the years being arranged in cycles of nineteen years in the calendar.

[8] Head (with Mar Mathatia as opposing Gaon) of the academy at Pumbedstha, in the middle of the ninth century.

the exalted One, strengthen him. And the Sheikh Abu Sa'īd[1] controverted Menahem on the subject of dogmatic theology, and he wrote an excellent book. The Sheikh Yashar ben Ḥesed ben Yashar al-Tustarī[2]—may God, the exalted One, have mercy on him—was one of the great scholars, and he wrote a "Book of Indications" on dogmatic theology in their language and their mode of argumentation. He also argued against al-Fayyūmī, and wrote a book on "Equalization," and he wrote much on foreign law. Then comes the Sheikh Solomon ben Mubarrak ben Ṣa'īr, the author of "Al-Taisīr[3]." Then the Sheikh 'Alī ben Sulaiman, the author of the abridged "Egrōn[4]." Then our Master Aaron ben Elijah, of Constantinople. Then our Master and Lord Yehūdah ha-Abēl ben Elijah Hedessi. Then our Master Israel had-Dayyan; then our Master Yefeth ben Ṣa'īr, who is known by the title of the "famous physician"; then our Master Isaiah ben 'Uzziyahu hak-Kohen, who is known by the title of the "illustrious Doctor"; then our Master Samuel the Teacher, son of Moses, who is known by the name of al-Sinni[5]; then Samuel ben Moses ha-Rōfē, the Maghrebite, the author of the "Questions and Answers," and of a book on the Commandments, and also of Introductions to the "Questions and Answers." He is the last of the learned and wise men, who are guides to the truth, and the "Maskilim[6]" shall shine, &c. There are also learned Karaites whom we do not know and whose writings we have not studied. Peace be upon Israel.

G. MARGOLIOUTH.

[1] It is difficult to say who this Abu Sa'īd was, if Menaḥem Gaon, of the ninth century, was the authority against whom he wrote, for Yefeth's son flourished more than a century later.

[2] See Hark., *op. cit.*, p. 158. The British Museum possesses a philosophical work by this writer, entitled, *At-Talwīḥ ila't-Tauḥīd wa'l-'Adl.* His Arabic name was 'Abu'l-Faḍl Sahl (Hark., *Sahl Ibn Faḍl*).

[3] See Hark., *op. cit.*, pp. 158, 159.

[4] See e. g. Neub., *op. cit.*, p. 18.

[5] See Pinsker, *op. cit.*, p. 125, where a שמואל סני (or שמואל בן משה בן שני) is recorded.

[6] A title which the Karaites (of Jerusalem only?—see Neub., *op. cit.*, p. 7) took to themselves in allusion to Dan. xii. 3.

CHRISTIAN DEMONOLOGY.

III.

Evidence of Assyrian Monuments.

IT is much to be desired that some scholar, able to decipher for himself the cuneiforms of ancient Assyria and well acquainted with the general history of magic, should write a book in which the outlines of Assyrian beliefs should be clearly and fully traced from the ancient monuments and illustrated from the copious material which the records of later superstition afford. Such a book would show how persistent and how uniform have been, not only the beliefs in evil spirits, but the magical practices and methods of exorcizing them, from the earliest dawn of human civilization in Mesopotamia some 4,000 years B. C. down to the eighteenth century. In Europe and North America we are not wholly emancipated yet from such beliefs; but among the more backward civilizations of India, China, and the Pacific they are still everywhere alive and active. If, then, the phrase *quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus* holds true of any body of belief it holds good of these; and the Church possesses no real Catholicity[1], such as is claimed for it, except in so far as there lies imbedded in the New Testament, in the writings of her Fathers and in her rituals, this primitive element of demonological belief and practice.

Age and continuity of belief in devils.

[1] Cp. Pliny the Elder (*Hist. Nat.* xxx. 4) who, speaking of magic, says: "Adeo ista toto mundo consensere, quamquam discordi et sibi ignoto."

The library of Assur-bani-pal.

In exploring the ruins of Koyoundjik Sir Henry Layard came on a large subterranean chamber littered to a depth of half a yard with cuneiform tablets. He had found the library of king Assur-bani-pal. But the texts so found did not all belong to so late an epoch as that monarch's, who succeeded only in B. C. 669. Masses of them were in the Sumero-Accadian dialect which preceded the Semitic language in the basin of the Tigris and Euphrates, and which was their sacred language; and these Sumero-Accadian clay books contained also versions in Assyrian of their contents, so that our Assyriologists can translate them for us. Prof. Sayce puts back much of this literature, especially the magical incantations and exorcisms, to about the year 3600 B. C. So remote is the epoch to which we can trace back a faith in evil spirits, in possession by them, in the use of names, identical with that of the New Testament writers.

Nature of Assyrian magic.

Assyro-Chaldaean magic, says Babelon[1], rested on the belief that innumerable spirits are dispersed all over nature, directing and animating all created beings. They cause good and evil, guide the heavenly bodies, bring on day after night and night after day, watch over the return of the seasons, cause winds to blow and rain to fall, with snow, hail, and thunderbolts. They too make the land fertile or barren, generate and destroy life, send health or disease and death. They are everywhere—in the heaven of stars, in the bowels of earth, or in the middle regions of the air. Earth, air, fire and water are full of them.

Chaldaeans preoccupied with bad spirits.

Of these spirits some are good, some bad by nature, and their opposing hosts form a vast dualism embracing the universe. But the Chaldaeans were more concerned with the bad than with the good spirits; and the chief purport of their incantations was to expel the evil from men and introduce good ones in their place. For in Nineveh and Babylon

[1] *Hist. Anc. de l'Orient*, new edition, tom. V, p. 194.

there were no physicians in our sense of the words, but only priests armed with mysterious formulae in the dead and sacred dialect which the demons alone understood and respected, but of which the common people had no knowledge. Like Origen's demons, those of ancient Assyria liked to be addressed in a sacred language which they understood.

Marduk the mediator and saviour from demons.

As in Christianity, so in the old Assyrian religion, there was a mediator, Marduk the Merciful, called in the Sumerian dialect Silik-mulu-hi, i. e. he that arranges good for man, reveals to men the wishes and thoughts of Êa, the spirit of heaven. Says Marduk: "I am he that walks before Êa, I cause hymns to be sung unto Êa, I war (with the evil spirits), I am his eldest son, his messenger." Like the Christ, he is "The Son unto whom the Father revealeth all things."

Example of an Assyrian exorcism.

The following piece gives us an idea of the mediatorial activity of Marduk; I extract it from a French work of M. Halévy, *Documents religieux de l'Assyrie et de la Babylonie*, Paris, 1882, p. 54. The particular piece which I select for illustration is entitled a "Magic incantation against Head-ache." It runs thus:—

1.

"Incantation. The (demon) Head-ache runs up from the desert, blowing like the wind. He thunders like the lightning, he skims high and low. He breaks like a twig him who fears not his god. He tears asunder his veins like a castor-bean[1].

"He crushes the flesh of him that has not a protecting goddess. The victim faints and swoons like a star of heaven, vanishes in the night as water.

2.

"He attacks in front mortal man and smites him instantly. He kills that man.

[1] Babelon (p. 203) renders: "Son ulcère l'opprime comme une entrave."

"The man writhes as one whose heart is being torn out. He tosses himself to and fro as one whose heart is taken away. He burns like a thing fallen into a great fire. His eyes are filled with darkness like a wild ass in agony.

"He is consumed in his soul, he clings to the dead.

"The Head-ache is like unto a great storm. None knoweth its path. No one knoweth its whole force, nor how long its assault lasteth[1].

"This the god Maroudouk (lord or master of evil spirits) beholdeth. He betaketh him to his father Ia, enters his abode and saith: 'My father, Head-ache hath taken possession of this man.'

"Then he saith twice:

"'I know not what this man must do, nor by what means he will be healed.'

"Ia answered his son Maroudouk: 'My son, what knowest thou not? What wilt thou I should add unto thee? Maroudouk, what knowest thou not? What wilt thou I should still tell thee? That which I know thou knowest also.

"'Go, my son Maroudouk: gather a herb which grows apart by itself in a desert place. Cover thy head with a handkerchief so soon as the sun shall have entered into his dwelling. Then wrap up in it the herb and shut it up.

"'At dawn of day ere the sun rises, scatter it about in the place where the (sick man) is staying. Take the roots (of the plant), take also the wool of a young and virgin sheep. Wrap up in it the head of the sick man; wrap up in it the neck of the sick man. The Head-ache which dwells in the body of that man will depart at once; like a leaf that the wind carries away, it will not ever return to its place. Remember the oath of heaven. Remember the oath of earth.'"

Halévy on its import.

In the last lines, says Halévy, the demon is exhorted to remember the oath which the demons took, probably at the time of their creation, to submit

[1] Babelon's version ends here.

to order and not harm any creature. The idea that the order of nature, of well-being, peace, health, rest on an oath of fealty, which from the first the gods imposed on all subordinate beings, and that all disorder and trouble is through their breaking of this oath (or covenant)—this idea was not only Babylonian, but forms the basis of Hebrew religion and of all the system of reward and punishment found in the prophets and psalmists.

The same writer remarks that the Semitic symbolism of bodily and moral purity finds significant expression in the wool of the innocent lamb wrapped round the head of the sinner whom his protecting deities have abandoned to the fury of the demon.

Functions of the god Êa and of Marduk.

Babelon has some just remarks about the incantation just quoted. When, he says, the demons have to be driven away, the exorcism takes on a dramatic character. After a description of the ravages caused by the evil spirit, it supposes that Silik-mulu-hi has heard the complaint. But his power and knowledge are not enough to overcome so powerful a demon. So he addresses his father Êa, the divine intelligence which pervades the universe, the master of the eternal secrets, the god who presides over theurgic acts and reveals the mysterious rite, the formula or the all-powerful and hidden name which will break down the most formidable powers of the abyss.

Good spirits must replace evil ones.

The same author remarks (p. 202) that in delivering a person possessed from the evil demon, it was usual to introduce into him after its exit a good or holy spirit, as the surest way of preventing the evil spirit from returning.

Recurrence of the number seven.

For want of such a precaution the evil spirit in the Gospels came back along with seven others. In the Sumerian formulae the number seven plays a great part. The formulae which make up an incantation are commonly seven in number and must be repeated seven times. The spirits invoked are also seven,

like the seven angels which stood before God in Revelation; and in the magic formulae printed by Prof. Sayce at the end of his *Hibbert Lectures* the demons present themselves time after time in groups of seven. The recurrence of the number seven in the New Testament is noteworthy. There are not only seven evil spirits and seven spirits of God, but seven churches in Asia, seven stars as their angels, seven deacons, seven seals, seven sons of Sceva the Jew, seven loaves among five thousand, seven baskets of fragments from their feast, seven husbands in succession of one wife, seven nations in Canaan. We may well suspect as mythical any narrative in which things go by sevens.

Chaldean form of Traditio Satanae.

Just as St. Paul delivered over unto Satan the blasphemers Hymenaeus and Alexander, so also the old Assyrian sorcerer let loose the demons against his enemies, provoked their possession by demons and sent sickness upon them. He could even compass their death by his drawing of lots and imprecations (Babelon, p. 208). Like Origen's demons those of ancient Assyria had outward forms and were so ugly that if you made an image of them and held it up they would often flee, affrighted at their own image (Babelon, p. 212). Our museums contain specimens of such images. An image of a benevolent demon, especially of Silik-mulu-hi, had the same apotropaeic virtue as has to-day a statue of Christ or of the Virgin or the mere representation of the Cross; and Babelon (p. 210) gives a formula for driving out the demon of fever by such a device. Purified and enchanted waters had a similar effect, like the sprinklings or περιῤῥαντήρια and baptismal rites of the Greeks, Essenes, Christians and Hindoos.

Chaldean devils had outward form.

Prof. Sayce in his *Hibbert Lectures* gives the same account of the Demonology of ancient Assyria as the authors already quoted. "All sickness," he says[1], "was ascribed by the Assyrians to demoniacal

Sayce on Assyrian Demonology.

[1] *Hibbert Lectures*, p. 310.

possession—the demon had been eaten with the food, or drunk with the water, or breathed in with the air, and until he could be expelled there was no chance of recovery."

Shamanism. This belief Sayce[1] terms Shamanism and defines it as Animism controlled and regulated by a body of exorcists or medicine-men "who take the place of the priesthood of a higher cult."

The prevention and cure of disease was the main object of the magical texts and incantations. And very characteristic are the opening words, as rendered by Sayce, of the great collection of Chaldaean magical texts :—

"The evil god, the evil demon, the demon of the field, the demon of the sea, the demon of the tomb, the evil spirit, the dazzling fiend, the evil wind, the assaulting wind which strips off the clothing of the body like an evil demon,—conjure, O spirit of heaven! conjure, O spirit of earth! . . . . That which is misformed, that which is diseased, that which is racked (with pain), even a diseased muscle, a swollen muscle, an aching muscle, a broken muscle, an injured muscle,—conjure, O spirit of heaven! conjure, O spirit of earth. . . .

"The painful fever, the virulent fever, the fever which quits not a man, the fever-demon who leaves not (the body), ... Conjure, O spirit of heaven! conjure, O spirit of earth!"

Its affinity with the beliefs of the N. T. In these texts, then, we recognize most of the diseases, mental and moral, healed by the name or authority of Christ. There are demons of the tomb, of the field, of the mountain, of the sea and wind, the demon of disused muscle, of broken blood-vessels, of the evil mouth, of the evil tongue, of fever; and as in Luke's Gospel (viii. 27) the possessed had for a long time worn no clothing, so here we read that the demon stripped its unfortunate victim of his clothing[2].

[1] *Hibbert Lectures*, p. 329.

[2] A Scotch writer, Mr. Colin Campbell, in his *Critical Studies in St. Luke's*

All these lesser and malignant demons the old Assyrian exorcist drove out in the name of the great cosmogonist spirits, who were essentially beneficent. "The ceremonies," writes Sayce[1] (described in the Assyrian ritual texts), ". . . . were not so much a communion with the deities of heaven as an attempt to compel them by particular rites and words to relieve the worshipper from trouble, or to bestow upon him some benefit. Divine worship, in short, was a performance rather than an act of devotion, and upon the correctness of the performance depended entirely its efficacy. The mispronunciation of a single word, the omission to tie a knot at the right moment, would invalidate the whole ceremony. The ritual, therefore, was a sort of acted magic."

Assyrian worship was acted magic.

Evidence of Zoroastrianism.

In laying before my reader this evidence I must beg him to excuse its second-hand character. The sacred books of this faith have survived among the Parsis of India, the sole modern upholders of the Fire-worship which originated in Media many centuries B.C. and spread over Persia some generations before Cyrus. They are written partly in an old Iranian dialect akin both to Vedic Sanscrit and to the old Persian in which Darius dictated his inscriptions of Behistan, and partly in Pehlevi, or the middle Persian used in the third and following centuries of our era. Their evidence is only accessible to me through the translations of Darmesteter, West and Mills, and the works of Dr. Wilhelm Geiger, Franz Spiegel, Madame Ragozin, and others.

The Parsi Scriptures.

According to this religion a division into good and

Gospel, 1891, p. 94, has noticed this and other points of resemblance between the old Assyrian beliefs and the New Testament.

[1] *Hibbert Lectures*, p. 319.

evil runs through the whole universe of things visible and invisible. Ahura Mazda, the ultimately supreme god, heads a phalanx of good spirits, human and superhuman. Against his kingdom of light is arrayed a counter one of darkness and evil, headed by Angra Manyu, the mediaeval Ahriman, prince of the powers of the air and of night. The latter, through his demons, causes death and disease, droughts, and all convulsions of nature. The demons, if male, are called Daiva; if female, Druj. Every good demon is opposed and thwarted by a corresponding bad one; and among the evil ones may be noticed Aishma, the demon of sudden anger, who appears in the book of Tobit as Aeshma Daeva or Asmodeus. There is also Bushyâsta, the demon of sleep. With the demon of anger we have already met in the Shepherd of Hermas, and with that of sleep in the Twelve Testaments.

Dualism of old Persian belief.

Persian dualism does not seem to have been absolute in the sense that the counter principles of good and evil were represented as coeval. At any rate Angra Manyu is in some ways posterior to Ahura Mazda. He is not mentioned in the old Persian inscriptions of Darius and Cyrus; and his realm of evil spirits and evil things is later than the kingdom of good, of the blissful and immortal Amesha Spenta. The Zoroastrians believed the whole earth and air to be full of evil spirits, which attacked both men and animals, generally through the baleful enchantment of an apostate or a witch. Yet the demons could be driven out by certain formulae or health-giving sayings, repeated in the right way, as also by various talismans. And the kingdom of darkness was shaken from top to bottom by the appearance on earth of Zarathustra or Zoroaster, the prophet and friend of Ahura Mazda and revealer to men of his light and truth. This prophet's mission was to liberate man from the evil spirits, which possess the waste, dry, and waterless regions of the

The good spirit was prior to the bad.

The saviour Zoroaster.

earth, and are ever seeking to ruin crops by drought or sowing tares, and so to render the whole land a desert incapable of supporting man. Likewise, as in Luke's Gospel and in the Appendix of Mark, so in the Avesta, all noxious animals and insects, snakes, scorpions, ants, flies, and the wolf—the counterpart and enemy of the domesticated dog—are creations of Angra Manyu or Ahriman and of his demons. Prior to the advent of Zarathustra, Ahriman had also created evil spirits in human form—Drujas, Pairikas, and Daevas; but after Zarathustra had once hallowed the human form by assuming the same, the supreme evil spirit lost his power of creating men-demons; he could thenceforth only injure man by causing in him various deformities. However, man in the exercise of his free will can still so fall from the good as even to become a daeva, especially after death.

The creatures of Angra Manyu.

For the soul is immortal and good spirits go to Paradise, crossing the bridge Chinvat which spans the wide water into the heaven of light, where Ahura Mazda and his angels welcome them. But the souls of the bad cannot cross the bridge, because evil spirits hinder them and the demon of death drags them down in fetters into hell.

Fate of the soul.

But, as in the New Testament, so in the Avesta, the reign of Angra Manyu does not last for ever. At the final dissolution of things a new earth arises purged of demonic agencies; and in the last Judgment and final triumph of Ahura Mazda and his angels the evil spirits with their leader will be condemned and destroyed for ever.

Final triumph of good over evil.

The Avesta creed is so similar in all its essentials to that of Christianity, that James Darmesteter in his last work tried to cast upon it the suspicion of having been influenced thereby. It is true that the existing recension of the Parsi Scriptures cannot be earlier than the Sassanide revival of Magism in

Resemblance of Zoroastrianism to Christianity.

the third century A. D. Yet their substance is much earlier, and Christianity is itself rather the debtor than the creditor of early Persian religion in all that concerns Demonology. The New Testament belief in evil spirits and in their final suppression by a Messiah contains much that is racy of the Persian soil alone.

Evidence of Folklore in general.

To try to outline the demonological beliefs of Hindoos, of Buddhists, or of the less civilized races which represent to us to-day the primitive man of a remote past is impossible. The material is too vast. All that I shall attempt is to illustrate from them some points in the New Testament.

1. Let us begin with the well-known miracle of Gadara, in which the legion of devils passed into a herd of swine. I have already given examples from classic sources of disease demons being induced to leave a human being by the provision for them of another host. Let me add two instances from savage life out of the many with which folklorists have provided us.

Transfer of evil demons to a new host,

"In the island of Nias (in New Guinea)," writes Mr. Frazer (*Golden Bough*, 1890, Vol. II, p. 160), "when a man is seriously ill, and other remedies have been tried in vain, the sorcerer proceeds to exorcize the devil who is causing the illness. A pole is set up in front of the house, and from the top of the pole a rope of palm leaves is stretched to the roof of the house. Then the sorcerer mounts the roof with a pig, which he kills and allows to roll from the roof to the ground. The devil, anxious to get the pig, lets himself hastily from the roof by the rope of palm leaves; and a good spirit, invoked by the sorcerer, prevents him from climbing up again."

with substitution of a good spirit.

The idea, of course, is that the evil spirit passes into the

pig out of the sick man; and the substitution of a good spirit for a bad belongs to the same order of ideas as we have already met with in the Latin rite of baptism, except that in the latter the priest blows out the evil one instead of tempting it out with a pig.

Idea of a scapegoat.

Here is another example. In the Western Himalayas the people take a dog, intoxicate him with spirits and bhang or hemp, and having fed him with sweetmeats, lead him round the village and let him loose. They then chase and kill him with sticks and stones; and believe that, when they have done so, no disease or misfortune will visit the village during the year.

In this instance the dog is a scapegoat, which the Gadarene swine, strictly speaking, were not. But the underlying idea is the same, namely, that the evil spirits will go into the newly-provided host and leave the old.

It is not always needful even to provide a living host. For the demon also admits of being transferred into a rag or a paste of clay laid on the part afflicted and subsequently removed. We have examples of such cures in the New Testament [1], as where Jesus spat on the ground and made clay of the spittle to anoint the eyes of a blind man withal. Similar cures were common in antiquity. In the *Satyricon* of Petronius Arbiter, for example, a writer of Nero's age, a witch makes a cake of clay with her spittle, anoints a young man affected with some weakness on the forehead and instantly cures him [2].

Transference of the evil into lifeless objects,

e. g. into cakes of clay and spittle.

Frazer, in his *Golden Bough* [3], relates how the Incas of Peru banished sickness from their country by rubbing their entire persons with a paste made of maize kneaded with the blood of children. They did this, he says, in order that the paste might take away all their infirmities.

[1] John ix. 6.

[2] *Satyricon*, ch. 131: "Mox turbatum sputo pulverem medio sustulit digito, frontemque repugnantis signat."

[3] Vol. II, p. 167.

A similar cure is related by Tacitus[1] on the faith of informants who witnessed it. In the year 70 A.D. the Emperor Vespasian was in Alexandria, and one of the natives, notoriously blind, prayed him to cure his blindness by deigning to smear with his spittle his cheeks and eyeballs. For the god Serapis in a dream had bidden him seek this remedy. Vespasian consulted with his advisers and with the medical men, and ended by doing as the blind man besought him to. "Statim . . . caeco reluxit dies," at once the day-star shone once more for the blind man. As a rule the disease preferred to pass out into a medium similar to that from which it was expelled. For example, a cure for tooth-ache was to tie two snakes' teeth to one's neck, upper or lower teeth as the pain was in the upper or lower jaw. A tooth torn from a live mole was also effective as a cure, if bound to the aching jaw[2].

Vespasian's miracle.

In the presence of such analogous cures, who will pretend that Jesus did not entertain the same conception of the causes of blindness and other diseases as the Incas of Peru, or the Alexandrians, "dedita superstitionibus gens," as Tacitus calls them in connexion with Vespasian's miracle?

2. In Matt. xii. 44[3] the unclean spirit walks through

[1] *Hist.* iv. 81.

[2] Pliny, *Nat. Hist.* xxx. 8. The same author relates that a popular remedy for a cold in the head was to kiss the nostrils of a mule (xxx. 11). Numerous uses of human spittle are recorded by Pliny, e. g. that of a man fasting was a cure for snake bite (*Nat. Hist.* xxviii. 7). You spat in presence of an epileptic by way of rejecting the disease and expelling it from yourself (ibid.). This was why men spat in the presence of St. Paul. We know therefrom that he was an epileptic. Pliny (ibid.) also tells us that you could heal a man's opthalmia by anointing his eyes with your spittle early in the morning. Bloodshot eyes were healed by the spittle of a fasting woman (ibid. xxviii. 22).

[3] What is the bearing on the context of Matt. xii. 43-45? What had Jesus in mind in uttering these words? It has been suggested to me by Mr. H. A. L. Fisher, that some demon which Jesus had cast out had returned and retaken possession of the person from whom it had been expelled. Then Jesus had been taxed with this apparent failure of his exorcistic powers, and these verses 43-45 are his answer to his accusers. In

waterless places, when he is gone out of a man. Finding no rest there, he decides to return into his house from whence he came out; "and when he is come he findeth it empty, swept and garnished. Then he takes seven other spirits more wicked than himself, and they enter in and dwell there, and the last state of that man is worse than the first."

The demons of dry places.

Canon Gore, anxious to clear the teaching of Jesus Christ with regard to demons from the imputation of containing "Elements of Superstition," declares that in the above passage he is "plainly speaking in metaphor." The "waterless places," he writes, through which the demon walks are as metaphorical as "the empty, swept and garnished house" of the soul (*Dissertations*, i. § 3). If Mr. Gore had been familiar with the demonology of that age and of ages before and after it, he could not have so written. For, in the first place, it is notorious that of old, as still among races that believe in them, the demons inhabited the desert and ruins; and all apotropaeic ritual was intended to coax or drive off demons from the fertile and inhabited haunts of man into the desert. Hence the scapegoat was sent into the wilderness; the demoniac in Luke viii. 29 was driven by the evil spirit into the desert, and Asmodeus in the book of Tobias fled, pursued by the angel, into the utmost parts of Egypt, which were desert. Then as to the "house empty, swept and garnished," there is no reason to suppose that by it is meant the man's soul, or rather body, out of which the first devil went forth. For when a man was exorcized, the house he lived in was carefully swept out to make sure that the demon did not continue to lurk in it.

The dry places and the swept house not merely figurative.

Mr. Frazer (*Golden Bough*, p. 164 foll.) gives many

them he lays the blame on the wickedness of that generation. The verses or verse in which his failure was alleged would probably have been erased from the text of the Gospel as being derogatory to the Son of God. No cure of his could be partial or imperfect.

examples of such a custom. Thus the Eskimo of Alaska, when they periodically hunt out the demons from their houses, brush their clothes, violently calling on the spirits to leave them. The Incas of Peru (p. 169) "shook their clothes as if they were shaking off dust, while they cried 'Let the Evils be gone.'" So the ancient Athenians at the close of the feast of Anthesteria, during which the souls of the dead rose up and were fed and walked about the city, swept out their houses, crying *Thuraze kêres*[1], "begone, ye demons," i.e. of death or disease. The Incas washed themselves in running water to get rid of the demons, and the same idea underlies baptism. In most ancient languages to hallow or consecrate was to *cleanse* from impure spirits. On the Gold Coast (Frazer, p. 170) the women wash and scour all their wooden and earthen vessels "to free them from all uncleanness and the devil." Among the Hindus (ibid. p. 176), at the close of the festival of lamps, at which the souls of ancestors are believed to visit the house, the oldest woman of the family takes all the sweepings and rubbish of the family and throws them out, with the words: "Let all dirt and wretchedness depart from here and all good fortune come in." In the Greek islands to this day you must not sweep out a sick man's house, lest you sweep out his soul, and he lose it for good[2]. For sickness is conceived of as the temporary absence of the soul from the body. And this fear of sweeping out the soul of one still living by mistake is met with all over the earth. Now as you are careful not to sweep out a man's soul so you are careful to sweep out demons, which are similar in their composition. Porphyry, we saw, believed that

Custom of sweeping devils out.

[1] So Ovid, *Fasti* v. 442, relates how at the close of the Lemuria festival the householders after feeding the shades dismissed them:

"Et rogat ut tectis exeat umbra suis.
Quum dixit novies: Manes exite paterni."

On the whole subject see Rohde, *Psyche*, ed. 1890, p. 219; and Tylor, *Prim. Cult.* ii. 181, 182.

[2] I owe this detail to Mr. W. R. Paton.

houses are full of demons, which must be driven out of a room or a building before it is used for worship; and Eusebius quoted his opinion on this as on other points with approval. The consecration of a church or burial-ground reposes on such a belief.

Thus the probable meaning of Matthew's text becomes clear. It may actually have been the man's house which was swept and garnished, and not his person or body at all. After expelling the demon from a man's body you would also sweep his house out to make quite sure that the spirit was gone. Having lived in the man, the spirit had also tenanted his house, which he therefore speaks of as his own. And he returns to haunt it, much to the inconvenience and distress of its human proprietor. Yet it may be true that the term house (οἶκος) really means the man himself in this passage; just as in Rom. viii. 11 Paul speaks of the Spirit as making his house (ἐνοικοῦν) in our mortal bodies (cp. 2 Cor. vi. 16). But even if this be so, we must still see in such phraseology a reference to the superstitious habit of purifying a bewitched house to get rid of demons. And there is no reason for supposing that Jesus did not believe in the language of current demonology which he here as everywhere else employs. It is a hopeless task to try to pick and choose in the New Testament, to accept all we can take literally and then to coolly explain away the rest.

3. It will startle many orthodox persons to be told that Jesus Christ believed the winds and waves to be evil demons. That it should be so is only a proof of the extent to which rationalism has eaten into the heart of their religion; at the same time it proves the emptiness of the orthodox commentators on the Gospels, to understand which we must become, if not as little children, at least sympathetic with the simple-minded orientals who wrote them and for whom they were written.

Storm-demons

In Mark iv. 39 we read, in the account of the stilling

of the storm, that Jesus "awoke and rebuked the wind, and said unto the sea, 'Peace, be still.' And the wind ceased, and there was a great calm." But here the Revised Version, which we quote, seems of set purpose to have blurred the sense of the Greek text, which really means the following: "he rebuked the wind and said unto the sea, Be silent, be muzzled. And the wind grew weary," &c. Here the entire phraseology is demonological. "He rebuked" (*epetimā*) is the regular word used to describe Jesus' way of addressing evil spirits. It is not a very common word in the New Testament, yet in five other cases it is so used, not reckoning the parallel narratives to this of Matthew and Luke, who both use it. Then come the words, "Be silent, be muzzled" (*pephimôso*). Mark uses the latter word but once elsewhere, in i. 25, where we read that Jesus rebuked (*epetimêsen*) the unclean spirit, saying, Be muzzled (*phimôthêti*), and go forth out of him. There can be no question in what light Mark regarded the incident, and Matthew and Luke by using the same word "rebuked" also assent to this interpretation of it. Nor are there wanting those among the early fathers who took the passage in such a sense. Ephrem Syrus, though he wrote in the fourth century, more than any other father of that age reflects the tone of Palestine in the first and second centuries, probably because he was a Syrian and not a Greek. In his Commentary on the Diatessaron he thus writes about the incident: "What authority, what benevolence is here displayed by Jesus! For see here, it submits through his force. That our Lord silenced these (elements) that were not his own—namely, the winds of the sea and those devils withal—thereby he showed that he is son of the Creator." Ephrem, then, regarded the winds and waves as having been demons and alien to Jesus. And so did the Apostles who marvelled that the wind and sea *obeyed* him. The word *hupakouô*, here translated "obey," is in all the three Synoptics, and Mark only uses it once

in the Gospels.

Ephrem Syrus believed in them.

elsewhere (i. 27), and then of unclean spirits submitting to Jesus.

Here, then, we have most fully illustrated in the Gospels that primitive animism which invests the elements with life and turns winds and waves into demonic agencies.

Kindred beliefs of Old Assyrians,

So the Assyrians had their wind- and tempest-demons; and Babelon[1] figures an image of the demon of the South-West wind preserved in the Louvre. It is a horrible demon, erect, with lion's claws, a scorpion's tail, wings of an eagle, and body of a dog; while the head is a dead skull with the flesh half torn off, with goat's horns over the eyes. At the top of the head is a ring by which it was hung up at a door or window to scare away by its own ugliness the very demon which it represented.

So the ancient Persians also had their wind-demons, and

of Persians, Latins, and Arabs,

Origen, as we saw above, expressly sets down to their malice the storms which wrecked mariners. The Romans had their wind-god, Aeolus, to whom they raised altars even as they did to Πυρετός, the fever-demon. Herodotus[2] relates how in the land of the Psylli, the modern Tripoli, the Simoom had dried up the water-tanks. Whereupon the people took counsel and marched in a body to make war on the South wind. Mr. Frazer, to whose work on the *Golden Bough* I owe this reference, gives many similar cases. The Bedouins of East Africa stab with drawn creeses the centre of a dust-storm as it sweeps across the path, in order to drive away the evil spirit that is believed to be riding on the blast. When the Eskimos want a calm and

of Eskimos.

respite from North-Westerly winds, they light a fire, chant and invite the demon of the wind to come under the fire and warm himself. As soon as he arrives

[1] *Hist. Anc.*, ed. 1887, p. 213.

[2] iv. 173; Aul. Gell. xvi. 11. Xenophon (*Anab.* iv) relates how he and his soldiers appeased the fury of Boreas on the Armenian uplands by sacrificing a victim thereto.

they throw water on the fire to extinguish it, and shoot arrows into the spot where it burned and where the demon is supposed to be still sitting. We find similar beliefs all over the world, and even to-day winds are sold by old women in Lerwick in North Britain just as they are in Mediterranean ports. In old Christian art we meet with the same belief. For example, in the Taylor Gallery in Oxford an old Italian picture (No. 15) depicts the rescue of a storm-tossed ship and crew by Nicholas of Myra, who comes flying through the sky in response to the mariner's prayer; while the storm-demon, not unlike a nereid, makes off through the waves at his approach [1].

The Holy Spirit as a dove.

4. I have already referred to the descent of the Holy Spirit as a dove. In Luke's Gospel it is in bodily shape, ἐν σωματικῷ εἴδει, a dove; and in the Hebrew Gospel it not merely alighted on, but entered into, Jesus. Of course the theosophy of the Alexandrine Jews which chose the dove as symbol of the Divine Spirit had its part in the generation of this the central incident in the life of Jesus. Thus Philo compares the Human Reason and the Divine Word respectively to the domestic pigeon and the turtle-dove [2]. "For," says he, "the Word of God is fond of the desert and of solitude, not mixing with the throng of things which come to be and pass, but accustomed to roam and soar aloft." And elsewhere he says that "it is the property of the Divine Knowledge or Wisdom to roam aloft, like a bird; wherefore it was," he says, "symbolically called a turtle-dove [3]."

Twofold origin of this idea, (1) in Alexandrine theosophy,

But underneath this comparison, already common among Greek Jews in Philo's day, there lay the popular belief that the soul or reason or spirit of man is winged like a bird; for, as Tertullian says, every spirit, good and bad alike, had wings. We saw above how according

(2) in popular folklore.

[1] See Mrs. Jameson's *Legendary Art*, vol. II, p. 72.

[2] Philo, ed. Mangey, i. p. 590.

[3] Ibid. p. 506.

to the Pseudo-Pionius [1] a dove visited Polycarp preparatory to his consecration[2], and how in the hour of his martyrdom his soul or spirit left his body as a dove. In strict accordance with such ideas, the Holy or Divine Spirit rested or, according to one account, entered into Jesus at his baptism as a dove, replacing his merely human soul. And this explains why in the earliest texts of the Gospels a voice was heard from heaven on this occasion to say: "Thou art my beloved Son, this day have I *begotten* thee;" that is to say, "this day have I communicated to thee my spirit, soul or life." And immediately after the baptism Jesus, we read, was full of the Holy Ghost—as he had not been before—and was led thereby into the wilderness. Such was the earliest form of the story of the Baptism of Jesus. But in a later age, when the belief in the virgin birth and conception by the Holy Ghost had grown up, it became necessary to represent the Divine Soul or Spirit as having been in Jesus from birth. With this newer view the text "This day have I begotten thee" was not compatible; so it was changed in all copies of the New Testament into the words, "with thee am I well pleased."

The dove was the divine soul entering into Jesus.

Now this idea of a soul entering or leaving the body in the form of a bird is widespread. In the *Odyssey* (xi. 222)[3] we read how at death the soul of a hero fluttered up like a bird and flew away. So in Plato's *Phaedrus* (p. 249) the soul has wings and feathers with which she soars upwards to the ruler of the universe. And to the ancient Greek such language was no metaphor, but expressed a serious belief. Mr. Frazer[4] draws our attention to many

Other examples of such a belief: among Old Greeks,

[1] See Lightfoot's *Apostolic Fathers*, vol. I, p. 644, and vol. III, p. 390.

[2] Faustus, an Armenian author of the fourth century, relates the same story of the consecration of the patriarch Nerses.

[3] Ψυχὴ δ' . . . ἀποπταμένη πεπότηται. The same belief comes in the *Iliad* xvi. 856, and xxii. 362.

[4] Vol. I, ch. ii. p. 124.

parallels in savage beliefs. When the Malays see a soul on the wing in bird form they scatter rice to lure it back. In Java the first time an infant is set on the ground it is put in a hen-coop and the mother makes a clucking sound like a hen to keep the infant soul from straying. In the Celebes, a bridegroom's soul is apt to fly away at marriage, so coloured rice is scattered over him to induce it to stay, for it is imagined to be like a bird.

among Malays,

In Celtic mythology, says Mr. Whitley Stokes[1], good souls appear as white birds; e. g. in the middle Irish *Dá bron flatha nime* (Two sorrows of Heaven's kingdom), "Lebor na huidre," p. 17, and in the *Vision of Adamnan*, ibid. p. 31 *b*, the souls of the righteous come "in shape of pure white birds" to be taught by Eli under the tree of life. The souls of Mael Suthani's three pupils come to him "in shapes of three white doves" (O'Curry, Lectures 530). The souls of the wicked appear as ravens (Vita S. Paterni, Rees, *Cambro-British Saints*, Landov. 1853, p. 92). In Jacob Grimm's *Deutsche Mythologie*, Vierte Ausgabe, Bd. ii, p. 690, and Bd. iii, p. 246, are several examples from Old German, Bohemian, Polish, Arab, and other mythologies, of the soul appearing as a bird, especially as a dove. Hesychius gives the definition ψυχὴ πνεῦμα καὶ ζωΰφιον πτηνόν, i.e. the soul is a spirit and a little living thing with wings. Grimm (l. c.) gives an old Spanish example of the soul being regarded as a butterfly from a Roman tombstone: "M. Porcius M. haeredibus mando etiam cinere ut meo *volitet* ebrius *papilio*. Among the ancient Greeks the belief was so universal that Demosthenes, c. 50, says of the soul of a departed friend simply ἀπέπτη, "it flew away." In the old Egyptian mythology the sparrow-hawk with a human head repre-

among ancient Celts.

Other examples.

[1] In *Revue Celtique*, tom. II, p. 200. Cp. also Prof. Rhys, *Hibbert Lectures*, pp. 240, 398–99. This writer also refers me to Wood Martin's *Pagan Ireland*, pp. 140, 141, for examples of human souls appearing as swans and butterflies.

sents the soul (Bunsen, *Dingbilder* 126). The Romans had the custom of letting fly an eagle from the funeral pyres of their emperors, probably to provide the kingly soul with a vehicle wherein to ascend to heaven. So Professor Rhys (l. c.) gives examples from old Celtic mythology of the conversion of souls into eagles.

Devils as sowers of tares.

5. I will take two more examples of the way in which the New Testament admits of illustration from popular superstitions. In Matt. xiii. 25 we read in the parable of how a man sowed good seed in his field. But while men slept his enemy came and sowed tares among the wheat, and went his way. This parable must have appealed with twofold force to an audience that really believed the tares among their crops to be sown by night by evil spirits. In the old Persian religion the powers of darkness, which work by night and flee from the first rays of dawn and from the song of the chanticleer, sowed tares and weeds. And Mr. Frazer in his *Golden Bough* devotes many pages to the enumeration of spring and harvest customs, of which the object was to induce the spirits to furnish man with good crops and to deter the evil spirits from doing them harm.

Removal of trees and mountains by faith or magic.

6. In Matt. xvii. 20 Jesus reproves his disciples for the want of faith which prevented them from casting out the evil spirit from the epileptic boy, and he added these notable words: "If ye have faith as a grain of mustard seed, ye shall say unto this mountain, Remove hence to yonder place; and it shall remove; and nothing shall be impossible unto you." And in Luke xvii. 6 the logion takes this form: "If ye have faith as a grain of mustard seed, ye would say unto this sycamine tree, Be thou rooted up, and be thou planted in the sea; and it would have obeyed you." May not Jesus have held such language in view of the popular, and in that age almost universal, belief that by use of certain incantations and powerful names trees could be brought down off the mountain, hills removed, and even

the moon drawn down to earth? Thus Vergil writes in his eighth Bucolic:

> Incipe Maenalios mecum, mea tibia, versus.
> Omnia vel medium fiant mare.

And again:

> Carmina vel caelo possunt deducere Lunam.

So Ovid, *Metam.* xiv. 340, tells how the wife of Picus called Canens could move trees and rocks with her incantations, "Silvas et saxa movere." Medea was believed to have done all this and to have enchained the torrent as well:

> Illa refrenat aquas, obliquaque flumina sistit,
> Illa loco silvas, vivaque saxa movet.

Petronius Arbiter[1] in graceful verse has enumerated all the miracles which a witch could work:

> Quidquid in orbe vides, paret mihi. Florida tellus
> Cum volo siccatis arescit languida succis . . .
> Mihi pontus inertes
> Submittit fluctus, Zephyrique tacentia ponunt
> Ante meos sua flabra pedes.

Seneca in his play "Medea[2]" attributes to his heroine similar miraculous powers. Everything obeys her incantations. In Claudian the witch says: "Ire vagas quercus, et flumina stare coegi[3]."

Fruit trees and crops also could be withered and destroyed by magic incantations, as Tibullus says (lib. i, Eleg. 8, 19):

> Cantus vicinis fruges traducit ab agris.

And at Rome it was a provision of the XII Tables[4] "ne quis fructus excantassit," that no one by charms should ruin another's fruit-crop. The influence of the evil eye, *fascinatio* as it was termed, prejudiced human beings, animals, and plants. In this wise Jesus cursed and so withered the fig-tree.

[1] Ch. 134. [2] l. 752 foll. [3] Lib. i. in Rufin.

[4] Pliny, *Nat. Hist.* xxviii. 4. He also was condemned "qui malum carmen excantassit."

Nor must we think that these beliefs were the fancies of poets. The fathers of the Church with one accord believed that the magi or magicians by use of incantations and invocation of devils could work such miracles, nor would Lucian have ridiculed them so keenly had they not been objects of popular credulity. Nor is it so long since such things were believed in Europe; and a learned Jesuit, Martin Delrio, as late as 1600 in his *Disquisitionum Magicarum libri sex*, after citing the above passages from the Latin poets, gravely argues that they were no exaggeration of what witches and magicians with the help of the devil could do.

Such beliefs in power of magic seriously held.

We shall be much in error if we suppose that a Syrian or Palestinian city in the age of Christ contained fewer credulous people for its size than did Cologne, where in the seventeenth century the disquisition of Martin was printed and read. It is evident to any one who compares the leading marvels of the Gospels—the turning of water into wine, the walking on the sea, the withering of the fig-tree, the stilling of the storm, the feeding of the 5000, the raising of Lazarus and others—that it was the fixed aim of the earliest biographers of Jesus not only to prove that he fulfilled the predictions of the prophets and was therefore the promised Messiah, but equally to put him into successful competition with the leading popular magicians of the age. At his birth the magi came from the East to do homage, and when he grew up he had to excel them all in their own peculiar skill. He had to distance them on their own ground. Doubtless many devout minds in the present age would rather that this thaumaturgic element were not in the Gospels, and feel rightly that it impairs the true isolation and dignity of the central figure. However, we must be thankful for them as they are, and congratulate ourselves that in a document emanating from Syria in the first century the miracles are not more numerous and more striking than they are. It

Jesus as arch-magician.

was indeed very creditable to the Jews of Jerusalem at the time of the crucifixion, that they mostly refused to listen to the tale of the bodily resurrection. For it was a credulous age in which Herod's first thought was that Jesus was John the Baptist risen from the dead, and in which even the Roman legions had to be set in motion in order to put down the insurrection of a sham Nero who equally with Jesus had risen from the dead, and was acclaimed as having done so by millions of Syrians. Resurrection in that last half of the first century was in the air; and the wonder is not that so many, but that so few believed from the first in the risen Christ.

Credulity of the first century.

7. One other point may be noticed, and that is the use in the Gospels of a phrase, borrowed directly from contemporary magic, namely "binding and loosing." Jesus said to Peter: "Whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven[1]." And a little later[2], he grants this power to the whole body of his disciples.

Binding and loosing.

By incantations the ancient magicians or witches bound the elements, bound the feelings and wills of men, controlled their actions and movements, inflicted on them disease and even death. *Ligare* and *defigere* are the Latin equivalents. Thus the nurse in Seneca's play *Hercules Oetaeus*, l. 453, says: "Artibus magicis fere (? vaga) Coniugia nuptae precibus admistis ligant." And the same author (l. 6, *De Benef.* c. 35) has the phrase "caput alicuius dira imprecatione defigere." So Vergil in the *Ciris*, v. 377:

Regis Iolchiacis animum defigere votis.

Pliny, *Nat. Hist.* xxviii. 19 relates that the vestal virgins could by their prayers prevent a fugitive slave from quitting the city. By use of charms earthenware pots could

[1] Matt. xvi. 19. [2] Matt. xviii. 18.

be broken [1]. Snakes, he says, would yield to the same influence, and houses could be burned down by incantations scrawled on their walls (*incendiorum deprecationibus*). In later Greek the Gospel word *deô*, "I bind," regularly means "to enchant"; and Diodorus Siculus, lib. i. p. 23, preserves this inscription of Isis: "I am Isis, queen of all the land, and brought up by Hermes; and whatsoever I shall *bind*, no one is able to *loose*." And Aristides, in his oration for Bacchus, p. 53, says that "nothing can be so firmly *bound*, either by disease or anger or any fortune, as that Dionysus cannot loose it." This recalls Luke's phrase used of the woman who had a spirit of infirmity [2]. Satan had *bound* her for eighteen years. Symbolic knots were often used, especially in disease. Prof. Sayce points out in his *Hibbert Lectures* what importance attached to the tying and untying of these. Pliny (*Nat. Hist.* lib. xxviii) mentions a symbolic binding of the sick with linen. Witches, says Ovid [3], and old women used magic knots in order to silence wicked tongues. In Somersetshire the peasants still tie symbolic knots on the back of a sick animal; and in the Pitt Rivers Museum at Oxford such a knot recently used is exhibited. Agabus the prophet, in Acts xxi. 11, in binding his hands and feet seems to have mystically compelled the fulfilment of his peculiar prophecy.

But I need not multiply instances. The words "bind and loose" signify any kind of occult influence gained by the use of the names of gods and demons, by spells sung, as Pliny remarks, in the ritual way without transposition or omission of a single word, amidst the reverential silence of the bystanders, and to the sound of a flute played without intermission, lest anything else but the words of the charm be heard by the supernatural powers [4]. We

[1] Pliny, *Nat. Hist.* xxviii. 4, "Nondum egressa urbe mancipia fugitiva retinere in loco precatione."

[2] Luke xiii. 16.

[3] *Fasti*, ii. 575, 581.

[4] Pliny, *Nat. Hist.* xxviii. 3.

can hardly doubt that the choice of the phrase "binding and loosing" to describe the power conferred by Jesus was suggested by these magic arts. The association with the magic use of the name—which I shall presently discuss—at least suggests that the power itself as originally conceived was simply of a theurgic or magical kind.

(To be concluded.)

F. C. CONYBEARE.

MASSORETIC STUDIES.

IV.

The Division into Verses (continued).

3. *The Division of Verses of the Massorah.*

In the preceding investigations it was presumed that the division of verses of the Massorah was known, and that, with very few exceptions, it was identical with that of our editions of the Bible. This identity is, in the first instance, based upon tradition; for our editions flowed from MSS. in which the division of verses was marked. It is further based on the concurrence of the numbers of the verses of separate sections (Pentateuch), and of the sums of the verses of the separate books and of the three parts. That also the separate verses in respect to their magnitude, i.e. the division of verses, in a narrower sense, are the same in our copies as those which the Massorah hands down and demands, follows from the diversified statements about the "Pesukim," which can be verified by the "Pesukim" of our copies. It is for the purpose of establishing this assertion, and, at the same time, of illustrating what importance the Massoretes attached to the division and limitation of verses, and what amount of labour they consequently bestowed on them, that we will produce here a few characteristic data from the Massoretic material extant. For this object we shall make use of the *Massora marginalis* and *finalis*, such as Frensdorff's Massoretic works (*Ochlah We-Ochlah*, Hanover, 1864, and *Massoretisches Wörterbuch*, Hanover and Leipzig, 1876), and Ginsburg's *The Massorah* (3 parts). In the latter books the reader can find the further explanations of the data we produce, and, of course, a great number of other data on this point[1].

[1] Vide particularly *Ochla*, Nos. 39, 164, 171–175, 179, 194, 225–230, 268, 274–282, 286–288, 296–360, 362–365, 374; *Massoretisches Wörterbuch*, pp. 373–381. The Massorah follows, on the whole, in its arrangement the *Masora finalis*; the above-mentioned book, the *Massoretisches Wörterbuch*, can therefore be used. It is rather more difficult, as we have done, to look out the needful passages from the Index to vol. II. But, having regard

We commence with the proofs for whole verses. There are three verses (Gen. ii. 5, Num. xxvi. 8, Josh. xi. 14) which number eighty letters (*Ochla*, No. 316, cf. *M. W. B.*, p. 377 b); three verses commence and terminate with שׁ (*Massora Exodus*, 29, 30; *M. W. B.*, p. 378 b; Ginsburg, ש, No. 17). Eleven other verses begin and terminate with נון (Ginsburg, II, נ, No. 13=Lev. xiii. 9; Num. xxxii. 32, &c.). There are ten verses each word of which contains a שׁ (*Massora*, Num. xxvi. 24; *Mf.*, ש, 8; Ginsburg, ש, 18); the whole alphabet (Ginsburg, פ, 277; *M. W. B.*, p. 381 b; for instance, Zeph. iii. 8: cf. *Minchat Shai*; Ezek. xxxviii. 12, &c.). Five verses have forty words each: Jer. xxxviii. 4, Dan. iii. 15, v. 23, Esther iii. 12 (*Massoret. Wörterbuch*, 380 and 381, No. 1). The fifth verse was unknown to Frensdorff; it is, as Ginsburg, מ, 442, correctly states, Dan. vi. 13. Fourteen verses of the Pentateuch contain three words each (*Massora Exodus*, 28, 13, &c.; *Mf.* ד, 1; *M. W. B.*, p. 381, No. 4; Ginsburg, מ, 439). Four verses have each seven words consisting of four letters (*Mp.*, Ps. lxxiii. 2, Prov. xvii. 3). Ps. cxix has four verses—namely, 15, 47, 113, and 146—having four words each (*Massora*, Ps. cxix. 47: *Mf.* עד, 17). So has Ps. cxix, verses 43 and 128, ten words each (*Mp.* cxix. 128). Seven verses have fifteen words each, of which the middle word, i.e. the eighth, form a Ketib and Keri: 1 Sam. xiii. 19, xxx. 24, Jer. xxxiii. 8, &c. (*Ochla*, No. 164). Eleven verses of the Torah begin and end with the same word, for instance, Lev. xxiii. 42 (*Massora*, Lev. vii. 19; *M. W. B.*, p. 381, No. 3). Ginsburg, מ, 424, mentions, in accordance with the Massorah to Lev. vii. 19 cited by him, only ten, but in the index he correctly notes י״א. In other places, also, there are discrepancies between Ginsburg's text and the index, which were not noted by Baer in his review of Ginsburg's work in the *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, XL, 743 sqq. Cf. about the notation in question Ginsburg, III, p. 221 a, where thirty-three verses of that kind are adduced; also ו, 98. Three verses begin and terminate with the Tetragrammaton (Deut. xxxi. 3; *Mf.* אד, 50; *M. W. B.*, p. 338, *sub fin.*). We also refer briefly to several numbers of the *Ochla*, where various combinations of the same particle in *one* verse are noted: 230 (אֶת), 298–315 (כל), 317, 318 (מן), 321–324 (עד), 328–333 (אין), 334 (בְּ֫ם),

to the space at our disposal, we can only give a small fragment. After some study of the Massoretic material, the corresponding data can easily be found in these four collections. We, therefore, refer to this only occasionally. *Ochla* is the handiest of them, but contains, comparatively, the fewest data; which proves that, in the course of centuries, the Massoretic material has increased also in this respect. We do not especially cite Frensdorff's notes.

335–337 (שָׁמָּה), 339 (הִנֵּה), 340–342 (והוא), 346 (אִם), 349–355 (עַל), 356 (גַּם), 362, in three verses of which לֹא occurs once, and וְלֹא occurs four times. These references occur also in Ginsburg's work and elsewhere, e.g. א, 517, in three verses of which, after אֶל, וְאֶל occurs four times, again followed by אֶל. This very small collection of data is sufficient to give an idea of the host of indications contained in the Massorah towards the fixing of the division of the verses.

A number of data give certainty about the COMMENCEMENT of verses: *Ochla*, Nos. 39, 171–175, 319, 320, 327, 338, 343, 345, 360, 368. In order to enable the reader to gain a correct idea of the amplitude of such data, I shall give a selection out of the less accessible work of Ginsburg, *and only such notes about the commencement of verses as are noted under* א: 88, Abraham commences a verse five times; 805, אָמַר ה׳ three times; 1469, אַתָּה ה׳ three times; 869, ויאמר ה׳ אליו three times; 193, ואולם five times; 340, וְאַיֵּה three times; 365, וְאֵיךְ three times; 418, אִישׁ ten times in the Pentateuch and twice in Job; 452, אַךְ eight times (cf. 457); 650, אֱלֹהִים thirty-one times; 735, 736, אִם seventeen times in Exodus and seven times in Leviticus; 813, אָמַרְתָּ three times; 82, לאמור nine times; 957, וַאֲנִי thirty-three times; 1096, אֶרֶץ thirteen times; 1109, וְהָאָרֶץ eight times; 1182, וַאֲשֶׁר twelve times. And to give a few more instances of other letters: ה, 93, וְהוּא thirty-three times; ז, 49, וְזֹאת seventeen times; י, 196, וַיהוָה five times in Genesis; ע, 920, עַתָּה twenty-five times.

On the MIDDLE OF VERSES (מצעות פסוק), see *Ochla*, Nos. 325, 326, 345, 346, 363; Ginsburg, א, 320, אַחֲרֵי כֵן twice; 384, אין אין sixteen times (cf. ibid., 387, 390, 394); ב, 370, וּבְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל fifteen times; כ, 250, וכל ישראל thirty-five times, &c.

On the TERMINATION OF VERSES (סוף פסוק) see *Ochla*, Nos. 357, 268 (cf. ibid., note); Ginsburg, א, 808, אָמַר ה׳ twenty times in the Prophets; 945, אֲנִי ה׳ twenty times in Leviticus; 949, אֲנִי ה׳ אֱלֹהֵיכֶם seventeen times; 750, אִם לֹא seven times; ד, 147, לְדוֹרוֹתֵיכֶם five times; ה, 255, הֵם twelve times; י, 123, וידעתם כי אני ה׳ (in the index erroneously וידע׳) eleven times in Ezekiel.

It is noteworthy that the notes about the commencement of verses are considerably more numerous than those about the middle or termination of verses. We remind the reader of our previous observations as to the much greater significance attached, in the Talmud, to the commencement of verses than to their middle or termination. The latter is not mentioned at all, and for very good reasons. A knowledge of the beginning of the verses was useful in the schools and in the study of the Scriptures, because it called

to memory the whole verse, which could then be read correctly to the end. Thus it was allowed to arrange on Friday evenings the beginnings of the verses for children. But we do not hear anything about the terminations of verses, because these only gained a significance later, after the verses had not only received their limitations by accentuation, but had also become fixed for recitation by means of written signs. The Massoretic notes on the beginnings of verses, which are more natural intersections of the text than the terminations of verses, were, for the reasons stated above, already deemed worthy of attention in remote times, and therefore the number of such notes is greater. This becomes evident by a comparison of the data contained in *Ochla*, where the notes about the beginning of verses form by far the majority. The circumstance that *we* speak frequently of סוף פסוק, and hardly ever of ראש פסוק, rests, as already mentioned, on our system of accentuation, which knows no ראש פסוק, but only a Silluk, usually called סוף פסוק. The alphabetical portions of Holy Writ prove that the beginnings of verses had already a significance in Biblical times: for the terminations of verses not even a rhyme exists.

The hosts of data contained in the Massorah make an accurate limitation of the individual verses possible; and thus the discrepancies are not numerous, either in the Massoretic works or in the editions. What we know about this, we have given in the previous chapter. *The result is, that Tradition, Massorah, and the Editions of the Bible are in perfect harmony on this point.*

4. *Division into verses and Stichometry.*

The verses of classical antiquity differ essentially from those of the Alexandrine Bible. In secular writings, the "verses" served the purpose of fixing the remuneration of the copyists: they wrote lines of a certain length—thirty-six to thirty-eight letters to the line—without any attention being paid to the contents; but in Holy Writ the sections or lines were, at the same time, sections in reference to the contents. Every sentence formed a line, a *στίχος* or versus[1]. A פסוק can have, therefore, several verses (lines), as well as several כתוב, מקרא, קרא. We can identify *stichos* with דָּבָר, or, better still, with the טעמים of the Jerusalemite, or the פסקי טעמים of the

[1] Cf. Berger, *Histoire de la Vulgate*, p. 316 sqq.; E. König, *Einleitung in das alte Testament*, p. 462, and the works quoted in these books. We have made mention already, II, 1, of more recent works. It would be worth while to make a thorough comparative study of the division into verses and the Biblical *Stichometry*, and we recommend such study to those to whom the literature in question is accessible.

Babylonian Talmud. The question is whether the Hebrew Bible knew of *Stichoi.*

Hupfeld[1] answered this question in the affirmative in respect to the poetical pieces. We assent to this opinion, without, however, wishing to decide whether such sentences made a line each. We consider it as certain that such sentences formed a unity, and were recognized as such. People knew that the individual sentences in the poetical pieces, Exodus xv, Deut. xxxii, Judges v, and 2 Sam. xxii, were complete in themselves, and were reproduced also in writing in accordance with such limitation[2].

Another question, which does not concern us here, is, how this limitation of individual sentences was expressed in writing. It is known that the three books of Psalms, Job, and Proverbs were, as late as the Middle Ages, written as שירה, although the linear representation in the MSS. is no longer the original one. It is, therefore, beyond doubt, that the Talmud, Kiddushin, 30 a, when giving the number of the פסוקים of the Psalms as 5,896, means such *stichoi*[3]. Consequently, *the number of stichoi is found in the Talmud in the same manner as*, on the other hand, *the number of Massoretic verses in the non-Hebrew codices.* A distinction (mentioned also elsewhere) is found in Cod. Erlangen, 770, 8 *sub fin.*, which gives the number as 2,606: "Ter quinquagenos David canit ordine psalmos Versus bis mille sexcentos sex canit ille[4]." Still more remarkable is the account given in a fragment of the Psalms in the Royal Library in Copenhagen, in which the number of the verses of the Psalms is given as IIDXXVII. *This is the figure given by the Massorah*, which seems to have escaped Berger[5]. I am fortunate enough to be able to point out the Massoretic number of verses for the Pentateuch in a MS. of the Vulgate. For Exodus, Berger, p. 363, gives "*Mille ducenti et novem*: compl.[1]," and this agrees with the Massorah to the letter[6].

[1] *Ausführliche hebr. Grammatik*, 1841, pp. 84–114, König, 461.

[2] Vide Megilla, 16 b, and Minchat Shai to Deut., c. 32.

[3] Luzzatto, *Hebrew Letters*, ed. Gräber, p. 346; Hupfeld, *Grammatik*, § 20; Delitzsch, *Psalms*, II, 398, 3rd edition; I, 21. Luzzatto, in accordance with Joel Brill's edition with commentary, really obtained the number 5,896, but not without some artifices. The Massorah counts in the Psalms only 2,527 verses. By adding the number of verses of the individual chapters, I get for the Peshitta 4,793; in Berger, p. 365, I find 5,000, and from MSS. of the Vulgate, 5,500.

[4] Delitzsch, *Psalms*, II, 398, the same is cited by Berger (p. 365), from B, No. 10,420.

[5] *Histoire de la Vulgate*, p. 365; for the description of the MS. in "Nouveau fonds royal," No. 1, vide ibid, p. 380.

[6] For a description of the Codex Compl.[1], vide Berger, p. 392. The

The same Codex gives for Genesis: *Mille* LXXXIIII. This figure cannot possibly refer to *stichoi*, the numbers of which vary between 3,070 and 4,900 (Berger, p. 363). The Massoretic number of verses for Exodus being attested, it is not too hazardous to assume that for Genesis also the Massoretic figure was originally given, and we really obtain it if we substitute D for L=1,534. Three sets of figures of *stichoi* are preserved for Leviticus, namely, 2,300, 2.400, and 2,600,—tens and units are neglected. A fourth record gives MCCC (=1,300). This figure cannot possibly refer to *stichoi*. On the ground of the information given by the Massorah about the number of verses, and previously pointed out by me, I venture to conjecture, by the figure as given in this MS., which hails from the tenth century, and which, according to Berger, exhibits the Spanish text of the Vulgate, that the number of verses as given by the Massorah is meant. It is only necessary to put D instead of M,—DCCC=800, the figure given by the Massorah. As in the other codices, tens and units are neglected. The assumption that in Kiddushin, 30 a, the *stichoi* of the Psalms are given bears a high amount of probability. It is, therefore, plausible that figures giving the number of verses of the Chronicles, which is handed down together with that of the Psalms, also refers to the number of *stichoi*. The Chronicles have, according to the Talmud, 5,880 verses; the figure given by the Peshitta, which is of Jewish origin[1], is only slightly less, namely, 5,630[2].

The passage in the Talmud, frequently mentioned but not explained, is protected against far-reaching conjectures by the evidence of a Gaon. In the *Responsa of the Geonim*, edited by Harkavy (Berlin, 1885), No. 3 a, the question occurs how the sums of the verses of our

MS. is in the library of the Central University at Madrid, No. 31: "Première Bible d'Alcala: Nombreuses notes hébraïques en marge." The MS. hails from the ninth century. If it is possible to venture making a conjecture on the ground of the ample description (l. c., p. 22 sqq.), Jews must have had a part in the translation, or, at least, in the correction. Might not the Hebrew marginal notes be by Alfonzo de Zamora, about whom Neubauer wrote in this REVIEW, VII, 398 sqq. ?

[1] Rappoport, *Halichoth Kedem*, p. 16; Perles, *Meletemata Peschittoniana*.

[2] ראיתוהי פתגמא חמשא אלפין ושתמאא ותלתא; *Vulgate* (Berger, p. 364), 1 Chron. 2,040, 2 Chron. 2,100. The figure given by the Peshitta refers, perhaps, to the Chronicles together with Ezra and Nehemiah; although 2,361 is given as the number of Ezra only (to which Nehemiah, of which no figure is given, probably belongs also). In reference to Proverbs, Peshitta (1,863) and Vulgate (IDCCCXL=1,840) almost entirely concur, especially if XL is altered to LX. Rappoport's conjecture can be called a happy one in that particular point, that the Jews also occasionally used the word פסוקים in the sense of *στίχοι*.

Baraitha were to be understood, as they were contradictory to the facts. The Gaon answers: Your question is well-founded; we have quite different figures, namely, Torah 5,884, Psalms 2,524, Chronicles 1,970: the Baraitha refers to a Bible found in Jerusalem, which differed from other Bibles in respect to writing and number of verses. The three books in question have at present the afore-mentioned numbers[1].

I shall give another conjecture on the *stichoi* in Jewish literature in the last note of the next chapter.

5. *The number of verses of the Pentateuch*[2].

Before entering upon the question of the sum total of the verses of the Torah, we must first bring some order in the detailed information about the separate Sedarim, in which many variations show themselves. It is fortunate that, besides the Editions (=E), there are five lists at our disposal, which correct each other reciprocally. Four occur in Ginsburg's work,—ii. 450 sqq. (= A); iii. 6 sqq. (= B); iii. 269 sqq. (= D); iii. 301 sqq. (= F); and one in the *Manuel du lecteur*, pp. 111 sqq. (= C). The last (C) is identical with the first (A);

[1] The words in the Responsum read: יפה הוקשה לכם ודאי דלא האוי הכין · הורה חמשת אלפים ושמונה ושמונים וארבעה פסוקי · וספר תילים שני אלפים וחמש מאות ועשרים וארבעה פסוקין · דברי ימים אלף ושבע מאות ושבעים אלא כך שמענו מפי חכמים הראשונים שאמרו בריתא הרא בספרים מסכתא (?) באותו סגר תורה שמצאו אותו בירושלים שהיה משונה בכתב ובמנין פסוקין שלו וכן ספר תלים וכן ספר דברי ימים אבל עכשיו אין תורה אלא כך ואין תלים אלא כך ואין דברי ימים אלא כך. It is remarkable that the Gaon gives the Massoretic figure only for the Psalms. The variation 24 instead of 27 is easily explained by a corruption from ז into ד, which was natural by the Arabic pronunciation of the Dzal, and which occurs elsewhere also. In the case of the number of verses of the Pentateuch ושמונים וארבעה is perhaps a corruption of ושמונ' וארבע' (= ושמונה וארבעים). As we shall endeavour to show in the next chapter, the Pentateuch has 5,842 verses, if the Decalogue is reckoned for ten verses; but if the Gaon reckoned it for thirteen verses, he would obtain 5,848: but perhaps מ"ח was read instead of מ"ה. It is more difficult to reconcile the Gaon with the Massorah in reference to the verses of the Chronicles. The latter have, according to Ginsburg, II, p. 453 (1,765 V), אלף ושבע מאות וששים וחמשה; according to Norzi, ed. princeps (1,787), אלף ושבע מאות ושמונים ושבעה; according to Baer (*Orient*, XII, 262), 1,764. It is, therefore, probable that in the *Responsum* of the Gaon שבע מאות must be read instead of תשע מאות, so that only a surplus of five or six verses remains.

[2] This subject has been treated by Baer, *Orient*, XII, 202 sqq.; I. Derenbourg, *Manuel du lecteur*, note iv; Geiger, *Jüdische Zeitschrift*, X (1872), 22 sqq.

we nevertheless reckon them for two, for three variations[1] seem to prove that Ginsburg had not taken that list from the *Manuel*. The Arabic list, B, accords with these, and is, in cases of difference, the most precise one. D and F belong together; both show the same corruptions, and differ only in two cases, which are obviously errors of the copyists[2].

A comparison of all the lists, including those which are afforded by the editions of the Bible, show to demonstration that they flow, one and all, essentially from the same source, i. e. that they are all based upon the same numbering of verses. In by far the most cases they agree with each other, and their origin is obvious in spite of the comparatively few discrepancies. The latter are, for the most part, errors in copying or in reading, which are easily recognized and explained. A conclusive proof of the correctness of this assertion lies in the fact that the total sums of all are equal, without, however, even in one single list, according with the results offered by the detailed data. If we have here different methods of counting the verses, we must needs ascribe this harmony to the strangest possible errors of addition.

We shall now make such comparison for the purpose of proving the above proposition, and of fixing the correct figure for the number of verses, and for many sections of verses. We shall give *seriatim* the numbers of verses of our weekly portions—no tradition existing to my knowledge about the Palestinian Sedarim—according to A, and compare them with those of the other lists, and with what other data there are. No discrepancy is noted whenever all lists and all references concur. For the sake of brevity the names of the portions are not given[3].

[1] קדושים has, according to A, ארבעה ושׁשׁים סוֹ וסימן נודד; C has the same note, only more correctly סוֹ for יוֹ. Ginsburg, strangely, marks נודד with a query, instead of יוֹ. Now if he had taken his list from the *Manuel*, סו, which is protected by the query against misprint, would be unintelligible. בהר has, according to A, fifty-seven verses (= חַמְשִׁיל); according to C, שׁבעה וחמשׁים נר נגד המנין הִשְׁשִׁיל. Here we should have to assume a tacit correction by Ginsburg, which is improbable in view of the previous example. שׁמות has, according to A, ninety-seven; according to C, שׁשׁה ותשׁעים צו נגד המנין עִנּוּיֵהוֹ צו. It is true צו = צו and שׁשׁה = שׁבעה; nevertheless, a tacit correction cannot be assumed. This very capable Massorete will, perhaps, shortly give an account of his sources; for in that case only his work will be of real service to science.

[2] D has תוריע, 66, F 67 (סו = סו); כי תצא D 110, F 106 (קִי = קִי).

[3] For another comparison, vide Baer, *Orient*, XII, 205. Has not Baer coined several mnemonics himself?

Genesis: 146 + 153 + 126 + 146 + 105 + 106 + 148 + 154 + 112 + 146 + 106 + 85. D F have 84 instead of 85 (Vayechi). Vayerah has in B E 147, which is the correct figure, for otherwise the sum total for Genesis would not be 1,534, as given everywhere, but only 1,533. קְמוֹ was turned into קָמוֹ, and afterwards the mnemonic יְחִזְקִיָּהוּ was invented. Accordingly, B has another mnemonic, כוננוהו, which is correct. E, although giving here correctly 147, furnishes, nevertheless, 1,533 as the sum total of the book; for it gives only 153 as the number of וישלח. A פסקא באמצע פסוק, Gen. xxxv. 22, was undoubtedly taken for two verses, which is not the case in our editions of the Bible [1]. The two verses do not belong together, and were only read as one to enable the reader to omit the first without its being noticed [2]. xxvii. 40 is given as the middle of the verses. The book numbers 767 verses up to this verse, if Vayera numbers 147 verses. This follows also from the note that Genesis numbers 1,000 verses up to xxxiv. 20 (*Man. d. l.* 149 and elsewhere): if Vayera had only 146 verses, there would only be 999. The figures are exclusive of xxvii. 40, resp. xxxiv. 20; this follows from the data on the next thousand, on which we shall have to dwell again.

Exodus: 124 + 121 + 106 + 116 + 72 + 118 + 96 + 101 + 139 + 122 + 92. D F show the following corruptions: ואירא, 118 (D also 98); בוא, 129 (D also correction, 106); פקודי, 96. The first error may be accounted for by erroneous addition, — 118 instead of 121. The second error may have arisen in this way: that the fourth Palestinian סדר of בוא was taken in full, i. e. twenty verses of בשלח (xiii. 17–xiv. 14) also; for B C first give the Palestinian Sedar of each week. This would produce מאה ועשרים וששה, which then became מאה ועשרים ותשעה. In the third instance צו = צב, ש׳ = תשעים ושש = תשעים וששה. The other sources produce identical figures. The main difficulty consists in this: how is the figure 1,209, which is universally handed down as the sum total, to be accounted for? The addition of the separate figures produces only 1,207. The half of the number of verses of the book is fixed at xxii. 27, exclusive (Ginsburg and *Manuel*); and up to that verse there are only 602 verses, and not 604 ($=1\frac{2}{2}0\frac{2}{2}$), whilst, as a matter of fact, there are 604 verses from xxii. 17 to the end. The two missing verses must therefore be looked for in the first half. Besides, according to the *Manuel* (p. 149), there are from Gen. xxxiv. 20 to Exod. xvii. 15 one thousand verses: this statement

[1] Cf. S. Baer, *Orient*, XII, 202, and Geiger, *Urschrift*, p. 373.

[2] Mishna, Megilla, 25 a; Shabbat, 55 b. According to another interpretation of the Talmudical passage, which we gave above, the Talmud assumes here only one verse; but the Massorah numbers two, and explains the Talmudical passage in the way given here.

proves to be correct, both according to the separate verses and the editions. The two verses in question must therefore be looked for in chapters xviii–xxii. This closer limitation at once suggests the decalogue.

It is known that the decalogue can be divided into two sets of verses. If it is divided according to the commandments, we find ten verses; if no regard is had to the commandments, there are thirteen verses[1]. In the former case, the weekly portion, Jethro, has seventy-two verses, and seventy-five in the second case. The number of verses is, therefore, either one too many or two too few. The larger figure is usually adopted, and the number 1,209 upheld by the elimination of one verse[2]; but some correct the Massorah, e.g. S. J. Reggio[3]. The statement of the Massorah cannot be upheld, once the decalogue is held to contain thirteen verses. But we reject this mode of reconciling the two statements, and for an important reason. All lists agree in assigning to the weekly portion, Jethro, seventy-two verses; all of them have, therefore, divided the decalogue into ten verses. The decalogue in Deuteronomy is, in all lists, also stated to have ten verses; for they assign to Vaetchanan 119 verses, our editions numbering 122[4]. But if the decalogue is counted as ten verses, then two verses are missing from the sum total both of Exodus and Deuteronomy. Exodus would have 1,207 verses instead of 1,209, and Deuteronomy 953 instead of 955.

I believe I shall be able to trace the two missing verses in Exodus xix. 9 in accordance with Kiddushin, 30 a. It is stated in this Talmudical passage that the Palestinians divided the verse in question into three

[1] Cf. W. Heidenheim's *Meor Enayim*, Appendix to Exodus. The stereotype edition erroneously counts sixteen verses, by dividing ch. xx. 13–16, לא תרצח . . . צל שקר, into four verses. This is admissible only when the division is made according to commandments, but in that case vv. 3–6 and 8–11 would be only one verse each. In Deut. v. 17 these commandments count correctly as one verse.

[2] Vide Baer, "Die Verszählung des Pentateuch," *Orient*, XII (1851), 200 sqq. A. Geiger, *Jüdische Zeitschrift*, IV, 265 sq., takes xx. 2–3 as one verse. Cf. also, on the division of the verses of the decalogue, Geiger, *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift für jüdische Theologie*, III (1837), 153, 463.

[3] Igroth Jaschar, p. 30.

[4] A proof that the decalogue was counted as ten verses can be found in Chizkiyah's words, according to which, the reason why in the synagogue no less than ten verses should be read, was in order to correspond to the ten commandments: חזקיה אמר כנגד עשרת הדברות. (J. Taanith, 4, 3, fol. 68 a at the bottom = J. Megilla, 4, 2, fol. 75 a; cf. b. Meg., 21 b, in the name of רב יוסף.) It would have been remarkable if they had satisfied themselves with ten verses for the sake of a decalogue of thirteen verses.

verses; and as the same tradition assigns the origin of the fixing of the numbers of the verses to the Soferim, which would mean that it had come from the Palestinians to the Babylonians, there could not be anything remarkable in the circumstance that in fixing the figure 1,209, Exod. xix. 9 was counted as three verses. The Massoretic notes must be sifted according to their original sources. The sum total, 1,209, dates from time immemorial, and has its origin in Palestine; the detailed figure seventy-two is either of Babylonian origin, or has been changed from seventy-four after the Babylonian division of verses had already counted xix. 9 as one verse. The fact that several contradictory statements occur in the Massorah side by side is also proved by this, that two notes, quoted by Heidenheim, *Exodus*, p. 80 b, contradict the division of the decalogue into ten verses.

As to the two missing verses in Deuteronomy, I believe that they must be looked for in Haäzinu, for in the lists F D, fifty-four verses, instead of fifty-two, are given as the number of that weekly portion. I do not venture to decide how these two verses are to be got at, but it is not impossible to do so, for this weekly portion contains several verses consisting of four parts. The middle verse of Deuteronomy is, according to the *Manuel*, p. 149, xvii. 10. According to the separate figures, the book numbers up to this passage only 475 verses, instead of the required number, 477 ($=\frac{9\,5\,5}{2}$). But this information cannot be used as an argument against our assumption, for it is also contradictory to the assertion of the *Manuel* and the other lists, that Veatchanan numbered 119 verses. The designation of this middle verse is based on the decalogue being counted as thirteen verses, but is not quite correct even then, for a verse remains superfluous if the number is given exclusive of the middle verse, as is usually done.

Leviticus has 111 + 97 + 91 + 67 + 90 + 80 + 64 + 124 + 57 + 78 = 859 D F gives for צו, וַיְצַו, which is a slip for וַיְצֵּו; in the same way D has for תזריע, וַיְ instead of וַיְ. We have already noticed that in A, in קדושים, וַיְ is an error for וַיְ, just as in C, in בהר, הטיל for חטיל. D F have further, in בחקתי, עה instead of עח. The middle verse is xv. 7. This is correct, for up to this verse (exclusive) there are 429 verses = $\frac{8\,5\,8}{2}$. The note that Exod. xvii. 16 to Lev. xi. 7 contains a thousand verses is also correct. That בהר has fifty-seven verses and not fifty-four, a thing evident in itself, follows also from the note that the fourth thousand is contained in Lev. xi. 8 to Num. x. 16.

Numbers. The unanimous information of all sources produces: 159 + 176 + 136 + 119 + 95 + 87 + 104 + 168 + 112 + 132 = 1,288. The middle verse is xvii. 20 (exclusive) = 644 = $\frac{1\,2\,8\,8}{2}$. The *Manuel* shows

1,289 verses, because there xxv. 19 and xxvi. 1 are taken as two verses each, although they are real cases פסקא באמצע פסוק. This is also shown by the note that Num. x. 17 to Deut. iii. 29 contain a thousand verses. פנחס must, therefore, have only 168 verses, and not 169, as correctly given by Heidenheim, and S. D. Luzzatto, *Il Pentateuco* (Padova, 1875).

Deuteronomy: 105 + 119 + 111 + 126 + 97 + 110 + 122 + 70 (נצבים וילך) + 52 + 41. We have already dwelt upon ואתחנן; also on D F, which give 127 in ראה, where קכו = קכו: on D, 106 in כי תצא = קו = קי (110), which is passed over by Ginsburg; on C in שפטים, where צו = צו; and on D F, in reference to האזינו, 54. These figures give 953, and not 955 of the usual tradition. Everything that was required to be said on this point, as also on the middle verse, xvii. 10, has already been remarked above. Deuteronomy, from iv. 1 to the end, has 845 verses. Consequently, ואתחנן is counted as 122 and not 119 verses, and שפטים as 97 and not 96.

The whole of the Pentateuch contains, both according to the Massoretic works[1] and the editions[2], 5,845 verses. The figure 5,835, which is twice met with in the Massorah of Tshufut-Kale[3], is not an independent statement, but merely an error of the copyist; for it is not based on special detailed information, and is, moreover, in direct conflict with previous statements. It is frequent in the Massorah that numbers expressed by letters are easily corrupted, and that the erroneous statements that have thus arisen are further transmitted after having been transcribed in words. We have already given several instances of that kind in the course of these articles; in the present case הף מה was turned into הף לה. We are convinced that there exists no rival information in the copies of the Massoretic notes. Our investigation leads to the conclusion that, in spite of the many discrepancies that these notes show, we may confidently assign all information of the Massorah referring to the number of verses in the Pentateuch to the same source.

[1] Ben Asher, *Dikduke Hat^{e}amin*, p. 55; *Manuel du lecteur*, p. 179, h. D Ginsburg, *The Massorah*, II, p. 338 b, at the top; II, p. 452 b.

[2] E. g. Minchat Shai, ed. Mantua; W. Heidenhein, *Meor Enayim*, Rödelheim, 1818 sqq., and in the concluding Massoretic remark on the Torah. In Bomberg's Rabbinical Bible of 1526, and in Buxtorf's Bible of 1665, the figure 5,245 is the error either of the copyist or of the printer, for the addition of the separate numbers at the end of each book produces 5,845.

[3] Ginsburg's *Massorah*, III, 269 b and 301 b, at the end of the two lists D F discussed above. I cannot find any reason why Ginsburg should have printed twice the same list.

But the information given in b. Kiddushin, 30a, which states the number of verses in the Torah to be 5,888, seems to be of a different character[1]. It is not impossible that there was a time when forty-three more verses were counted in the Torah. There was, perhaps, another division of verses in the poetical portions of Exod. xv and Deut. xxxii, which produced forty-three additional verses. This figure could be arrived at from Heidenheim's two MSS. Heidenheim observes at the end of Deuteronomy, in the repeatedly-quoted edition, that the separate figures of the weekly portions amount to 992, and not to 955. Add this difference of thirty-seven to 5,845, and we obtain 5,882. For the sake of reconciling the two figures, we should have to read in Kiddushin, שמונים ושנים instead of שמונים ושמונה. But Baer (*Orient*, XII, p. 204, n. 3), and, after him, Geiger (*Jüd. Zeitschrift*, IV, 265) observe, that the separate figures in Heidenheim's MSS. were not correct; the harmony between the two figures is, therefore, merely accidental. It would be very peculiar indeed if the Tanna as well as the Massorete had first counted the total of וילך נצבים, and then again the verses of נצבים separately. The many "eights" in the Baraitha are suspicious from a Massoretic point of view. Otherwise we should be led to assume that 8,888 should be read instead of 5,888 (ה=ח), as Isaiah Berlin corrects Berachot, 7a. This figure would then be connected with another, which refers to the definition of the moments. A פסוק would certainly be too much for a רגע.

A third information is that of the Yalkut, i. 855, which gives 15,842 as the number of verses of the Pentateuch[2]. Rappoport wanted to conclude boldly from this passage that the Palestinians had divided most verses into three, and that the enormous figure had thus arisen[3]. But in all probability we have here only a wrong interpretation of the letter ה used as a figure. The words הי אלפים were taken for 15,000[4]. We then should get the figure 5,842, which we consider

[1] ח"ר חמשת אלפים ושבעונה מאות ושמונים ושמנה פסוקים הוו פסוקי ספר תורה יהר עליו תלים שמונה חסר מימנו ר"ה שמונה.

[2] וחשבון פסוקים של תורה מ"ו אלפים התמב.

[3] G. Pollak, *Halichot Kedem* (Amsterdam, 1846), p. 10. Cf. supra, c. 2, *sub fin.*, the refutation of that opinion.

[4] Cf. J. Müller, *Sopherim*, p. 135, n. 9. In the Massorah הי is usually written, not הא; vide *Manuel*, 35, 7, 9; 37, 6; 126, 6; Ginsburg, *Massorah*, I, p. 234a at the commencement, p. 224b and 289b several times; also b. Menachot, 29b. Other instances, taken from the Talmuds, are found in Berliner, *Beiträge der Hebräischen Grammatik im Talmud und Midrash*, p. 19. From the Jerushalmi, the form הא only is quoted there. In Ginsburg,

the most correct. In discussing the number of verses of the Pentateuch we have already endeavoured to prove that the decalogue counted only as ten verses. We conjectured that the missing two verses were contained in Exod. xix. 9. The number of verses of Deuteronomy seemed to be in conflict with that assertion, because it amounts to 955 only, if the decalogue counts as thirteen. But the Yalkut gives, as a matter of fact, only 5,842 (not 5,845), and the decalogue must, therefore, have been taken to contain only ten verses; and this, as we have seen, was really done in the detailed amount of Vaetchanan. It is noteworthy, also, that Levita, *Massoret Hammassoret*, III. Preface *sub fin.*, counts 5,842, and not 5,845. The exact Massoretic number of the verses of the Pentateuch may, therefore, be 5,842. The identity of the hundreds, tens, and units in Yalkut and Massorah goes to prove that the discrepancy in the thousands owes its origin to a corruption, provided that we have, in our editions, the original reading, and not a reading corrected in conformity with the Massorah [1].

III, 70 a, הא occurs repeatedly. פי is also written like הי in *Manuel*, 35, 2; 39, 2, 7, and elsewhere. Ginsburg, II, 429, has פא only in the heading emanating from Ginsburg; the four notes cited there have פי. The mode of writing הא and פא is of a more recent date; and it seems to me that it was not used at all in ancient times.

[1] מדרש is given as the source of this Agada. This points to a younger Midrash, as Zunz, *Gottesdienstliche Vorträge*, 302, note, observes. Since Simeon Kara, as Zunz assumed, and A. Epstein again proved in his treatise: ר' שמעון קרא והילקוט שמעוני (Cracow, 1891), lived in the thirteenth century, the Midrash in question must be very recent. It is not impossible that this Agada was taken from the collection of Midrashim of Moses Hadarshan, who embodied in his work also non-Jewish Agadas, and even such as are opposed to Jewish conceptions, as Epstein proved in his *Beiträgen zur jüdischen Alterthumskunde*, XI, *Moses ha-Darshan aus Narbone* (Vienna, 1891), p. 9, and *Revue des études juives*, XXI, p. 80 sqq. I am led to assume this, in the first place, by the calculation of the days of seventy years and of the two verses that fall to each year; the figure seventy and the Gematrias belonging to the favourites of Moses Hadarshan. In the second place, the mentioning of verses from the Apocrypha is most remarkable, מספרי החיצונים לבד; this can only have been done by Moses Hadarshan, who did not keep himself free from Christian conceptions. Nor is the computation of the seventy years according to the solar cycle Jewish. Add to all this the number of the eighteen ימי החג, which do not accord with the number of the festival days of the Diaspora, and refer perhaps to the eighteen days on which the individual in *Palestine* could recite the complete Hallel (Taanith, 28 b, ימי החג = י"ח ימי ההלל"), for which reason the recitation of the two verses is omitted). All these considerations suggest the assumption that this Agada has issued from

Grätz (*Monatsschrift*, XXXIV, 97 sqq.), arguing from the number of verses as given in the Talmud and Yalkut, endeavoured to establish important discrepancies in reference to the division of verses. In this he looks for support also in the threefold information about the middle verse of the Torah, which is given in Kiddushin, 30 a, as Lev. xiii. 33; in Masechet Soferim, IX, 3 (ed. Müller, XVI) as Lev. viii. 23; and in the Massorah and *Dikduke Hat'amim*, p. 55, as Lev. viii. 8. Grätz argues that the first indication referred to the Babylonian, the second to the Palestinian, and the third to the Karaite division of verses, and that the latter had become solely and universally adopted. The three figures given as the sum total of the verses of the Pentateuch are explained by Grätz in the same way, namely, that 5,888 was the figure of the Babylonians, 15,842 that of the Palestinians, and 5,845 that of the Karaites. The Baraitha in Kiddushin, 30 a, which is introduced by the words תנו רבנן, must, in that case, be of *Babylonian* origin; further, in a division of verses which gives for the whole Pentateuch an overplus of forty-three verses only, and which, therefore, almost entirely agrees with ours, the middle verse must be moved forward by 152 verses (Lev. viii. 8 to xiii. 13), from which it would follow that they had made their verses longer than ours in the first half of the Pentateuch, and shorter in the second half. Nothing of this can be entertained. Grätz attaches too much importance to the expression בעלי מקרא, which he considers to refer, like בני מקרא, to the Karaites; but the expression is frequently enough applied in Talmud and Midrash to those who have a great knowledge of the Bible[1]. We can, however, in complete refutation of Grätz's assumption, adduce the numerous data, quoted from the Talmudim and Midrashim in the second chapter of this inquiry, which constitute irrefragable evidence for the division of verses as possessed by us. From these data, being partly of Babylonian and partly of Palestinian origin, there can be no doubt that, barring insignificant differences which can have no weight in deciding this question, essentially the

an extraneous, non-traditional source. If this be the case, the enormous number of verses, which according to this computation must be the result, can also be understood. For according to this calculation, there must be at least 41,160 verses; for seventy years have 20,580 weekdays, every day two new verses should be given to God = 41,160. The Hebrew Canon containing in round figures 23,000, the Apocrypha must supply the still missing 18,000. Or Moses Hadarshan counted the *stichoi* as Biblical verses; in that case the number of verses required can be accounted for. I believe that the enigmatical Agada could be solved after this method, although not strictly in the way indicated here.

[1] Erulim, 21 b; Baba Mezia, 33 b; Sanhedrin, 101 a, and elsewhere.

same division of verses existed in both countries. In the face of this fact we can dispense with all other, however obvious, refutations.

Turning to the question of the divergent information about the middle verse, the one given in the treatise Soferim, namely, Lev. viii. 23, can be explained in two ways. Up to Lev. viii. 8 there are 2,922 verses; the verse indicated as the middle verse belongs, therefore, neither to the first nor to the latter half, but stands between, for $2,922 \times 2 = 5,844$, and there are 5,845 verses. Now suppose a Massorete had in the Talmud the reading 5,882 (שנים=שמונה), and considered this the correct number, either from having omitted to check it, or on the ground of a different numbering of the verses of Deut. xxxii, in that case he had to count till he reached the half of that figure, $\frac{5882}{2} = 2,941$. If he, further, took the decalogue to contain thirteen verses – a thing not at all impossible, considering what we said before on the subject – then on reaching Lev. viii. 8 he had 2,925 verses, and sixteen more verses brought him to Lev. viii. 23 = 2,941 verses. Another explanation would be this: that the abbreviation ויש׳ (=וַיָּשֶׂם), Lev. viii. 8, was turned into וַיִּשְׁחָט, Lev. viii. 23. The information about the middle verse as given in the Talmud is more difficult to explain. It cannot have been based upon an essentially different division of verses, for the very same Baraitha gives the sum of the verses of the Pentateuch as only forty-three verses more than that of the Massorah, but there are 152 verses between Lev. viii. 8 and xiii. 3. I admit I can propose nothing in explanation, except that the ancient Massorete made a mistake in counting, or that he failed to understand the note about the middle verse. It is also possible to conjecture that the big ג had been originally an indication of the middle letter, which indication was erroneously transmitted to the middle verse, the ו in גחון serving for this purpose. I do not attach much value to this conjecture; I give it merely as a suggestion.

6. *The Number of Verses of the Prophets, the Hagiographa, and the whole Bible.*

The sums of the separate books of the Prophets and the Hagiographa are given, besides the editions, which cannot be relied on[1], by Ginsburg, פ, 195–215, and partly by Baer, *Orient*, XII, 262. We give here Ginsburg's list, and add Baer's variations in brackets. A "B" is added where both agree; where Baer has given no figure nothing is added.

[1] In the stereotype edition of the Bible Society the figure for the Chronicles is 1,656.

Prophets.		*Middle.*
Joshua	656[1].	xiii. 26.
Judges	618[1].	x. 8.
Samuel	1506.	I, xxviii. 24.
Kings	1536 B.	I, xxii. 6.
Isaiah	1292[1] B.	xxxiii. 21.
Jeremiah	1365[2] [1364]	xxviii. 11.
Ezekiel	1273 [1272][3]	xxvi. 1.
XII Prophets	1050.	Micah iii. 12[4].
	9296	

In spite of the separate figures, the sum total is given by Ginsburg as 9,294; and by Baer, who has only two verses less, as 9,292[5]. In another Massorah (Ginsburg, II, p. 338 at the top), the figure 9,298 occurs. *Dikduke Haṭ'amim* gives, in agreement with the first figure, 9,294. Isa. xvii. 3 is indicated as the half of the Prophets (חצי הנביאים), *Dikduke*, 56, Ginsburg, II, 338 a 6; this accords both with the figure 9,294 and the figure 9,296. In the former case xvii. 3 belongs to the second half, and in the latter case, to the first; for up to Isa. xvii. 3 there are 4,647 verses=9,294 : 2. If 9,298 verses are counted, the two additional verses would be equally divided between the two halves, and the middle verse would remain the same.

Hagiographa.		*Middle.*
Psalms	2527	lxxviii. 36.
Proverbs	915 (914)	xvi. 18.
Job	1075	xxii. 16.
Song of Solomon	117	iv. 14.
Ruth	85	ii. 21.
Lamentations	154	iii. 34 (32 misprint).
Kohelet	222	vi. 10.
Esther	167 B	v. 7.
Daniel	357 B	vi. 12[6].
Ezra (Nehemiah)	688 (686)	iii. 32[7].
Chronicles	1765 (1764)[8]	I, xxvii. 25.
	8072	

[1] The same in Baer's edition.

[2] In the סימן : אסכה the ם is a misprint for ש.

[3] Baer gives, in his edition of Ezekiel (Leipsic, 1884), the figure 1,273.

[4] [5] [6] [7] [8] For these notes see next page.

The sum total is not given by Ginsburg in this place, but is found 338 b, as 8,063; *Dikduke*, p. 55, has 8,064. This figure can be reconciled with the separate items only by subtracting five verses from Job, two from Ezra, and one each from Proverbs and the Chronicles; this would give 8,063. Was not Baer induced by the addition to subtract, against the Massorah, a verse each from Proverbs and Chronicles? The remaining eight or nine verses can only be accounted for by eliminating five verses from Job, two from Ezra, and one from Esther (according to Norzi). Psalm cxxx. 3 is marked as the middle verse of the Hagiographa (Ginsburg, 338 a, and *Dikduke*, 56). The sum total being 8,063, there must be 4,032 to Ps. cxxx. 4. The Chronicles and Psalms have 1,765 + 2,527 = 4,292. From Ps. cxxx. 3 to the end of the book there are 259 verses; therefore 4,292 − 259 = 4033, which is not quite correct. A total of 8,064 must therefore be assumed, and Ps. cxxx. 3 must be counted to the second half [1].

The sum total of the whole Bible amounts, according to Ginsburg, II, 453, and *Dikduke*, p. 55, to 23,203. This sum can only be arrived at by keeping, according to Ginsburg and against the separate figures

[4] Ginsburg, it is true, gives the same verses, but persistently gives in his reference of chapter and verse the one that precedes. For Joshua, cf. Minchat Shai. For Ezekiel, the second verse of ch. xxvi was given by Baer (*Orient*, XII, 262), but in his edition he notes xxvi. 1. Norzi always notes the middle verses, and they agree with those given.

[5] 9,292 being expressed in words (תשעים ושנים), נסמן מ״ר צ״ד must be a misprint and not vice versa.

[6] Ginsburg, v, 29, וחציו בה בלילא קטיל, but up to v. 30 there are only 167 verses. Norzi and Baer mark correctly vi. 12. Has Ginsburg obtained his reference from some MS.? The Bible, ed. Brescia, 1493, marks Ps. lxxviii. 38 as the middle of the book, as Berliner observes: *Ueber den Einfluss des ersten hebräischen Buchdrucks auf den Cultus und die Cultur der Juden*, p. 28. He could have added, that Kiddushin, 30 a, also marks this verse as middle verse. Cf. Norzi, end of צו.

[7] There are 343 up to this verse = 686 : 2. According to the figure 688, one verse must be sought before and one after the middle.

[8] Norzi has Proverbs and Ezra 915, 688 respectively, Esther 166, Chronicles 1,787. Job has, according to Norzi, and Baer in his edition, not 1,075, but 1,070. The latter figure is verified by the addition of the verses. In Baer, ch. 5, the number of the last verse is missing, but the section is indicated. Ginsburg's figure, which is protected against misprint by its repetition in letters אתה, is consequently wrong. Whence has Baer 914 instead of 915, a figure already given in the Midrash? The same applies to Chronicles.

[1] For references on the Fourths of the Pentateuch and the Hagiographa, vide *Dikduke*, p. 56.

for the Prophets, to the traditional figure 9,294, and by supplying 8,064 for the Hagiographa. These figures are expressly preserved in *Dikduke*. Accordingly, 5,845 (Torah) + 9,224 (Prophets) + 8,064 (Hagiogr.) = 23,203. For the three divisions of Holy Writ, Ginsburg has, II, 338 b, the following figures: 5,845 + 9,298 + 8,063. This amounts to 23,206. Baer, *Orient*, XII, 262, gives 23,202, having adopted for the Hagiographa the figure 8,063. These differences can be explained. But the following formulae also occur:

(1) פסוקים שתי רבואות ושני אלפים ושבע מאות וארבעים ושבעה לא פחות ולא יותר (Ginsburg, II, 338).

(2) ותרתין אלפין ושבע מאות וארבעין ושבעה וחכו (תרתין רבוון).

(3) שתי רבוא ו····· אלפים ושבע מאות וארבעים ושבעה לא יתר לא פחות.

(4) ושלשה אלפים ושתי מאות וארבעים ושבע (שתי רבוא) (*Dikduke*, p. 56, note).

The identical introductory and concluding formula shows that we have to deal here with the same Massoretic note. On comparing these corrupted readings, we are struck by the fact that they have, besides the myriads, only the figure 47 in common. Although we are justified in considering the thousands and hundreds as errors of the copyists, we cannot do so with the figure 47. It would be incomprehensible indeed how ג could have become מ״ז, or שלשה have been turned into ארבעים ושבעה. It seems to me that we have here an intentional correction by an overwise copyist, who, instead of the Massoretic sum of verses of the Pentateuch (5,845), took that of the Talmud (5,888). Thus he obtained an overplus of forty-three verses, which added to 23,203 (4) gives 23,247. This different sum total is, therefore, the correction of the sum of the verses of the Pentateuch made by a copyist who had read the Talmud.

The Massoretic sum total is, however, the correct one. This is shown by the indicated middle verse of the whole Bible, which is Jer. vi. 7. There are, up to this verse, 5,845 (Pentateuch) + 5,608 (Joshua–Isaiah) + 149 (Jer. i. 1–vi. 6) = 11,602. This multiplied by two makes 23,204. It follows that the sum total of the Prophets is 9,296 (not 4), and the sum total of all the verses of the Bible is 23,205 (or 6). Without arithmetic one cannot find his way even in the Massorah.

We have described the history of the division into verses within the circle of Rabbinical Judaism, without entering upon the grounds upon which such divisions were based. The examination of its justification on internal grounds has been undertaken by the commentators, especially in respect to the poetical and prophetic. As to the prose writings, the Pentateuch only has been subjected to an investigation

from this point of view in the repeatedly-quoted essay by Friedmann (*Menora*, I), not reckoning occasional remarks by commentators. We do not wish to pronounce a judgment about this essay. We only express the wish that commentators may give their attention to this neglected branch of Biblical studies, in order to evolve the laws by which the division into verses are ruled. It may be advantageous to Exegesis. and may give many a clue or hint towards the elucidation of some obscure passages.

Budapest. LUDWIG BLAU.

A LETTER BY MOSES DI ROSSI FROM PALESTINE, DATED 1535.

In a *corpus geographorum*, for which it will be one of the first duties of Jewish Science to edit critical texts of Hebrew descriptive travels composed during the latter half of the fifteenth and the beginning of the sixteenth centuries, the post of honour will certainly belong to the Italians. The extraordinarily favourable relations between Venice and the whole of the Orient, the periodical voyages of perfectly equipped vessels to Egypt and Palestine[1], the development of trade between the Republic and the Levant, acted as a continual stimulus to the Italian Jews to visit the scenes of their national glory. Though a natural result of their refined intellects, their liberal education, which had reached a higher stage in Italy than elsewhere, and their mastery of the Hebrew language, exhibited in a flowing and pure prose, still praise is due to the Italian Jews for having preserved their observations and impressions permanently, in detailed reports of their travels, and in letters sent home to their relatives and friends. These reports and epistles furnish valuable historical data concerning countries and periods of which we should otherwise have remained in total darkness. The eagerness with which every one awaited news from the Orient transformed every pilgrim into a geographer, every traveller into an author. Merchant or scholar, saint or man of the world, all wrote accounts of their travels, which, on reaching their destination, were shown round and were even copied and widely distributed. Thus, for example, there are the valuable travels which Meshullam b. Menachem[2] di Volterra[3] wrote in 1481, describing his

[1] Cp. notices of these travelling routes in M. Steinschneider's *Hebr. Bibliographie*, XXI, 136.

[2] Possibly the scribe of the Codex Günzberg 166, Menachem b. Aaron b. Joab of Volterra is Meshullam's father. He styles himself, according to Senior Sachs' catalogue, at the close of this manuscript: הצעיר קצר ימים ושבע רוגז אימים מפני חמת המציקים מדיחיו נזיר אחיו מנחם בכמה"ר אהרן תנצבה בכמ"ר יואב זלה"ה מעיר ולשירא וכתבתיהו והתמתיהו וקדשתיהו לשמי כו' והנה היתה השלמיתו בארבעה עשר ימים לחדש אדר שני שנת חמשת אלפים ומאה ושלשים ושלש [1433].

[3] Edited by D. Castelli in A. M. Luncz's *Jerusalem*, I, p. 166, &c.

experiences during a journey to Egypt and Palestine. It appears that commerce with precious stones often brought the Florentine merchant to the Orient[1]. When Obadiah di Bertinoro, at the close of 1487, commenced his pilgrimage to the Holy Land[2], Meshullam was on the same ship, which he, however, left in order to re-embark at Rhodes in a vessel bound for Chios[3]. The letter which Obadiah di Bertinoro wrote to his father from Jerusalem is one of the most authentic Jewish itineraries ever composed. The anonymous Italian traveller who, probably impelled by R. Obadiah's example, left Venice on August 5, 1495, did not pass through Egypt, but went direct to Beyruth[4]. This omission is regrettable, because we have thus lost a number of valuable observations and evidences which we otherwise might have possessed.

With the Italian Jews' renewed interest in the Ten Tribes and the River Sambation, fostered by the accounts of David Reubeni and other reporters from the Orient, the correspondence from the Holy Land received a fresh impetus. The Cabbalist Abraham Levi of Jerusalem had already, in 1524, sent a letter to Mordecai Modena and Asher Levi[5]. In 1528 he gives an account of the Ten Tribes[6]. His colleague Israel, probably Israel Ashkenazi of Perugia, a friend of the Egyptian *Nagid*, Isaac Cohen Sholal, who was spending his closing years in Jerusalem in dire want, sends his patron Abraham of Perugia periodical letters, in which he discusses the signs of the times and gives news concerning the Ten Tribes[7]. Abraham of Perugia received reports on the same subject from Rafael b. Azriel Trabotto[8]. Previously to this period already, Juda b. Salomon di Blanes[9], in Castello, had begun to collect everything that reached him from the Orient on these topics[10].

Thus it will be explained that also a simple merchant, Moses di Rossi of Cesena, whom originally commercial interests brought to the Orient, sent to his native place a report of his travels, couched in literary form, in which he also touches upon the question of questions,

[1] Castelli in Luncz's *Jerusalem*, I, p. 186.

[2] His two Letters were published with a Translation in the *Jahrbuch für die Geschichte der Juden*, 1863, II, p. 195, &c.

[3] Ibid., p. 199.

[4] Also edited by A. Neubauer, and translated, ibid., p. 273, &c.

[5] Codex 62[4] of the Günzberg Collection in St. Petersburg, according to Senior Sachs' Manuscript Catalogue.

[6] Published by A. Neubauer in קבץ על יד, 1888, IV, p. 24, &c., and in THE JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, I, p. 196, &c.

[7] Ibid., pp. 25–32. [8] Ibid., p. 32, &c.

[9] Cp. D. Kaufmann in *Revue des Études Juives*, IV, p. 93, note 1.

[10] קבץ על יד, IV, p. 36, &c.

which so excited his co-religionists—the existence of the Ten Tribes. Abraham Joseph Salomon Graziano[1], the indefatigable compiler of Modena, justly deemed this letter worthy of preservation in his Collection, in which his industry and scientific instinct rescued from oblivion so many Jewish historical documents. From this work, which is in my possession, Moses' letter is here published for the first time. Moses di Rossi belonged, as his son Elias' name proves, to the family of Menachem b. Elias of Cesena[2]. He set out for the Orient in 1534. His son Elias appears to have been captured by pirates. The father learnt, however, from a correspondent at Famagusta in Cyprus, that Elias had been liberated from captivity. Safed, in Galilee, became the home of Moses; from this centre he undertook many journeys for commercial purposes. A sister Hannah, and her husband Isaac Baruch, accompanied him on his pilgrimage to the Holy Land. But Isaac's feeble health was unequal to the hardship of the voyage, so that a slight accident, a fall over a door step in Zidon, proved fatal. The widow, Moses' sister, did not care to stay longer in the East and soon returned home to Cesena, bringing with her, as a pious memento of her Oriental travels, a list of tombs in the Holy Land, given to her at Jerusalem, where she spent two months with her husband and whence she accompanied him to Hebron[3]. But though Moses leaves much to his sister's oral report, he will not send his letter without some account of the Ten Tribes. His meagre information only amounts to this: that a kingdom of free Jewish tribes are said to live in the desert, far from the ordinary course of caravans, and that they make common cause with the Arabs in raids on travellers; the Jews, however, whom they meet are treated hospitably, presented with rich gifts, and safely escorted to their destination. This completely corresponds with the account received by Abraham b. Isaac Halevi Ibn Megas, physician in ordinary to the Sultan Solyman, whom he accompanied on his expedition to Aleppo[4]. Our report repeats accounts of eye-witnesses concerning Jewish tribes in Ethiopia, *the Falashas*[5]. In the market-place of Trablous he met a Jewish merchant, who dealt in sugar, rice, paper, and other products, but who also had with him seventy-five Jewish male and female slaves from Ethiopia. Another Jewish

[1] Cf. D. Kaufmann, *Monatsschrift*, 39, 351, note 1.

[2] *Hebrew Bibliography*, XII, 107 f.

[3] Isaac Baruch cannot be the author of the work mentioned by Zunz (*Collected Writings*, I, p. 179, note 72), as the latter was written in 1521 and 1522.

[4] Zunz, I, p. 84, &c.

[5] Cp. A. Epstein, *Eldad ha-Dani*, p. 183, &c.

merchant of Trablous related his travels which brought him to the Falashas, how he had crossed the so-called Magnetic Sea in a ship put together without iron nails and so reached his destination. The heat in those countries was so intense that the inhabitants were forced to go about naked. The town Sindschel[1] was exclusively inhabited by Jews who sold the king of Portugal, annually, 40,000 burdens of pepper; the money they received was used by them in commercial enterprises. But what no other traveller has reported about the Falashas, came to the ears of di Rossi, viz.: that they only recognize Maimonides' Code and possess no other authorities on traditional law.

Consistently with the character of a cultivated Italian Jew, who was at the same time a man of the world and a child of his age, Moses di Rossi had also an eye for political and social life abroad. He reports the conquests of the great Sultan Solyman, who, with the assistance of the Grand Vizier Ibrahim, subdued Persia, the kingdom of the Ssafi Dynasty. On December 31, 1534, the victorious Sultan received the keys of Bagdad, which had surrendered without a blow having been struck, and he was able to add to his other titles that of Lord of Darus-Salam, the Home of prosperity and victory, as Bagdad used to be called[2]. The conquest of Tebris, the heavy losses of the Turkish army, which, in the winter of 1534–5, lost its beasts of burden[3] in the impassable streets, were, as we learn from Moses, quickly and correctly known at Safed. If Moses, as a Turkish subject, followed with keen interest and sympathy the military movements of his sovereign, he, on the other hand, does not fail to give his undiminished attention to political events in the land of his birth. The ship arriving from Ragusa had brought news of the election of a new Pope. Clement VII had died, having occupied St. Peter's chair for twelve years, and Alexander Farnese, after a cardinalate of forty years, had been elected, in the Conclave of October, 1534, Pope, in his sixty-seventh year, with the title Paul III[4]. Moses' expectation that this election would prove favourable to the Jews seems to have been justified[5] by subsequent events.

Moses was so far unfortunate in Safed that during his stay there the price of provisions, which in ordinary years was incredibly low, became, owing to a drought, excessively dear. The fruit that in other years came from Damascus was completely destroyed by a hail-

[1] On Singili or Cranganore in India, see Gustav Oppert, in *Semitic Studies*, ed. by G. A. Kohut, pp. 404, 410; comp. also pp. 613-614.

[2] Hammer, *Geschichte des osmanischen Reiches*, II^2, pp. 114–118.

[3] Ibid., p. 114.

[4] Leopold von Ranke's *History of the Popes*, I^8, p. 156.

[5] D. Kaufmann in the *Revue des Études Juives*, XXVII, p. 209, &c.

storm. The grapes of Safed, which grew to a fabulous size and weight, made up to some extent for the loss of other food stuffs.

Safed was a very busy place; it was the centre of the entire clothing industry. The trade in wool and its manufacture maintained the inhabitants comfortably. The skill they had attained in the tailors' art drove Venetian competition completely out of the field. The growth of the city would, Moses thinks, make it in another ten years unrecognizable. The chief commercial towns in the vicinity were Beyruth and Trablous. The latter city, especially, attracted to itself all the trade that had formerly flourished in the Square of Damascus. Trablous was the market to which all caravans flowed. From it Jewish merchants started for Aleppo, the chief staple town for the whole of the Turkish Kingdom as well as for Persia. Consequently the Jews of those districts seldom had occasion to visit Venice. All necessaries of life and wares were brought to their very doors.

Most gratefully Moses notes the freedom which the Jews enjoyed under the Arabs—so different from the condition of his co-religionists in Italy. In Palestine and Egypt, Jews, he tells us, held the chief offices in the Customs. Hardly any taxes were imposed. That year, in consequence of the extraordinary expenditure incurred by the Persian war, the Jews were exceptionally asked to make advances of loans, secured partly by pledges, and partly by municipal revenues which they themselves collected. In accordance with an old institution reinforced by the Egyptian *Nagid*, Isaac Cohen Sholal, scholars were exempt from every kind of burden except payment of the poll-tax. A list of the articles of commerce that come from Safed, and a eulogy on the salubrity of its climate, which renders the presence of a medical man unnecessary, and which restored his wife Sarah to perfect health, closes the letter, of which not one of the least noteworthy characteristics is, that its writer includes in his prayer all the inhabitants of his beloved fatherland.

DAVID KAUFMANN.

ברוכים אתם לה״

כי עתה הלאוני תהפוכות ומקרי הזמן העמידוני במטרא לחץ כי כבר ראו עיניכם לפי מה שאחשוב הר׳ אליהו בני יצ״ו והגיד לכם את כל אשר קרהו ורב הצרות עברו עליו כאשר ראיתי באגרותיו אשר קבלתי בפאמה אגוסטו יום ב׳ ד אדר שעבר[1] ואז קבלתי אגרתך ועיניכם תראינה באגרתי הגדולה אשר

[1] = Monday, Feb. 8, 1535.

יחדתי אליו את כל הצרות עברו עלי מיום שנשבה עם כי כל מה שכתבתי היה כטפה מן הים ולכולי עלמא אסיר לפתוח הכתב ההוא ולכם שרי לכן תקראו אותו ותשלחוהו אליו באשר הוא שם אחרי תחתמו אותו · ואם באולי נסע משם בני יצ״ו הנ״ל תשלחו האגרת יחדתי אליו לכמ״ר יוסף חתנו יצ״ו ממודינה קרובי ואליו תכתבו יקראנה ויישמור לעשות ככל הכתוב בה ואף כי אמנם כי אחרי קבלתי אגרותיו הקל מעלי הצער הרבה מ״מ לבי בל עמי עד באו ביתי בצפת לשלו׳ ה׳ ישמור צאתו ובואו מעתה ועד עולם · לכן אחַי אל תשימו עלי אשם אם לא אכתוב אליכם באורך כאשר היה עם לבבי לעת עתה אך בקוצר מלין אודיע לכם דרך כלל ולא אאריך לספר עסק פטירת כמ׳ יצחק ברוך גיסנו זצ״ל כי אחרי כי הכבודה מרת חנה אחותנו תמ״א[1] נפשה אותה ותעש לשוב אל ביתה כי נכמרו רחמיה על בניה יצ״ו ובנותיה מב״ת[2] היא תניד לכם ומפיה תשמעו כי אני לא נמצאתי בפטירתו וזה כי אני נסעתי מפה יום ראשון כ״ב שבט עם המשואות שלי ללכת בצידון ומשם לצפת ובהיותינו בדרך רחוק כמטחוי קשת ירדו גשמים רבים והגמלים שלי לא היו יכולים ללכת ועלו הגמלים שלי לבתיהם לכפר אחד שמו אלבוריי רחוק מפה ד׳ מיל ושם ישבנו עד יום ג באַ[דר] מפני הגשם והשלג ובין כך כמ״ יצחק ברוך גיסנו ז״ל הנ״ל ואשתו אחותנו מב״ת עברו לפני עד צידון כי לא היה טעון משואות כמו [... ...] לה ונפטר לעולמו בר״ח אדר בעונות וחסרנו צדיק אחד ונקבר שם בצידון רחוק מקבר זבולון כמו חצי מיל · והאמת כי פה נפל מפתח אחד על הארץ והיה גבוה הפתח מעט יותר מאמה אחת ונשבר מעט בחוטמו האמנם כי נרפא קצתו ויצא לחוץ על משענתו ולא היה מרגיש בשום חולי וחשבתי כי מיתתו היתה כי היה איסטנס וענוג מאד ולא נסה בנבכי ים ובפרט בדרך רחוקה כזו ולנו ולאשתו ולבניו ולכל ישראל שבק חיים ושלם · והוא כתב לבניו יצ״ו באַרך לכן לא כתבתי אני זולתי דרך כלל · מה אדבר ואומר לך חדשות מהמדינה הזאת כי כבר קדמוני אנשים רבי׳ בכתב ועל פה האיך והכמה מהגליל הלז וכלל אומר לך כי כמו שבאיטליאה מתקנים תקונים ומחדשי׳ נטיעות והישוב מתרבה בכל יום כן הוא במדינה הזאת ומי שראה צפת זה עשר שנים ורואה אותה עתה היא נפלאת בעיניו כי בכל עת מרבים היהודים לבא ומלאכת הבגדים מתרבה בכל יום ואומרי׳ כי יותר מט״ו אלף קריסיאי נעשו בצפת בזאת השנה מלבד הבגדי״ גבוהי׳ ויש שעושים מהם טובות כמו אותם שבאי׳ מוויניציא וכל איש ואשה שיעשה בצמר בכל מלאכה ירויח מזונותיו בריוח · הרופא לכל בשר ומפליא לעשות הוא יעמידך על קו

[1] תבורך מנשים אמן. [2] מנשים באהל תבורכנה.

הבריאות והחיים והשלו׳ · בהגיעי בצפת זה יותר משנה קניתי החטה שם לערך מ׳ הסטארו שלנו שם ציסינה ועתה שוה ג׳ ליט׳ כי נתייקר השער כי היה בצורת בכל הסביבות ובפרט באי ציפרי יש רעב גדול כי הארבה אכל כל מיני תבואה ודרך עכו בים הלך שם חטה לרוב וגם בפירות האילן היה בצורת גדול מפני הברד שירד בדמשק והכה כל פרי העץ זולתי ענבים רבים וטובים ממינים הרבה אכלנו בצפת · וספרו לי אנשי הארץ כי ראו אשכול ענבים אחד משקלו כ״ז רוטולי שהם כמו קס״ב ליט״ משלנו וברוך המשביע לרעבים הוא ישביעכם כל טוב בזה ובבא וצדקה תרומם אתכם · כבר חקרתי ודרשתי על ענין השבטי׳ היא נפלאת בעינינו לרוחק המהלך אין חקר יותר מא״ שנה ודרך המדבר · האמת כי נתברר אצלי מאנשים ומדרכים שונים כי בדרך למיקא יש במדבר אחד יהודי׳ הרבה יושבי אהלים ועמהם היינו קרוב להם יש ערביי׳ הרבה ונוזלים כל אשר יעבור עליהם בדרך וחולקים השלל היהודים והערביים ואם יזדמן להם יהודי נותנים לו מתנות ומלוים אותו עד מקום בטוח והרבה מעשים ספרו לי בכיוצא בזה · בהיותי בטריפולי בא תגר יהודי אחד ממצרים ולו שמנים וחמשה בין עבדי׳ ושפחות כלם כושיים ועמו צוקרו ואורז ונייר ומיני תגרות הרבה ומכר והחליף והלך לדרכו · עוד בא יהודי אחד תגר בטריפולי בהיותי שם ועמו אבני׳ טובות ובשמים וספר לי כי הוא הלך עד ארץ כוש דרך אניה בלב ים וראה נסים הרבה מספרת הים והוא היה בספינה גדולה שלא היה בה אפ׳ מסמר אחד של ברזל ובהיותו שם ראה האנשי׳ ערום הלכו מבלי לבוש לרוב החום וגם הוא היה עליו כתנת בד לבדה והיתה כבדה עליו והגיד לי כי הגיע עד סְנֶיֶל שהיא עיר גדולה כלם יהודים והם נותנים למלך פורטוגאלו בכל שנה ארבעים אלף משואות פלפלין והוא נותן להם מעות הפרעון ומתנהגים על פי הרמ״בם ז״ל · חדש אין פה בכל הגליל רק כי אדונינו המלך יר״ה יצא מקוסטנטינופולי והלך בארצות הצופי נקרא אל עַיִים ולקח את ארצו מידו בלי קרב ומלחמה עד בבל והצופי ברח מפניו והלך גם אל שושן הבירה והיא עיר גדולה ואינינה מוקפת חומה וכבש אותה ואח״ב חזר הצופי ותפש שושן הבירה כי לרוב הקור ובצער המים מתו סוסי׳ רבי׳ ועתה אדונינו המלך יר״ה עושה חיל בחיל לכבוש המלכות ה׳ יצליח דרכו ויתן לפניו גוים ומלכי׳ כאות נפשו אמ׳ · אין כל חדש בכל הגליל ולא בירושלים תובב״א כי זה ימי׳ קבלתי כתב משם אך בירושלם הביאו המים ממעין אחר אשר בדרך חברון אל המצודה אשר בנו בהר ציון והביאו שם עפר[1] ומזרקי אש לחזקה עדין לא הלכתי אני לירושלם ע״ה תובב״א[2] כי עונותי גרמו לי כי בה׳ ימי׳ לחדש

[1] =polvere.

[2] =עיר הקודש תבנה ותכונן במהרה בימינו אמן.

אדר נכנסתי לצפת ואחר חדש ימי׳ בא שמש הר״ אליהו בני ויצא מה שיצא וזאת הכבודה אחותנו היתה בירושלים תוב״ב ובחברון יותר מב״ חדשי׳ מפיה תשמע כי הן כל ראתה עינה גם בידה מספר מפקד כל הצדיקים שנקברו בארץ הקדושה הכל בכתב מיד סופרי ירושלם ע״ה תובב״א ומשם תראו · אל תתמהו על החפץ להניח הר׳ אליהו בני יזיי״א בפאמה אגוסטו כי כאב את בן ירצה ואלו הייתם שמה בשמעכם הדבות הרעות הוציאו על הארץ כבר הייתם חוזרים עד ווניציאה ולולי הסיתוהו אח״כ לבא לשם כי עתה היה בא לביתי בשלו׳ ובהשקט · עדין לא הלך עברך אנה ואנה לסחורה וטריפולי וברוטי כבר נודע לכם מהותן ובהן נמצאי׳ פרישין אתרוגי׳ ותמרי׳ בזול אך התמרי׳ אינם טובי׳ כמו הבאי׳ ממצרים ובהן ימצא כל מיני תגרות שבעולם כי רוב התגרים שהיו עומדי׳ בדמשק עתה הם בטריפולי והקול נשמע מהנאליא בבואם בטריפולי וברוטי כי בכל יום באים יהודי׳ לסחורה בטריפולי ומשם ילכו לאחלב ששם מוצא כל התגריות מארץ תוגרמה וארצות העים שהוא מחוז מדי ופרס · האמנם מפה לא ילכו יהודי׳ לוויניציא׳ אחרי כי התגריות יבאו עד פה כי אם פעם ביובל · בבא הספינה ראגושיאה זה כמשלש חדשי׳ בטריפולי הגידו מפטירת האפיפיור קלימענטי וכי עשו תמורתו החשמן פרניזי [ה׳ ישמרהו] ויחייהו חשבתי יהיה טוב ליהודי׳ גם הוא · כי השיגוני עונותי תכף לא עשיתי שום מלאכה רק קניתי מעט קריסיאי ובגדים ומכרתי אותם היה בהם ריוח הגון לפי הקצבה · פה אין גלות כמו בארצנו והתוגרמי׳ מכבדי׳ היהודי׳ הנכבדי׳ · ופה ובאליסנדריא׳ של מצרים הממונים על המכסים והכנסות המלך הם יהודי׳ · ואין בכל המלכות עולות רק השנה הזאת עבור מלחמת הצופי הוצרכו היהודי׳ להלוות מעות מה אל השרים ויש שנתנו להם משכונות ויש שנתנו להם מהכנסות העיר והיהודי׳ גובי׳ אותם אמנם תלמידי חכמי׳ לא יפרעו שום פרעון כי אם כסף גולגלתא · מכל מיני תגריות ימצאו באלו הארצות ומצפת יצא מוך טווי ובלתי טווי לרוב גאליא אסקמוניאה שמן ודבש ומשי מעט ובשאר ארצות משי ארמזי טאפיטה קורדובאני וכל מיני בשמים פלפלין גרופולי[1] אגוזים מוסקאטי זנגביל מאצי קנה בושם והרבה קונים מהם היהודי׳ לסחורה והכל נמכר ברוטולו שהוא ששה ליט׳ שם · ויש אשר יעשה חלוף עם היהודים מבשמים בעד עשרת אלפים בפעם אחת · הכבודה כלתי והנער משה נכדי יצו הם פה עמדי ומחר נלך בצפת בעהו והכבודה מרת שרה אשתי מב״ת מאו הגיעה בצפת שב ה׳ ורפא לה כי המים והאויר טובים

[1] Comp. Samuel Aboab, דבר שמואל, No. 365: קלא״ו בלעז גרו״פולו שהם עומרים לאכילה וניתנים בתבשיל איזו ברכה מברכין עליהם.

מאד אין כמותם ולזה אין חליים נמצאים שם כי אם מעט ולזה מלאכת הרפואה אין לה מבוא שם ולא ירויח הרופא מזונותיו והחולים יאכלו הקשואים רברבי וזוטרי והדלועים והרבה מיני פרות · כן אברככם בחיי וערב ובקר וצהרים אשיחה ואשא תפלה עליכם ועל כל יושבי איטליאה ומרחוק אשתחוה לכלכם קטן וגדול ולכל הקהלות הקדושות אשר באיטאליאה ולכל קרובינו ומיודעינו לכלם בשם אקרא · אחלה פניכם תכתבו אליהם מצדי ולכל אחיותינו ונכדינו וניסנו בפרט ולכל קרובינו בכלל ולכל אוהבינו ויודעי שמנו תקראו בשמי לשלו׳ וה״ יראנו לז ללז בשמחת יהודה וירושלם עם כל ישראל חברינו בחיינו ובמהרה בימינו אמן

נחפז מאד מאד אחיכם דוד הקטן מן האדומים כותב ליל מוצאי שבת קרוב לעמוד השחר ט ניסן רצ״ה [1] בתוספת אהבה ורב שלו׳

[1] = Sunday, Mar. 14, 1535.

ELIA MENACHEM CHALFAN ON JEWS TEACHING HEBREW TO NON-JEWS.

THE Renaissance brought about the revival of the language of Zion, along with that of the classical languages and literature. It is not one of the least remarkable traits of the Italian renaissance that dignitaries both of Church and State, that soldiers and scholars, threw themselves zealously into the study of Jewish literature, and eagerly engaged the services of some learned Jew to introduce them into the mysteries of the Rabbinical literature. Jochanan Allemanno and Elia del Medigo, the teachers of Pico de Mirandola[1], Abraham de Balmes and the Cardinal Grimani[2], Guido Rangoni and Jacob Mantino[3], Elia Levita and Egidius of Viterbo, were some of the most prominent examples of a close intercourse between Jewish scholars and great Christian disciples[4]. Such intercourse had become an everyday occurrence; and the circumstance that the custom of Christians of the highest social positions going to school to Jews, or receiving Jews as teachers at their own houses, had become the order of the day, induced, about 1530, Israel, the friend and correspondent of Abraham of Perugia, to hesitate, whether he ought to send the vaticinations of the child Nachman to Italy, for fear lest they might fall into the hands of those Christians who were so thoroughly versed in Rabbinical literature[5].

But such attachment of Christian scholars to the Rabbinical lore did not occasion unmixed rejoicings in Jewish circles. We know from Elia Levita, the typical representative of that new class of Jewish teachers to Christian scholars, that his activity in this direction caused much obloquy, and that many Rabbis of Italy resented it[6] that he revealed the wisdom of the Rabbis to cardinals.

[1] I. Perles, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der hebräischen und aramäischen Studien*, 179, 191 sqq., 196 sqq.

[2] Ibid., 193 sqq.

[3] Kaufmann in *Revue des Études Juives*, XXVII, 39, n. 5.

[4] Cf. Perles, l. c., 178 sqq., 200 sqq.

[5] קבץ עליר IV, 31, ולדעתי כי יש סכנה לשלחם אליכם יען כי הוגד לנו כי רבים מאחינו בני עשו לומדים לשון העברים והדברים עתיקים.

[6] In the second preface to מסרת המסרת : ולא נחשב · ועל זה גלה עלי הצעקה · לי לצדקה · וקצת הרבנים · אינם מסבירים לי פנים · משום הדרשה הבנויה · על משפטים בל ידעום הללויה.

The grounds for such disapproval can be easily understood. The tendency which was at the bottom of such hungry desire of acquiring a knowledge of Jewish lore was by no means a friendly one towards the Jews. A closer insight into the Rabbinical writings had become necessary, in consequence of an endeavour to find in the literature of the Jews themselves evidences for the truth of Christianity. It was particularly the mystical doctrines of the Cabbala in which it was expected to discover an affinity with the dogmas of the Christian religion. The most hidden passages in the literature of the Rabbis were dragged forth, misinterpreted, and distorted in favour of the arguments that were required. The spread of Hebrew knowledge among Christians began to present an apparently dangerous aspect; and Jews, who made a profit from teaching Rabbinical literature to Christians, came to be looked upon as traitors. The sentiment must be compared with that by which the government of a country is actuated when it is opposed to a study of the plans of its fortresses, and relentlessly imprisons those who disclose them. In this sense it was impossible for the Italian Rabbis to rejoice at the sudden favour shown by Christians for the Jewish literature, perceiving in it a tendency to controversy and proselytizing.

It appears, therefore, all the more valuable and characteristic that, at that very period, a man learned in Rabbinical lore, and participating in the scientific aspirations of the day, preserved his sobriety of judgment, and did not indiscriminately condemn all instruction in Hebrew by Jews to Christians. Elia Menachem Chalfan had been induced to issue in Venice, towards the end of 1544, a Rabbinical opinion on the question, which I herewith publish for the first time from a collection of Rabbinical responsa compiled by Abraham Joseph Graziano of Modena. Chalfan was the son of Abba Mari [1], and son-in-law to Kalonymos b. David, surnamed Maestro Calo [2], who had translated the works of Averroes into Latin. It is the same Elia Chalfan from whom Francesco Giorgio obtained a Rabbinical opinion for Richard Croke in the matter of the divorce of King Henry VIII [3]. His friendship with Salomo Molcho estranged Jacob Mantino from him [4], with whom he probably never was reconciled, and with whom he remained on the same terms of antagonism, since Jacob Mantino returned from Rome to Venice at the same time when Chalfan wrote his opinion on Jews teaching Hebrew to non-Jews.

[1] A letter of Perez Foa to Abba Mari on the beginning of the Kabbalas in cod. Günzberg, 302[31].

[2] M. Steinschneider, *Die hebräischen Übersetzungen des Mittelalters*, p. 984.

[3] Kaufmann in *Revue*, l. c., 51, n. 2, 52, n. 6.

[4] Ibid., 57, n. 5.

Elia's opinion is written in a strictly matter-of-fact way, and he does not intersperse his argumentation with any anecdotes or personal details. It is, nevertheless, of great historical interest. On the ground of numerous passages drawn from both Talmuds, and elucidated with logical acumen, Chalfan shows that tradition unconditionally permitted the instruction of the elements of Hebrew to non-Jews, if it were only for the purpose of enabling the latter to comply scrupulously and consciously with the seven laws given to Noah, i. e. with the primitive religion binding on all men without distinction. There had, as a matter of fact, never been a time without some Jewish scholars having non-Jews for disciples and friends. Thus, at the time of the Mishna and the Talmud, such friendships as that of R. Jehuda and the Emperor Antoninus, of Abba Arekha and Artaban, of Samuel and Ablat, and of others, are honourably recorded. Other Jewish scholars had repeatedly carried on disputations with non-Jews on subjects connected with Holy Writ. Just as, at a later period, Isachar Bär Eulenburg, the Rabbi of Friaul, distinguishes, in a well-known responsum[1], between Tradition and Instruction, Chalfan also made a similar distinction; for although he declares the teaching of Hebrew to be unquestionably allowed, he condemns the teaching of the oral tradition and its profound doctrines, and certainly of Theosophy. One of his observations casts a clear light on the deplorable conditions which had called forth the condemnation of Jews teaching Hebrew to Christians. He is of opinion that a strong reason for allowing faithful Jews to impart the elements of Hebrew to Christians lay in this, that the latter would in this way become acquainted with the honest, true, and unadulterated interpretation of the text of the holy writings, and not be constantly deceived by converts who made a business of their deceptions, and tried to make themselves agreeable to their clients by their partial disfigurements of the text. It was the time when conversions of Italian Jews were frequent; when David Reubeni recorded that at Rome alone he himself had met with five-and-forty converts[2]; and when two grandsons of Elia Levita seriously compromised the intercourse between Jewish and Christian scholars.

D. KAUFMANN.

[1] באר שבע sub fin.: באר מים חיים, No. 14. Cf. Samuel Aboab, דבר שמואל, No. 75: עלאיסור למוד התורה לגוי. Cf. also Lampronti, פחד יצחק, II, *s. v.*, גוי אסור ללמוד תורה. On Salomon Lurga's strict prohibition of such instruction see Güdemann, *Quellenschriften zur Geschichte des Unterrichts*, pp. 50 seq. and 111.

[2] Berliner, *Geschichte der Juden in Rom*, II, 1, 107. On the origin of the

דמותר ללמוד תורה לגוי

ודווקא לשון הקדש ופשטי הכתובים אבל לא סודות התורה

על שאלתא דשאילנא קדמיכון מהאנשים האלה מבני עמינו אשר נתנו מחמדיהם באוכל וישיבו את נפשם[1] כי העניות והגלות לא הניחו לישראל מדה טובה וע״מ לקבל פרס מלמדים לנכרים לשון הקדש ודקדוק ומקרא אם יש להם עון אשר חט [א] שצריך המוחה למחות אם יש בידו פן יספה בעונם או נאמר מורי לא מורינן ומחויי לא מחינן כי לא גדלה חטאתם ע״ז אציע לפני מכ״ת דעתי החלושה והקלושה ע״ד ללמוד ולא ללמד כי תורה היא

גרסי׳ בסוטה פר׳ אלו הנאמרין[2] ת״ר כיצד כתבו ישראל את התורה ר׳ יהודה או׳ ע״ג אבנים כתבוה שנ׳ וכתבת על האבנים את כל דברי התורה הזאת וגו׳ ואח״כ סדו אותם בסיד א״ל ר׳ שמעון לדבריך היאך למדו א״ה תורה א״ל בינה יתירה נתן בהם קב״ה ושינרו נוטרין שלהם וקלפו את הסיד והשיאוה ועל דבר זה נתחתם גזר דינם לבור שחת שהיה להם ללמוד ולא למדו וגו׳ ומפר״שי האיך למדו אומות העולם והלא לא נצטוו לכותבה בע״ לשון אלא לבא וללמדה כל הרוצה שלא יהיה פתחון פה לא״ה לומ׳ לא היה לנו מהיכן ללומדה · נוטרין שלהם סופרים והם קורין אותם נוטרין עכ״ל · הנה כי מזה ראיה שרצונו ית׳ שאומות העולם ידעו את התורה כדי שיהיו מזידין ולא שוגגין ולא יוכלו להתנצל וגם כדי שישמרו הז״ מצות שלהם כהלכתם כאשר נזכיר וכן ראינו מגדולי הדור שלמדום תורה בשלמות כדאית׳ בב״ק פ׳ שור שנגח ד׳ וה׳[3] ת״ר וכבר שלחה מלכות הרשעה שני סרדיוטות אצל חכמי ישראל למדונו תורתכם קראו ושנו ושלשו בשעת פטירתן אמרו להן דקדקנו בכל תורתכם ואמת הוא חוץ מדבר זה שאתם אומ׳ שור של ישראל שנגח שור של נכרי פטור וכו׳ עד ודבר זה אין אנו מודעי׳ אותו למלכות ובירוש׳ אומ׳ בלשון אחר וז״ל מעשה ששלחה מלכות הרשעה שני איסטרוטות ללמוד תורה מר״ג ולמדו ממנו מקרא ומשנה תלמוד הלכות ואגדות ובסוף א״ל כל תורתכם נאה ומשובחת חוץ מדברים הללו שאתם אומרי׳ בת ישראל לא תיילד לנכרית אבל נכרית מיילדת לבת ישראל בת

fable of Elia Levita's conversion vide Kaufmann in Berliner's *Magazine*, 1890, pp. 166 sqq.

[1] Comp. Threni, I, 11.

[2] Sota, 35 b.

[3] מושלי הרשעה : Baba K., 38 a.

ישראל לא תניק בנה של נכרית אבל נכרית מניקה לבת ישראל ברשותה גזילו של ישראל אסור ושל נכרי מותר באותה שעה גזר ר״ג על גזילות של נכרי שיהיה אסור מפני חלול השם שור ישראל שנגח וכו׳ כדלעיל בבבלי ומקשי׳ התום׳[1] וא״ת והא אמרינן בחגיגה המלמד תורה לגוי עובר בעשה דמגיד דבריו ליעקב וי״ל דעל כרחם עשו על פי דברי המלכות ולא נתחייבו למסור עצמן א״נ נעשו עצמן גרים כדאית׳ בספרי עכ״ל ולע״ד כי לזה עשו התו׳ התרוץ האחרון מא״נ כי לפי התרוץ הראשון יש להקשות כי אם עשו בעל כרחם ע״פ דברי המלכות למה למדום תלמוד הלכות והגדות שהיו כלם על פה שעדיין לא נכתבו כי מי הכריחם לזה לא היה די להם ללמדם תורה שבכתב כפי שאלתם למדונו תורתכם כאשר עשו הזקנים לתלמי מלך מצרים אלא בודאי שלא היה להם אסור ללמדם וגם לפי׳ האחרון מא״נ שנתגיירו וכי בתחלה כשהתחילו ללמוד היה קים להם שיתגיירו ודאי דלא ואפי׳ הכי למדום הכל באר היטב כמו שאו׳ התו׳ לעיל בזאת ההלכה[2] וז״ל אלא האדם לאו פירכא היא דהך ברייתא מתני כתב׳ וטובא איכא התם בכי האי גוונא דקתני התם וכן הוא או׳ פתחו שערים ראשיכם ויבא גוי צדיק וגו׳ ויבאו כהנים לוים וישראלי׳ לא נאמ׳ אלא גוי צדיק וכן הוא אומ׳ הטיבה לטובים כהנים לוים וישראלים לא נאמ׳ אלא לטובים הא למדת שאפי׳ גוי ועוסק בתורה הרי הוא ככ״ג וגו׳ עכ״ל ועוד אם תדקדק הלשון מר׳ אמי שאומ׳ בפ׳ אין דורשין[3] א״ר אמי אין מוסרין סתרי תורה אלא למי שיש לו ה׳ דברים הללו שר חמישים ונשוא פנים יועץ חכם חרשים ונבון לחש וא״ר אמי אין מוסרין דברי תורה לגוי שנאמ׳ לא עשה כן לכל גוי ומשפטים בל ידעום הנה אם תדקדק הלשון תמצא הפרש בין למוד ועסוק ומסירה וזה כי מה שאו׳ ר׳ אמי אין מוסרין דברי תורה ר״ל דברי׳ הנמסרין מפה אל פה והם בכלל סתרי תורה שאמ׳ למעלה שסודות התורה ומצוותיה הוא חלול ה׳ למוסרם לגוים וכן נראה מהראיה שהביא מהפסוק לא עשה כן לכל גוי כמו שראיתי דרש על זח קרוב לפשט מגיד דבריו ליעקב למי שהוא מהול ביעקב דבריו ולא עוד שהם פשטים אבל חקיו ומשפטיו שהם הסודות למי שהוא במעלה כישראל כי שרית עם אלהים ועם אנשים לא עשה כן לכל גוי כ״ן עולה בגי׳ סו״ד כי אם יש להם הפסוקי׳ אינם יודעים הסודות והיינו משפטים בל ידעום הנה כי כוונת ר׳ אמי הן מלשון מוסרין והן מראיית הכתוב שאין לתת וללמוד סודות התורה לא לגוים ולא לעמי הארצות כי לשון מסירה מוכיח כן · אמנם לשון עסוק ר״ל

[1] Baba K., 38 a, *s. v.*: קראו ושנו.

[2] Ibid., *s. v.*: אלא האדם.

[3] Chagiga, 13 a.

שעוסק ומעיין בה בקביעות ובעיון גמור להיות בקי בהלכותיה ובמצוותיה כדאית׳ בסנהד׳ פר׳ ד׳ מיתות[1] אר׳ יוחנן גוי שעוסק בתורה חייב מיתה שנאמ׳ תורה צוה לנו משה מורשה לנו ולא להם וליחשבוה גבי ז׳ מצות מאן דאמ׳ מורשה מיגזל קאגזיל לה ומאן דאמ׳ מאורסה דינו כנערה המאורשה דבסקילה · מתיבי היה ר׳ מאיר או׳ מניין שאפי׳ גוי ועוסק בתורה הרי הוא ככ״ג שנא׳ אשר יעשה אותם האדם וחי בהם כהני׳ לוים וישראלי׳ לא נאמר אלא האדם הא למדת שאפי׳ גוי ועוסק בתורה הרי הוא ככ״ג התם בשבע מצות דדהו ומפרש״י עוסקין בהלכות אותן ז׳ מצות להיות בקיאין בהם הנה כי לשון עסוק כמו שאמרתי היא לעיין בהלכות כפר״שי והנה העולה מזה המאמר שבין לר׳ יוחנן שאו׳ שחייב מיתה משום גזל או משום גלוי עריות שהם מהז׳ מצות ודאי שר״י מתיר להם לעיין בז׳ מצות שלהם ובהלכותיהם שאם לא ידעו אותם איך יקיימום ולזה נוטה דעת ר׳ מאיר ואם יש להם היתר ליעיין בהלכות אלו השבע מצות הלא הן הן גופי הלכות מתורה שבכתב ושבע״פ כדאית׳ בפר הנז׳[2] תנא דבי מנשה ז׳ מצות נצטוו בני נח ע״ז ג״ע וש״ד גזל אבר מן החי סרוס כלאים פוק חזי כמה ענפים מסתרגים מאלו השבעה שרשים שאם יצטרך שגוי ובן נח ידע אותם כהלכותיהם ובדקדוקיה׳ שיוכל ויצטרך לו ללמוד ספרי וספרא וכולי תלמודא בהיתר כאשר אמרנו וכמצווה ועושה ואם לא ידעו לקרות הלשון הקדש היאך יביגו וכן ראינו גדולי ישראל שהיה להם חברה ואהבה עם שרי האומות שהיו לומדין עמהם כמו שמצינו בע״ז פ״ק[3] אנטונינום שמשיה דר׳ אדרכן שמשיה לרב כי שכיב אנטונינום א״ר נתפרדה החבילה כי שכיב אדרכן אמר רב נתפרדה החבילה ומפרש״י אדרכן שר של אומות היה והכי איתא בזבחים פ״ב[4] אמ׳ רב אשי אמ׳ לי הונא בר נתן זימנא חדא הוה קאימנא קמי׳ דאיזגוד מלכא והוה מדלי לי המיינאי ותותייה נהליה ואמ׳ לי ממלכת כהנים וגוי קדוש כתיב בכו כי אתאי קמיה דאמימר אמ׳ לי אקיים בך והיו מלכים אומניך ומפרש״י אבנטיה היה גבוה חגור מלמעלה מכנגד אצילי ידיו והשפילו[5] למטה כדי לנאותו ואמ׳ ממלכת כהנים כתיב בכו וצריכים אתם לגהוג כלכם בתפארת של כהנים דכתי׳ בהו ולא יחגרו ביזע הנה שכל הגדולים שהיה להם חברה עם גדולי ישראל היו בקיאין בחדרי תורה ובלשונינו כמו ג״כ שמואל ואבלט[6] ודומיהן וכן היו הולכים להוכח עמהם מגדולי ישראל להתווכח עם חכמי האומות כדאית׳

[1] Sanhedrin, 59 a. [2] Ibid., 56 b. [3] Abodazara, 10 b.
[4] Sebachim, 19 a. [5] Instead of our text: והפשיטו.
[6] Comp. Rapoport, ערך מלין, *s. v.* אבלט; Abodazara, 30 a.

בשבת פ׳ כל כתבי[1] בעי מיניה יוסף בר חנין מר׳ אבהו הני ספרי דבי אבידן מצילין אותן מפני הדליקה או אין מצילין אין ולאו רפיא בידיה רב לא אזיל לבי אבידן וכ״ש לבי נצרפי שמואל לבי נצרפי לא אזיל לבי אבידן אזיל אמרו ליה לרבא וכו׳ עד מר בר יוסף אמ׳ אנא מינייהו אנא ולא מיסתפינא מינייהו זימנא חדא אזל בעו לסכוניה וגו׳ ומפרש״י ספרים כתבו להם הגלחים להתוכח עם ישראל ומקום שמתוכחי׳ שם קרי ליה בי אבידן אמנם בעל הערוך[2] מפרש חצר ידועה למלכים ויש בה ספרי חכמות מכל אומה ויש בה ספרי תורה נביאים וכתובים כתובים בלשון הקדש ומפני שאין ידוע מי כתבם אי ישראל או זולתן ע״כ רפיא בזה ר׳ אבהו להורות עליהן להצילן ובבי אבידן נקבצין מכל אומה ולשון חכמים ונושאי׳ ונותני׳ בדברי חכמות ובדיני כל אומה ולשון עכ״ל והגה שמואל ומר בר׳ יוסף היו הולכין להתוכח עמהם מתוך ספרי הקודש ולא היו יראים מפני מעלתם ואותם שלא היו רוצים ללכת כמו רב בזה הפרק ור׳ אליעזר בן פרטא בפ״ק דע״ז[3] היה מפני יראתם פן יהרגום מתוך הויכוח אבל לא מפני חשש אסור ללמוד ולהתווכח עמהם מתוך ספרי הקודש הנה מה שעלה בידינו ההפרש יש בין עסוק ומסירה כאשר אמרנו אמנם לשון למידה הוא שייך למי שהוא משולל מאותה הידיעה ואין לו אפי׳ התחלה בעלמא וההתחלה נקר׳ למידה כדכתי׳ ולמדתם אותם למען תלמד(ו)[4] וכדאית׳ בשבת פ׳ ב״מ[5] ת״ר מעשה בגוי אחד שבא לפני שמאי א״ל כמה תורות יש לכם א״ל שתים תורה שבכתב ותורה שבע״פ א״ל גיירני על מנת שתלמדיני תורה שבכתב גער בו והוציאו בנזיפה בא לפני הלל וגיירה יומא קמא א״ל אב״גד למחר אפיך ליה וגו׳ שלשה מעשים כך הנה כי לשון למידה הוא ההתחלה הראשונה ואל יקשה המקשה לומ׳ שהלל בתחלה גיירה ואח״כ למדהו כי לא עשה זה בהיות אצלו אסור ללמדו קודם שיתגייר אלא שבתחלה הגוי היה או׳ גיירני על תנאי וגו׳ וע״כ גיירו קודם ולולי זה אולי לא היה מגיירו עד אחר הלמוד לראות איך היה עומד בדעתו בשומעו הקלות והחמורות מתורתינו הקדושה כאשר עשה נעמי לרות וכמאמרם ז״ל בההוא עובדא[6] הנה הכלל בזה העולה בידי שמותר ללמוד להם פשטי הפסוקים כאשר אמרתי ובלבד שלא ימסרו להם סודות ורמיזות הקבלה האמיתית שעליה נאמ׳ לא עשה כן לכל גוי וכדאית׳ בכתובו׳ פ׳ (פ״ק) [י״ג][7] השבעהי אתכם בנות ירושלם וגו׳ עד ור׳ זירא מיבעי ליה לכדר׳ לוי דאמ׳ שש שבועו׳ למה תלתא הני דאמרן

[1] Sabbath, 116 a.
[2] See ערוך השלם, ed. Kohut, II, 46 n.
[3] Abodazara, 17 b.
[4] 5 Mos. 5, 1 and 14, 23.
[5] Sabbath, 31 a.
[6] Tebamoth, 47 b.
[7] Kethuboth, 111 a.

אינך שלא יגלו את הקץ ושלא ירחקו את הקץ ושלא יגלו את הסוד לא״ה וגו׳ ומפר׳ רש״י ושלא יגלו את הסוד אמרי לה סוד העבור ואמרי לה סוד טעמי תורה הנה כי כל האסור הוא בלמוד הסודות האמנם ללמדם הלשון והדקדוק והכתב אין בדעתי שום אסור כי מה ללשון עם החכמה כאשר מצינו בב״ק פ׳ מרובה[1] ובמנחות פר׳ ישמעאל[2] ובסוטה פ׳ בתרא בהלכה[3] ת״ר כשצרו בית חשמונאי זה על זה וגו׳ עד וחכמת יונית מי אסירא והתנייא א״ר בארץ ישראל לשון סורסי למה או לשון הקדש או לשון יוונית ואר׳ יוסי כל לשון ארמי למה או לשון הקודש או לשון פרסי אמרי לשון יוני לחוד וחכמת יונית לחוד וכו׳ כדאית׳ התם ומי שיש לו הלשון יונית בודאי יותר בקלות יוכל ללמוד חכמת יונית מזולתו ואפי׳ הכי התירו למוד הלשון ואסרו למוד החכמה כך נקיש ונאמר בלשונינו הקודש שלע״ד יש היתר גמור ללמדו לכל מי שירצה ועוד רצוני לומ׳ כי אחרי שבעה״ו רבו הפריצי׳ מבני עמינו שהם כנהמא דדהבא מאותם אשר אחז״ל בחגיגה פ׳ אין דורשין[4] גבי אשר קומטו בלא עת ומסיק שעמד הקב״ה ושתלן בכל דור ודור והן הן עזי פנים שבדור היוצאים מכלל ישראל ותורתינו הקדושה ומשתמדין ומהפכין ד״ת למינות ולגנות כדי שהאומות יכבדם ויקלסם באושרם שכבר נואש מאומתו ותורת ומגלים פנים לתורה שלא כהלכה להיות סמך לעלוי יראתם ומרביצים להם תורה מזוייפת הלא יותר טוב להיות בוחר הרע במע(י)[ו]טו שיהיה אותו המלמד להם יהודי וילמדם דרך ישרה בלי זיוף ועוות הפסוקים כאשר עושים אלו הנבלים שכפרו בעיקר ואין להם דת וכל זה רצוני לומ׳ הלשון ופשט הפסוקי׳ לבד כאשר אמרתי וכאשר מצינו בר״ה פ׳ אם אינן מכירין[5] כיוצא בזה פעם אחת בקשו בייתוסי׳ להטעות חכמי׳ וכו׳ עד אמרו לו מי הזקיקך לכך אמ׳ להם שמעתי שבקשו בייתוסי׳ להטעות את חכמים אמרתי אלך אני ואודיע להם שמא יבואו בני אדם שאינם מהוגנים ויטעו את חכמי׳ כך אני או׳ בעובדא דידן הגם כי כחגיגה פ׳ אין דורשין נר׳ שהתו׳[6] מנגדין לדעתי בזה וז״ל קשה להר״ר אלחנן תיפוק ליה דגוי העוסק בתורה חייב מיתה כדאמ׳ פ״ד מיתות והמלמדו עובר מלפני עור לא תתן מכשול וכי תימ׳ בז׳ מצות דידהו דאינו חייב מיתה כדקאמ׳ תלמודא התם וכו׳ עד וי״ל דהכא מיירי אפי׳ היכא דאיכא גוי אחר שרוצה ללמדו דליכא מלפני עור כדאמרי׳ בע״ז המושיט כוס יין לנזיר עובר מלפני עור וה״מ דקאי אתרי עברא דנהרא שבלאו נתינתו

[1] Baba Kama, 82 b. [2] Menachoth, 64 b. [3] Sota, 49 b.
[4] Chagiga, 13 b. [5] Roschhaschana, 22 b.
[6] Chagiga, 13 a, *s. v.*: אין מוסרין.

אי אפשר להביאו אליו אבל אי לאו הכי אינו עובר מלפני עור ה״נ אפי׳ במקום שגוי א׳ רוצה ללמדו דליכא מלפני עור וגו׳ מ״מ אסור משום מניד דבריו ליעקב וגו׳ הנה כל זה הוא כמו שאמרתי בהוכחת זה הכתוב שאינו אלא בסודות וסתרי התורה אבל בלשון ופשטי התורה ליכא מלפני עור כי כבר יש גוים ומומרים הלומדים אותם לשם סטן וע״ז וליכא נמי משום מניד דבריו ליעקב · הנה הצעתי לפניך אדונירם מעט קט שברקתי עד מקום שיד השגתי מגעת גם כי צעירה היא להעדר ידיעתי ואפס הפנאי אשר לפני ואתה אדו׳ בשכלך הטהור והזך תבחר ולא אני האוכל מתוך הפסולת כי לא (ריבא) [רופא] אנא רק אסיא דמגן שוה[1] ועלי נאמ׳ תנא ופירש קשה מכלם אמנם האהבה קלקל[ו] את השורה להכניסני לפנים ממחיצתי והיה אך שלום אשו״ר[2] עד כי יערה עלינו רוח ממרום[3] ויהיה כל הארץ שפה אחת[4] (בני) (l. וני׳) לעובדו שכם אחד[5]

ויהיה הוא ושמו אחד[6] וכן י״ר אכ״יר

נאם השפל והנבזה הצעיר שבתלמידים אהו׳ נצח אליה מנחם חלפן בכמוהרר אבא מרי חלפן זלה״ה כותב על הלחץ פה ויניציאה שנת ש״ה כ״ב חשון[7]

[1] Baba K., 85 a.
[2] אשור = סליק see Kethuboth, 10 b.
[3] Jes. xxxii. 15.
[4] Gen. xl. 1.
[5] Zeph. iii. 9.
[6] Zech. xiv. 9.
[7] An unknown Talmudical responsum of our author, לענין הנחת תפלין בחול המועד, there is to be found in Cod. Günzberg, 333[10].

A PRINCESS AS HEBRAIST.

It is a peculiar circumstance that, at the time of the revival of letters in Germany, a comparatively large number of women, especially such as belonged to royal houses, occupied themselves with the study of Hebrew. Thus we find that Maria Dorothea, the consort of the Duke of Saxe-Weimar, had advanced so far, that she was not only able to refer to the Hebrew Bible, but was also able to read and understand it[1]. Elizabeth, daughter of the unfortunate Frederic of the Palatinate, understood Hebrew; as also did Maria Eleanora, the wife of Charles Ludovic of the Palatinate, the same who offered Spinoza the chair of philosophy at the University of Heidelberg. Johann Cocceius wrote his Hebrew dictionary for Maria Eleanora. One of the most prominent of these royal Hebraists, who were one and all contemporaries of that bright "Star of the Century," Anna Maria Schurman, was the Princess Antonia, daughter of Duke Eberhard of Würtemberg, who was blessed with a numerous offspring. Although it may be an exaggeration when it is averred that she read the most difficult Rabbinical books, and, what is more, that she understood the mystic Cabbala so well that she even surpassed many Rabbis, and indeed could shame a number of them[2], one thing is certain, that she had obtained a good knowledge of the Hebrew language and its grammar. M. Esenwein, who was Dean in Urach, and afterwards professor in Tübingen, wrote as early as July, 1649, to his master Johann Buxtorf, in Basle, that Antonia, "who had already been well grounded in the Hebrew language, and the reading of the Bible, was burning with desire to learn also the art of reading the Hebrew text without vowels[3]," and, three years after, he wrote to

[1] A brief account of female Hebraists was given by M. Steinschneider, *Hebr. Bibliographie*, XX, 66 sqq.

[2] *Hebr. Bibliographie*, XX, 67.

[3] "Antonia, fundamentis in Ebraea Lingua et lectione bibliorum hebraicorum haud perfunctorie factis, artem sine punctis legendi addiscere ardet." The letters of Esenwein and others, who are named here, are found in the collection of Buxtorf (father and son), in the town library of Basle (G. i. sqq.).

Buxtorf that "the Princess was aglow with incredible love of the holy tongue, and had already made such progress with it that she had, with her own hands, put vowels to a Hebrew Bible written in rather large letters by some copyist, and had, besides, acquired a considerable knowledge of Hebrew grammar[1]."

The fact that Antonia, who never had a Jewish teacher[2], took a great delight in the study of Hebrew, is also attested by Philipp Jacob Spencer, who had also been a pupil of Buxtorf's, and who, profound scholar though he was, inclined rather to overwrought pietism. During his temporary stay at Heidelberg he was on familiar terms with Princess Antonia, and together they studied Cabbala, as he mentions himself in a letter to Buxtorf of July 16, 1662, adding that she really deserved the affection of scholars[3]. Antonia had a great regard for Buxtorf, who, on his part, did not fail to send her his works through his pupil, Professor Esenwein of Tübingen, as tokens of respect and admiration. After she had received the *Cusari*, Esenwein wrote to Buxtorf, on February 21, 1661: "Our Antonia wishes ardently to compare your *Cusari* with the most beautifully written copy, left by Weinmann, who was famous as preacher at our University and as a Hebrew scholar[4]." This was probably the same copy which Reuchlin had bought at Rome for his own use, and which was afterwards presented by Antonia to her brother Henry[5].

We have already mentioned that Antonia occupied herself with the study of the Cabbala; and evidence thereof is even now preserved in the Royal Library at Stuttgart. At that place there is an *Unterschiedlicher Riss zu Sephiroth* ("Diagrams to the Sephiroth"), containing Cabbalistic diagrams, some few of which are interpreted in Hebrew and German, as mentioned by the Librarian in the MS. catalogue. These diagrams were drawn by the Princess Antonia of Würtemberg, who delighted in Cabbalistic and Rabbinical lore.

[1] "ut maiorem Bibliorum Ebraicorum partem a manuductore quodam literis Ebraeis maiusculis sine punctis scriptam punctis suis propria manu eleganter vestiverit, adeoque Grammatices sacrae cognitionem haud perfunctorie hauserit."

[2] "Praeceptorem Iudaeum nunquam ipsa habuit," also is written in a letter of Spencer to Buxtorf.

[3] "Antonia . . . virorum doctorum mereri amorem."

[4] "Antonia nostra summo desiderio flagrabat cum ei exemplar Ebraicum elegantissime scriptum a cl. Weinmanno, concionatore quondam aulae nostrae et Philologo Ebraeo satis claro, relictum ad manus sit, quod cum impresso gestit conferre."

[5] Spencer saw this copy in the private library of Duke Frederic of Würtemberg.

This conjecture gains certainty from a letter appended to the MS., which bears the heading:

שלום עד בלי ירח
עבודתי עד בלי כח

"Illustrious, Exalted Princess, Gracious Lady!"

and which concludes thus:

ובכן אקוד מול פני שָׂרָתִי ואומר ירים ה׳ את קרנך כבבת עין יצרך

"Zültz (?), July 19, 1653.
PASTOR M. WILHELM KOCH[1]."

The praises of the learned Princess, who, by her example, had given such a stimulus to the study of Hebrew, were not unfrequently sung in Hebrew poems by the clergy of Suavia, and by Hebraists of high standing. The following poem in honour of "the celebrated Princess Antonia," with the acrostic אנטוניה דוכסום מוועריטעמברג, translated from Hebrew into Latin by Johann Martin Rebstock, Pastor in Laufen, was sent as a curiosity to Johann Buxtorf, and is still preserved in manuscript among his collection:

Laus illustrissimae Principis Antoniae.

Fama in aulis Magnatum celebratur,	את שמה נודע בשערים
Bonitas et clementia illustratur,	בחסד ובאמרי שְׂפָרִים
Nomen in aeternum laudatur.	יגדל שמה לדור דורים ·
Corona Dei in ipsius capite fulget,	נזר אלהים על ראשה
Laus, honor, fides et charitas resplendet,	הוד והדר חסד ואמת לבושה
Et in omnia saecula nitet.	לעולם לא יכבה אֵשָׁהּ ·
Puritas instar favorum mel stillantium	טהורה ומתוק מדבש ונופת צופים
Decus Wirtembergiae principum,	בה תלוי מגן אלופים
Miserorum asylum et refugium.	המחזיקים ידי רבים ·
Gloria illius magnificatur,	ונדול תפארתה
Dominatio exaltatur,	ותתרומם ממשלתה
Principatus ut sol illustratur.	כצאת השמש בנבורתה ·

[1] Communicated by Dr. Stössel, Rabbi in Stuttgart.

In forma speciosa,	נחמד ביפיפיתה
In sermone graciosa,	הוצק חן בשפתותיה
In omnibus nationibus gloriosa.	בכל העמים נודע תפארתה ·
Faciei puritas illuminat,	יאירה פניה זך וזוהר
Instar lucis coruscat,	אורה מזהיר
Ut ipsum caelum fulgurat.	כעצם השמים לטוהר ·
Castitas electa,	דהצנועה והישרה
Ut luna pulchra,	בלי קץ וְנָמִירה
Ut sol pura.	יפה כלבנה וכחמה ברה ·
Suavis fortitudinis currus,	דודי צח ואדום דגול מרבבה
Aspectus ut flamma splendidus	מראיה כאש ולהבה
Benedictus ipsi Dominus.	יברכוה האל בשפע טובה ·
Ut ignis absque fumo lucet,	וכאור נוגה בלי עשן
Ut rosa inter flores fulget,	כן תציץ ציץ פרח שושן
Ut vapor gloria surget.	שכינתיה תעלה כקיטור הכבשן ·
Odor sicut cassia et cinnamon,	זקנה וקנמון
Fecundus ut granatum,	ריחה כאפרסמון
Suavis ut ros in Hermon.	וכטל חֶרְמוֹן ·
Vestis textilia	חכותה בבגד ישרון
Sicut Saronis lilia,	כבחצלת השרון
Sic et sermonis consilia.	לה נאה לרון
	בניב שפתים וגרון ·
Inhabitans caelorum culmina	והשוכן בשמי מעלה
Iungat gaudiorum iubila	יוסף שמחה וצהלה
Et avertat malorum nubila.	וישמרה מכל מחלה ·
Erigens collapsos,	טומך נופלים
Colligens contritos	בפרי קודש הלולים
Super rivales plantatos.	כאלונים על פלגי מים שתולים ·
Laudem permultam audiet,	יהולל שמה ממרחקים
Aquam vitae hauriet,	דולה מים חיים מבארות עמוקים
Quae iusta sunt perficiet.	עושה משפט וחוקים ·
Columna est firmissima,	ולי העמודים
Oratio iucundissima,	אמריה נחמדים
Prae auro et argento electissima.	מכסף וזהב הצניפות והרדידים ·

Mane, meridie et vespero	ערב ובקר וצהרים
Manus aperta misero	עושה צדקה עם דלים ורֵקים
Tenia, contrito ac oppresso.	חלושים וגבורים ·
Spiritus sapientiae,	רוח חכמה ובינה
Monilia prudentiae	עמה שוכן כאכן פנה
Hic habent arcem residentiae.	נושא אלמתיה ברנה ·
Clementia ipsius Thronus,	כיוב ונכון כסא עולמים
In fide vera bonus,	בחסד וברחמים
Quem celebrabit colonus.	אליה ידרושו גוים ועמים ·
Scientia hic subtilior,	עמה דעת ומזמה
Melle longe suavior	טוב ומתוק טעמה
Et manna caeli gratior.	כמַן הנשלח מן השמימה ·
Sermo ex ore prolatus,	מניך שפתיה ושיח אמריה ערבה ומתוקה
Dulcedine roboratus,	יערוף כשמן הטוב שריחו בו דבוקה ·
Balsamo non minus odoratus.	
Cantici iucunditas	בשיר ובשבחה
Qualis myrti amoenitas	פרי עץ הדר ממנה צמחה
Tristibus est hilaritas.	לעגומים ולמרי נפש אם הכנים שמחה ·
Heroinae fuere multae praeter hanc,	רבות בנות עשו חיל והיא עלות על כלנה
Sed existit nulla supra hanc,	תשועות חן חן ילין במחנה ·
Omnes gratia infra hanc.	
Laudes eius quis enunciet?	גדולתה ותהלתה מי ימלל
Laudibus illam quis superet?	אין גומרים עליה ההלל
Magna praeda gratiam non vincet.	שש אנכי על אמרותיה כמוצא שלל ·

We may not be too hard on the poet for his arbitrary use of uncommon words. Who was he? An Italian Count, who lived for several years in Würtemberg, Charles Filibert, Count of Candel, from whom some letters to Sybil, daughter of Duke Johann Friedrich of Würtemberg, are still extant in MS., but who is otherwise unknown. We only know that his mother had been born a Jewess.

Antonia studied Cabbala till a few years before her death. When she "held in 1673 the so-called Turrim Antoniam, or dedicatory address on occasion of the erection in the church of Deinach (Teinach)

of the Tablet of Instruction voted by Her Grace, and sprung from the Cabbalistic tree of mysteries," Johann Christian Rumetsch, Rector of the High School of Spiers, honoured her with a long laudatory poem, to which he added numerous learned notes [1].

M. KAYSERLING.

[1] Speyer, *Math. Metzger*, 1673. Dr. Stössel writes to me that the royal library at Stuttgart possesses also a book from Raith, entitled *Turris Antonia, oder Einweihungsrede bei Aufrichtung der von Antonia in der Kirche in Deynach gestifteten Lehr-Tafel* (fol.)

IMPRECATION AGAINST THE MINIM IN THE SYNAGOGUE.

IT is known that the Fathers of the Church, both Greek and Roman, hurl against the Jews the accusation that they pronounced in the Synagogue an imprecation against the Christians. As far as I know the literature on this point, all modern scholars think of the so-called benediction about the heretics (ברכת המינים) in the daily Tefillah, and I have myself dealt with the subject from this point of view in this REVIEW (V, 130–134)[1]. Now, in that benediction the wish is uttered and the prayer made that the wicked may be punished, but on a close consideration, an actual curse, an imprecation, will not be found there. Another difficulty is that the Fathers of the Church say also that the curse was pronounced *after* the prayer, i.e. after the conclusion of the Tefillah[2], according to which our ברכת המינים[3] cannot be meant.

I believe I am fortunate enough to be able to throw some light on this subject.

Haman's accusation in Esth. iii. 8–9, which has become typical for later times, is interpreted by the Midrashim to the passage in this way,

[1] On that occasion I tried to prove, that the word הרשעה or הרשעים meant really the name of a sect. I add now, to the various readings, from *Machsor Vitry*, ed. Hurwitz, § 42 : וצל הרשעים תניף ידך, in the MS. וצל הרשעים תשת ידך (communicated by M. Weiss in the Hungarian Essay, *Machsor Vitry*, p. 15, note 44). Cf. also the expression רשיעא in Koheleth Rabba, I, 8 (Mathnoth Kehuna, ad loc., must have connected the passage with Christianity, for the Wilna edition, 1884, subjected to censorship shows here a blank). Cf. Koheleth Rabba, VII, 26, also Geiger's remark in *Urschrift*, p. 154, and Derenburg, *Essai sur l'histoire de la Palestine*, p. 362, note 2 ; also ibid., p. 345, note 2.

[2] Schürer, *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi*, II, 2nd ed., p. 386, note 164 : "It is noteworthy that later the form of imprecation was pronounced *after the prayer;*" vid. my remark on this in this REVIEW, V, p. 131, note 3.

[3] The enemies of the Jews have nevertheless always attacked this benediction, vid. Landshut's observations in סדור הגיון לב (Königsberg, 1845), p. 61.

that the Jews were also accused of pronouncing a curse upon the king and the people of the land. It is true the form of the curse is also reported [1], but probably only as an Hagadic interpretation and not as an authentic historical tradition. Historically, the case may rather have stood thus, that the curse, or something which could be considered as one, was always pronounced after the reading of the Torah [2]. The plainest indication of a curse in the synagogue occurs in Jalkut, Esth. iii. 8 (§ 1054, fol. 172 a, Venice): פותחים בתי כנסיות וקורים דברים שאי אפשר להשמע ואומרים שמע ישראל ואחר כך עומדים להתפלל ואומרים בתפלתם מכניע זדים ואומרים שאנו זדים ' ' ' ואחר כך נוטלין ספר תורה ומקללים אותנו בעלילה ואומר[ים] ויכחשו אויבך לך, "They open their synagogues [3], read things which one cannot hear [4], say the 'Hear, O Israel'; then they stand in prayer, and say in their prayer 'The One who humbles the wicked,' and say that we are the wicked .... they then take out the scroll of the Torah and curse us in a crafty way [5], reciting Deut. xxxiii. 29."—We see that Jalkut preserved here a feature, which all other Midrashim do not contain [6]. Though it may be argued whether the narrative of the Jalkut is based on some old source or not, so much is certain, *that we have here the echo of the accusation which was brought against the Jews in the Christian time.*

As the Jalkut says clearly that the curse was pronounced after the Tefillah, there must have been something in the order of the prayers which could have called forth the accusation. One thinks in the first instance of the prayer עלינו, which really contains an imprecation against the nations, of course only against the idolatrous ones [7]. It is known, however, that this prayer has no connexion with the reading of the Torah. It would, therefore, be preferable to think of

[1] Esther Rabba: וקללת המלך שנורה בפיהם ומהו הקללה שמקללין אותנו כו', so also in Midrash, *Abba Gorjon*, p. 30, and *Lekach Tob* to Esther, p. 100, ed. Buber.

[2] *Targum Sheni* of Esther iii. 8 (pp. 246, 247, ed. Lagarde), several times ולא ידעינן אם מילט לייטין לנא ואם ib. ; קרין בסדריהון ומתרגמין בנביאיהון ולייטין במלכנא מברכא מברכין לנא ; cf. the expression בעלילה in Jalkut, *infra*.

[3] Cf. Epiphanius, *Haeres* xxix. 9 ... *ἀνιστάμενοι ἔωθεν* ... (REVIEW, V, 139).

[4] The precepts about the sacrifices (פרק איזהו מקומן) are perhaps meant.

[5] Cf. Jerome's words (REVIEW, V, 139), which also mention cunning on the part of the Jews.

[6] For the words לעשות נקמה בגוים כו' are found in Jalkut, *infra*, just as in Esth. Rabba.

[7] In the Spanish and Italian prayer-books, after בכל המינים, there is a sentence: שהם משתחוים להבל וריק ומתפללים אל אל לא יושיע, which could very easily be thought to refer to Christianity. The absence of the sentence is, in *Machsor Vitry*, indicated by points (p. 75).

the so-called יהי רצון, which is recited on Mondays and Thursdays, the days of the reading of the Torah, and which, indeed, contains a passage which would be open to malicious attack[1]. But this would be in contradiction with the information of the Fathers of the Church that the curse was pronounced daily, and even three times a day. I must, therefore, still consider as an open one the question as to which passage they misinterpreted into an imprecation.

SAMUEL KRAUSS.

[1] The piece is already found in Siddur R. Amram, as Baer says in his Siddur; ibid. also the words להשמיד אויבינו. Vid. also about this prayer לבוש and עטרת זקנים to Orach Chajim, § 429. Mr. A. Gestetner of Budapest brought under my notice that N. Brüll attributes the authorship of the prayer to R. Levi Bezalel (*Wiener Jahrbuch*, 1868, p. 189). Spanish and Italian prayer-books do not have the prayer.

MARINUS, A JEWISH PHILOSOPHER OF ANTIQUITY.

WHEN I wrote, two years ago, about the Jewish philosopher Domninus[1], I had already the opportunity of mentioning several times the philosopher Marinus. I devote now a little study to the latter, because I have since become convinced that Marinus was a Jew.

Marinus hailed from Flavia Neapolis in Palestine (the ancient Shechem); he was a pupil of Proclus, whose successor he was in the chair of philosophy in Athens in the year 485 B.C., and he was the teacher of Agapius[2].

The circumstance that he was born in Shechem is, of course, by itself no proof that he was a Jew, because many heathen Greeks lived also in Palestine, especially at that late period. But a remark of Damascius[3] points undoubtedly to the fact that Marinus was of Jewish descent, for we read there that *Marinus had gone over to the Hellenic religion*[4]. But a formal conversion to paganism certainly did not take place, it seems rather that the mere fact that Marinus belonged to the Athenian school of philosophers was already considered as a change of religion[5].

We have no information as to other circumstances of the life of Marinus; we know from Damascius that he was physically weak and moderately gifted, and that he owed his honourable position in the school to his industry. Before his death, he appointed Isidorus to be his successor[6].

[1] REVIEW, VII, 270–277.—I pay herewith a debt of honour, and say that Zunz knew already that Domninus was a Jew; for he writes in his essay: "Names of Jews" (*Gesammelte Schriften*, II, 11): "Domninus, Suidas s.v. Γέσιος, cf. Photius, p. 1073." In the note, "As much as Domninus, Ebedjesu, p. 104, דמניס; as a Roman name, Suidas, s.v. Ἰουλιανός."

[2] Paully's *Real-Encyclopädie*, IV, 1571.

[3] Vita Isidori, c. 141.

[4] Vid. Zeller, *Die Philosophie der Griechen*, part III, division II, 3rd edition, p. 833, note 6. In Nicolai's *History of the Greek Literature* (Magdeburg, 1878), III, 275, we find "Marinus: at first a Jew, afterwards a Neo-Platonist."

[5] Cf. the apostasy of Elisha b. Abuja, as narrated in the Talmud.

[6] For these particulars, vid. Zeller, l.c.

We possess of Marinus only a small Greek work, which contains the eulogistic biography of his teacher Proclus. The title of the *editio princeps* used by me is: Μαρίνου Νεαπολίτου Πρόκλος ἢ περὶ εὐδαιμονίας; in Latin: *Marini Neapolitani De Procli Vita et felicitate liber: nunc primum Innominato quodam interprete in Latinum sermonem conversus, adiectus etiam Scholis.* Place and year of printing are not given[1]. It is prefaced by the small biography of Marinus by Suidas, which, although only containing anecdotes, yet contributes to the knowledge of the man. I therefore give it here *in extenso:* Marinus Neapolitanus philosophus et Rhetor, Procli Philosophi discipulus et successor, Procli praeceptoris sui vitam tum prosa tum carmine condidit et questiones quasdam philosophicas; scripserat etiam Philebi Platonis enarrationem copiosam, super qua cum Isidorum Philosophum consuluisset isque praeceptoris (id est Procli) commentarium satisfacere dixisset, mox librum igne combussit. Et forsitan etiam in Parmenidem Commentarium perdidisset cum ab eodem Isidoro Procli in eundem dialogum tractationem meliorem esse convinceretur, nisi iam editus fuisset.

The philosophical value of the book, *De Procli Vita*, which has come down to us, is only small[2]; but it impresses the mind of the reader all the more by the ardour of expression, and the warm affection to the master Proclus evinced by the pupil. We meet also with Orphic and Chaldaean conceits as practised by the Neo-Platonic school, and as we also observed in the essay about Domninus[3]. It is further noteworthy that a certain Ulpianus of Gaza is mentioned, who, considering his native town, may also have been a Jew (Οὐλπιανὸς ὁ Γαζαίος συμφοιτητής, p. 166).

SAMUEL KRAUSS.

[1] Another edition is that of Boissonade, Leipzig, 1814.

[2] Philosophical sayings of Marinus in the works of later authors were collected by Zeller, l. c., p. 834, but these also are of little importance.

[3] Cf. Kroll, Die Chaldäischen Orakel, Rheinisches Museum, L (1895), 636.

A FRAGMENT OF A SHORTHAND HAGADAH.

A MS. recently acquired by the Bodleian Library (Hebr. MSS. *e* 68) contains an interesting shorthand fragment of the Hagadah for Passover. The instructions for the several ceremonies are given in Arabic, and are, with a few exceptions, the same as in the printed Hagadahs. The exceptions are these: The washing of the hands before the partaking of the parsley is followed by the blessing על נטילת ידים; this is not the case in the German rite. According to the Hagahoth Maimuni, this was the practice of former generations—perhaps in the time of the Talmud and the Geonim, but not e.g. in the days of Maimonides. This circumstance would lead us to assume that the fragment was copied from a very old original[1]. Another deviation from the established rite is the recital of a blessing after having partaken of the parsley. The form of this blessing is likewise peculiar. The usual initial formula is followed by בו[יא] נפ[שות] רבות על מה שברא ב א י חי העולמים "Creator of many desires for that which he created, blessed art thou, O Lord, who livest for ever[2]." It is doubtful whether this form is in accordance with some established rite, or is merely the result of the copyist's negligence, of which there is good evidence in the fragment. It is further insisted upon, that each time the cup is refilled with wine it should previously be rinsed with water, a process (שטיפה) prescribed in the Talmud (Berachoth, 601 a) for every כום של ברכה.

The Kiddush is almost identical with that contained in our printed editions; but the first paragraph of the Hagadah, which usually begins כהא לחמא עניא, has, in our fragment, the following form: הש[תא] הכה ליש[נה הבאה] בארעא דישראל · הש[תא] עב[די] ליש[נה הבאה] בנ[י] חר[ין] · כ[ל] דכ[פין] י[תי] ויכ[ול] וכ[ל] דצ[ריך] י[תי] ויפ[סח][3].

As regards the sequence of the questions, the MS. has the same order as Maimonides, but in a shortened form; the words אפילו פעם אחת, שתי פעמים (the MS. has אנו מטבילין instead) and כלנו are omitted. The next paragraph runs as follows:

עבד[ים] היינו לפר[עה] במצ[רים] ויוצי[אנו] י אלה[נו] משם בי[ד]

[1] The mistakes met with in the fragment, especially on the first page, are such as can only be attributed to a copyist.

[2] The accepted form is: בורא נפשות רבות וחסרונם על כל מה שברא להחיות בהם נפש כל חי ברוך חי העולמים.

[3] The letters in square brackets have been added by me.

חזקה וב[זרע] נטו[יה] ואי[לו] לָא נא[ל] המק[ום] בר[וך] הו[א] וש[מו] את אבת[ינו] ממצ[רים] כבָ[ר] אָנו משוע[בדים] (שנא׳) לא את אבו[תינו] בלבד גאל אל[א] אף (אבות) אתנו גאל שנא׳ ואותנו הוצי[א] משם:

The next two paragraphs being omitted, the MS. continues כנגד ארבעה בנים דברה תורה, with the following variation in reply to the wicked:

לכ[ם] ול[א] לִ[י] ולפ[י] שהו[ציא] את עצ[מו] מהכל[ל] וכ[פר] בָעקר אף את[ה] אמ[ור] לו והק[הה] את שנ[יו] בע[בור] זה עש[ה] יי לִ[י] ול[א] ל[ך] אילו היית שם לא הי[ית] ננאל:

In the next section there are no variations of importance, except that in the paragraph beginning והיא שעמדה the words שבכל דור ודור עומדים עלינו לכלותנו are omitted. The section beginning רבי יוסי הגלילי to לכפר על עונותינו is likewise absent. The following two paragraphs are likewise a peculiarly contracted form:

בכ[ל] דור ד[ור] חי[ב] אד[ם] לרא[ת] א[ת] עצ[מו] כא[לו] הי[ה] יצ[א] ממצ[רים] שנ[אמר] ואות[נו] הוצ[יא] מש[ם]:

לפי[כך] אנו חי[בים] להַ[לל] לש[בח] לפ[אר] לרו[מם] לגד[ל] ולהו[דות] למ[י] שע[שה] לנו ולאבו[תנו] את כל הנסים האל[ה] והוציאנו מעב[דות] לחר[ת] ונאמר הללויה והללויה:

The next sentence concludes the fragment:

הללו עבדי יי כלה בצאת ישראל עד חלמיש:

The copyist was suddenly interrupted, or else he would have added the two words למעינו מים.

The MS. is written on paper in Syro-Egypt. characters, about 1300 according to Dr. Neubauer. Vowels are occasionally added; the signs are the ordinary ones, but the writer does not seem to have always been able to distinguish between *ḥolem* and long *kamets*; for he writes עבָדה instead of עבֹדה; הילָד instead of הילֹד; במָפתים instead of במֹופתים, לָא=לֹא, and so on. Probably he pronounced long *kamets* like *ō*. It may further be noticed that an interchange, as in Yemen MSS., takes place between *pathaḥ* and *segol*, and between *segol* and *tsere*; that a simple vowel takes the place of a *sh'va compositum*.

The object of a shorthand Hagadah of this kind was probably to enable the Jews to carry copies of the ritual with them when compelled to move from place to place. It assisted the memory in things known almost by heart, which were thus saved from oblivion. (Comp. "Fragment of the Hebrew Bible," *Proceedings of the Society for Biblical Archaeology*, March, 1896.)

M. FRIEDLÄNDER.

CRITICAL NOTICES.

STUDIES IN JUDAISM.

Studies in Judaism, by S. SCHECHTER, M.A. (London: A. & C. Black. 1896.)

THE great mass of the reading British public is profoundly ignorant of the history and inner life of modern Judaism. This insularity, as it has been aptly termed by Mr. Montefiore (*J. Q. R.* VIII, 196), is partly due to the influence of national habit, but partly also to the fact that sources of information are not readily available. Whatever tends to remove such barriers of ignorance and to promote sympathy between those several classes who are the constituent factors in our composite British nationality, is worthy of sincere commendation.

In this direction Mr. Schechter has rendered a real service by this volume of essays in which he has introduced us to certain chapters in the history of humanity and human thought which have a living interest to all, and concerning which information is not easily accessible elsewhere. There is a certain charm of originality in the style of his composition which is forcible and clear, lighted up here and there by quaint modes of expression which make the book easy to read.

It would be presumption on the part of one who cannot claim any special knowledge to criticize a work of this nature written by one who is acknowledged to be a master of his subject; but I am glad to have the opportunity of testifying to my appreciation of the volume. Naturally, in many respects, our standpoints differ, but this has only added an additional interest to the study of the book.

The literature of any people affords to the anthropologist a field of work in which by careful analysis he can search for the manifestations of race-characters, and for light on the history and development of institutions. In these essays one is confronted with persons and institutions and a literature which bear a certain stamp of individuality, and on that account they have a peculiar interest; and the anthropologist will endeavour to determine if there be a definite national solidarity indicated in the variety of character and in the prevalent cast of thought. The tendency to cosmopolitanism which

is characteristic of the latter half of this century, due to the increased facilities for travel and for the international exchange of thought, is toning down in all literatures their specific peculiarities; but these essays deal with persons and writings of pre-Victorian age, and they are therefore worthy of examination from this point of view.

The ordinary English reader expects to find marked features of individuality in anything Jewish. There is a prevalent belief that in physique, in literature, in religion, there is this national unity; but certainly the predominant impression which the study of the persons and the literature treated of by the author leaves on the mind of the reader is that of diversity rather than of unity. The physical anthropologist has already learned that the Jewish peoples can be divided into groups which present strongly contrasted types of character, such as the Ashkenazim, prevalently blonde, the Sephardim, prevalently dark, the Falashas, &c., indicating the probable existence of complex strains in the national ancestry. The material, anthropometric and ethnographic, at the disposal of science, is insufficient to enable us to make a definite pronouncement on this subject, but is enough to show that while, on the one hand, Renan was mistaken in denying the existence of a Jewish race as an ethnic entity; yet, on the other hand, the evidence put forward by Dr. Victor Jacques is insufficient to prove that the existing variations have been acquired by an originally homogeneous and unmixed people during centuries of changing environment. The sum of our knowledge of the physical characters of the Jewish people indicates that there is one central physical type, but that with this there have been blended other elements whose hereditary influence has made itself conspicuous in a considerable percentage of individuals. The persons and literature portrayed in the essays before us present in like manner certain central prevalent characters, along with strongly diverging individual traits. Dominating all these is the unifying factor of a highly-developed religious feeling, which in extreme cases tends to develop in certain definite directions, showing itself in ceremonial devotion to the national cultus, in mysticism, in pantheism, or in other correlated forms. A certain degree of unity of thought has also arisen from the usages of the national language, itself at once the product and the moulder of the prevalent national mental character, with its figurative tendencies, and its disposition to subtle distinctions. It is these two characters of religious feeling and thought which have made the Semitic races the religious teachers of the civilized world. Bitter persecution, continued through fifteen centuries, has also been an important environing force in producing a degree of unification in the Jewish moral and social type. But,

notwithstanding these, there are, in the peoples and thoughts sketched for us, marvellous varieties of character; and we can trace herein the germs of almost every conceivable philosophical system, and the outline of almost every imaginable doctrine.

The studies which Mr. Schechter gives us in this book naturally fall into three classes: the first five are mainly biographical, the four that follow are mainly doctrinal, and the remaining five are more varied in character, literary and social. The essays of the first group are the most interesting, as the men whose lives and works form their theme are distinct types.

In the founder of the Neo-Chassidim we have depicted a religious enthusiast, whose emotional nature had become stimulated by solitary meditation and introspection to a pitch of spiritual fervour almost prophetic in its intensity. His extravagances seem to have been those of his time, which was one of religious unrest. The wave of excitement of which the heresy of the Frankist Zoharites was the outcome, and the revival of the Kabbalistic mysticism which had distinguished the followers of Sabbataï Zevi, had agitated men's minds even in the remote Carpathian villages. Here Israel of Miedziboz became so impressed with the idea of the present immanence of God in human nature that he broke away from the more formal restraints of the system of Talmudic Judaism, and became a reformer and revivalist. Around the obscurity of the life of the new teacher there gathered a cloud of myths, evidently inspired by the story of the life of an earlier ideal; but the new teaching was different in its essentials from that of its predecessors, and had little in common with that of the Maccabean Chassidim whose name it assumed, and considering the environments of its origin, it is not to be wondered at that the spiritual life of the followers of Baalshem degenerated, and their system of teaching became degraded under the leadership of the astute successor of the prophet into a tissue of superstitions not unmixed with fraud, and a Zaddik-worship, whose character is sketched in a darker colour by Graetz and Zunz than that in which it is drawn by the gentler hand of Mr. Schechter.

The calm rationalism of the Western Jew, as typified by Nachman Krochmal, the subject of the second essay, forms a strong contrast to the emotional mysticism of the Eastern. He also was a reformer, but of a widely different school. Under the influence of the new scientific learning, and probably stimulated by the example of his great predecessor Mendelssohn, he learned to look upon the past history and future prospects of Judaism from a new standpoint, and carried on his life work, which was the translation of the older traditional views into a new scientific shape, and the philosophical

treatment of the history of his people. Mr. Schechter has given a sympathetic sketch of the character and labours of this great leader of the progressive movement of modern Jewish thought, whose work is often overshadowed by that of his more prominent successors, Rapoport and Zunz.

A third type, differing from either of the foregoing, is represented in Elijah Wilna, the "Gaon," the devout seeker after truth, patiently striving to discover the real meaning of every part of the Torah and Mishnah, and labouring to brush away the clouds of casuistry to which so many of the Talmudists of his day were devoted. In him we see the reverent humble critic who follows with single heart the quest for truth, regardless of the difficulties into which that quest may bring him, seeking no honour or promotion for himself; although ready at the call of duty to take a firm and determined stand against such foes of truth as the Chassidim, whose heresy he considered to be dangerous and destructive.

In Nachmanides, "the Father of Knowledge," Mr. Schechter has portrayed for us the cultured scholar of an earlier age and a higher social position: one whose bent of mind was towards mysticism rather than towards philosophy, but who, unlike the generality of mystics, was inclined to emphasize the ethical rather than the dogmatic side of his religious teaching. Eminent in medicine, and deeply read in the literature of his people, he occupies a niche in history on account of his participation in a famous controversy, and in literature for his many writings, particularly his commentary on the Pentateuch.

The last of the biographical essays is of a slighter nature and treats briefly of two men, Maharil the reformer of ritual, and his devoted servant and "Boswellian" biographer, Rabbi Solomon of St. Goar.

In these character sketches Mr. Schechter is at his best, and one wishes for more. There are many other striking figures in the history of mediaeval and modern Judaism which are appropriate subjects for essays of this nature, and it is to be hoped that Mr. Schechter may, as a relaxation from his severer textual labours, give us a second series of biographical studies. The courtly *littérateur* Mendelssohn, the poets Hallevi, Erter and Steinheim, the Kabbalist Eibeschütz and his opponent Emden, the heretics, Frank and Sabbataï Zevi, and the greatest of Jewish philosophers, Spinoza, who carried the doctrine of the immanence of God to the extent of acosmism (as Hegel aptly termed his pantheism); these and others that might easily be named may be commended to his consideration. Some of these have been the subjects of interesting essays by other hands, but Mr. Schechter has such an unusually wide acquaintance with the literature of the

Jewish people that he is peculiarly well qualified to show the place and influence of each in the development of the national life and thought.

Of the more purely theological essays, the first, on the dogmas of Judaism, is perhaps the most important. In it our author argues against the well-known dictum of Mendelssohn that Judaism has no dogmas, and ascribes the influence of this anti-dogmatic school to the prevalence of the spirit of historical criticism at the present day which is hostile to theological speculation. He traces the development of the process of the formulation of the Jewish Creed both before and after the time of Maimonides, and discusses some of the more important points at issue between the Maimonist advocates of a faith based on reason and their anti-Maimonist opponents who laid stress on authority. The sum of the argument in this essay is that in the elements which are essential to the making-up of a religion worthy of the name there must be a dogmatic nucleus, around which the aspirations and ideals which constitute it are concentrated ; otherwise the cultus will be unorganized and incapable of adapting itself to different modes of life and thought. This condition he believes can be shown to exist in the religion of Israel, and he indicates the nature of those elements which make up the essential parts of its creed. The view of the subject here taken is not adopted by all, indeed the opposite quality is predicated of Judaism by the late Isidore Loeb, and regarded by him as the secret of the astonishing flexibility of the Jewish religion and of its indefinite perfectibility. "Tandis que d'autres religions ont une Église officielle, qui fixe les dogmes, arrête les formes religieuses et souvent les immobilise, le Judaïsme peut se développer en toute liberté. Cette religion, qu'on prétend être la plus stationnaire de toutes et comme figée dans les formes du passé, est, au contraire, la plus libre de toutes et la plus apte à se transformer. Aucun dogme, aucune Église ne l'enchaîne" (*Revue des Études Juives*, 1894, XXVIII, 173).

The article of faith concerning divine retribution is dealt with in the eighth of these studies. The views which the several rabbinical authorities have entertained on this subject naturally vary with their varying appreciation of the nature of sin ; and this, in turn, depends on the views held with regard to the relations of human thought and conduct to the absolute holiness of God. The connexions between some of these conceptions of retribution and the doctrine of solidarity are interesting. If each individual be an integral part, a limb of the body of Israel, there is a consequent liability on the part of each one to suffer for the sin of another, and the whole community may be affected by the act of one member. On this view the innocent may

be made to suffer for the guilty, and the hereditary extension of the penalty of transgression expressed in the Second Commandment becomes a special case of the natural law.

The review of Weiss's work, *Zur Geschichte der Jüdischen Tradition*, is valuable as the book itself is, on account of its being written in Hebrew, inaccessible to the English reader, but Mr. Schechter gives a concise summary of the contents of these five slender but compactly filled volumes, which trace the course of Hebrew tradition from the earliest times down to the compilation of the *Shulchan Aruch*.

In the second review, that of Toy's *Judaism and Christianity*, there is a fair criticism of the author's position from the Jewish standpoint. The spiritual history of Israel is the history of the relation of the law and legal obligation to the nation and to the individual conscience. Mr. Schechter shows that the later development of legalism did not suppress the ethical side of religion, for the production of the gnomic literature of the Wisdom Series was coeval with the period of the priestly code, and after the close of the prophetic age; nor did it suppress the spiritual and emotional side of religion as the post-exilic Psalms testify. But it cannot be ignored that there is another aspect of legalism due to the element of human weakness, which in the case of many persons has led to an undue attention to ceremonial, and to the consequent loss of the true perspective of the relation between formal observance and spiritual life on the part of a considerable section of the people. Hence, when judging of any phase of a religion, it is not enough to take into account its possibilities, but regard must also be had to its actual effects on the whole people subjected to its influence.

The remaining five essays deal with subjects of more varied nature. The two literary studies, which treat of the Hebrew Collection in the Library of the British Museum and the titles of Jewish books, give a graphic view of the extent and variety of Hebrew literature; and the last paper, on the Jewish Community in Rome, is an interesting historical sketch of this oldest European settlement, whose former quarter, unhappily demolished, is well remembered by the writer of this paper.

The Child in Jewish Literature is perhaps the most popular of all these studies, and to those outside the Jewish community it gives a most interesting and attractive picture of Jewish family life. The elements of folklore which were, and perhaps still are in some places, mixed with the graver ceremonies enjoined by law, such as those connected with the name of Lilith and the Holle Kreish, belong to a series of survivals whose kindred may be traced in peoples widely separated from the Jews.

The remaining essay of social life, "Woman in Temple and Synagogue," is a useful supplement to Kayserling's more elaborate treatise, *Die Jüdischen Frauen in der Geschichte*, and contains original matter which is most interesting.

There are few books of which it can truly be said that they fill lacunae which were hitherto void, but I think I may safely say that Mr. Schechter's work deals in an interesting, instructive, and attractive manner with a number of subjects concerning which there are very few other sources of information in the whole range of English literature.

ALEX. MACALISTER.

THE ARITHMETIC OF ELIJAH MIZRAḤI.

Die Arithmetik des Elia Misrachi; ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Mathematik, von GUSTAV WERTHEIM. Braunschweig, 1896.

THE custom of continental colleges to have a learned essay, written by one of the teaching staff, added to the annual report, encourages the teachers to continued study and research, each in his particular speciality, and has been the source of many valuable contributions to literature and science. From the same source comes the interesting book, *On the Arithmetic of Elijah Mizraḥi*, by Gustav Wertheim, which first appeared in the *Programm der Realschule der Israelitischen Gemeinde zu Frankfurt a. M.* 1893. The present volume is the second, improved and amplified, edition of this essay. Elijah Mizraḥi (b. 1455, d. 1526 at Constantinople) is well known to the student of Hebrew literature as the author of a supercommentary on Rashi's Commentary on the Pentateuch. When any difficulty is met with in Rashi, the Mizraḥi is consulted, and is generally found to discuss the problem in full length, though not always in a manner satisfactory to the puzzled inquirer. The reader of the supercommentary will hardly expect that the author was an excellent mathematician, because he never avails himself of any given opportunity to display his knowledge of astronomy, geometry, or arithmetic. As Chief Rabbi of the Jewish congregation at Constantinople, he had frequently to reply to questions addressed to him on religious matters, and some of the replies are contained in two collections of Responsa, viz. *Mayim Amukim* and *Shaaloth utheshubhoth*. But the work to which our attention is for the present directed is his *Sefer ha-Mispar* (The Book of Arithmetic), of which Rabbi Joseph Solomon del Medigo, in a letter addressed to his son, says: "It is indeed a very valuable book to those who are able to

read it and to understand it" (Geiger's *Melo Chofnayim*, p. 12). Mizraḥi considers mathematics as the intermediary between theology and natural science, being, as it were, the bridge which leads thought from the material to the immaterial, and enables men to obtain a thorough knowledge of things. Of the four parts of mathematics — arithmetic, geometry, astronomy, and music—the first two are of a more general character, and must in study precede the other two; and since arithmetic has frequently to be applied in geometry, it must be studied first of all the different branches of mathematics. There was no lack of books on arithmetic; but these were unsatisfactory in the opinion of Mizraḥi, because they only taught how to solve arithmetical problems without showing the reason for the method adopted. The students, in using such books, did not learn the method adopted by other scholars, and much less were they trained in the art of inventing new methods of their own, when they met with problems different from those which they were taught. And as, in addition, his numerous disciples had begged him to write for them a book on arithmetic, and discuss in it the methods of previous authors with their proofs and arguments, he resolved to comply with their request, and his *Sefer ha-Mispar* is the outcome of this resolve. He did not, however, pretend to give all possible methods, but he promises to teach the foundations of the various artifices which are employed by teachers of arithmetic in the solution of problems. Of the numerous interesting problems discussed by Mizraḥi, the following will suffice to show his genius and method.

1. Find the sum of the natural numbers from 1 to n.

Solution.—The proportion of 1 to the next number is $=\frac{1}{2}$; of $1+2$ to the next number is $=1$, i.e. $\frac{1}{2}$ more than the preceding; of $1+2+3$ to the next number is $=\frac{3}{2}$, again $\frac{1}{2}$ more than the preceding proportion, and so on,

hence $$\frac{1+2+3+\ldots+(n-1)+n}{(n+1)}=n\cdot\tfrac{1}{2}$$

and $$1+2+3+\ldots+n=(n+1)n\cdot\tfrac{1}{2}$$

2. Find the sum of the squares of the natural numbers from 1 to n.

Solution.—Comparing the sum of the squares of the natural numbers with the sum of these numbers themselves, we obtain the following equations:—

$$\frac{1^2}{1}=1;\qquad \frac{1^2+2^2}{1+2}=1+\tfrac{2}{3};\qquad \frac{1^2+2^2+3^2}{1+2+3}=1+2\cdot\tfrac{2}{3};$$

$$\frac{1^2+2^2+3^2+4^2}{1+2+3+4}=1+3\cdot\tfrac{2}{3};$$

and so on, each successive proportion increasing by $\frac{2}{3}$; so that

$$\frac{1^2+2^2+3^2+\ldots+n^2}{1+2+3+\ldots+n} \text{ is} = 1+(n-1).\tfrac{2}{3} = \frac{2n+1}{3}$$

Hence $$1^2+2^2+3^2+\ldots+n^2 = \frac{n(n+1)(2n+1)}{2\cdot 3}$$

3. Find the sum of the cubes of the natural numbers.

Solution.—

$$\frac{1^3}{1} - 0 = 1$$

$$\frac{1^3+2^3}{1+2} - \frac{1^3}{1} = 2$$

$$\frac{1^3+2^3+3^3}{1+2+3} - \frac{1^3+2^3}{1+2} = 3$$

$$\frac{1^3+2^3+3^3+4^3}{1+2+3+4} - \frac{1^3+2^3+3^3}{1+2+3} = 4$$

$$\frac{1^3+2^3+3^3+\ldots+n^3}{1+2+3+\ldots+n} - \frac{1^3+2^3+3^3+\ldots+(n-1^3)}{1+2+3+\ldots+(n-1)} = n$$

By addition we obtain

$$\frac{1^3+2^3+3^3+\ldots+n^3}{1+2+3+\ldots+n} = 1+2+3+4+\ldots+n^2$$

and $$1^3+2^3+3^3+\ldots+n^3 = (1+2+3+4+\ldots+n)$$

Among the works used by Mizraḥi the *Sefer ha-Mispar* of Ibn Ezra occupies the first place. Of the hundred problems treated in Mizraḥi's book, twenty-one are taken *verbatim* from Ibn Ezra. Also in the theoretical part the same source may frequently be traced. It is remarkable that Mizraḥi, like Ibn Ezra (*J. Q. R.* IX. p. 659), ignores altogether problems concerning interest and discount.—Herr Wertheim gives only an analysis of Mizraḥi's work, but this analysis, being concise and clear, will prove far more useful than a literal translation, which in many cases is less intelligible to the reader than the original. In the interest of Hebrew literature, however, I should have liked to see this analysis as an introduction to an edition of the Hebrew text. Sebastian Münster, of the sixteenth century, found this work of such importance and usefulness that he edited for his pupils a part of it, together with a portion of Abraham b. Ḥiyya's *Tsurath ha-Arets*; we may fairly assume that books of this kind will also in the present century, with its numerous new centres for the study of Hebrew literature, find friends, readers, and admirers.

M. Friedländer.

THE JEWISH LAW OF DIVORCE

The Jewish Law of Divorce. By DAVID WERNER AMRAM, M.A., LL.B. 224 pp. (Philadelphia, 1896.)

I AM glad to find in this treatise by an American Jewish lawyer the Jewish law of divorce discussed in a legal and scientific spirit. Men who are not lawyers always seem to approach the question of divorce from an impassioned and sentimental standpoint, and are therefore prone to do injustice to one system or another. I know men whose opinion is worth much upon other subjects speak of the Jewish law of divorce as something purely oriental and horrid to the more refined feelings of Englishmen. This little treatise by Mr. Amram will be a cure for much prejudice and ignorance.

Our views of marriage will necessarily influence our views of divorce. If marriage is a sacrament, then it should be indissoluble. Such is the teaching of the Roman Catholic Church, and such is the law of Italy at the present day, where marriage can be dissolved by death only. Since the Reformation the tendency in Protestant countries has always been to recognize the validity of divorce. In Prussia *mutual aversion* is regarded as a proper ground for dissolving the marriage tie. I do not say that marriage should be regarded simply as a contract, like all other contracts, voidable at the simple will of the parties; but as the object of marriage should be the happiness of the parties, including the children, it seems to me that the contract view of marriage, safeguarded by the appeal to the religious sentiments of the contracting parties, is the truer view, and the one which is likely to become more and more general in Europe. I know that it is often said that if divorce is forbidden, husband and wife are more likely to bear with the inevitable, and give and take. This may be so, but the argument does not seem to me to have the support of experience. I do not think that there is any evidence to prove that marriages are happier or morality higher in Italy than in Germany.

I think that the Jewish law of divorce, not as it is laid down in the simple command in Deuteronomy, but as it is developed by the Talmud and later Rabbis, is the expression of the true *via media* in this thorny question. According to the Pentateuch the husband could divorce his wife without ceremony, without the presence of a public official, without witnesses; and the wife was absolutely powerless. If she were injured, no redress was possible for her; her consent was not asked. Those Jews who flout Rabbinism cannot

do better than study Mr. Amram's book on the law of divorce. Law often implies ethics. Perhaps it always does, except in questions of mere procedure, and it will be found that the ethical legal concepts of the Rabbis are actually higher in this matter than those which are contained in the Pentateuch. We need not wonder at this. A living law never stands still, never becomes crystallized; and Rabbinism was a sincere attempt to preserve the Jewish system as a living system.

Mr. Amram's book is not a code or a digest, but in its fifteen chapters it gives a sympathetic account of the Jewish law, and an account which is true as far as it goes. The origin of the Kethubah is very clearly stated, and its importance demonstrated. The author shows how under the Herods the Roman law exercised its influence, and how it became the custom for some time for women to divorce their husbands, and thus explains the answer of Jesus in Mark x: "If a woman shall put away her husband, and be married to another, she committeth adultery."

It is often the custom to deride legal fictions. I feel a kindness towards them. They are signs, not of falsehood or of self-deception, but of an earnest desire for conservative progress. By means of a legal fiction it was possible in Jewish law to force a husband to consent to divorce his wife when his wife was able morally to lay claim to a divorce. In Mr. Amram's fifth chapter the question of an enforced divorce as consistent with consent is well treated. I may also refer to the author's remarks on the decree of Rabbenu Gershom of Mainz, and to his excellent summary of the rules of procedure in divorce taken from the *Schulchan Aruch*. These rules, though they seem trivial to the thoughtless, were intended to prevent the Get from being given hastily and without the authority of responsible officials. As a frontispiece there is a copy of the Get in the formula given by Maimonides in his *Yad Hachazakah*.

The present English law of divorce is a marked improvement upon the old state of things, when marriage could be dissolved only by a private act of Parliament preceded by a separation *a mensa et thoro* in the ecclesiastical courts, and a successful action for crim. con. in the common law-courts. But I do not think that a mark of an English-Jewish patriot is the regarding of 20 & 21 Vict. c. 85 as the highest height of inspired wisdom, and the Talmudical treatise of Gittin as the deepest depth of absurd folly. The English law halts between conflicting opinions. It cannot make up its mind as to whether divorce is penal or contractual, and the English law, backed though it is by public opinion, which gives the paramour the right to marry the guilty wife, seems to me morally

lower than Jewish law, which is also continental law, and generally also the law of Scotland. Something should be done by our Rabbinical authorities to meet the difficulty of a husband divorced by the civil law refusing to give the Get to his former wife. This is no fault of the Jewish law, but the difficulty arises from our own want of jurisdiction.

Putting this aside, it does not seem advisable to abolish the Get, and it is logical that the Synagogue, which insists upon marriage between Jews being performed in accordance with Jewish rites, should also insist upon the divorce being performed in accordance with the same rites. The book of Mr. Amram will be useful, by its clearness and impartiality, in throwing light upon a difficult question. That it should have been written in America is a proof of a much stronger conservative spirit in American Judaism than we generally gave it credit for.

L. M. SIMMONS.

DR. MALTER ON AL-GAZZÂLÎ.

Die Abhandlung des Abû Hâmid Al-Gazzâlî: Antworten auf Fragen die an ihn gerichtet wurden, von DR. HEINRICH MALTER. Frankfurt a. M.: J. Kauffmann. 1896.

THERE is no more interesting personage in the history of Arabic, or, more exactly, of Moslem, thought, than Al-Gazzâlî, who gained the names of Haǵǵat ul-islâm (Proof of Islam), Zain ad-din (Ornament of religion). He was born in the Khorassan in the year 1058, and died in 1111. He was director of the Nizamiyya College at Bagdad. He gave up his chair to make the pilgrimage to Mecca, and then taught at Damascus, at Jerusalem, and at Alexandria. He retired to Tus, his birthplace, and became in the end a member of the mystic sect of the Sufites, and composed there his celebrated works, the aim of which was to prove that Islam was superior to all other religions, to all systems of philosophy.

Even before the Abbasids had ascended the throne at Bagdad, and the Caliph Al-Mamoun had put forth efforts to propagate the science of Greece amongst the Arabs, Moslems had begun to think on the problems of theology. But it was from the rise of the Motazzilites at Basra that attempts were made to reconcile philosophy, especially the philosophy of Aristotle, with the truths of Islam. The names of Al-Kendi, Al-Farabi, and Avicenna at once occur to us. Al-Gazzâlî, however, was not a reconciler of Islam and philosophy. His aim was

to show that philosophy was not to be relied upon, that her supposed truths crumbled away when they were examined, and that in the end all we could know of the meaning of life was given us by revealed religion. His two works which treat of the contradictions of philosophy bear the names of *Al-Maqaṣid*, or "The Tendencies," and the *Tahâfat Al-Fulâsafa*, "The Destruction of Philosophers." They attempted, perhaps unconsciously, to found belief upon unbelief. Philosophically, Gazzâlî was a sceptic, and probably he is best known in the history of thought by his analysis of cause and effect. He says that there is no necessary connexion of cause between things which occur habitually together. If there seems to be a connexion it is only because the divine mind has ordered that the one should always occur after the other. It is a divinely ordained habitual sequence, but there is no causal connexion, no law of nature, so that we can say it must be that a so-called effect must have a so-called cause. This is approaching Berkeley's theory of causation. It is not the theory of Hume, because Hume would have rejected any reference to the divine mind. At any rate, on that point he would have been decidedly Agnostic.

For Jews and students of Judaism, the influence of Gazzâlî upon Jewish philosophy is of deep interest. Dr. Joel, in his work on Don Chasdai Kreskas, compares the method of Kreskas to that of Gazzâlî, but is not inclined to place the indebtedness of Kreskas to Gazzâlî very high. Dr. Kaufmann, in his *Attributenlehre*, states how deeply Jehudah Hallevi in his *Kusari* was affected by Gazzâlî, and in many cases how he took bodily whole passages from the Moslem philosopher. But neither Al-Gazzâlî nor Jehudah Hallevi thought that a doctrine was true because it was absurd. Both wished for a reasonable religion, but each thought that Islam and Judaism respectively should teach its own truths without being incommoded by extraneous teachings.

Probably Al-Gazzâlî's most important theological work, at any rate his most popular, was his *Ihja'ulum ad-din*, "The Revival of Religious Knowledge." The extracts from it which lie before me are evidences of a religious spirit, and many of his sayings and quotations are truly spiritual, and prove that an ethical Islam is no contradiction, and that Islam, when rightly understood, is a true guide for conduct to those who would follow her. It is sometimes said that it is especially the teaching of Christianity that he who loses his life gains his life. Al-Gazzâlî quotes with approval the following saying of Moslem teachers: "The joy of heaven is only gained by him who is ready to give up the joys of earth." The education of the soul is compared to the weaning of an infant child. Of divorcing a wife he says that of all man's free acts it is the one most hateful in the sight of God.

What he says of metaphysics or religious philosophy is highly characteristic : "Metaphysics are necessary on account of the fancies of the men of our days, just in the same way as pilgrims to Mecca need protection from the Bedouin robbers. If the Arabs ceased from their attacks, the pilgrims would need no guard; and so, in the same way, if men gave up their new fancies, we should no longer require theology, for theology is not needed in an age of belief, such as the age of the companions of the prophet. But theology should know its limits, and bear in mind that its position to religion is that of a guard to the pilgrims on the road to Mecca." According to Gazzâlî, theology is a *pis-aller* or a necessary evil in an age of scepticism.

How far was Al-Gazzâlî serious ? Was he really a philosophical sceptic, or did he believe in philosophy and teach metaphysics to an inner circle ? This question has often been discussed, and the object of the work of Dr. Malter is to throw light on the question. At the end of some manuscripts of the Hebrew translation of the *Tahâfat*, a little work is added in which Al-Gazzâlî treats in obscure language some important philosophical questions. This work bears, through Moses Narboni, who translated the *Tahâfat*, the title בונת הבונות, "The Tendency of the Tendencies," and therefore seems to be intended as a supplement to Gazzâlî's own *Maqasid*. Dr. Malter restores the Hebrew text, and in his first part refers the work to its sources, either in Gazzâlî's own *Maqasid*, or in the astronomical work of Al-Ferganis, adding the Arabic text, and giving a German translation. In the second part he restores the Hebrew text, and refers simply to the *Maqasid*. In each part valuable notes are given. Dr. Malter, who is a pupil of Dr. Steinschneider, tells us that he has prepared a complete edition of the *Maqasid*. We trust that it may soon be published.

Dr. Malter decides the question of consistency or sincerity against Al-Gazzâlî. This is the generally received opinion. Averroes, who wrote against Gazzâlî's *Tahâfat* in the treatise *Tahâfat al-Tahâfat*, "Destruction of Destruction," accuses him of being an Asharite with the Asharites, a Sufi with the Sufites, a philosopher with the philosophers. Gazzâlî, speaking of the work which is assumed to be his, says at the end of it: "This work is to be communicated to those only who have a right mind and sound intelligence, in conformity with the maxim, 'Speak to men according to their intelligence.'" Ibn Tofail says of Al-Gazzâlî, in his well-known philosophical romance of *Hai ibn Yoqdan*, which has been translated into more than one European language, and is perhaps best known in Pococke's translation, which bears the name of *Philosophus autodidactus*, that "he now binds and then loosens, now denies certain things and then declares them to be

true." Al-Gazzâlî's character and position in Moslem thought are most interesting. He was more original than Jehudah Hallevi, but no one has ever doubted our Jewish poet-philosopher's truthfulness of heart.

L. M. SIMMONS.

GRÜNBAUM'S JUDEO-SPANISH CHRESTOMATHY.

Judeo-Spanish Chrestomathy, by M. GRÜNBAUM. Frankfurt a. M.: J. Kauffmann. 1896 (160 pp.).

M. R. FOULCHÉ-DELBOSC has opened the *Revue Hispanique*, edited by him, with a very interesting essay, entitled, *La Transcription Hispano-Hébraïque* (*Revue Hispanique*, Paris, 1894, i. 23 sqq.), which, it seems, was unknown to the author of the above-named book. If he had known it, his labour would have been less difficult, and he might have been induced besides, not to confine himself in his introduction to a discussion of the characteristic differences only between German-Jewish and Spanish-Jewish, but also to deal more fully with the peculiarities and the character of the latter dialect or of the *Ladino*. The Ladino, often called also *lengua castillana*, or *idioma español*, is an invaluable source for the investigation of the Old-Spanish language, and has, hitherto, not been made sufficient use of for this purpose. It is distinguished from Spanish or Castilian by the great number of Old-Spanish words and forms, which were still current at the time of the expulsion of the Jews from Spanish territory. Thus we find in the Ladino most frequently *m* for *n*, as *muestros*, *mos*, for *nuestros*, *nos*; *n* for *m*, as *tienpo* for *tiempo*, *conpañia* for *compañia*; the inserted *n*, *conplas* for *coplas*; the transposition of *d* and *r*, as *vedrad* for *verdad*, *acodro* for *acordo*, *pedrer* for *perder*; the prefixing of an *a* before verbs and other words, *aconjurar* for *conjurar*, *arobar* for *robar*, *afuera* for *fuera*; the use of *f* instead of *h*, as *facer* for *hacer*, *fasta* for *hasta*. The Ladino has often *pr*; thus *probre* for *pobre*, *presona* for *persona*, *probeza* for *pobreza*. The Ladino does not as a rule double the consonants; טיירה = *tierra*, קאריירה = *carrera*, &c.

M. Grünbaum, who published also a Chrestomathy of German-Jewish about fourteen years ago, gives in his book extracts from Spanish-Jewish translations of the Bible, the prayer-books, the Hagada of Passover, the *Pirke-Aboth*; also from ethical and religious works, such as *Choboth-Halebaboth*, *Kav-Hayashar*, *Shevet-Mussar*, *Peli-Yoëtz*; from Almosnino's *Regimiento de la Vida*, from didactic and cabbalistical, humoristic and entertaining writings, from the pretty abundant periodical literature, &c. The only thing we miss in the

Spanish-Jewish Chrestomathy is the Spanish-Jewish proper, or, to speak more plainly, the Spanish printed with Jewish, or so-called Rashi letters, with a transcription in Roman characters. If this had been done, the book would be of use to such also who can only read books with Hebrew characters, and the learning of the Ladino would thus become easier and more general.

M. Grünbaum's transcription is usually correct, and I shall only note here some slips. P. 67, read instead of *siendo el*, *siendo es* לאילנות כ״ה, *hazerlo* instead of *hazerto*, and *y con este se le* instead of *se te perdona*. P. 68, read *Le dimando como te* for *lo . . . pasas en aquel* mundo? *Loamos el Dio* for *à Dio*. P. 69, in the *Conplas de* בשבט ט״ו, rather incompletely reproduced, is found אסינדר לה מינורה, which Grünbaum transcribes: *â cenda la* מנורה! It should be: *hacender la menora*. P. 75, *desnudo y vario*: In the Ladino is read ואזיאו, i.e. *vacio*, and means, in connexion with the preceding *desnudo*, "naked and bare." אגונטאדו = *ajuntando*, אוזאנשאש = *usanzas*, not *asanzas*, for *fraguodo* read *fraguado*, &c. פאשיאדו (p. 73) must not be read *faxiado*, which is nowhere found, but *paseado*. *Ainde* (p. 89) is Old-Spanish, and means "before," &c.

The book, which is enriched by the learned author with many important bibliographical references, linguistic explanations, and several indices, is a valuable contribution to the Spanish-Jewish literature.

M. KAYSERLING.

SERMONS BY M. A. LÉVY.

Les Doctrines d'Israël: Sermons par ALFRED LÉVY, Grand Rabbin de Lyon. Lyon: Schneider Frères, 1896.

THIS volume is a collection of sermons of very unequal merit. Perhaps it will receive respectful attention on account of the position of the author, but depending entirely on its own virtues, it would hardly be welcomed with enthusiasm and delight. It is evidently a conscientious work, animated by a pure and lofty purpose; but it cannot be regarded as a rich contribution to the best pulpit literature of the day. In the preface (iii) the author sets himself the task of combating ignorance of Judaism from within and prejudice against Judaism from without, but the promise is hardly realized in the performance. To the general reader we fear the work will prove somewhat disappointing. It will appeal more readily to those who have preserved a natural taste for sweet and wholesome admonition of the old-fashioned type, and herein lies the main interest of the

sermons contained in this collection. But in justice to the preacher it should be noted that it is not at all improbable that some of these addresses, which are not too inspiriting to read, give the impression that they would have been stimulating to hear. With the exception of the sermons on state occasions, there is, however, an old-world air about the topics chosen, and a placid manner in which the subjects are treated. Pages often follow one another without a gleam of poetry or a spark of inspiration.

The arrangement also is far from being up to date. The selected sermons, ranging from the year 1871 to 1895, follow one another in chronological order, and are not divided according to their matter or the occasion of their delivery. Even the chronological order is not consistently adhered to, for in the Funeral Addresses, one delivered in 1886 (p. 326) and another in 1889 (p. 335) come *after* the one delivered in 1894 (p. 313).

The sermons comprise three for Passover, entitled "Feminine Piety" (p. 107), "Patriotism" (p. 252), and "Moral Freedom" (p. 293); three for Pentecost, "Ye are God's Children" (p. 31), "Respect for Life" (p. 191), and "The Virtuous Woman" (p. 229); two for New Year, "Creation" (p. 131), and "Prejudice" (p. 273); one for the Day of Atonement, "Reparation for and Pardon of Sin" (p. 151); and one for Purim, "Purim and the Alliance Israélite" (p. 171). The author's inaugural sermon, "The Mission of a Rabbi," begins on p. 79. Addresses at the consecration of a synagogue, "The Brotherhood of Man" (p. 55), the reconsecration of a synagogue, "The Temple" (p. 4), and the sermon delivered on the occasion of "The Centenary of the Revolution" (p. 211), constitute the remainder.

Many of the sermons contain attacks on anti-Semitism. The taste of such passages may be justified in the place and under the circumstances of their delivery, but the wisdom of their publication may be seriously doubted. While such attacks may confirm wavering French Jews in their faith in Judaism, they may be the cause of counter-replies, swelling the number of anti-Semitic writings.

The two best sermons in the volume are those entitled "Feminine Piety" (p. 107), and "The Centenary of the Revolution" (p. 211). These are pre-eminent, not so much for their homiletical value as for their eloquent historical summaries of certain episodes in French Jewish history. The following passage from the sermon on the Revolution is a fair specimen of the author's style at his best. "It is because we have proved to our dear France that the love of religion and the love of country strengthen and complete each other; that when necessity arises, even certain religious prohibitions

disappear before national obligations; it is because, from the time she gave us access to every career, we have served her with ardour and devotion in every path of human activity; it is because she has seen us and ever will see us ready to undergo any sacrifice and encounter any danger, even to shed our last drop of blood in defence of her integrity and honour, that she counts us among her children, and shows us the same tender affection as we feel for her. Whatever our detractors may say, France has not children more loving, more devoted, and more grateful than ourselves" (p. 221).

In England, where duelling is no more, the following extract will be read with interest: "But if it be our duty to follow the opinion of the majority, it is on the express condition that that opinion should be in conformity with the immutable laws of truth and justice. To follow it under all circumstances would be to expose ourselves sometimes to the sanction of great wrongs. What, for example, is more iniquitous than the duel? Is it not the height of absurdity that in order to save our honour we should have to incur the risk of receiving a mortal wound from him who has committed an outrage on our dignity?" (p. 287).

The author's treatment of quotations is tantalizing. Sometimes references are given, at other times they are omitted. In the former case, the quotations are usually familiar, and the best citations from Talmud or Midrash are left without any indication as to their exact source.

Although the volume is unequal in parts, one cannot fail to recognize the piety and the learning of the author. In closing the book one's only regret is that, as the primary facts of religion and morality are changeless, nothing would have been lost and much gained by these principles being clothed in a more modern garb.

S. LEVY.

THE PSALMS OF SOLOMON.

1. *Die Datierung der Psalmen Salomos, ein Beitrag zur jüdischen Geschichte*, von Lic. th. W. FRANKENBERG (Beihefte zur *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, Giessen, 1896).
2. *Les Dix-Huit Bénédictions et les Psaumes de Salomon*, par M. ISRAEL LÉVI (*Revue des Études Juives*, tome XXXII, No. 64, pp. 161–178).
3. Review of Frankenberg's essay, by Prof. E. SCHÜRER (*Theologische Literaturzeitung*, Feb. 6, 1897).

I HAVE placed these three publications together for obvious reasons. The review of Prof. Schürer, indeed, effectively disposes

of Herr Frankenberg's attempt to revive Ewald's theory that the Psalms of Solomon are a product of the Maccabean age. Not that the Pompeian theory is without difficulty. The Psalms are not, on the face of them, so distinctly of a party character as the now generally accepted theory of Wellhausen would require. Sometimes the atmosphere of the Psalms is better suited to the Maccabean period than to the age of Pompey. But Renan is simply begging the question when he remarks (*Histoire du Peuple d'Israël*, V, 150): "Les sources talmudiques ne mentionnent pas le siège de Pompée ; la *Megillath Taanith*, 'livre des jeûnes,' qui consacre des anniversaires insignifiants, n'a pas de souvenir pour cet évènement. Les vaincus de l'an 63 n'eurent pas la consolation ordinaire des vaincus, qui est de noircir leurs vainqueurs. Pompée ne fut nullement traité par la légende comme Nabuchodonosor et Tite. On admira sa modération ; on trouva qu'il s'était comporté selon ce que l'on attendait de sa vertu (Josephus, *Antiq.* XIV, iv, 4). Pas une trace de deuil ni de colère. Quand on compare cela au siège qui eut lieu cent trente-trois ans plus tard ! La chute des Amonéens fut évidemment une délivrance, un soulagement pour Israël." Between the lines of Josephus' mild account one can read that Pompey's entry to Jerusalem was marked by much oppression. The intrusion of Pompey into the Holy of Holies (Josephus, *Antiq.* XIV, iv, 4) must have left a strong impression on the Jewish imagination, but it may well have been obliterated later on by the more bitter memory of the deeds of Titus. In particular, Herr Frankenberg fails utterly to explain Ps. Sol. ii. 30–31 of Antiochus. To take this circumstantial account of the oppressor's death, with Ewald and Frankenberg, as a pious and unfulfilled wish, is indeed impossible. The verbal and general agreement of this passage with the death of Pompey as described by Plutarch is unanswerably close. And, as every one has recognized, the seventeenth Psalm clearly refers to Pompey, and has no relevance (esp. verse 9) to Antiochus.

Indeed, Herr Frankenberg's essay would hardly have been written had he been better acquainted with the literature of the subject. He does not meet some of the clearest points in favour of the Pompeian theory. He altogether ignores the phrase (xvii. 14) ἐξαπέστειλεν αὐτὰ ἕως ἐπὶ δυσμῶν, which exactly corresponds with the conduct of Pompey, who sent Aristobulus and his family to Rome to adorn his triumph. What prisoners were sent *to the West* by Antiochus? Against these and other definite points Frankenberg urges nothing. Yet he would have found them raised in the works of Ryle and James and of other writers on these Psalms. Again, would a Jewish writer have said of Antiochus that he came "from the uttermost parts of the earth"

(viii. 16)? What drought or famine (Ps. v) can be placed in the Maccabean age? Cf., however, Josephus, *Antiq.* XIV, ii, for a drought at the period of the outbreak of hostilities between Hyrcanus and Aristobulus. Finally, I recall no clear passage in the Psalms of Solomon parallel to the definite statements in Daniel and the Books of the Maccabees that the oppressor of the Jews forced the latter to partake of forbidden food. The only allusion in the Psalms of Solomon is to general desecrations of the altar by lax priests.

At the end of his essay Herr Frankenberg places a useful translation of the Psalms of Solomon into Hebrew. This translation is frequently happy and effective, but too often his Hebrew is the Hebrew of the dictionary. And it certainly arouses some astonishment to read the author's remark on p. 63: "Damit ist zugleich gesagt dass der Zweck dieser Version nicht der ist, eine lesbare hebräische Übersetzung zu liefern, sondern der rein wissenschaftliche, das verlorene Original wenigstens einigermassen dem Leser näher zu bringen." I know that some modern emendators of the MT. imagine that they can write better Hebrew than Isaiah, but it is a new thing to hear that the original Hebrew of the Psalms of Solomon was something else than "readable Hebrew."

Finally, I would refer those who are interested in the Psalms of Solomon to M. Israel Lévi's remarkable and original essay, which is placed second at the head of this notice. In this essay M. Lévi argues that the whole of the eighteen Benedictions were completed before the destruction of the Temple. Be that as it may, he proves that there are some striking parallels between the eighteen (or nineteen) Psalms of Solomon and the eighteen (or nineteen) Benedictions which appear in the daily service of the Synagogue. M. Lévi holds that the eighteen Benedictions were all composed earlier than the Psalms of Solomon, therefore before B.C. 63. Now it is very probable that the first three and the last three of the Benedictions are even as old as the Maccabean period. But are the rest as old? M. Lévi lays down the canon: "Selon qu'une œuvre littéraire des derniers temps de l'indépendance juive trahit de l'hostilité ou de l'admiration ou simplement de l'ignorance à l'égard des Romains, on peut affirmer qu'elle est antérieure ou postérieure à cet évènement (viz. the campaign of Pompey). Le Schemonè-Esré doit donc avoir été composé, dans ses plus récentes parties, avant l'année 63."

But I cannot see the force of this argument. On the contrary there are two good reasons why the Psalms of Solomon seem anterior to the eighteen Benedictions in their complete form. First, the Psalms of Solomon were evidently written at a special, defined crisis. It is far more probable that some of its ideas were subsequently *generalized*

than that a general form already existent would be specialized to suit the case of Pompey. The analogy of the canonical Psalms strongly supports my view.

But, secondly, M. Lévi's brilliant discovery of a parallel between the eighteen Benedictions and the Psalms of Solomon, suggests the solution of a very serious problem. "It is possible" (write Messrs. Ryle and James, p. lix.) "that the whole collection of the Psalms of Solomon was intended for public or even liturgical use." In two passages the word διάψαλμα (Selah) occurs, viz. in xvii. 31 and xviii. 10, while the titles of Psalms viii, νίκος; x and xiv, ὕμνος, point to a musical setting. True, these headings and the occurrence of Selah have been regarded as interpolations, but if so, why are similar additions not more frequent? Copyists would have thrown in more than a paltry doublet of Selahs if they were arbitrarily inserting them. Again, and this is important, Psalm ix. concludes: τοῦ κυρίου ἡ ἐλεημοσύνη ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον Ἰσραὴλ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα καὶ ἔτι; Psalms x–xii with similar verses. I must quote the close of Psalm xi: ποιήσαι κύριος ἃ ἐλάλησεν ἐπὶ Ἰσραὴλ καὶ ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ ἀναστήσαι κύριος τὸν Ἰσραὴλ ἐν ὀνόματι δόξης αὐτοῦ· τοῦ κυρίου τὸ ἔλεος ἐπὶ τὸν Ἰσραὴλ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα καὶ ἔτι. Cf. also Psalm iii. 2, and other passages. Now these are clear doxologies, or indications that the Psalms were used in public worship. If so, why has all trace of them vanished from Jewish sources? M. Lévi supplies the answer. Because they were effaced by the eighteen Benedictions which were probably completed long after B. C. 63. It may be, as Prof. Cheyne says, that the Psalms of Solomon are "a fine specimen of the best Judaism of their time," but the eighteen Benedictions are a finer specimen. "Noticeable," says M. Israel Lévi, "is the serenity that reigns in the eighteen Benedictions." There is no recrimination for any but *internal* foes. Hence they were in every way more suitable for public worship than a Psalter which was written in the throes of an invasion. Hence, perhaps, the Psalter was deposed from its temporary place in the liturgy, and in consequence fell into oblivion among the Jews.

I. ABRAHAMS.

THE

JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW

JULY, 1897

THE HEBREW TEXT OF ECCLESIASTICUS.

THE original Hebrew text of the Book of Sirach, from which Saadiah, a thousand years ago, made several quotations, and which was regarded as hopelessly lost, has, by the fortunate discovery of Mr. S. Schechter and Dr. Neubauer, again become—at least so far as the fifth Part (xxxix. 15–xlix. 11) is concerned—one of the recovered possessions of science.

Grateful as all feel for the discovery, we are equally thankful for the speedy appearance of the excellent edition of the fragments (Cowley and Neubauer, *The Original Hebrew of a portion of Ecclesiasticus.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1897). My present intention is to offer a contribution to their correct estimation and appreciation. In the major portion of my remarks, suggestions are made for the correction of the errors of the Hebrew text (Part III); and the *prima facie* probability is established that this text of the Book of Sirach is corrupted by a large number and variety of mistakes which, however, did not exist in the texts used by the Greek and Syriac translators, though those texts were also corrupt, as is sufficiently apparent from the exegesis of the book.

A few glaring examples, especially in the Greek version, are collated in the first part; while in the second part some misunderstandings of the Greek translator, and a few cor-

ruptions of the Greek text are pointed out, by the aid of the Hebrew original. The gaps in the Hebrew text, arising from the condition of the extant fragments, have not been supplied in the edition. But in the English translation, the editors have supplied the defects by what must, on the whole, be pronounced happy conjectures. In the fourth part I have attempted to fill the greater portion of the lacunae regarded, even in the translation, as hopeless. In the fifth and last part, I offer various remarks on the linguistics of the Hebrew text from the lexicographical point of view. This text is of the highest value for the history of the Hebrew language, and especially for the origin of the Mishna dialect. Yet, while bearing this in mind, one must not lose sight of the fact—emphasized at the beginning of the last part—that Sirach enriched his diction by consciously borrowing, for the sake of ornament, phrases from the Biblical writings.

His vocabulary and phraseology he draws from the ancient literature mainly. His plane and range of diction differs, however, from that of the later Biblical authors, who adopt the expressions of their predecessors. Sirach is the oldest example of the style that constructs sentences out of a mosaic of Biblical phrases. The quotations from the Syriac version I transcribe in Hebrew letters. On a few occasions I quote Prof. R. Smend's remarks on the edition of the text of Sirach, in the *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, 22nd year, No. 6, cols. 161–166.

I. *False readings in the original Hebrew text which the Greek translator used.*

xxxix. 26. In Hebrew, the verse 26 c is to be completed thus: חָלָב ודבש [וְחֵלֶב חטים]. The Syriac has ותרבא וחטא instead of ותרבא דחטא. The Greek καὶ σεμίδαλις πυρός, corrupted from σεμίδαλις πυροῦ, i. e. וסלת חטים. Cp. Ex. xxix. 3. That וחלב חטים is the original reading is proved not only by the agreement between the Hebrew and the Syriac versions,

but also by the fact that the next *stichos* contains the phrase דם ענב as the term for "wine," borrowed from Deut. xxxii. 14, where also occurs the expression חלב כליות חטה identical with חלב חטים Ps. cxlvii. 14.

xxxix. 28. Heb. הרים יעתיקו (cp. Job ix. 5); Syr. טורא עקרן; Gk. *ἐστερέωσαν μάστιγας αὐτῶν.* Corresponding somewhat to this phrase is חָרִים יחזיקו.

xxxix. 30 d. Heb. בְּאַצָּרוֹ; Gk. *ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς*=בארצו. Possibly the original Hebrew reading was באצרות Job xxxviii. 22.

xl. 5. Heb. אך קנאה; Gk. *θυμὸς καὶ ζῆλος*, i.e. אף וקנאה (also Syr. רוגזא). But אך is the correct reading. This verse belongs to ver. 1 c "From the day of his birth till his death . . . nothing but jealousy, anxiety, terror." Cp. אך טוב וחסד Ps. xxiii. 6. The editors consider אף to be the original reading and correct the Hebrew accordingly.

xl. 29 c. Combining the readings in the text and margin the Heb. would be נפש מטעמי זבד (=מגעל) מעגל. The Gk. read, instead of מטעמי זבד, מטעמים זרים, *ἐν ἐδέσμασιν ἀλλοτρίοις.* In ver. 29 d, the Greek translator read, instead of יְפוּר (the marginal variant), יָסוּר or יִפּוֹר, and rendered it *πεπαιδευμένος.* The Syr. has באבא = (יְפוּרִי).

xli. 11. Heb. הבל; Gk. *πένθος*=אֵבֶל.

xli. 12. Heb. אוצרות חמדה (thus the marginal variant, not אוצרות חכמה; cp. Hos. xiii. 15, אוצר כל כלי חמדה); Gk. *θησαυροὶ χρυσίου*=אוצרות חרוץ.

xli. 14 a. Heb. מוסר בשת; Gk. *παιδείαν ἐν εἰρήνῃ*, i.e. מוסר בשלום.

xli. 16 c. Heb. ולא כל הכלם נבחר (parallel with לא כל בשת נאה לשמור); Gk. *καὶ οὐ πάντα πᾶσιν ἐν πίστει εὐδοκιμεῖται.* He read in his text ולא הכל לכל באמונה נבחן.

xli. 18. Heb. מאדון וגברת (see Ps. cxxiii. 2); Gk. *ἀπὸ κριτοῦ καὶ ἄρχοντος.* He read מדין וגבור.

xli. 19 b. See Part II of these notes.

xlii. 8 d. Heb. צנוע; Gk. *δεδοκιμασμένος*; perhaps צרוף.

xliii. 13. Heb. תתוה ברק; Gk. *κατέπαυσεν χιόνα.* Perhaps תחנה ברד; the verb being in the Hiphil and transitive form and ברד taken in the sense of שלג, "snow."

xliii. 19. Heb. ויציץ כספיר ציצים; Gk. *καὶ παγεῖσα γίνεται σκολόπων ἄκρα.* Possibly ויתיצב כסירי קוצים.

xliii. 21 a. Heb. יבול הרים בַּחֹרֶב יִשָּׁיק; Gk. *καταφάγεται ὄρη καὶ ἔρημον ἐκκαύσει* = יאכל (or יכלה) הרים וערבה ישיק.

xliii. 21 b. Heb. ונוה, which the editors render "stateliness," their reference being Ezek. vii. 11 (נֵהָה). But the original reading must obviously have been יִכְוֶה = "he burns"; parallel to יִשָּׁיק = "he kindles, destroys by fire" in the previous passage. And from this follows naturally the Greek translation *ἀποσβέσει* = יכבה.

xliv. 13. Heb. זכרם; Syr. דוכרנהון; Gk. *σπέρμα αὐτῶν*, i.e. זרעם.

xliv. 19. Heb. דופי (the marginal variant, which is more original than the reading מום in the text); Gk. *ὅμοιος* = דומה.

xlvi. 1 c. Heb. בימין; Gk. *κατὰ τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ* = בשמו.

xlvii. 6. Heb. בנות; Gk. *ἐν μυριάσιν* = ברבבות; ibid. ברבבה; Gk. *ἐν εὐλογίαις Κυρίου*, possibly ברכות.

xlviii. 10 d. Heb. ולהבין (Syr. ולמסברו "to instruct"); Gk. *καὶ καταστῆσαι* = ולהכין.

xlviii. 13. Heb. ומתחתיו נברא בשרו. The editors read with the Greek translator נִבָּא for נִבְרָא, and render the phrase "and from its place his flesh prophesied." But this is neither a clear reference to 2 Kings xiii. 21, which is already alluded to in ver. 14 b (ובמותו תמהי מעשה), nor is the use of the term נבא in this sense probable. I rather think that this passage refers to Elisha's miracle, recorded in 2 Kings iv. 34, when the prophet lay upon the dead boy and brought him back to life; the meaning would be "and under him the flesh was recreated." For נברא in this sense see Ps. civ. 30 תשלח רוחך יבראון "Thou sendest forth thy spirit, they are recreated." Instead of בשרו, the reading should be בשר. The Greek translator read נבא instead of נברא, and understood the verse to refer to 2 Kings xiii. 21.

xlviii. 18 d. Heb. ויגדף אל בנאונו (cp. Isa. xxxvii. 23 את מי חרפת וגדפת); Gk. *καὶ ἐμεγαλαύχησεν ὑπερηφανίᾳ αὐτοῦ*. Instead of ויגדף אל, the Greek seems to have read ויתגדל (cp. Isa. x. 15).

xlix. 9. Heb. וגם הזכיר את איוב המכלכל כל דרכי צדק, i. e. "Ezekiel also mentioned Job who observed all the paths of righteousness." As Ben Sirach had no opportunity, in his eulogy of the Fathers, to mention Job, the hero of one of the books of the Bible, it is quite intelligible that he should have mentioned him in connexion with Ezekiel, who is also only once referred to by our author (xlix. 8). The reference is to Ezek. xiv. 14. He uses, with a slight change, the expression in Ps. cxii. 5 יכלכל דבריו במשפט. The Greek translator read אויב instead of איוב, and thought of Ezek. xxxviii, and must have divided the words המכלכל כל, and have read במטר לכלכל. See Ezek. xxxviii. 22 אמטיר עליו. Also Syr. has איוב. (See also Geiger's *Gesammelte Schriften*, III, 282.)

Smend (col. 165) thinks that the original reading was אזכיר, and asserts that he has, by the aid of photography, deciphered after איוב the letters נב, which he completes into נביא. But apart from the improbability of the title "prophet" being given to Job, איוב נביא is grammatically inaccurate. It would have to be איוב הנביא.

II. *The Greek translator's misunderstandings cleared up by the text before us.*

Corruptions in the Greek text.

xxxix. 23. Heb. זעמו גוים יוריש "His wrath dispossesses nations." Cp. אוריש גוים Exod. xxxiv. 24; הורשת גוים Ps. xliv. 3. The translator understands יוריש in the sense of "cause to inherit" followed by a double accusative (cp. Job xiii. 26), and renders ὀργὴν αὐτοῦ ἔθνη κληρονομήσει.

xl. 9. Heb. תולדו; the Greek translator did not read תּוֹלִידוּ but תִּוָּלְדוּ; hence γεννηθήσεσθε.

xli. 19 b. אלה the Greek translator read as אֱלֹהַּ, and rendered it θεοῦ. The word before אלה is missing in the Hebrew, and the Hebrew equivalent to ἀπὸ ἀληθείας in the Greek version is no longer apparent. Possibly מחמס

was the word (cp. חמסו תורה Zeph. iii. 4), for which the translator read מאמת.

xlii. 24. שנים the Greek translator read, not שׁוֹנִים, but שְׁנַיִם, and renders it *δισσά*; also the Syriac תרין תרין.

xlv. 12 d. The Hebrew read, according to the correct completion of the lacuna, מחמד עינים וכליל יופי. In the Greek version the word יפי is taken as the beginning of the next verse, *ὡραῖα*.

xlvi. 3. Heb. מי הוא לפניו יחיצב; Gk. *τίς πρότερον αὐτοῦ οὕτως ἔστη*; The Greek translator took לפניו in the temporal sense, while the true meaning is as in Joshua i. 5 "Who could stand his ground before him?" This misunderstanding necessitated the addition of *οὕτως*.

xli. 1 d. Gk. *καὶ ἔτι ἰσχύοντι ἐπιδέξασθαι τροφήν*; Heb. ועוד בו חיל לקבל תענוג; Syr. ותוב איתּ ביה חילא למקבלו תפניקא. Obviously, instead of *τροφήν* the reading should be *τρυφήν*. The sentence then becomes characteristic—"He is still capable of enjoying the pleasures of life."

xlii. 21 b. Gk. *ἕως ἔστιν*; Heb. אחד הוא. Hence the reading should be *εἷς ἐστίν*.

xliii. 9 b. Gk. *ἐν ὑψίστοις Κύριος*; Heb. במרומי אל. Hence *ἐν ὑψίστοις Κυρίου*, as most MSS. read.

III. *Emendation of the Hebrew text, mostly with the aid of the Greek Version.*

xxxix. 17 d. Instead of אוצרו read אוצרות (see Ps. xxxiii. 7); Gk. *ἀποδοχεῖα ὑδάτων*. The last word in 17 c is certainly to be read נד, and is also derived from Ps. xxxiii. 7. יעמד could easily turn into יעריך. The whole *stichos* would therefore read ברברו יעמד נד (Gk. *ἐν λόγῳ αὐτοῦ ἔστη ὡς θημωνιὰ ὕδωρ*); in 17 d, the original must also have been, instead of ומוצא פיו, ובמוצא פיו (=*καὶ ἐν ῥήματι στόματος αὐτοῦ*).

xxxix. 21. Instead of נבחר read נברא (=*ἔκτισται*). Only thus does the sentence make sense: "Everything has been created for his use." Syr. עבידין. See also xxxix. 30 c, where the Hebrew נבראו has also the marginal variant נבחרו.

xxxix. 24. Instead of לזרים read לזדים. Gk. *ἀνόμοις*; Syr. לרשיעי.

xxxix. 25 a must read טוב לטובים חלק מראש. For חָלַק the Greek has *ἔκτισται*; Syr. אתבריה, which, however, seems to be a free rendering of חָלַק. The verb is used in the same sense as in Deut. iv. 19, where the Vulgate renders also חלק with "creavit" (Septuagint: *ἀπένειμε*).

xl. 3 a. לגבה; Gk. *ἐν δόξῃ*. We must therefore read לכבוד. Cp. כסא כבוד, 1 Sam. ii. 8.—Ibid. 3 b. Heb. עד לשוב (marginal variant לובש, which is recognized by the editors); Syr. ועדמא ליתבי, i.e. עד לְיֹשֵׁב; the Greek has *ἕως τεταπεινωμένου*, and accordingly read עד לנשפל, or, as Smend, col. 164, thinks, לשח. Cp. 1 Sam. ii. 8, from which verse also is derived the expression יושב כסא לכבוד. For עד ל . . ., see Ezra ix. 4 עד למנחת ערב.

xl. 6 c. מעט טע gives no sense whatsoever. The connexion, and also the Gk. *τεθορυβημένος*, suggests מרתיע, and eventually מרטיע "He is terrified by the vision of his soul." Cp. Talmud Jerushalmi Berachoth, 6 d, והרתיע מלפניו במרתיע מפני הנחש. Of the root רטע, Levy gives only one example (following the Aruch article רטע, ed. Kohut, VII. 272 a), from the Yelamdenu: היא מרטעת.

xl. 13 a. For the unintelligible מחול אל חול the margin has the variant חיל מחיל, which the editors render "riches born of riches," which, however, does not give clear sense. The Gk. *χρήματα ἀδίκων* suggests the correct reading חֵיל מְעַוֶּל (see Ps. lxxi. 4), possibly originally meant to be חַיִל מֵעָוֶל (cp. הון מהבל Prov. xiii. 11). Smend adopts this reading. חיל מעול could easily have become חיל מחיל; this combination is reminiscent of Ps. lxxxiv. 8, מחיל אל חיל, and thus this phrase found its way into the text and became corrupted into חול. The Syriac also has נכסא דשוקרא.

xl. 20. Heb. יין ושכר יעליצו לב; Syr. חמרא עתיקא מחדא לבא. The Syriac version, like the Targum, takes שכר to mean "old wine," and disregards יין. Consequently, it puts for ומשניהם the singular ומטבא מנה. The Greek has *οἶνος καὶ μουσικά*, i.e. יין ושיר. This seems to have been the original

version. "Wine and song" always go together as sources of joy. Cp. xlix. 1 c וכמזמור על משתה היין, and Isa. xxiv. 9 בשיר לא ישתו יין.

חיי יין ושכר, xl. 18 is, in any case, a corruption of the original reading, neither does the marginal variant יותר שכל give correct sense. In the Syriac this *stichos* is absent. The Greek has *ζωὴ αὐτάρκους ἐργάτου*. שָׂכִיר might correspond to *ἐργάτου*. The verb ימתקו suggests Koheleth v. 11 מתוקה שנת העבד; and if we assume that the sentence originally read חיי יָשֵׁן ושכיר ימתקי, we obtain the Hebrew and Greek. The Greek understands יָשֵׁן as the labourer resting after his task is accomplished, in the same sense as in the text just quoted from Koheleth.

xl. 27 b. For וכן כל כבוד read ועל כל כבוד; Gk. *καὶ ὑπὲρ πᾶσαν δόξαν*. The entire passage is taken from Isa. iv. 5, except that חפתה is substituted for חפה, with a reference to יראת אלהים. The term ערן, in the first *stichos*, makes the supposition probable that Sirach, in using חפתה, also thought of the glory of Paradise, with a reference to Ezek. xxviii. 14, בעדן גן אלהים היית כל אבן יקרה מסכתך. In the Midrash, מסכתך is explained as equivalent to חפה (cp. the thirty-two rules of R. Eliezer b. R. Jose Hagelili, rule 17); and Ezekiel's description is applied to the glorious tent given to the first man in Paradise.

xli. 14 a. Instead of שמעו read שמרו; Gk. *συντηρήσατε*. This corresponds to ver. 16 b, לא כל בשת נאה לשמור.

xli. 17. וְשָׂר, the marginal note, is better than יושב in the text adopted by the editors. Gk. *καὶ δυνάστου*. ושר might easily have become ישב.

xli. 19 a. For זר the word in the original text was probably גזל; Gk. *περὶ κλοπῆς*.

xli. 21 b. מחשבות מחלקות מנה in the Hebrew gives no sense. The Greek has *ἀπὸ ἀφαιρέσεως μερίδος καὶ δόσεως*. That would be מֵהַשְׁבִּית חלק ומתנה. This suits the context, and the verb מהשבית co-ordinates with the remaining verbs מהשיב (21 a, which the editors correctly substitute for מחשב), מהחריש, מהביט.

xlii. 1 f. Instead of ואל תשא פנים וחטא read ואל תשא פני חטא "Do not regard sin," in accordance with the Gk. *καὶ μὴ λάβῃς πρόσωπον τοῦ ἁμαρτάνειν.*

xlii. 9 d. . . . בנעוריה פן תגור ובבתוליה פן. The second *stichos*, the last word of which is missing, is translated by the editors "and in her virginity lest she be defiled." They thus seem to have conjectured תֵּעָנֶּה as the last word. But the word בנעוריה in the first *stichos* does not correspond to בבתוליה in the second; especially as the latter term occurs immediately after, at the beginning of ver. 10 a. The marginal variant has, instead of בנעוריה, בבית אביה; and, instead of בבתוליה, בבית בעלה. The same sense is given in the Gk. *καὶ συνῳκηκυῖα μή ποτε μισηθῇ*; and in the Syr. ומן בעלה דלא תסתנא. The original reading was, therefore, וּבַבְּעוּלָה "and with the married woman," which the marginal variant paraphrases with בבית בעלה. The conclusion, according to the Greek and Syriac, must have been פֶּן תִּשָּׁנֵא (cp. Deut. xxi. 15). תִּשָּׁנֵא changed into the marginal variant תנשה (cp. Isa. xliv. 21).

xlii. 15 c. Instead of רצונו read נוצרו. Yet the margin has the reading מעשיו (=נוֹצָרִין), and this corresponds with the Gk. *τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ* and with the Syriac עבדוהי.

xlii. 25 b. Instead of וימי read ומי, which is also tacitly assumed in the English translation.

xliii. 4 a. כור נפוח מהם מצוק gives no sense, and the translation of this passage is followed by a query. Instead of מצוק the margin has מוצק. It should probably, however, read מֻחָם, instead of מהם. "The furnace glows with the strong heat." The Greek and Syriac had another text.— Instead of שולח in 4 b, the original reading was certainly שלוש; Gk. *τριπλασίως*; Syr. חד תלתא. The sense is: "the sun heats the mountain thrice as powerfully as a furnace."

xliii. 5. ודבריו ינצח אביריו gives no sense. I propose to read ודברו ינצח אֶבְרוֹ "His (God's) word gives power to the wings of the sun," i.e. God's word enables the sun to traverse its path rapidly. Mal. iii. 20 also speaks of the wings of the sun (ומרפא בכנפיה). The Greek and Syriac translate in the same sense *καὶ ἐν λόγοις αὐτοῦ κατέσπευσεν πορείαν*; ובמלי

קדישא סרהב הלכתיה. Their text seems to have had as its last word, not אברו, but ארחו (cp. Ps. xix. 6). In the same sense נִצַּח may be taken in ver. 13 b, ותנצח זיקות, where the Greek translates καὶ ταχύνει ἀστραπάς, describing the swift lightning. The Glossary, p. xxxiii, explains נִצַּח as "to make brilliant." But the agreement of the two passages and the Greek version prove that the verb has the meaning "to hasten," literally "to give strength for a rapid flight." The marginal note on xliii. 13 reads ותזנח יקום במ, which gives no sense. יקום is a corruption of זקים (a variant in one instance for זיקות); and ותזנח is a corruption of ותזנק, to be read as וַיְתַזֵּנֵק, according to Deut. xxxiii. 22, and rendered in a transitive sense "to sprinkle," "to shoot forth." The verb is used in the Talmud with this transitive meaning, of the gushing forth of blood. See the examples in Levy, I, 546 a. במ is an abbreviation of במשפט.

xliii. 20 b. וכרקב יקפיא מקוה (*sic* in margin; the text has מקורו instead of מקוה). וכרקב gives no sense. It must have probably read וכרקיע "He congeals the mass of water like the firmament." The smooth, shining surface of the ice is compared to the sky. The Midrash Genesis Rabba (c. 4, beginning) represents the origin of the sky as an icy congelation of the upper waters, גלדה טפה האמצעית. Talmud Jerushalmi Berachoth, 2 c, גלד הרקיע. Cp. also Ezek. i. 2 רקיע כעין הקרח הנורא.

xliii. 23 a. מחשבתו . . שיק רבה. The editors complete the middle word תשיק and translate "burneth up." The added query is justified. In Greek the equivalent is ἐκόπασεν, this suggests תשקיע. Cp. Amos ix. 5 ושקעה.

xliii. 23 c. According to the Gk. ἐφύτευσε, the original reading was ויטע, instead of ויט. But the latter term also gives good sense, as describing the stretching forth of islands across the length and breadth of the sea.

xliii. 27. לא נוסף does not fit in with the context. Read לא נסוף "we cannot come to an end," if we wish to enumerate all the wonderful works of God. This agrees with the Gk. καὶ οὐ μὴ ἀφικώμεθα.

xliv. 4 c. The marginal variant for בספרתם is במס׳. This suggests במוסרם, like the Gk. *ἐν παιδείᾳ αὐτῶν*. Smend thinks that the word signifies "in their scholarship." I, however, fancy that this abstract derivative from סוֹפֵר is improbable.

xliv. 4 d. במשמרותם must be emended into בממשלותם. ממשלות is in New Hebrew frequently used for משלים. See Levy, III, 144 a. The Syriac has בתשבחתהון, and accordingly read במזמוריהם. According to my emendation, the verse would read חכמי שיח במוסרם ומושלים בממשלותם, and excellently describes the men versed in proverbs, whose aim is מוסר, and whose medium of instruction is the משל.

xliv. 8. For בנחלתם read בתהלתם; Gk. *ἐπαίνους*; Syr. תשבחתהון.

xliv. 10. Originally read וצדקתם לא תשכח.

xliv. 18 a. Originally read ברית עולם כרת עמו.

xlv. 1. Instead of זכרו לטובה, the eulogistic addition after Moses' name, the Greek has *οὗ τὸ μνημόσυνον ἐν εὐλογίαις*. So also Syr. דוכרנה לבורכתא, equal to זכרו לברכה. This seems to have been the original reading. For xlvi. 11, speaking of the judges of antiquity, has יהי זכרם לברכה. That is the oldest example of this formula in mentioning names of deceased. See on this subject Zunz, *Zur Geschichte und Literatur*, p. 322.

xlv. 7 d. Instead of בתועפות ראם, which gives here no sense, read במעטה תהלה from Isa. lxi. 3, where the LXX translates *καταστολὴν δόξης*. In this passage the Greek has *περιστολὴν* (var. *στολὴν*) *δόξης*. A trace of תהלה is to be found in the variant תואר.

xlv. 8 b. Instead of בכבוד ועוז read בכלי עוז; Gk. *σκεύεσιν ἰσχύος*; Syr. במאנא דתוקפא. כלים means "garments."

xlv. 10 a. וארגמן is to be connected with the second *stichos*.

xlv. 10 c. Instead of אפוד ואזור the Greek translator had in his text אורים ותמים, which here agrees better with the context.

xlv. 12 a. מעיל between עטרת פז and מצנפת is senseless.

This garment was also named in ver. 8 c. We should therefore read מֵעַל למצנפת (Gk. *ἐπάνω κιδάρεως*), which is the same as על המצנפת מלמעלה Exod. xxxix. 23.

xlv. 25 c. נחלת אש לפני כבודו gives absolutely no sense. I propose to read נחלת ישי לבנו לבדו, which presents a contrast to the following *stichos*, נחלת אהרן לכל זרעו. The sovereignty descends from father to son; the priesthood to all descendants of Aaron. See Geiger, *Nachgelassene Schriften*, III, 279. This is the sense given by the Greek and Syriac. But they translate the first two words *κληρονομία βασιλέως*, יורתנא דמלכא, which should therefore read נחלת מלך.

xlv. 26. After ויתן לכם חכמת לב add לשפוט עמו בצדק. Thus the Greek. The Syriac has לשפוט עמו בשמו.

xlvi. 1 e. להנקם נקמי אויב cannot mean "to execute vengeance upon the enemy," for נָקָם has no plural; and להנקם נקם אויב or להנקם נקמת אויב would mean "to take vengeance—on behalf of the enemy," not "against the foe." Cp. נקם נקמת בני ישראל Num. xxxi. 2; ונקמתי את נקמתך Jer. li. 36. Instead of נקמי אויב read בְּקָמֵי א׳, and this would be equivalent to באויבים הקמים, which the Greek translator renders *ἐπεγειρομένους ἐχθρούς*. The Syriac translates freely מן גברא סנאא.

xlvi. 7 c. Instead of בפרע read בפרץ. So also the Syr. בתורעתא דעמא. Cp. xlv. 23 d ויעמד בפרץ עמו.

xlvii. 7 b. Instead of ויתן בפלשתים ערים read נקם ב׳ ו׳. Cp. Ezek. xxv. 14 ונתתי את נקמתי באדום. The Syriac also translates thus: ואתפרע מן פלשתיא. The Greek translator renders *καὶ ἐξουδένωσεν Φυλιστιεὶμ τοὺς ὑπεναντίους*. He must have had ויחרם פלשתים הקמים.

xlvii. 11 d. Instead of ירושלם read, with the Greek and Syriac, ישראל.

xlvii. 18 c. Instead of כברזל read, with the Greek and Syriac, כבדיל.

xlviii. 4 b. After אשר, add מי.

xlviii. 8. Instead of מלא read מלך. This refers to Jehu, the king who executed vengeance (Gk. *ἀνταπόδομα*) on the house of Ahab. Jehu was not indeed anointed by Elijah, but Elijah gave him the impulse to his work (1 Kings xix.

16). The Greek and Syriac Versions, which read מלכי, think of Hazael as well as of Jehu (1 Kings xix. 15).

IV. *Gaps in the Hebrew text supplied from the Greek or Syriac Versions.*

xxxix. 17 d. See supra, under III.

xxxix. 28 b. [ובחמתם הר]ים יעתיקו.

xl. 26 d. [מטמ]ון does not suit the context. The equivalent to the corresponding Greek term (*βοήθειαν*) and Syriac (מעדרנא) is עזרה. Possibly we should supply [משע]ן.

xli. 5 b. ע[תולדת רש]ונכד אויל. In the first *stichos*, דבר רעים (variant דבת רעים) is a corruption of תולדת רעים. The Syriac has in both halves of the verse תולדתא.

xli. 20 b, 21 c. מהביט [אל אשה זרה] ומה[ש] ק[יף] [א]ל בעולה.

xlii. 23 a. [עד] ל[י וקים] הוא ח. Syr. וחיין וקיימין לעלמין.

xliii. 14 b. [ענן כרשף] ויעף. See ver. 17 c.

xliii. 15. [בגדלו הגביר עננים] ל[הפיץ אבני ברד].

xlv. 3 a. [אותות הסי]ר בדברו. See Exod. viii. 5, 27; x. 17.

xlv. 13 b. זר [בשם לעולם] ולא ל.

xlv. 20 d. חלקו [כי אשי יי].

xlv. 23 b. [בגבורה ה]בגבורה.

xlvi. 6 a. [ויפי] ל[ם] [על העם] וב[מורד האבידם].

xlvii. 10. נה [בכל שנה וש] ל[חגים הוד] [שָׁם].

xlvii. 11. [גם] יי׳ העביר פשעו.

xlvii. 22 c. [ויתן ל]יעקב פליטה [ול]דוד ממנו שרש.

xlviii. 3 b. [ויורד שלש] אשות.

xlviii. 11. אשר ראך ומת [הוא]? [לא כ]ן חיה יחיה "Shall he that saw thee, die? Nay, he shall surely live." After the Syriac.

xlviii. 12. [בסער נלקח] ואלישע [נמלא רוחו] אליהו.

xlviii. 22 d. [אשר צוה ישעיה הנביא הגדול והנאמן בחזונו].

xlviii. 23. [בימיו עמד השמש ויוסף על חיי המלך].

V. *Sirach's Vocabulary.*

In regard to the lexicographical peculiarities of Sirach, we must first note the circumstance that he borrows a

quantity of ready-made expressions and phrases from the Scriptures. One can say that Sirach already exhibits that mosaic style which is characteristic of the productions of the later post-Talmudical Hebrew literature. The chapters before us can furnish us with a large number of examples of this style. In the following list I omit those passages where Sirach quotes Biblical phrases, because the subjects are taken from the Bible: as e. g. the description of the high-priest's garments, &c. An example of mosaic work is the Biblical phrase used in a sense different to that it has in the original passage from which it is taken: e. g. the expression אם כל חי is used of the earth, the mother of all living, while in Gen. iii. 20 it designates Eve. The most noteworthy of Biblical phrases in these chapters, used by Sirach for the adornment of style, are the following:—

אבני חפץ xlv. 11 (Isa. liv. 12).
אין אונים וחסר עצמה xli. 2 (Isa. xl. 26).
להדריכו על במתי ארץ xlvi. 9 (Deut. xxiii. 29; Amos iv. 13).
בני בשן xlvii. 3 (Deut. xxxii. 14).
ש[יא]ל[גח ברד] xlvi. 5 (Ps. xviii. 23).
דם ענב xxxix. 26 (Deut. xxxii. 14).
הרים יעתיקו xxxix. 27 (Job ix. 5).
וזה חזיתי ואספרה xlii. 15 (Job xv. 17).
חלב חטה xxxix. 26 c (see above, Part I).
ותחלל את יצועיך xlvii. 20 (Gen. xlix. 4).
חזין קולות xl. 13 (Job xxxviii. 25).
חרב נוקמת xxxix. 30 (Lev. xxvi. 25).
חרחר וחרב xl. 9 (Deut. xxviii. 22).
מים עד ים ומנהר עד אפסי ארץ xliv. 21 (Ps. lxxii. 8).
ויהפך למלח מלשקה xxxix. 23 (an allusion to the destruction of Sodom; משקה in Gen. xiii. 10).
נוחו על משכבו xlvi. 19 (Isa. lvii. 2; cp. Kethuboth, 104 a).
נין ונכד xlvii. 22; xli. 5 (Isa. xiv. 22).
עטרת פז xlv. 12 (Ps. xxi. 4).
על כל כבוד חפתה xl. 27 (see above, Part III).
עפר ואפר xl. 3 (Gen. xviii. 27).
שביב אשו xlv. 19 (Job xviii. 5).

וישבר להם מטה לחם xlviii. 2 (Lev. xxvi. 26).
שד ושבר xl. 9 (Isa. lx. 18).
שחק מאזנים xlii. 4 (Isa. xl. 15).
שן סלע xl. 15 (Job xxxix. 28).

That Sirach used such words, which occur very seldom, is evident from the Glossary which Driver has carefully compiled. To these words belongs also זַן, plural זנים, in the sentence on Ezekiel xlix. 8, יחזקאל ראה מראה ויגד זני מרכבה. Yet it is not quite clear what is meant by "divers kinds of chariots"; as there was only one divine chariot in Ezekiel's vision, and its parts cannot be described as "kinds." The Syriac, indeed, also read זני (גנסא דמרכבתא), but in the Greek version the word is unregarded. I believe that the original text had זיו "the glory of the chariot" (cp. the Talmudical phrase: זיו השכינה), which turned into זני.—יֵשׁ, which word in xlii. 3 should have the same meaning as in Prov. viii. 21, is ambiguous. I think it probable that the *stichos* read ועל מחלקות נחלה וירשה. וירשה could have become ויש. The marginal variant has, instead of ויש, וישר, into which וירש could easily have turned. The Greek has *κληρονομίας ἑταίρων*, and thus read נחלת רֵעִים.

In the vocabulary of this text of Sirach, those words are especially noteworthy which are neither to be found in the Bible nor in the traditional literature, or which are used in a unique sense.

Substantives to be noticed are — זְהִירָה "brightness" (xliii. 8); חֲלִיפוֹת, in the sense of "past" (xlii. 19); לֶקַח, with the meaning of מִקָּח (xlii. 7, where מתת ולקח is used in the sense of מַשָּׂא וּמַתָּן, the margin has שואה ותתה); מַטְמוֹנֶת with the same meaning as מַטְמוֹן "treasure" (xlii. 9); מכונה in the sense of מָכוֹן (xliv. 6); נִפּוּי, in the sense of נִפָּיוֹן (xliv. 20); תַּשְׁלוּמוֹת as a synonym of תַּשְׁלוּמִים (xlviii. 8).

The substantives of the form מִפְעָל (e.g. מִגְעָל, xl. 29) are indicated by the Glossary, p. xxxii. The most prominent new word is תַּחְלִיף = "successor" (xliv. 17; xlvi. 12; xlviii. 8), a word like תלמיד, formed after the model of abstract nouns

but designating a person (see Kaufmann, *Monatsschrift*, XLI. 837).

Of verbal forms in Hiphil are to be noted—הִשְׁרִיק "to shine with a red glow" (marginal variant on xliii. 9); הַצְהִיר, denominative of צהרים "noon" (xliii. 3). בהצהירו ירתיח תבל is not well translated "by his shining, heateth the world"; the sentence means: "When the sun shines at noon it makes the world glow." The Greek renders it *ἐν μεσημβρίᾳ αὐτοῦ*. The Syriac has במצעתה דטהרה. הַצְהִיר has the same relation to צהרים as הֶעֱרִיב to ערב, and הִשְׁחִיר to שָׁחַר. The Hiphil form הֵזִעִים, assumed by the editors in the Glossary, is contestable; for יזעים, in xliii. 16, is a corruption of יזעו or יזדעזעו (Gk. *σαλευθήσεται*).

Hithpael forms—חִתְפַּתֶּה "to allow oneself to be beguiled" (xlii. 10, margin), also in the language of the Mishna; הִתְבַּלְבֵּל "to maintain oneself" (xliii. 3); הסתולל, "to become a burden, wearisome" (xxxix. 24 "His (i.e. God's) ways are straight to the pious but wearisome to the wicked"). Especially notable is אל תִּסְתַּוֵּד from סוד (xlii. 12), translated in the Gk. *μὴ συνέδρευε*; in the Syriac version לא תשפר שועיתא. It signifies the same as נמתיק סוד, Ps. lv. 15; or בוא בסוד, Gen. xlix. 6.

The following Aramaisms may be mentioned:—גור "adultery" (xlii. 9); גִּפָּה "bank" (xl. 16); עלעול "storm" (xliii. 18, margin); שׁוּתָּף "partner" (xli. 18; xlii. 3, margin); תְּמַהּ, plur. תְּמָהִים "wonder" (xliii. 25; xlviii. 14). An Aramaism is the phrase להשתעות בתהלתם (xlvi. 8, see above, Part III), rendered in the Syr. למשתעיו על תשבחתהון. The same verb seems also to have been retained in xliv. 15 חכמתם תשמע עדה, which must be emended into בחכמתם תשתעה עדה. The Greek rendering is *σοφίαν αὐτῶν διηγήσονται λαοί* (also in xliv. 8 *ἐκδιηγήσασθαι*). Surprising is the absolutely Aram. ממחיו "to beat" (xlii. 5), for which the variant is מוסר "chastisement"; ממחיו was probably originally a gloss.

A few more lexicographical remarks. Sirach is partial to the use of the term כְּתָב (xxxix. 32; xlii. 7; xliv. 5; xlv. 11). The expression תורה שבכתב, to denote the written

law, possibly already existed in Sirach's time.—חק (xli. 2, 3) has the special meaning of "fixed limit," "definite period," as in Job xxiii. 14; חֻקִּי, ibid. xiv. 5 (חֻקָּיו, *Kethib*); לחק (in xl. 6 a), left untranslated, can also be explained in this way.—נוֹשֶׁבֶת (xliii. 4) is equivalent to ארץ נושבת, as רַבָּה (xlv. 23, 25) is the same as תהום רבה. כרשף (xliii. 17 c) is rendered in the Greek version ὡς πετεινά; also (xliii. 14) where the lacuna is to be supplied with the term כרשף. Hence it, at all events, follows that the translator understood this word in the same sense as the old versions of Job v. 7. It is probable, however, that Sirach himself also uses רשף with the meaning of "bird," as he designates with the term "the flying clouds." The translation, "darting flashes," which is offered by the editors for xliii. 17 c, is untenable.—Instead of קרדמת (xl. 16), the note and Glossary, p. xxxiv, have the excellent conjectural emendation קרומית (see Levy, IV, 381 a). It is, nevertheless, possible that the ד is original, and קרדומית is an older form of the term. I infer this from the fact that קרדימא in the Babylonian text of the Mishna Sabbath, XXII. 6, signified "reed" (in the Palestinian text פילומא = πήλωμα is substituted); קרדומית can thus designate the marsh and the reed growing on it. It is even possible that Sirach, in this passage, meant by קרדומית the marsh or puddle itself. For the sentence reads בק׳ על גפת נחל לפני כל מטר נדעבו. נדעבי, applied to a plant, gives no sense; for a plant cannot be "extinguished." On the other hand, the Book of Job, from which Sirach has borrowed several other unusual terms, applies נדעבו to the brook that dries up in the heat of the sun (Job vi. 17 בחמו נדעבו ממקומם). The meaning of the sentence under discussion would accordingly be, "As a puddle by a brook which dries up before the rain," i.e. before the rain, which supplies it with moisture, comes. The Greek and Syriac deviate widely from this text. The Syriac has the following for the second *stichos*, דקדם כל יורק היא יבשא (= Job viii. 12 b). The Greek also read חציר for מטר.—An apparent Arabism may be noted. In two passages of our text, the verb חלק is found in a context which would

give it approximately the sense of "to create" (=Arab. خلق, خلق); and in both passages, the Greek as well as the Syriac version so render it: xxxix. 25 a (see above, under III) טוב לטובים חלק מראש; and xl. 1 עסק גדול חלק אל ועול כבד על בני אדם. Smend assumes that חלק has the meaning "to create." Yet this view seems inadmissible; for nowhere else in the Hebrew language do we find the word with this meaning. The signification "to divide," "allot," "destine," gives good sense in both passages, which speak of the lot assigned to every human being by God. The verb has the same meaning as in xliv. 2, רב כבוד חלק [להם] עליון, where the Greek also renders ἔκτισεν (Syr. נפלוג). For the Biblical usage cp. Deut. iv. 19; אשר חלק Job xxxix. 17; ולא חלק לה בבינה and especially the use of the substantive חֵלֶק in Job xx. 29; xxvii. 13; xxxi. 2.

A point in syntax may be noted. Beside such idioms as כל מארץ (xl. 11), כל מאפס (xli. 10)—cp. חַיִל מֵעָוֶל, xl. 13 a, above, Part III—for which reference should be made to the Glossary, we find short forms after the model of יום אירא (Ps. lvi. 4), בור חצבתם (Isa. li. 1). See xli. 10 ממקום תגור; xlii. 1 דבר תשמע. They harmonize with the rhythmical forms of the sayings of Sirach, which follow the model of the scriptural parallelisms which involve elliptical constructions.

W. BACHER.

March, 1897.

POSTSCRIPT.

Since the foregoing article left my hands in the middle of last March, several critical notices of the recently published fragment of Sirach have appeared. Naturally, these have dealt with some of the points discussed in my article. It is unnecessary to indicate these points in detail, but I should like to add a few remarks on some of the points which have been raised.

M. Israel Levi has devoted pp. 1–50 of the *Revue des Études Juives*, vol. xxxiv, to an elucidation of eighty-two numbered passages from Sirach, and has treated, in an admirable style, of the relations between the Hebrew text and the Greek and Syriac Versions. In no. 9 he remarks that the Syriac in xl. 20 read יין ישן instead of

יין ושכר. The Syriac, however, must have read שכר, for the translation חמרא עתיקא is the Targum for שכר in Num. vi. 3 and Judges xiii. 4. (Cf. Peschitto to Num. xxviii. 7.) — In no. 14 M. Levi completes xli. 19 b to מֵאֵמִין אלה וברית, which, however, gives no sense in the context. According to my suggestion above (II) the reading is מֵחָמֵם אלה וברית, i. e. "(Guard thyself) against the violation —infraction—of oath and covenant." This also explains the Syriac translation מטל דמבטל (=מֵחָמֵם). — In no. 20 M. Levi thinks that in xliii. 30 the Greek read וכברקת instead of וברקב, and translated it by *κρύσταλλος*. But ברקת is the name of a precious stone, which the Greek would not have rendered *κρύσταλλος*. I think that my suggestion above (III) is more probable. — In no. 21 M. Levi holds that in xliii. 21 b the Greek read יכוה for ונוה. As, however, the Greek has *ἀποσβέσει*, we must go further in the emendation and suppose that the Greek read יכבה. It is very surprising that Levi translates *ἀποσβέσει* by "brûle." — In no. 29 M. Levi holds that the Greek must have read בקמים אויבים, which he rightly regards as ungrammatical. But the Greek probably read בְּקֶמֶי אויב or בקמי אויבים (see above, III), which is in accordance with the biblical use of the Status Constructus. Two co-ordinate nouns are combined by the use of the construct state. (Thus בת ציון הבתולה = בתולת בת ציון; so also, בקמי אויבים = באויבים הקמים.) — In no. 34 M. Levi thinks that the Greek read ויגדל for ויגדף. I have discussed the point above (I). — In no. 78 M. Levi holds that אם כל חי in xl. 1 c, to which I have above called attention as an example of the mosaic style of Sirach, is not an original reading, though the Greek has *μητέρα πάντων*. I think this opinion untenable, and that the original reading was indeed אם כל חי, and not ארץ כל חי. Sirach had Job i. 21 in his mind, ערום יצאתי מבמן אמי וערום אשוב שמה — where the mother's body and the earth in which man is received after death are connected in idea. It is thus no foreign figure to picture the earth as the "mother of all things." The whole verse in Sirach, מיום צאתו מרחם אמו עד יום שובו אל אם כל חי, is closely parallel to the passage which I have cited from Job. — In no. 82 M. Levi explains xlv. 25 c d as I have done above (III), but he cannot make sense of the words נחלת אש. My view, that the original reading was נחלת ישי, I will not support by a reference to Isaiah xi. 1, גזע ישי. Perhaps one might call to mind the passage in 2 Sam. xx. 1, 1 Kings xii. 16 ולא נחלה לנו בבן ישי.

Prof. S. Fränkel (*Monatsschrift*, XLI, pp. 380–384) has also called attention to the substantival adjectives in Sirach, e.g. נושבת (=ארץ נו״) and רבה (=ג׳ רבה). Of בהצהירו, xliii. 3, his explanation agrees with

mine. Well worthy of note is Fränkel's suggestion that the Greek translator, in rendering יגצח, xliii. 5, by *κατέσπευσεν*, thought of נחץ (see above, III). Moreover, Fränkel believes that in the Greek of xliii. 19 the translator had before him בסיר instead of בספיר. According to Levi, no. 19, the original word was בסופי, but this is philologically untenable.

In the *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*, XI, 95–103, Dr. Felix Perles has made some interesting remarks on the Hebrew text of Sirach. He thinks that נושבת, xliii. 4, is an imitation of the Greek *οἰκουμένη*, but the expression is purely Hebraic. It is an abbreviation of the phrase ארץ נושבת in Exod. xvi. 35, which is the opposite of ארץ לא נושבה in Jer. vi. 8.—With regard to a verse from an earlier portion of Sirach than is in the fragment (III, 21) frequently quoted in the Talmud and Midrash, Perles remarks that the original Hebrew was not עסק בנסתרות but תועלת בנסתרות, because the Greek translation is *χρεία τῶν κρυπτῶν*. But, as a matter of fact, in xlii. 23 b of our fragment, צרך corresponds with the Greek *χρεία*, and it is probable that the translator read צרך instead of עסק, the two words being closely alike in shape. The original is certainly עסק, for this alone gives a good sense. Cf. עסק בתורה. Prof. J. H. Müller in his remarks on Perles' article, ibid., p. 103–105, also considers עסק the original reading.

In an article on the word תחליף in the *Monatsschrift* (XLI. 337–340), Prof. Kaufmann also discusses xlviii. 8 of Sirach. He, too, considers that מלך is the right reading instead of מלא, but his explanation of תשלומות is not tenable, for even though Elisha could be anointed by Elijah as his successor in his own stead, it cannot be said that Jehu, who was to be anointed king by Elisha, can be regarded as a substitute for the dynasty of Ahab which Jehu was to destroy. מלך תשלומות really means "king of retribution," i. e. the king who is called to take retribution on the house of Ahab. In the choice of this word Sirach was probably influenced by 2 Kings ix. 26, where Jehu, when he is beginning the slaughter of the house of Ahab, quotes a prophetic oracle which he heard on the occasion of the judicial murder of Naboth. In this oracle the words occur: ושלמתי לך בחלקה הזאת. The word תשלומות has the same meaning as שִׁלּוּם Hos. ix. 7, שִׁלּוּמָה Ps. xci. 8, שִׁלּוּמִים Isa. xxxiv. 8.

מלך תשלומות is a combination such as מלך המשפט, the "king who exercises justice."

W. Bacher.

Budapest, *June*, 1897.

THE WORD תחליף IN ECCLUS. XLIV. 17.

We should like to be allowed to point out that Prof. Kaufmann's polemic, in the May number of the *Monatsschrift*, against the rendering of this word by "successor," rests on a misunderstanding. "Successor" in English means more than merely a "follower": it means one who *takes the place of another, fills the same dignity, holds the same position, and carries on the same office.* Thus we meant by "successor" exactly what Prof. Kaufmann understands by תחליף, and if we had been writing a commentary we should have explained the term in exactly the same way. The note in the Glossary (p. xxxv) clearly showed what we understood by the word. The corresponding Hebrew verb (החליף) is there explained, not by *follow*, but by *cause to come in place of* (cf. Kaufmann, p. 339, "an die Stelle des Vorgängers treten"), *make to succeed*, and the corresponding Syriac word by *substitute, representative* (cf. Kaufmann, "Ersatz," "Stellvertreter"). Neither of these words could, however, have been used as a *translation* of תחליף in any of the three passages in which it occurs. Before Prof. Kaufmann decides that "das neue Wort mit einem Uebersetzungsfehler zur Welt gekommen sei," let him find a word which will represent it—not of course in German, but in *English*—better than "successor," or (in xlvi. 12) "succeed."

The difficulty in "filled with retribution" (xlviii. 8) we do not perceive. If Micah can say he is filled with judgment (iii. 8), why cannot Jehu, in view of 2 Kings ix, x, be said to be filled with retribution? We greatly doubt the sense in which Prof. Kaufmann would understand מלך תשלומות: in New Hebrew, תשלום means "Ersatz," not in the sense of *substitution*, but in the sense of *requital, repayment, compensation* (as in such phrases as תשלומי נזק, Schadenersatz, נפטר מן התשלומין); in the Targums, also, תשלומא is "Vergeltung" (in a good sense) in 2 Sam. xix. 37, and תושלמא is "Vergeltung" (in a bad sense) in Is. xxxiv. 8 and elsewhere. A "king of substitutions," in the sense of a king succeeding another king, seems to us a most forced and questionable rendering of מלך תשלומות; and if we adopted the marginal reading מלך, we could only understand it in the sense of a "king of requitals *or* retributions" (the plural being naturally intensive).

PROF. SMEND'S EMENDATIONS.

In the *Theologische Literaturzeitung* (May 15, 1897) Professor Smend gives the result of a very careful examination of the Oxford Sirach-fragment, which he made in the spring of this year. Every one interested in the establishment of the new text will be glad to have

the benefit of Prof. Smend's skill and experience, although they may not always be able to accept his conclusions. Disregarding emendations (with which we are not at present concerned), the passages in which the changes are proposed are naturally in parts of the MS. which are defaced and extremely difficult to read. In such cases, often the only hope is in a happy conjecture. When once the right reading is divined, it is frequently possible to see on the MS. that it *is* right, but the final appeal must always be to the MS. itself. Prof. Smend, however, lays very great stress on the readings of the photographs, as having been taken before the MS. was *washed* (*gewaschen*). While it is true that photography often affords considerable aid in the decipherment of effaced MSS., yet it may be accepted as an axiom that its evidence is unsound unless supported by the original. In other words, there must be in the MS. some traces of the reading which is preserved more clearly in the photograph. The present MS. is no exception to the rule. After being photographed it was not *washed*—a process which is never applied to MSS. of this kind—it was *cleaned*, as far as possible, by removing dust, &c., with a soft brush or duster, and then the whole surface was covered with transparent paper. Therefore whatever has disappeared from the MS. since it was photographed can have been lost only by the accidental breaking off of minute fragments where the paper was brittle. Although the thin paste necessary to affix the transparent paper may possibly have caused the ink to run in some places, and thus rendered the reading difficult, it is impossible that, where the surface remains intact, letters should have totally disappeared. In the interest, therefore, of those who have not the opportunity of consulting the MS. for themselves, we have made a thorough examination of all the passages challenged (comparing the photographs), and now give a list of (*a*) corrections to which we agree without reserve, (*b*) passages in which we are unable to accept Prof. Smend's reading, (*c*) passages in which certainty is impossible, and where, therefore, we cannot either accept or reject without hesitation.

(*a*) The following corrections we accept without reserve: xl. 26 a, יניל for . . . יגב (but see under *b*). xl. 26, margin, נא קול written as two words. xli. 21 a, margin, מי השע is written as two words. xli. 21 b, . . מהש for . . מחַש. xli. 21 c, . ומהי for . ומהַי. xlii. 3 a, before חובר a ב is crossed through. xlii. 9 c, after תגור a ר crossed through. xlii. 10 c, תזנה was our conjecture; see the translation. xlii. 23 a, margin, וקים for יקים. Prof. Smend's completion of this line (הוא הַ[י ועומ]ךַ ל[עד]) is certainly favoured by such traces of letters as remain. xliii. 14 d, omit the ל: it is probably only taken off from the next page. xliv. 15 a, margin, תשנהַ for תשמע. xlv. 9, margin,

אידר for אורד (so also Prof. Bevan in the *Athenæum* for April 3, 1897). xlv. 23 b, נחל after בגבורה. xlvi. 13 e, [דבר]ב for [ביא]נ. xlvii. 10 b, שנה, as we translate. xlvii. 12 a, בעבורו for אין בעמ[ו], but we should now reject the [ו] at the beginning. xlvii. 15 a, ארץ כסית ב . . . ך. xlvii. 23 f, אשר חטא והחטיא (or perhaps ויחטיא) (see also under *c*). xlviii. 12 d, ומופתים כל for ונלמד בכל.

(*b*) The following readings we cannot see our way to accepting: xl. 19 c, עוגר for שגר. xl. 22, י[פי ונע]ם: but [י]פ[עם ויו] would be possible. xl. 26 a, ללב [ו]יגילל, but we agree to יגילו ללב, or better הלב (see also under *a*). xl. 26 margin, we find no trace of מי before גופת, although we have supplied it. xl. 26 d, מעין for [מטמ]ן: the י is not possible: even the ן is doubtful: the word looks like מ . . שן. xli. 1 b מעונתו for מבונתו. xli. 2 b אנגים (proposed since the article was in print) for אונים. xli. 19 d margin, ממועט (also proposed later) for ממנע; but we agree that the נ is doubtful. xlii. 9 b, after תפ nothing is certain: the remnants of עש (whence Prof. Smend's תפריע ש), which are visible on the photograph, are really parts of the first two letters of בשאול (xli. 4 d) showing through the hole in the paper. xlii. 10 b the completion ובבית [בע]ל[ה] ל[א תש]טה would no doubt fit the space, but the clause depends on פן, and לא therefore gives an entirely wrong sense: moreover ט is quite uncertain[1]. xlii. 10 d margin, line 3, after תע not מ but ש in the common shortened form ע. xlii. 24 b, שי[ש]איר: we agree that שׁ is more probable than שׂ: then there are traces which seem to be parts of a מ or ב, then possibly one more letter, after which the paper is perfectly clean and fresh: we see no signs of איר: שישאיר also yields a bad sense, and would be the only instance in the fragment of the use of the relative ש. xliii. 1 b, the ר in מ[רביט] appears certain: לה (i. e. להביט?) is not possible. xliii. 7 b, חופין עופה: the word after וחפין seems to be שנה: there is a mark about the middle of the נ which gives it, at first sight, the appearance of a פ, but it is a flaw in the paper and not made with the pen. xliv. 20 b, בבריתת. xlv. 13 a, the י is there. xlv. 13 c, הוא בן: there is no sign of ו, nor room for it between ה and א: a ב or כ is possible after הא. xlv. 20 a, א.ק before ל. xlv. 23 b, שלישי. xlvi. 6 b, בנען. xlvii. 11 a, גם: we originally supplied this obvious particle at the beginning, but abandoned it, as no traces of the letters remain. xlvii. 23 a, מיועש. xlvii. 23 b, בן מנון: we see no traces of any but the last letter, which may be a ן. xlviii. 11 b [ו]אש[רי]: we find no signs of אש. xlix. 7 b, להשיב: we cannot accept this, but allow that our reading ולהעז is doubtful: the remains of the letters are fairly clear,

[1] We mentally supplied ל[א תלר]; see translation.

but their form is peculiar. xlix. 10 d, וישעֲנוהו: we read וישיבוהו rather doubtfully.

(*c*) In the following cases the reading is uncertain: xl. 10 margin, ובשכרו, for the unmeaning נבשכון, is possible. xl. 22, מי[יע]דו for מי[יח]דו: of the letters supplied only dots at the top of the line remain, which may belong to ע rather than to ח. xl. 24 a, [ו]ש[ותף], after אח, is probable. xli. 1 a, יברך for זכרך: the כ (ב) is not very well defined: the ז, though doubtful, is not impossible. xli. 4 d, חיים perhaps belongs to the text; perhaps a ל (but not על) stood before it. xli. 5 a, margin, כן for בֵּן. xli. 6 b, ורשׁ is improbable: our זרעֹ is doubtful: it is, however, possible that no letters are wanting before זרעֹ. xli. 15 b, margin, perhaps מֵסמין, but the word is crossed through and very doubtful. xli. 21 a, מהשב. xlii. 5 c, ממהיר ממכר[1] for ממחיו עבד בגד תנר: the horizontal line of the ר is not visible, as the paper is cracked, but the down-stroke which remains might have formed part of a ר: of the first מ (in ממכר) nothing remains, there being a hole in the paper: the second מ is doubtful: the next letter is more like ב than כ: the ר is very probable: the next letter was originally a ר which has been altered or crossed out, but ת is very doubtful: the ג might be a נ: the ר is probable. xlii. 10 c, margin, תעצר for תש[ט]ה: the ר is above the line, as Professor Smend points out: the letter before has a long tail, perhaps תעקר[2]. xlii. 10 d, the last word may perhaps be תע[צֵר]. xliii. 1 a, ז. ו may be only taken off from the next page. xliii. 23 a, יעשיק: more probably תֵּשיק. xliii. 32 a, ק for ז is very doubtful. xlv. 3 a, the MS. has חר, but the ח may be a ה blotted: מֵהר is probable. xlv. 12 d, מחמ[ד עי]ן ומ, the ן ומ are possible, but uncertain. xlv. 13 a, ל[פנ]י[הן] is more probable than ל[פנ]י[הם]. xlv. 13 b, ועד עולם for ...ל[א]ל[ו]: ועד is only possible if the paper has been pressed together; the space is insufficient for עולם: the remnants look more like גילם. xlv. 20 c, ת[רומות] for ה. xlvi. 15 a, דרוש for וֹדֵשׁ[ק]: the רוש is probable: the remnants of the first letter are more like פ (פרוש). xlvii. 9 a, ח at the end. xlvii. 10 d, ירון for ירנן: the lower half of the doubtful letter (whether ו or נ) is

[1] We should naturally be glad to be rid of the strange form ממחיו: at the same time, however, the marginal מוסר is distinctly connected, by the usual circle, with the word which was so read by us.

[2] We doubt עצר in the sense *close the womb*: we have עצרני מלדת Gen. xvi. 2, *hath shut me up from bearing*, עצר כל רחם Gen. xx. 18, *hath shut up all the wombs*, and, where the limitation is apparent from the immediate context, Isa. lxvi. 9 אם אני המוליד ועצרתי; but do these cases justify the absolute use of תעצר *be shut up*, in the sense of *have the womb closed*? Would it, used alone, suggest more than *be detained* or *imprisoned* (Jer. xxxvi. 5, 2 Kings xvii. 4)? For תעקר, cf. the New-Hebrew use (Levy, s. v. no. 2).

lost. xlvii. 11 c, חק ממלכת for חקת מל׳: the words are very close together, and the ת (or מ) is uncertain: we originally read חק ממ׳, but eventually decided for חקת מל׳ after much hesitation, although ממלכת in the absolute state occurs in xlvi. 13 e, and although מלכת would naturally be written in the MS. מלכות. xlvii. 20 c we supplied להביא, but find nothing of the word left: the same remark applies to xlvii. 23 f, ישראל. xlviii. 11 a, after מת probably nothing followed. xlix. 9 a, נשיא after איוב: the paper is so much discoloured that we cannot be sure of any marks. xlix. 11 a, perhaps מה at the beginning, but very uncertain[1].

THE EDITORS OF THE HEBREW TEXT
OF ECCLESIASTICUS.

A NOTE ON THE TEXT AND INTERPRETATION OF ECCLUS. XLI. 19.

A WELL-KNOWN Rabbinical term for God is מקום = place. It has hitherto been difficult to fix the date when this remarkable usage originated. Frequent in the Mishna, it is quite unknown in Biblical Hebrew. The question which the present note raises is this: Was it employed by Ben Sira?

The question is suggested by the marginal text of xli. 19 a, which reads ממקום ונגיד על זד; the line is dependent on בוש of v. 17 and can hardly be translated in any other way than "(Be ashamed) before God and a prince of pride." Our question, in the first instance, resolves itself into a consideration of the relative values of the two readings here offered by the newly discovered MS. It is recognized by the editors of the Hebrew MS. that the marginal notes give "the variants of another copy of Sirach, or more probably of two other copies" (p. xii). A glance at these very numerous variants suffices to show that in some cases they represent the better text; though a thorough comparative examination of all of these would be necessary in order to determine whether as a whole the best text is that which the MS. presents in full, or one or other of the texts which are represented in the marginal readings. It must suffice for present purposes to recognize that the marginal notes are genuine variants.

I hope to show that there are the strongest possible exegetical reasons against the reading of the Hebrew text in xli. 19 a; that these do not hold against the reading of the margin; and that

[1] In xlix. 10 b, when it was too late to introduce the correction, Prof. Driver pointed out that there is not room in the MS. for תם[ממקומו], and that תם[מתח] should be supplied; cf. the Syriac and xlviii. 13.

therefore, on exegetical grounds, the marginal reading must be considered superior to that of the text.

The line in question occurs in the short section (xli. 14–xlii. 5) headed "The discipline of Shame," and in particular in a sentence or sub-section extending from xli. 17–19 a, which, together with the four preceding verses, is omitted in the Syriac Version. These verses run thus in the *marginal* text:—

17 בוש מאב ואם על פחז מנשיא ושר על כחש
18 מאדון וגברת על שקר מעדה ועם על פשע
19 ממקום ונגיד על זד משותף ורע על מעל

The lines may be rendered thus—

Be ashamed before father and mother, of wantonness,
Before master and mistress, of deceit,
Before a companion[1] and a friend, of trespass,
before a prince and a governor, of a lie.
before the congregation and the people, of transgression;
before *makom* and a prince, of pride.

It will be observed that we have here six symmetrically constructed clauses: in each case we have two terms expressing persons in whose presence shame ought to be felt, followed by one term expressing a course of conduct of which to be ashamed. This symmetry is broken twice[1] by the Hebrew *text*, once with and once without the support of the LXX and the Old Latin. In 17 b, probably no one will dispute that the Hebrew *text* (מנשיא יושב אל כחש = Before a prince sitting (in judgement) of a lie) has arisen from an earlier text still found in the Hebrew margin and underlying the Versions by ordinary transcriptional error, ושר having become יושב and אל, על. In 19 a, the Hebrew text has (in the main)[2] the support of the Versions (LXX and Old Latin) in reading וממקום תגור על זר = And before the place where thou sojournest, of a stranger. But here, as in 17 b, I believe the text reading to have resulted in transcription from the marginal (תגור from ונגיד, and זר from זד); but in this case the transcriptional corruption took place earlier—before instead of after 132 B.C., the date of the Greek translation. The text reading involves—(1) the extraordinary construction בוש ממקום = to be ashamed before a place, (2) the breaking of the symmetry of the clauses, (3) a most improbable isolation in respect of construction for this single clause,

[1] In 18 c the first word is undecipherable in the text, but the ו of ורע, which is fairly clear, indicates that a parallel term preceded.

[2] For the last word זר the Versions appear to have had something different; LXX (A B) has κλοπῆς = theft, and so Old Latin: LXX in א—πλοκῆς.

which would agree as little with those which follow as with those which precede; for, as the preceding (five) clauses are identical in structure, so are several that follow, an action of which to be ashamed being in these introduced by מן. The sense, moreover, of the whole clause "Be ashamed before the place where thou sojournest of a stranger" is unnatural. These objections, as it appears to me, would have justified a condemnation of the text as corrupt, even had no variant existed.

Dismissing the Hebrew text then as erroneous, we are left with these alternatives—(1) the clause is a later insertion; (2) although מקום ונגיד is nearer the original than מקום תגור, it is itself a corruption of the real text, in which some other personal term occupied the place of מקום; (3) the Hebrew marginal reading is the original, and Ben Sira therefore used מקום as a term for God.

The first alternative has in its favour that it occurs in a section omitted by the Syriac. The significance of this can only be rightly estimated in the light of a thorough study of the relative value of the texts of the Hebrew and the Versions; but it must be borne in mind that the Syriac Version of Ecclesiasticus is characterized by the absence of long sections. The second alternative does not carry us far: for the Greek translation was made in 132 B.C., and we should therefore have to refer the usage of מקום=God sufficiently far back to admit of ונגיד becoming corrupted in transcription into תגור by the year 132.

The difficulty of the third alternative is unquestionably serious. We should certainly not have expected so early and isolated an instance of the usage of מקום for God. It would apparently be quite isolated; for there is no other trace of the usage in the Hebrew fragment, nor any clear suggestion of it by the Versions in those parts of the book of which the Hebrew has not been recovered. The Greek *τόπος*, the regular equivalent of מקום, occurs eight times in chaps. i–xxxviii. 14, viz. in iv. 5; xii. 12; xiii. 22; xvi. 3, 14; xix. 17; xxvi. 18 (א, A); xxxviii. 12. In most of these cases it is perfectly manifest from the context that מקום was not used of God; in iv. 5 and xvi. 14, such a usage may have occurred in the original and been misunderstood by the translators, but even in these cases the supposition is unnecessary and improbable.

The isolation of the instance in xli. 19, if the marginal reading be correct, must then be admitted. The next point to be considered is the earliest subsequent usage.

The term מקום, used of God, is already frequent in the Mishna, i.e. four centuries later than Ben Sira. If, however, we are willing

to rely on the accuracy of the Rabbinical oral tradition, not merely for the substance of the early sayings, but for minute points of phraseology in them, we can carry the usage much further back than the period at which the Mishna was completed. It occurs in a saying attributed to Simon ben Shetakh, who lived about 100–70 B.C., and which runs as follows: מה אעשה לך שאתה מתחטא לפני המקום ועושה לך רצונך כבן שהוא מתחטא על אביו ועושה לו רצונו וגו׳ (Taânith 3, 8). This would carry the usage back to within about a century of Ben Sira.

If we are not prepared to base much on this tradition, then we have to bear in mind that there is but very little extant Hebrew literature of the period of four centuries between Ecclesiasticus and the completion of the Mishna, and what there is (Daniel, Esther, and some Psalms) belongs to the earliest part of it.

The indirect evidence next falls to be considered; and of this the most important is Philo's use of *τόπος*. In his discussion of Gen. xxviii. 11 (*ὑπήντησεν ἐν τῷ τόπῳ*), Philo says "God is himself called 'place' (*τόπος*), because whereas he embraces the universe (*τὰ ὅλα*), he is embraced by nothing at all, and because he is the refuge (*καταφυγήν*) of all, and forasmuch as he is himself the room which he occupies (*ἐπειδήπερ αὐτός ἐστι χώρα ἑαυτοῦ*), containing himself and resembling himself alone. . . . Now the deity being embraced by nothing is of necessity his own place." *De Somniis*, § 11, Mangey, I, 630). The full significance of this passage only appears when we compare it with the explanation of ויפגע במקום in Genesis Rabbah[1]:— רבי הונא בשם רבי אמי אמר מפני מה מכנין שמו של הקב״ה וקוראין אותו מקום שהוא מקומו של עולם ואין עולמו מקומו מן מה דכתיב הנה מקום אתי הוי הקב״ה מקומו של עולם ואין עולמו מקומו א״ר יצחק בתיב מעונה אלהי קדם אין אנו יודעים אם הקב״ה מעונו של עולמו ואם עולמו מעונו מן מה דכתיב י״י מעון אתה הוי הקב״ה מעונו של עולמו ואין עולמו מעונו. The points of contact between the Philonean and the Hebrew Midrashic explanation are too numerous to be accidental; both introduce the explanation in connexion with the same passage: "And he lighted on a place" (Gen. xxviii. 11), both give the same

[1] c. LXVIII. (ed. Berlin I. 125 b, top).—The first part of the above-quoted passage is referred by R. Isaac Solomon to Ben Sira; see JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, III, p. 706 and no. 64, in the list of quotations prefixed to Cowley and Neubauer's edition of the Hebrew text. Mr. Schechter very reasonably suggests that the reference by R. Isaac Solomon is merely apparent, ב״ר the marks of citation for בראשית רבה having become corrupted into ב״ס, the abbreviation of בן סירא. The error might have been facilitated if it was known that Ben Sira actually used מקום in the sense of God.

reason, although the Hebrew interpretation is a little terser—"God is called place because he is the place of the world, but the world is not his place"; and both connect with the discussion the fact that God is also called מעון, *καταφυγή*, i.e. refuge (Ps. xc. 1), although the mode of connexion is different: in Philo, the fact that God is a *καταφυγὴ τῶν συμπάντων* is part of the reason for the term *τόπος*; in the Midrash, the statement about מעון is co-ordinate with that about מקום. We must, therefore, conclude either that the Hebrew *explanation* of "place" as a name of God is derived from Philo[1]; or that the explanation contained in the Midrash Rabba, although attributed to a comparatively late Rabbi (circ. 275–300 A.D.), is of much more ancient Palestinian origin. In the latter case, the usage of מקום is certainly prior to Philo's tract *De Somniis*, and consequently very nearly, if not quite as early as the beginning of the Christian era. But even in the former case, the *usage*, though not the *explanation*, may have originated in Hebrew: and this at least seems more probable, for Philo appears to discuss *τόπος* as a borrowed term rather than as one of his own creating. On the whole, the balance of probability is in favour of referring the usage of מקום for God, at least as far back as the beginning of the Christian era, i.e. about two centuries after Ben Sira.

Two points indirectly affecting our question call for briefer notice. (1) Parallel in some degree to the usage of מקום, under consideration, is that of שמים = heavens for God. This also is frequent in the Mishna; in the Gospel of St. Matthew, too, the phrase "the kingdom of heaven" is the regular equivalent of "the kingdom of God," which is used in the Gospel of St. Luke. But unlike מקום, שמים as a term for God can be traced back to the Old Testament literature; it there occurs once and once only, viz. in Dan. iv. 23 מן־די תנדע די שליטן שמיא = From the time that thou recognizest that the heavens govern (cf. v. 22 עד די תנדע די שליט עליא). The usage is as isolated in Daniel and in Biblical Hebrew as the usage of מקום in Ecclesiasticus would be. On the other hand we can trace it sooner and more clearly subsequently: it occurs several times in 1 Maccabees (certainly in iii. 50, cf. ver. 51; iv. 10, 24), which dates from about 100–70 B.C. (2) The Hebrew text confirms the accuracy of the Greek in a passage (xliii. 27) which had been questioned on the ground of its supposed pantheistic character. That either this sentence (וקץ הדבר הוא הכל) or the usage of מקום implies pantheism,

[1] We should possibly have a parallel for this in the Targumic use of מימרא for God, which Schürer (*Gesch. d. jüd. Volkes*, II. 879, n. 15) thinks to be most probably derivative from the Philonic use of *λόγος*.

in any strict sense of that term, is highly questionable: but the thought of the sentence is certainly akin to that which appears to have given rise to the term.

To sum up; the reading of the Hebrew text is improbable; the strong exegetical objections to it outweigh the support of the LXX and the Old Latin. The reading of the Hebrew margin, on the other hand, yields an excellent sense, perfectly maintains the symmetry of the section to which it belongs, and by familiar transcriptional errors would pass into the form found in the Hebrew text. The only objection to it is the use of מקום. That objection is certainly weighty: for the usage is quite isolated in Ecclesiasticus, and cannot be traced with absolute certainty till nearly four centuries later. On the other hand, Rabbinical oral tradition carries the usage back to within a century of Ben Sira; the parallel use of τόπος in Philo most probably implies the use of מקום as early at least as the beginning of the Christian era, and in the general lack of extant Hebrew literature between Ecclesiasticus and the Mishna the failure to establish the usage directly cannot be pressed. Further, the somewhat parallel use of "heaven" for God is found quite isolated in Daniel, written within twenty years of Ben Sira, and lastly, there are traces in Ecclesiasticus of that kind of thought out of which the usage of מקום would naturally grow.

G. BUCHANAN GRAY.

THE TEXT OF JOB.

It is a distinguishing merit of Prof. Budde's original and ingenious commentary on the Book of Job that he has bestowed so much attention on the text. For a fresh start forward in criticism and exegesis we need, not only a more thorough examination of archaeological evidence, but a closer inspection of the text. The grammar and lexicon will also gain considerably from such a course. For many idioms and words linger in our grammars and lexicons which have only a precarious right to be there. Having given some attention of late to the text of Job and Psalms, from the point of view here indicated, I venture to collect the chief corrections which I have been led to make, provisionally of course, in the text of the former book. Some of them are given in a review of Prof. Budde's work which has appeared in the *Expositor* (June–July, 1897), but it may be convenient to special students to have them brought together, with others, in a summary. I should like, however, to mention in the first instance the fairness which Prof. Budde has shown in mentioning his predecessors. Prof. Wellhausen's *Psalter* in Haupt's Bible is, with all its cleverness, so extremely and dangerously deficient in this respect that I feel bound to give all the more credit to Prof. Budde for his graciousness to his colleagues. It is often not easy to find out what has been done by others; it requires time and trouble to discover the books and periodicals which contain the corrections which others have made in the text. Completeness no one can expect to attain; even good corrections are only too

likely to escape one's attention. Probably Prof. Budde's connexion with the *Theologische Literaturzeitung* has contributed to his wide knowledge of English and American literature, but this would not have sufficed without a preceding goodwill for which he deserves our gratitude. One clever, but little known, English writer owes a special debt to Prof. Budde. This is Dr. Bateson Wright, a pupil of Prof. Sayce at Oxford in the days when that versatile scholar still worked at the great Oxford educational machine. This able student, now thrust by circumstances into an English college at Hong Kong, but still (as his most recent work on Bible history shows) keenly interested in critical research, brought out in 1883 a "new critically revised translation with essays on scansion, date, &c."; it was reviewed the following year by Prof. Budde in the influential periodical mentioned above, and justice was done to the acuteness of the author. That the reviewer should also refer to the weak points in the author's scholarship was inevitable. But the point is that a German scholar was found to take notice of the grains of good wheat in the book, undeterred by failings which in a completely trained scholar would have been difficult to pardon. Again and again Prof. Budde refers to Bateson Wright's book in his commentary, and the following are among the textual corrections which he has taken from this source.

Job iii. 16, omit לֹא. vi. 4, נַעֲרוּנִי. vi. 7, זהמה. x. 20, יְמֵי חֲלָדִי. xvii. 11, מֵיתָרֵי. xxxii. 4, בְּדַבְּרָם את־איוב. xxxviii. 27, צָמֵא. xxxix. 18, מֹרִים [א]בּ. The second of these corrections has also been made by Castelli in the JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, 1889, p. 286 (not noticed by Budde).

That Prof. Budde should know so little of Grätz's emendations of Job is not surprising. Very few Christian scholars in Germany know much of this brilliant, though (as they may think) unscientific, student, who went on to the very end unweariedly pursuing his high ideals. Several times I have found corrections assigned to the

younger Perles which really belong to Grätz. The few references to the latter which I have noticed seem to me to be secondhand. I find no mention of the many contributions to textual criticism in Grätz's *Monatsschrift*, nor even of vol. XXXVI (1887). This contains a conspectus of Grätz's corrections of the text of Job as far as chap. xxix, which I am surprised not to find included in the posthumous *Emendationes*. Nor have I discovered a reference to the corrections offered by Prof. Gottheil in his review of Siegfried's *Job* in this REVIEW.

I add the following suggested corrections for the consideration of students, especially those who are frankly "reconstructionists" (a brand-new word which I have just discovered in a theological magazine). The reader will readily understand that to mention the numerous points in which I agree with Prof. Budde would be impossible. As a whole I greatly admire his work.

i. 17. For כשדים the original story of Job may have had בשים, i.e. either the Kasshites of Babylonia, or the Kushites of Central Arabia; more probably the former, who were no doubt confused with the Kasdim or Chaldeans. LXX. *ἱππεῖς*, פרשים, from כדשים (faulty transposition). Hommel wrongly takes this for a reading.

iii. 5. כְּמְרִירֵי יוֹם. Read כְּמוֹ אֹרְרֵי יָם. The line (apart from כְּמוֹ) is a gloss on verse 8 a. כְּמוֹ was inserted when the line received its present wrong position, because where it now stands חשך וצלמות is the subject. Again and again Bickell's suggestions have to be accepted in spite of numerous extravagances, on which Budde is almost too hard. יָם for יוֹם as in iii. 8, where Budde greatly errs in rejecting Gunkel's admirable emendation (see *Expositor*, June, 1897).

v. 3 b. וָאֶקּוֹב. Read וַיִּוָּקֵב. Similarly in Prov. x. 7 correct ירקב into יוּקַב, with Krochmal.

v. 2–6, a later insertion, perhaps a variant to iv. 8–11. Budde's correction in verse 7 (יוֹלִיד) is plausible, but scarcely correct. The poet means, Call on the angels if you will; they would reject your unreasonable request ("for trouble is natural to man"), and they have a higher sphere to move in ("and the

flame-born ones take their flights on high"). The בני רשף are the angels; the term suggests the later view of the fiery origin of angels. See *Expositor*, June, 1897.

v. 5. Even Bickell has failed; he gives מחלם צמא ושאף "and the thirsty is greedy for some of their vinegar" (cf. Ruth ii. 14). I believe the poet to have written חמרם צמא ושתה "and the thirsty drinks their wine." חמרם became מחרם, then מחלם; then מ became attached to צמא. This should be taken with the correction of xviii. 9; צַמִּים will then pass into limbo. The "obscure" stichus (Bickell) יקחהו ואל־מצנים should certainly be cancelled. מצנים is, of course, a miswritten צמים. ואל is a miswritten יאכל.

v. 26. בְּכָלַח. Read בְּלֶחֶךָ (cf. Deut. xxiv. 2 and Jer. xi. 19, reading בְּלֶחוֹ). Neither Budde nor Dillmann hits the mark here. Cf. on xxx. 2.

vi. 3. לָעוּ. Better עִלְּגוּ (Isa. xxxii. 4). לָעַע "to stammer," is non-existent. In Prov. xx. 25 read יָלִין with Krochmal and Grätz. But the true reading in Job vi. 3 is probably נִמְרְצוּ "are vehement." LXX. *ἐστὶν φαῦλα*; cf. vi. 25 *ἔοικεν φαῦλα* = נמרצו. See on vi. 25, xlii. 6.

vi. 14. Read הֲלֹא מָשׁ מֵעֲמָדִי חֶסֶד אֵל וּפִקֻּדַת שַׁדַּי עֲזָבָנִי. LXX. *ἐπισκοπή*, as x. 12.

vi. 21. חֲתַת. A non-existent word; cf. on xli. 25. Read מְחִתָּתִי; cf. LXX. *τὸ ἐμὸν τραῦμα*.

vi. 25. נִמְרְצוּ. Read נִמְלְצוּ (cf. Targ.), and see on vi. 3, xlii. 6. The occurrences of מרץ should be carefully examined. Job vi. 25 goes with Ps. cxix. 103. Job xvi. 3 stands alone; cf. Ass. *marṣu* "sick," or "in pain." Mic. ii. 10 is corrupt. For 1 Kings ii. 8 either read נחרצת (Grätz), or cf. Ass. *arrata marušta* "a dreadful curse."

viii. 17. Follow Merx in preference to Budde (see *Expositor* article).

ix. 23. מַפַּת. Read מַבַּת (Grätz).

xi. 12. Read וְאִישׁ נָבוּב יִלָּמֵד וְעַיִר פֶּרֶא יִלָּכֵד "Even a senseless man may be taught, and a wild ass's colt may be caught" (like the assonance in Job). Perhaps an improvement, both upon Budde's and upon Grätz's correction.

xii. 2–6. Budde is, I fear, too imaginative; no doubt all critics

are so now and then! The tristichs (verses 3, 4, 6) all need correction. Bickell rightly makes two tetrastichs, and his corrections and omissions are, I believe, all right, except as regards the fourth line of the first tetrastich; צדיקה תמימה לכתי is against parallelism, nor is לכתי for דרכי probable. I prefer לִקְחִי תָמִים וּבָר "my teaching is blameless and pure" (alluding to xi. 4). [לקח[י] was corrupted into שחק; also into צדיק. ובר was corrupted into לפ[י]ד. The editor did his best to make sense of these words; and poor enough is the result! Now for the tetrastichs. I will give them in English; scholars will easily recognize the Hebrew[1].

"1. Forsooth ye are [intelligent] folk!
With you wisdom dies out!
But I too have understanding like you;
My teaching is blameless, pure.

2. The careless man despises Shaddai's times of doom;
At the appointed season his foot remains firm;
Prosperous are the tents of the destroyers,
And those who provoke God have security."

xiv. 4. This late insertion (Bickell, Baer, Budde in his note) took the place of an illegible distich. xiii. 28 is too poor to introduce here with Bickell.

xv. 4. תִּנְדַּע. Read תִּפְרַע (cf. Smend's note on Ezek. v. 11).

xv. 24. Read כְּמַלְאָךְ עָתִיד לְשָׁדוֹד. A contribution to angelology.

xvi. 8. Bickell should here be consulted. לְעֵד הָיָה seems to me a gloss on כָּל־עֲדָתִי.

xvii. 15. Read תִּקְוָתִי with Grätz.

xvii. 17. Omit לִי. The scribe began to write לֵילוֹת (Geiger).

[1] Two points only need be mentioned. In stanza 1, line 1, supply נָבוֹן (Bickell) or עֲרֻמִּים (Baer). In stanza 2, line 1, read, not בָּז לְעִתּוֹת שַׁדַּי with Bickell, but בָּז לְעִתֵּי שַׁדַּי, i.e. change his לְעִתּוֹת into לְעִתֵּי. For these reasons: 1. עִתּוֹת is an imagined plural of עֵת; Ps. ix. 10, x. 1, xxxi. 16, where it occurs in Mas. text, are, as Grätz has shown, corrupt. In Job xxiv. 1, which suggested Bickell's correction, the form is עִתִּים. 2. Bickell inserts שַׁדַּי, but does not notice that שדי still exists under a disguise in Mas. text, which has בוז לעשתות שאנן. Now ת in לעשתת (we may neglect the *inserted* ו) is merely a corruption of די. Thus we get לעשתדי, i.e. לעתי שדי. י after ת fell out, and ש was transposed to make sense (Baer and Ginsburg, לְעַשְׁתְּרוֹת).

xviii. 9–12. By all means read in the main as Bickell; but substitute צירים "pangs" (see Isa. xiii. 8) for צמים, which ought to mean "the thirsty" (see LXX.), but on which the moderns force the meaning "a snare." (צַמִּים is an imaginary word which ought to be removed from the Lexicon.) Bickell's insight is here marvellous. *κύκλῳ* and the omission of *δὲ* after *ὁλέσαισαν* are due to Origen (which Budde has not noticed). Verses 8–13 make two tetrastichs. Read verse 8 as in Mas. text. Then continue: יחזקו עליו צירים בעתהו בפהות רב לרגליו יהיה רעב ואיד נכון לצלעו. רב would easily be omitted owing to רעב in the next stichus. Differently from Bickell, I omit ואון, which he prefixes to ואיד. Mas. text has אֹנוֹ, which is perhaps due to אונו in verse 7.

xxvi. 13. Read בְּרִיחֵי שָׁמַיִם סִגַּר הוּא. In verse 12 רגע means "he made to start back" (so Siegfried).

xxix. 18. This passage runs thus in Rev. Vers.: "Then I said, I shall die in my nest, and I shall multiply my days as the sand." This gives a very strange combination of figures, and involves taking עִם 'with,' as = בְּ 'in.' Budde, with the Jewish Midrash and with Delitzsch, substitutes the mythical bird called the Phoenix for the sand, and explains "with my nest" by a detail in the Greek story in Herodotus (ii. 73). But (1) such an allusion seems improbable in a poem so strongly Hebrew in feeling as Job; (2) it introduces a wrong idea—that of the resurrection, of which the *bennu* or Phoenix was a symbol; and (3) it is inconsistent with the context, which requires a tree to be referred to. The LXX. is, I believe, nearer the true text, which seems to have run: וָאֹמַר זָקֵן אָגֻוַע וּכְתָמָר אַרְבֶּה יָמִים, i.e. "And I said, I shall expire as an old man, and like a palm-tree I shall multiply days." בְּזָקְנִי (for עִם־קְנִי) is also possible. See verse 19, and read what Tristram says of the palm (*Nat. Hist. of the Bible*, pp. 380–384). The corruption implied in line 2 is strange, but palaeographically not impossible.

xxx. 2. בֶּלַח. Read בָּל־חַיִל "all capacity." Cf. אַנְשֵׁי־חַיִל "men of capacity," Gen. xlvii. 6. Budde's לֶחַ (cf. on v. 26) is less natural.

xxxvii. 22. זָהָב. Read זֹהַר "supernatural brightness," Ezek. viii. 2, Dan. xii. 3.

xl. 19 b. Gunkel הֶעָשׂוּי יִגַּשׁ חֲרָבוֹת. The best suggestion yet made. But should we not rather change Gunkel's יִגַּשׁ into לְשַׂר? The LXX. reading הֶעָשׂוּי לְשַׂחֵק בּוֹ and that of Mas. Text הָעֹשׂוֹ יַגִּישׁ חַרְבּוֹ can be readily accounted for by palaeographical considerations and the insertion of letters to make sense of a corrupt reading.

xli. 1. Read, with three improvements (as I hope) on Gunkel:

1 הֵן־תּוֹחַלְתְּךָ נִכְזָבָה
גַּם־אֶלֹם מַרְאוֹ יָטַל׃

2 מַלְאָךְ יִשְׁעַר כִּי יְעוֹרֲרֶנּוּ
וּמִי הוּא לְפָנָיו יִתְיַצָּב׃

3 מִי הִקְדִּימוֹ וַיִּשָּׁלֵם
תַּחַת כָּל־הַשָּׁמַיִם לֹא אֶחָד׃

The probability of this form of the text is great. The only objection known to me is that it favours a view of Leviathan which is opposed to that which has become traditional, the view that this wonderful monster is nothing greater than—the crocodile. It may open our eyes perhaps a little wider to the popular beliefs of the post-exilic Jews, who were by no means arid rationalists. Compare xli. 2 with iii. 8. Verse 4 is of course a later insertion which presupposes a corrupt form of the text of verses 1–3. יִשְׁעַר in verse 2 corresponds to LXX.'s δέδοικας; cf. xxvi. 13, δεδοίκασιν αὐτόν, i.e. שְׁעָרֻהוּ.

xli. 25 b. לִבְלִי־חָת "to be a fearless one." Budde sees nothing suspicious about this. To me it seems weak. Nor am I at all sure of the existence of a substantive חת. In Gen. ix. 2 read חִתַּתְכֶם (xxxv. 5). Here, however, it would be too cheap an expedient to correct לִבְלִי חִתָּה. Comparing the corresponding line of the next distich, and the correction already made in xl. 19, we should correct, hardly לְבַעַל תַּחַת (Gunkel), but לְבַעַל תַּחְתִּית (cf. Ps. lxiii. 10, cxxxix. 15). Behemoth is the "prince of the dry places"; Leviathan the "lord of the lower places," and the "king of all the sons of pride" (verse 26 b).

xlii. 6. Bickell and Budde both see that metre and sense require

a word to be supplied. The former supplies לְעֹתִי "my random talk," comparing לָעַג in vi. 3. But LXX.'s ἐφαύλισα ἐμαυτὸν (καὶ ἐτάκην) points to נִמְרַצְתִּי; see on vi. 3. I agree with Bickell that an accus. to אמאם is indispensable, and would render "I retract my vehemence." Budde's אשר דברתי is rather weak.

To justify the title of this little article, I am bound to refer to Budde's treatment of the important subjects of (1) strophes, and (2) the relation of the pre-Origenian Septuagint (represented by the Sahidic Version) to the Hebrew text of Job. I can, however, only state my conclusions, which are (1) that there does appear sometimes to be a tendency to four-line stanzas, and (2) that the omissions of the Septuagint do appear to be sometimes occasioned by marks in the Hebrew MS. used by the translator which indicate that certain passages ought to be omitted. I cannot say that I greatly admire Prof. Budde in his controversial relations with Prof. Bickell, and I should be sorry for the latter to suppose that all English readers considered that the greatest of special students of Hebrew rhythm and metre has been well treated by Prof. Budde.

I conclude with a recommendation of Gunkel's *Schöpfung und Chaos* as a work which, with all its faults both of omission and of commission (see *Critical Review*, July, 1895), is yet very useful alike for archaeological and for textual criticism. It will be desirable for the student to compare his statements, so far as they relate to Job, with those of Prof. Budde, and to put aside every consideration but that of truth. It is not pleasant to expose oneself to charges of rashness and eccentricity from more conservative critics, but it may be necessary, and conservative critics (who are just as anxious for truth as others) may soon come over to views from which they now feel compelled to dissent.

T. K. CHEYNE.

CHRISTIAN DEMONOLOGY.

IV.

In the discussion of certain salient problems, suggested by the data already before us, with which I shall conclude, I shall try to repeat as little as I can of the evidence already adduced. To this final discussion, therefore, I now pass.

1. And the first problem is that of the use of the name.

Problem of the use of the name.

Why did Jesus instruct his disciples to cast out demons in his *name*? Why do we end our prayers with the formula "in the *name* of Jesus Christ our Lord"? Why did the Christians glory in the *name*? Why were they persecuted for the *name*? The answer to all these questions is furnished by ancient magic.

It can be paralleled from old Assyria.

The magical use of a name as revealed in the many examples I have given from Origen, Celsus, Lucian, Porphyry and the papyri, is in all respects the same as was the use among the ancient Babylonians over 3000 years before Christ. "Like all primitive peoples," writes Prof. Sayce[1], "the Chaldaeans confounded the person and the name by which he was known. The name in fact was the personality, and whatever happened to the name would happen to the personality. When[2] the gods lost their names they lost their individual personality as well. Injury[3] could be done to a person by using his name in a spell, and, similarly, to pronounce the name of a deity

[1] Sayce, *Hibbert Lectures*, IV, p. 302.

[2] Ibid. p. 305.

[3] Ibid. p. 302.

compelled him to attend to the wishes of the priest or exorcist . . . The sacredness attached to the name of the God of Israel among the later Jews, and the frequent employment of the name for the person of the Lord, bear witness to the fact (viz. that the same superstition was deeply imprinted on the Semitic mind)."

"The preservation of their names," remarks the same writer[1], "was a matter about which the kings of Babylonia and Assyria were especially anxious. Terrible curses are enacted against those who should destroy or injure the writing of their names, and substitute their own names instead."

This is a point which in the consideration of old historical documents must not be forgotten. We often find that in old historical records everything in the way of action and incident is freely changed by successive scribes, except lists of names. These are more faithfully handed down than anything else. We may be sure that there was a superstitious scruple as well as a political dislike at work in the erasure from monuments of a name like that of Commodus and the substitution of one less ill-omened.

Use of a name compelled the power so named.

"Closely[2] connected with the mystical importance thus assigned to names, was the awe and dread with which the curse or excommunication was regarded. Once uttered with the appropriate ceremonies, the binding of knots and the invocation of divine names, it was a spell which even the gods were powerless to resist."

Nor was this belief confined to Semitic races. "The whole Aryan family," says Prof. Rhys[3], "believed at one time, not only that his name was part of a man, but that it was the part of him which is termed the soul, the breath of life."

Now the use of the name Jesus Christ in prayers and exorcisms is based on the same belief in a mysterious con-

[1] Sayce, *Hibbert Lectures*, IV, p. 304. [2] Ibid. p. 305.

[3] Rhys on "Welsh Fairies," *Nineteenth Century*, Oct. 1891, p. 566.

nexion and almost identity between the name and the person named which Origen explicitly insists upon—appealing to Aristotle in support of his belief. The Christians invoked Jesus against the demons and he came, and from his presence, all unseen, like their own, they fled. Nor only this. Jesus had possessed a peculiar divine power or *dunamis*, which entered into him at baptism and which, according to the Gospel of Peter, and to many other early sources, left him when about to die. This power was along with the name of Christ and with baptism into that name mystically communicated to the believer. To invoke the name was to summon the power indissolubly bound up therewith, to invest ourselves therewith, to become one with it and gain at least for the nonce a control over the unseen world such as the Messiah possessed. So the use of a demon's name, according to Tertullian[1], however empty and fictitious it might be, yet brought in an instant to your aid the demon or unclean spirit, if you intoned it in a superstitious spirit; such was the binding power over the spirit of a holy name.

The modern Abyssinian believes in the demons being constantly on the watch to steal if they can a Christian's baptismal name[2]. His idea of course is that the demons will use the stronger names to work their own evil ends. In baptism a mystical union with Jesus and communication of his powers to the worshipper was effected by calling over him the holy name.

In the N. T. the name = the personality.

If we examine the passages in the New Testament in which the word *name* is used, we shall find that they imply on the part of the writers this belief in a mysterious connexion between the name and the personality or power of the named. Thus we read Matt. vii. 22, "Many will say unto me in

[1] *De Idololat.*, ch. 15 : "Utique scimus, licet nomina inania atque conficta sint, cum tamen in superstitionem deducuntur, rapere ad se daemonia et omnem spiritum immundum per consecrationis obligamentum."

[2] Lejean, *Voyage en Abyssinie*, p. 78.

that day, Lord, Lord, did we not prophesy by thy *name*? and by thy *name* cast out devils? and by thy *name* work many powers?" The allusion is to false prophets, to whom Jesus will reply: I never knew you. But though corrupt in their fruits it is clear that by the mere use of the name of the Lord Jesus they would achieve supernatural results; just as in Mark ix. 38, John informed Jesus that he had seen an unbeliever casting out devils in Jesus' *name*. It is clear that such a use of Jesus' name was identical with the use of the names of Jewish patriarchs in magical incantations; and, accordingly, in magical recipes we find the name of Jesus Christ juxtaposed with the tetragrammaton, with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and even with heathen deities. Of such juxtaposition I will give a single instance[1]: "Here is a goodly gift of Apsyrtus, a saving remedy, wonderfully effective for cattle. IAO, IAE, in the name of father and of our Lord Jesus Christ and holy spirit, iriterli estather, nochthai brasax, Salolam nakarzeo masa areons daron charael aklanathal aketh thruth tou malath poumedoin chthon chthon litiotan mazabates maner opsakion, aklanathalila iao, iae in the name of father and of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the holy spirit. And write the same with a brass pencil on a clean smooth plate of tin." To return to the New Testament[2]: "Where two or three are gathered together into my name, there am I in the midst of them." Here the use of the name actually brings the power named into the circle of worshippers, or, as Tertullian says: "rapit ad se daemonem per consecrationis obligamentum." "And on Simon he laid the name Petros, and on James and John the name Boanerges, or Sons of Thunder." The new names were supposed to impart to them new qualities or fortify their moral characters, or even to protect them from the evil demons which would, by a change of name, be thrown off the track. Such a change almost certainly had a mystical import like the change of Abram

[1] Cp. *Incantation from Hippiatr.*, p. 128, c. 1206, ap. Ric. Heim, l. c.

[2] Matt. xviii. 20.

into Abraham. It is still a belief among Jews that you can save a sick man's life by changing his name. The new name makes him another person, and presumably the Angel of Death is baffled and unable to identify him. For a somewhat similar reason on the occasion of a public purification at Rome persons with lucky names (*prospera nomina*) were selected to lead the victims to the altars [1].

A convert to the Latin church receives, I believe, a new name, often that of his guardian angel or patron saint. In this way he not only dodges the devils, but acquires as well the prestige, power, and protection of the superior name [2]. Philo relates how an unbeliever who scoffed at the extra letter which God in his goodness added to Abram's name was struck down with death for his blasphemy.

Parallel Essene belief.

We read in the account of the Essenes given in Josephus [3] that they had a secret knowledge of the *names* of the angels, which members of the brotherhood swore not to divulge. Their congeners, the Therapeutae of Alexandria, who occupied themselves with the mystical interpretation of Old Testament names, had among themselves a faculty of healing superior to that which is practised in cities. This perhaps means that they invoked holy names in order to heal the sick.

And this interpretation of Old Testament names in a half-etymological, half-mystical manner, was a chief occupation of Philo, who never wearies of telling his readers that in all Scripture names are contained wondrously beautiful conceptions and hidden meanings; and though he does not regard names after the superstitious manner of his age, yet it was no doubt the prevalent belief in the

[1] Pliny, *Nat. Hist.*, XXVIII, 5.

[2] In the excerpts of Theodotion, ch. 22, who wrote in the last half of the second century, we have an allusion to this custom: ἵν' ᾖ βεβαπτισμένος ὁ τὴν λύτρωσιν κομισάμενος τῷ αὐτῷ ὀνόματι, ᾧ καὶ ὁ ἄγγελος αὐτοῦ προβεβάπτισται: "That he who has won redemption may have been baptized with the same name with which was baptized before him his guardian angel." This reference, with much other matter, I owe to Dr. P. Ruben.

[3] Jos., *B. J.*, II, 142.

efficacy of names which led him to attach so much importance to the allegorical exposition of their meanings.

The disciples then were to baptize in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost[1]. . . That is to say, by means of the theurgic invocation in baptism, the fullness and power of the triple Godhead was to be communicated to the believer and dwell in him, as it had dwelt bodily in Jesus. "By my name shall they cast out devils, speak with tongues, take up serpents, lay hands on the sick[2]," and so forth. Such a use as this, was, as I have already pointed out, purely magical and theurgic. It was not only a way of introducing the pure spirit and of banishing the impure. It was also a subsidy against the noxious reptiles that in the old Persian religion were the special creations and instruments of Angra Manyu.

Erasure of names.

"Blessed are ye when men shall hate you . . . and cast out your *name* as evil, for the son of man's sake[3]." This seems to imply not the mere erasure of a name from records, but its exorcism as in itself a sinister power. As in the case of the ancient Assyrians, so here the mere erasure of the name was tantamount to annulling the owners' power and personality.

"He gave the right to become children of God to them that believe in his *name*" (εἰς τὸ ὄνομα)[4]; i. e. the power of Jesus and his authority over the seen and unseen worlds of men and spirits was bound up with his name.

"Whatsoever ye shall ask in my *name* ye shall receive it"[5]; i. e. because the authority of Jesus was irresistible. "I manifested thy *name*," says Jesus addressing the Father[6]. "Holy Father, keep them in thy *name* which thou hast given to me . . . I guarded them and not one of them perished . . . I made known unto them thy *name*, and will make it known; that the love wherewith thou lovedst me may be in them, and I in them[7]." So the Jews believed

[1] Matt. xxviii. 19. [2] Mark xvi. 17. [3] Luke vi. 22.
[4] John i. 12. [5] Ibid. xiv. 14.
[6] Ibid. xvii. 6 and 11. [7] Ibid. xvii. 26.

that Jesus had gained a knowledge of the mysterious and not to be divulged name of God, and in that manner acquired his supernatural powers.

"By what *power* or in what *name* have ye done this[1]?" is the question put by the priests to Peter, who had cured the man who was lame from his mother's womb. And it was a question which could only have been asked by people conversant and themselves imbued with the belief in the magical efficacy of names. And Peter in reply quotes no doubt the full title, the use of which had effected the cure. "Be it known unto you all, that *by the name* of Jesus Christ of Nazareth, whom ye crucified, whom God raised from the dead, by this *name* doth this man stand here before you whole[2]." . . . "For," adds Peter, "there is no other *name* under heaven, that is given among men, wherein we must be saved[3]." And just below the faithful pray to God that signs and wonders may be done "through the *name* of thy holy servant Jesus."

Gallio on names.

Gallio did not care about names any more than Lucian, but his words to the Jews[4]: "If these be questions about words and *names* and your own law," betray his knowledge of the magical use of names among the natives of his province. They might flog their evil spirits with any names they chose, so long as their quarrel about what name was most efficacious did not lead to overt breaches of the *pax Romana*. It was a matter for the Jews to settle among themselves whether demons were to be expelled by one name rather than by another. His court could not decide a point so metaphysical. Jesus, we read in Hebrews[5], had inherited a more excellent *name* than the angels, and so become by so much better than they, as to sit down on the right hand of God. God, we read in the same epistle[6], "is not unrighteous to forget the love which ye showed toward his

[1] Acts iv. 7. [2] Ibid. iv. 10. [3] Ibid. iv. 12.
[4] Ibid. xviii. 15. [5] Heb. i. 4. [6] Ibid. vi. 10.

name, in ministering to the saints." Love of the name was equivalent to love of the spirit called by the name. "This *name* was above every name that is named, one in which every knee should bend[1]."

"Many shall come in my *name*," says Jesus, "saying I am the Christ[2]." A passage which indicates that it was the Messianic authority or name to which these pretenders would lay claim. The same identification of name with person is instanced in such a phrase as meets us in Acts i. 15: "There was a multitude gathered together of *names* about 120." So in Apocal. iii. 4: "Thou hast a few *names* in Sardis which did not defile their garments."

Similar beliefs of savages.

The same identification of name with object or person named is wide spread among savages, one of whom will tell you anything sooner than his name; because to know his name is to have a hold over him; since it gives you a faculty of using him and his personality. Therefore in Arabic tales the first thing to do with a ginn or spirit is to find out his name, as a preliminary to availing yourself of his power. Thus it is that in old Georgian, *Sakheli*, the word for name, means, that which gives power.

The references to the magical use of the name are specially common in the Apocalypse. We hear of a white stone on which a new *name* was written which no one knoweth but he that receiveth it[3]. This stone, the prize of Christian endurance, reminds us of the tablets on which powerful names were inscribed in antiquity. Of the same champions of the faith we also read as follows[4]: "I will write upon him the *name* of my God and the *name* of the city of my God, the new Jerusalem . . . and mine own new *name*." So later on we hear of the 144,000 having the *name* of the Lamb and the *name* of his Father written on their foreheads[5]. So the Hindoos paint each the sign of his particular caste on the forehead; and the old Armenian

[1] Eph. i. 21 and Phil. ii. 9.
[2] Matt. xxiv. 5.
[3] Rev. ii. 17.
[4] Ibid. iii. 12.
[5] Ibid. xiv. 1; xxii. 4.

word for fate or horoscope means simply "what is written on the forehead." The same idea was at work in baptism and led to the setting of the cross on the catechumen's forehead, in addition to immersion in a holy stream. The *names* of blasphemy which the seven-headed apocalyptic beast bore on his heads were the names of heathen gods[1]. And the Word of God had a *name* written on his head which no one knoweth but himself[2]. The object of writing the most powerful of all names or of impressing the cross—the trade-mark of that name and power—on the forehead was this, that being so conspicuous it might frighten off the demons and hinder their very approach.

Summary. The Christian use same as the old Chaldaean.

To sum up. Jesus, the Messiah, in enjoining the use of his name, and his followers in using it, moved in a circle of ideas as old as the oldest written records we have of our race, namely the cuneiform tablets of ancient Assyria. Yet, as we find among primitive races all over the globe the same superstition about names, we need not necessarily suppose that the Greeks and Jews of the first and succeeding centuries derived the belief from ancient Babylon; though they probably did so, since the Chaldaeans were regarded all round the Mediterranean as born magicians. No fact is better calculated to impress on our minds the continuity of religious traditions and practices than this, that in adding to our prayers the phrase "in or by the *name* of Jesus Christ our Lord," we repeat a theurgic formula, and adhere to a magic ritual, which were in vogue in Babylon some six thousand years ago. I do not mean, of course, that the God invoked by us is the same as was theirs—though I should be glad to think so; but the mode of invocation or the method of compelling an answer to our prayers *is* the same.

2. And perhaps in our investigations we have hit upon the origin of creeds. Why did the Church invent these compendious statements of the chief events in the history of

[1] Rev. xiii. 1; xvii. 3.

[2] Ibid. xix. 12.

Jesus the Messiah? In the earliest age a creed could hardly have been used,—as it came to be used in the fourth century,—to winnow away the chaff of heresy from the wheat of true believers.

Origin of creeds.

The preaching of the various apostles must have been something more extended and less jejune than these condensations of the Messiah's history. Judging from the Acts and from Paul's letters, and equally from the Didachê, any statement of doctrine meant for the *instruction* of believers would have included some moral precepts. I believe, therefore, that one reason at least for the formation of the earliest creeds was the want of a short and effective formula for the exorcism of demons. Jesus had indeed enjoined the mere use of his name; but his followers soon found that this was not enough; and so Origen[1] informs us that to the name was added the *ἀπαγγελία τῶν περὶ αὐτὸν ἱστοριῶν*, i.e. an announcement of the history of Jesus, which was all the more effective if the exorcist who sang out (*κατεπᾳδόντων τοὺς δαίμονας*) the demons honestly, believed it. Such an *ἀπαγγελία* would be the appropriate string of words (*συμφυοῦς εἱρμοῦ*) which, he elsewhere informs us[2], must follow a name in exorcisms. It is not clear, however, that a passage from the gospels was not also read or recited; for a "reporting of the history of Jesus" may mean that; as may the phrase "teaching from the holy scriptures" (*τὰ ἀπὸ τῶν ἱερῶν γραμμάτων μαθήματα*) which he uses elsewhere[3]. Anyhow, he plainly hints at a form of creed similar to the so-called Apostles' Creed when he says[4] that his contemporaries cast out demons by simply calling over the sufferers the name of Almighty God and the name of Jesus along with his history. My theory is confirmed by the fact already observed that probably Peter used such an epitome of Jesus' history in healing the lame man; while almost the earliest form of creed known—I allude to the one in Justin Martyr—is clearly part of an exorcism.

[1] Origen, *C. Cels.* i. 6.
[2] Ibid. i. 24.
[3] Ibid. vii. 67.
[4] Ibid. iii. 24.

In the *Apology of Aristides*[1] there also occurs an early form of creed, as Mr. Rendel Harris has observed, not very unlike the Apostles' Creed; and it is remarkable that Aristides, as translated by him, says of it: "This is *taught from* that Gospel which a little while ago was spoken among them as being preached." The phrase of Origen, ἀπὸ τῶν ἱερῶν γραμμάτων μαθήματα, i.e. *teachings from* the scriptures, practically translates the Syriac phrase in Aristides; and we may conclude that such was the early name by which a creed was designated; the more so as Origen insists on the need of the exorcist *believing* the history which he recited to the demons. When Aristides in the same context dwells upon the *power* inherent in his summary of Christ's history and exhorts the Roman emperor to read the Gospel in order to comprehend that power, we seem to have a reference to the effectiveness of that creed, as a weapon against the powers of evil who must be put to flight before the Holy Spirit can enter and dwell in the souls of men.

Baptismal use of creed.

But surely some one may ask, Were there not other ends in view of which the earliest creeds are more likely to have been drawn up? Were they not rather meant to be recited by converts at baptism?

It is certainly true that Irenaeus[2] declares the creed to be a canon of truth accepted by every one at baptism, which the entire Church had by tradition received from the Apostles. Origen[3] equally speaks of the "ecclesiastica praedicatio per successionis ordinem ab apostolis tradita." And there can be no question of the connexion from a very remote epoch of the creed with baptism, which was indeed the only ceremony at which in the earliest ages a creed was formally recited.

This much is clear, that the Apostles' Creed so called is an expansion of the simple formula: "In the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost," into which, according to

[1] *Apol. Aristid.*, ed. Harris, § ii.

[2] Iren. I, i. 20.

[3] Origen, *Prooem. de Princ.*, 23.

Matthew[1], the disciples were bidden by Jesus to baptize all nations. And though in other parts of the New Testament we hear of baptism in the name of Jesus Christ alone, there can be no doubt as to the antiquity of the triple formula, since all churches however scattered have everywhere used it in baptism. The only question at issue is this. Was the formula enjoined in Matthew (or the simpler one referred to) expanded, as we already find it to be in Justin and in Aristides, in order to provide converts with a summary of their new faith to be repeated on the occasion of baptism; or, on the other hand, in order to furnish the demons with more explicit information about the higher power in whose name they were commanded to go forth? Of course both these necessities at once may have worked to expand the brief formula into one more comprehensive. But we must bear in mind that the rite of baptism was preceded from a very early epoch by an exorcism of the evil spirits which in the imagination of the very earliest Christians filled the air, and in particular beset the body of one who had been an idolater. The formula used in this exorcism, which prepared the way for the reception, through the water, of the Holy Spirit, was probably such an one as Justin has handed down to us, in which the demon is adjured to depart "in the name of the Son of God and first-born of every creature, who was born of the Virgin and became man, capable of suffering, was crucified under Pontius Pilate by your (i. e. by the Jewish) people, and died and rose again from the dead, and ascended into heaven." This formula contains, it is true, allusion to the Virgin as well as an anti-Docetic clause, "capable of suffering" (*παθητοῦ*), which is only appropriate to a period beginning about A.D. 80, and cannot be much older than that. So the baptismal canon of faith put forward as Apostolic and universal by Irenaeus[2] has an anti-Valentinian ring, as Harvey well shows. For the rest, however,

[1] Matt. xxviii. 19. [2] See *Irenaeus*, ed. Harvey, vol. I, p. 90, n. 1.

and excepting the reference to the Virgin birth, Justin's formula of exorcism is very similar to that used by Peter, as we can infer the latter from Acts iv. 10. With the creed of Aristides it is nearly identical. I should infer, therefore, that the expanded formula, or recitation of the redeeming acts of the Lord, "was first used in the exorcisms which delivered the Christian out of the power of darkness, and were so preliminary to the accession of the Holy Spirit and to the translation into the kingdom of the Son of God's love[1]." Having been used by the exorcist they would naturally be also repeated by the convert who was being baptized. And his formal recital of them as a profession of faith would be the natural complement to the exorcist's previous use of them, and would materially hasten the exit of the demons out of himself.

But whichever way we decide, it is most significant of the great importance attached to the expulsion of demons in the primitive church, that the very earliest creedlike formulae occur in connexion with cures and exorcisms. This much is certain. And as it is so probable that creeds were in the first instance drawn up less for the instruction of men than of demons, we ought, I think, to be doubly charitable to those who differ from ourselves on such points.

Dualism in the N. T.

3. A third point which is suggested by the facts we have reviewed is this. The New Testament, especially the writings of John and Paul, are often very dualistic in tone and tendency, much more so indeed than those of Philo, whom it is the fashion to set down as an oriental dualist. John regards this world as altogether given up to Satan; and Jesus Christ is not of this world at all, no more is his kingdom. "The world knew him not." Equally to Paul is Satan the ruler of this world; and in his belief the atmosphere and heaven are alive with evil spirits. Justin Martyr (*Dial.* ch. 105) declares, and rightly, that the whole purport of Christ's last prayer on the cross

[1] *Dict. of Bible*, art. Exorcism; Col. i. 13.

(Luke xxiii. 46), "Father, into thy hands I commit my spirit," after which he yielded up his ghost, was that the shameless and wicked demons who haunt the atmosphere and are always on the watch to grab a dying man's soul, might be baffled by the Father's receiving it direct into his own hands. How different this from Philo who discarded the belief in evil spirits as superstitious, and only allowed the existence of destroying angels in the sense of ministers of God's just wrath;— and for whom also the august gods of Greece, far from being base demons, were identical with the stars of heaven, immortal and holy natures! The oldest Talmud also, though it often mentions evil spirits and exorcism of them by means of the tetragrammaton, is yet less dualistic than the New Testament, for it does not contemplate a rival kingdom of evil, really antagonistic to the divine creator. Therefore it is that we so rarely find in it the titles so common in the New Testament of Satan, Beliar, Beelzebul, Devil, Adversary; or such a phrase as the kingdom of Satan. No doubt the authors of the earliest Talmud wished to avoid any violation of the monotheistic idea, and therefore banished such phrases.

more marked than in Philo and the Talmud.

The New Testament is often dualistic with the dualism of the Persians; and, in reading it, one can easily comprehend how and why the heresy of Marcion should have arisen. There is not a little in the fourth Gospel and in Paul's epistles upon which Marcion and the Manichees could base their peculiar teaching, which was but a slight accentuation in other respects also of Paul's beliefs. And this teaching also agrees with the rôle assigned to Jesus as the Messiah by his followers and probably claimed by himself. He was the victor of demons, the rescuer of man from the clutches of Satan. It was not the visible legions of Rome that he was to break and subdue, but the invisible legions of Satan by whom mankind was oppressed. There seems to have been a Persian element in the mind of Jesus alien to true Judaism.

4. And fourthly, we may notice once more how similar in their modes of operation the evil spirit and the good spirit were supposed to be. Inspiration was no other than possession by a good spirit. We see this brought out in the Latin ritual of baptism, in which the priest breathes three times in the child's face, saying: "Come out of this child, thou evil spirit, and make room for the Holy Ghost[1]." For as we saw in reading the Shepherd—a very primitive monument of the Roman Church—the Holy Spirit requires plenty of room, being light and ethereal, and is strangled and suffocated by the presence along with itself in the same vessel of evil spirits which are crass and heavy.

Good and evil spirits of similar composition.

The truth is that the Apostles had the same conception of spirit which held its own even in philosophy until the age of Descartes and is still entertained by the vulgar. They regarded a spirit as a form of wind; for wind moves and shakes objects; yet to the unscientific mind it is without weight even as it is invisible. The demons lived in the air and were made of air, and were like the air immaterial (ἀσώματοι), and as a rule invisible. The better spirits, however, and in particular the Holy Spirit, were emanations of the divine and subtle ether which surrounds the entire world and of which the stars are made. This ether was fiery in texture and rational; and the human reason, the only purely divine element in man, was, according to Philo, an ἀπαύγασμα or off-raying thereof. This is why the angels had bodies of fire, as Aristides[2] is careful to inform us.

Evil spirits made of heavy air.

Holy Spirit of fiery ether.

[1] Lenormant (*Hist. Anc.*, livre VI, p. 200) cites an ancient Assyrian formula similar to the above. It is this: "Let the evil demons depart. Let them fall on one another. But let the propitious demon and the propitious colossus penetrate and enter his body." This, remarks Lenormant, was the best security against the return of the evil spirits, and is to be likened to the divine grace or odour of sanctity replacing in the convert the state of sin and devotion to the Devil.

[2] Aristid. *Apol.* § 2.

Pentecostal descent of the Holy Spirit.

The description of the descent of the Holy Spirit in Acts[1] well exemplifies the philosophical categories of that age. It came down from heaven, which was a tract of ether spread out above the grosser atmosphere, the earth being of course regarded as fixed and flat. It made a noise as of the rushing of a mighty wind, for though more subtle than the vaporous air along the earth's surface, it was still gaseous and was to the earthly spirits somewhat as hydrogen is to carbonic acid gas. Being of this character it could fill all the house where the faithful sat, just as air rushes in at an open door or window. "And there appeared unto them tongues parting asunder like as of fire, and it sat upon each one of them." For being fiery in nature the Holy Spirit would project itself into tongues of lambent flame shooting here and there. It is noteworthy that exactly similar portents are related in the *Aeneid* in connexion with the young Iulus. In the very primitive Syriac text of the Acts which Ephrem Syrus used in writing his commentary, the Holy Spirit filled the upper chamber on the day of Pentecost not only with a bright light but with a *sweet smell.* For in that age you could recognize a god's presence by the fragrant smell and odour of sanctity which attended it. As says Ovid: "mansit odor; posses scire fuisse deam."

In the Hebrew Gospel also the Holy Spirit's descent on Jesus at the Jordan was attended by a flame-like appearance shining over the waters, and it was with the Spirit and *with fire* that Jesus promised to baptize the faithful. I have already noticed how Jesus, like the Egyptian wise men whom Celsus saw, or like Lucian's Chaldaean, blew upon his disciples; so communicating to them through his breath the Holy Spirit and no doubt dissipating and driving out the crasser spirits, as we can see done to this day at a Roman Catholic baptism. At the baptism of

[1] Acts ii. 2–4.

Jesus the Holy Spirit even materialized itself as a dove and entered—according to the oldest account—*into* Jesus, just as the evil spirit entered *into* a man's body.

I need not dwell further on the uniform and mechanical way in which all spirits, good or bad alike, acted. In that age popular thought had not yet risen to a truer conception of spirit as a simply conscious agency, which is where it acts instead of acting only where it is, and which only being what it does, has no need of a substrate of more or less attenuated or fiery vapour to serve as its substance and as the vehicle of its expression.

Bearing of these ideas on doctrine of the Incarnation.

This mechanical and materialistic conception of spirit and of spiritual operations also determined the earliest ideas of the Incarnation, and was at the bottom of a great deal of early Docetism. The divine Logos, for example, according to Irenaeus and the earliest fathers, simply thrust out, annihilated and took the place of the human soul in Jesus ; just as the Holy Spirit displaced the human understanding in those who talked with tongues, or as a demon took possession of a man, body and soul. In Docetism the idea was carried further, and Jesus had an ethereal body, such as had, according to Philo[1], the angels that visited Abraham, on which occasion, as he carefully explains, they ate and drank in appearance only.

Transference of spirits into material objects.

5. Prof. Tylor in his work on primitive culture describes how in India a Brahman may be seen sitting by the roadside putting the god into the little hollow images of clay brought to him by the faithful. I have seen it done myself. Now the belief, universal in the Fathers of the Church, that the evil demons had been induced by certain incantations and magic rites to enter and abide in statues and fanes, belongs to exactly the same stage of culture. And so also does the belief that by certain theurgic rites a Christian priest

[1] Philo, *Vita Abrahami.*

can induct the Spirit of God or of Christ into water or into a new-born child or into bread and wine[1], or into oil, or into a cross or crucifix, or picture, or into a church or shrine, or burial-ground[2]. All these ritual practices, which we may witness to-day in one church or another, originated in an age which believed that the god can be compelled to enter this or that material object by use of his name along with appropriate formulae. In this connexion I have already pointed out that the phrase "laying of a ghost," ἀνάκλισις δαιμόνων, occurs in Origen, who thoroughly believed in the reality of the process of getting a spirit or demon to enter anything or any one.

Belief of early church in heathen gods.

6. It is a fact too much ignored about the early Christian church that its teachers one and all, with the exception of Jesus and the evangelists, who do not allude to it, believed in the supernatural powers and reality of the old heathen deities. They were all evil spirits; and this belief is the nerve of the resolute refusal of the early Christians to sacrifice even to the *genius* of the emperor. For they believed the genius to be a demon. That we have in the Gospels little or no declamation against the ancient gods and idols, no propaganda of monotheism, is a proof that Jesus addressed himself to Jews alone, who were in no want of such teaching. Accordingly we first meet with it in Paul, the Apostle of the Gentiles.

7. A difference of attitude in regard to demons is to be

[1] E. g. in the Liturgy of S. James (Brightman, *Liturgies*, p. 54) the priest prays the Father "to send down his all-holy spirit, that it may approach and with its holy, good and glorious presence sanctify the bread and make it the holy body of Christ." A similar formula comes in most liturgies of the Mass.

[2] Cp. *Exc. ex Theodot.* 82: "And the head and the oil is hallowed by the power of the name, being the same so far as mere appearance goes as they were when laid hold of, but by power they have been changed into a spiritual power. So also the water in being exorcized, and the baptism in its process not only thrusts out the worse agency, but also acquires in addition the holiness."

traced among the four evangelists. John is silent about possession by demons and does not appear to have ascribed diseases to their agency. In this respect, as in others, he approximates to the mental attitude of a cultivated Alexandrine Jew, such as was Philo. The fourth Gospel is indeed a link between the Synoptists and the cultured Judaism of Egypt. In Luke there is a greater tendency to attribute even simple diseases of the body to demoniac possession than there is in Matthew and Mark, who tend to identify possession with lunacy and madness alone. This tendency of Luke is compatible with his being a physician, for the therapy of the age was exorcismal. It may be remarked that in Lucian's *Philopseustes*, Antigonus the physician excels all the other interlocutors in superstition.

Freedom of John from belief in demons.

8. And now in the course of our inquiry we have incidentally answered, many times over, the question we propounded almost at the outset, as to whether the demonology inside the New Testament is of a piece with demonology outside it. The answer is yes, no other is possible. Justin Martyr, Irenaeus, The Shepherd of Hermas, Tertullian, Minucius Felix, Origen, all testify that the demons which they saw expelled were of the same kind as those which Jesus cast out. It is in defiance of all reason and logic that most Protestants of to-day accept the demon stories of the New Testament and reject those of the second and succeeding centuries. If we allow one, we must allow the other. In the whole range of patristic literature, going back to a time long anterior to the fixing of the New Testament canon, there is never breathed by any writer the least doubt that the demons of the New Testament were real and active in any sense in which the demons of the subsequent age were not. The view which Dean Farrar is ready to accept, that they were specially created in the life-time of Jesus in order that he might have them to turn out, is therefore the most extraordinary of mental

N. T. demons the same with those of every age.

contortions; and to argue about such a view is, as Prof. Tylor well remarks (in his article on Demonology in the last edition of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*), too much like arguing whether the world was not flat during the ages in which men believed it to be flat and only became round afterwards, when they abandoned that belief.

Nor is it only the case that the demons of the New Testament are identical with those of Justin, and those of Justin with those of Irenaeus and Origen, and theirs again the same with those of later ages; but all the church writers in turn, as we have seen, attest that the demons exorcized inside the church were the same as those exorcized out of it. None of them raise a doubt as to the reality of the demons expelled by heathen exorcists. Where Christianity had an advantage over other religions was in this, that demons who fled from no other name, yet trembled at that of Jesus Christ. In particular the New Testament and the fathers attest that the Jewish exorcists expelled real demons before, during, and after the lifetime of Jesus.

Decay in this age of belief in demons

9. It was one of the chief tasks of Jesus as Messiah to rescue the world from Satan and his angels. That he was at once obeyed by the demons was a prime test and proof of his being the predicted Messiah. There is a curious irony in the history of our religion. The evil demons have been all expelled. They have no longer the engrossing interest for divines which they had for nearly eighteen centuries. It is the folk-lorist or anthropologist, if it is not the policeman or physician, anyhow not the bishop of the diocese or one of his deacons, who nowadays hurries to the remote village where old beliefs linger on and where some one is reputed to have a demon or to be a witch. It was not ever thus. Whence the change? why no demons any more? I should answer that it is free inquiry, a scientific attitude, modern science and modern scepticism, which during the last 150 years

due to Rationalism and not to Christianity.

have rid the civilized world of a burthen which dogmatic theology and Christian rites, and even the New Testament itself, had done nothing to alleviate and much to aggravate during seventeen centuries of undisputed sway. For from the earliest ages the superstitious way of regarding the New Testament as a book not to be impugned must have checked the growth of a more intelligent and humane treatment of lunatics. Origen testified to the antagonism which there was in his time between what we nowadays should call the superstitious and the scientific views; and unhesitatingly ranged himself on the side of superstition: "Let the physicians then," he writes, "give their physiological explanations, since they hold in this connexion that an unclean spirit does not even exist, and that madness is no more than a bodily accident (σωματικὸν σύμπτωμα). . . . But we believe in the Gospel and declare that this disease (i.e. σεληνιασμός or lunacy and epilepsy) is due to the working of an unclean spirit, dumb and deaf in the persons suffering from it; and we *see* that those who are accustomed, like the charmers (ἐπαοιδοῖς) of the Egyptians, to profess a power of healing in such cases, do actually seem sometimes to succeed in curing them" (*Comm. in Matt.* xiii. 6). Here we see that Origen appeals to the Gospel against the heresies of the "physiologist"; and it is heart-breaking to think how for nearly 2000 years, in Christian countries, lunatics have been, on the authority of the Gospel, alternately flogged and exorcized. Such are the evils which may attend blind reverence for a sacred book. "Saevius sic nos replevit umbr s[1]."

The task then of Jesus the Messiah and of his disciples, so far as it consisted in overthrowing and annihilating the evil demons which oppressed mankind, has been fulfilled, but not by Christian priests and exorcists, nor in the manner contemplated by Jesus Christ.

10. The question of the limitations of Jesus' knowledge

[1] Pliny, *Nat. Hist.* xxx. 5.

has been much mooted of late. It shows how timorous and halting any re-examination of main premises must ever be in a religious body organized like our Anglican Church, that the most distinguished advocate of the view that Jesus' knowledge was limited shrinks from adducing his demonological beliefs as a proof of such limitation and weakly tries to make out a case for their validity.

Limitation of Christ's knowledge.

The gospels, through which we look back on Jesus, are media of very different refracting powers, and it is impossible to decide whether Matthew and Mark rationalized or whether Luke was simply superstitious. According as we take one or the other view, we must or must not attribute to Jesus himself the belief that tempests and fevers were demons, and that rheumatism, madness, deafness, and dumbness and all other physical weaknesses were due to demoniacal possession. I myself am convinced that he did so regard them. Anyhow he regarded madness as such. Indeed if we are to credit the gospels at all, we must believe that he was thoroughly immersed in all the popular superstitions of his age concerning evil spirits.

Yet where others used names and spells, he cast out devils with a word. I think his voice and glance must have been fraught with a mesmeric influence. Any one who has conversed with one demented, must have felt that reason is in him let and hindered by some cruel flaw in its natural vehicle of expression; yet that it is there, if only one can penetrate behind the barrier that hems it in. In a high, perhaps in an unexampled degree, the manner, the presence, the voice of Jesus must have had this penetrative influence. To the same magic of word and look he must have owed his ascendency over his disciples. It would seem as if with many he had but to say "Follow me," and they followed him. He won almost at sight the lasting devotion of the strongest natures; and the entire history of the early church is inexplicable, except on the supposition that his was a strength of per-

Mesmerism of his presence.

sonality such as has rarely, if ever, in historical times belonged to any one. Others, like Mahomet and Napoleon, have had a natural gift of inspiring unlimited confidence in themselves; but where is any one who ever used the authority over others so gained to such pure ends as Jesus? who that ever had such a faculty of using men, had he chosen to do so for ends of his own, was yet so wholly without pride or false ambition? who ever availed himself so exclusively of his gifts in order to inculcate humility and goodness, and nothing else among others? We must not then make it a reproach to Jesus that he envisaged the combat with sin and suffering in the only way in which one born and bred in his surroundings could possibly envisage it, namely as a battle with evil spirits. His whole career betokens that, if any clearer view had lain within his reach, he would not have hesitated to embrace it, merely because the other view was conventional or widespread. He was not of that timorous cast of mind which economizes truth and makes believe to itself that it holds a creed out of which the time-spirit has stolen all life and substance. When Jesus saw that anything was a figment he hastened to denounce it as such.

The moral for us of his ignorance.

I confess that, if the spectacle of his demonological belief has any lesson for us at all, it is not that we should make vaunt of our superior wisdom. It should rather fill us with a deep humility to reflect that, though he shared with his age certain beliefs which, if held to-day, would be rightly termed superstitious, nevertheless he was, as a moral will and character, so much better than the best of men, that the most progressive races of the globe have rightly recognized in his life an almost unapproachable ideal of love and holiness and self-sacrifice.

(*Concluded.*)

F. C. CONYBEARE.

AN INTRODUCTION TO THE ARABIC LITERATURE OF THE JEWS.

I (*continued*).

5. *Some Classes of Names.*

A COMPLETE list of the Arabic names of the Jews numbers some hundreds, of which many need a special investigation or explication. Sometimes the preliminary question arises, whether such a name is Arabic at all, or belongs to some other language, although it looks much like an Arabic one. For instance, *Abudiente*, in Hebrew characters אבודיאנטי, might rather be of Romance origin (*Obediente*, *Cat. Bodl.*, p. 1762: Moses A. 1762), "diente" not being an Arabic word. We have already remarked that some names adopted by Spanish Jews under the dominion of the Arabs are of Romance origin, but partly changed in some way. Other names, though beginning with *Al*—a syllable which is very frequent in Arabic names, especially in *nominibus relationis* ending with *i*, *patronymia*, &c. (see below, § 15)—are not Arabic: for instance, Alatri, Alatrini, Almanzi, are Italian names. Alpastani in Sicily (1490, Lagumina, *Documenti*, n. 797, II, p. 492) and Samuel Albizi in Rome (1536, Rieger, *Gesch. der Juden in Rom*, II, 419), perhaps Albicci (?), are probably not Arabic. Some names of *modern* time, occurring in Africa, may be connected with some vulgar Arabic dialect—and I confess at once my total ignorance of all vulgar Arabic,—they are happily out of our scheme,

which keeps us closer to the literature of the Middle Ages [1]. A greater number of modern names of Africa and its emigrants in Italy (Leghorn, &c.) is to be found in the list of subscribers of Jona's *Commentary on Abot;* this list is reprinted by Jul. Fürst in his *Literaturblatt* (IX, 1848, p. 742), with a very arbitrary, incorrect division of family names and proper names.

Our alphabetical list of names will offer manifold specific considerations by which alone a correct reading and a true explication of a questionable name is to be ascertained. I will try here to form some groups under collective headings, by which we shall get the *criterion* for the explanation of individual names, and we shall affix some stray remarks which could not find a more convenient place before.

6. *Biblical Names.*

It would not be worth while to mention the Biblical names of the Jews in Arabia, if they had remained unchanged. But they reappear in an Arabian garb: Abraham becomes *Ibrahim*; Jizchak, *Isʿhak*; Jisrael, *Israïl*; Jischmael, *Ismaïl* (see below, § 9); David, *Da'ud* (דאוד) [2]; Ahron, *Harun*; Joseph, *Jusuf*; Ja'akob, *Jaʿakub*; Moses, *Musa*; Mordechai, *Marduk*; Schelomo, *Suleiman* (Turkish, *Soliman*); Schemuel, *Samwil* and *Ismawil*; Schimeon, *Schamʿun* (the ancestor of Josef ibn Aknin); Ieshajahu, *Schajʿa* (שיעא). The name *Ajjub* (Heb. *Ijjob*) is said to have been introduced into Arabia about B.C. 200 (*Zeitschr. für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*, III, 234), which would indeed prove that the Biblical name did not originate in Arabia (*Lit.-Bl. d. Or.*, I, 270).

A peculiarity is the dissolution of Benjamin into its two elements, בן יאמין, or even אבן יאמין (*Hebr. Bibliogr.*, XVI,

[1] We may doubt whether אליתום is an Arabic name or the Hebrew יתום (Brody, *Diwan Jehuda ha-Levi's*, n. 60) with the Arabic article.

[2] According to Wellhausen (*Skizzen*, III, 200) the name Da'ud shows its literary origin, and the Christians were the first in writing Arabic; no proof is given of that assertion.

12, 61, 62, XIX, 37, where it is the name of a Christian; see also *ibn Khallikan*, ed. Wüstenfeld, n. 790, v. Hammer, *Lit. d. Ar.*, III, 535, n. 1402; "ben Jâmîn" al Ba'sri, in the *Fihrist*, p. 162, l. 25, אבן[1].

Something similar is the case in some Hebrew names beginning with אל, which the Arabians considered as the article in their language, and thence used the name without אל. By this process, Lisbon has become אשבונה, Alexander appears as *Iskander*, and, even in Hungarian, Szandor, with modern Jews as *Sender* (Frankel's *Zeitschrift*, 1845, II, 322, notes 12 and 448; Rapoport, *Erech Millin*, p. 66). In this way I derive the name עזאר (*Azzar*) and עיזאר from Eleazar (and, by confusion, from Eliezer), see Zunz, *Zur Gesch. u. Lit.*, p. 521, l. 1; *Hebr. Bibliogr.* V, 51; XVI, 59; O'seibia, II, 86; Leclerc, I, 405; a subscriber at Gibraltar (1848), signs Jehuda צייפאתי (?) ben עזאר. It is not impossible that the Arabic ע got the diacritical point, or the correspondent pronunciation, and became *Gaidhar* (d'Herbelot, II, 522, n. 12). By another variation, of *s* instead of *z*, it might be altered into יאסר (see my *Handbuch*, p. ix, n. 2); ibn abi אליאסר was the name of the father of the historian Elmakin. Even the name יאזר ("Die Kleine Genesis," *Lit.-Bl. d. Or.*, VII, 9) of Terah, father of Abraham, might be a confusion of the father, and Elieser the servant, of Abraham (Frankel's *Zeitschr.*, 1845, II, 322). Treuenfels (*Lit.-Bl. d. Or.*, l. c.) compares with תרח (the expeller of the raven) טרח, Job xxxvii. 11; the legend itself is probably based upon Gen. xv. 11, וירד העיט; cf. B. Baer, *Das Leben Abrahams*, p. 96. In the same way I have explained אלעיזר or אלעזיר, which I found in the work of Zahrawi, being the name of the father of a Jewish physician, Musa (*Hebr. Bibliogr.*, V, 51; *Catal. München*, ed. 2, p. 236; Geiger, *Jüd. Zeitschr.*, I, 241). O'seibia, II, 86 (Leclerc, I, 403) spells the name אלעאזאר, that is, with the *litera protractionis*.

[1] Something similar is תלמי = Ptolemaeus, and Bartholomaeus = בר תלמי (cf. d'Herbelot, s. v. "Batholmai," I, 592 of the German edition), see *Hebr. Übersetz.*, p. 520.

I do not know whether Elijahu has become, through the medium of Greek or Latin, *al-Jas*; Djamal al-Din Husein בן איאז is called אבן אליאס (Uri, *Catal.*, n. 1079); סנאע אלדין אליאס, Ilyas (?), died 1523 (Ersch und Gruber, sect. 2, vol. XV, p. 24).

7. *Translations.*

The translation of names is not a real peculiarity of the Jews, but their wandering, by compulsion or predilection, multiplied the inducement to change their names, and the translation was the most obvious change. Goldziher (*Zeitschr. D. M. G.*, vol. L, p. 119) has pointed out many names of the *Samaritans* which he considers as Arabic translations, but he cannot find any reason why פנחס should be rendered by מנצור. I believe that I have detected the translation of a name in the Arabic legends, viz. כלתם (which means "robust"), the Arabic name of Miriam (see Frankel's *Zeitschrift*, 1845, II, 273); it would prove that the derivation of מרים from מרי is very old, and not a hypothesis of the year 1895. I believe I read it somewhere in a Jewish paper, perhaps in the *Monatsschrift*.

Rödiger discovered that *Lokman* is a translation of Bileam (see *Zeitschrift*, l. c.); and Derenbourg, independent of Rödiger, reached the same result. Zunz has traced a translation even in the Bible itself, in the names of חריף (Arabic) and יורה (*Ges. Schriften*, II, 3).

The oldest Arabic translation of a Hebrew name of the post-Muhammedan period is perhaps *Maschallah* (אם ירצה השם is *Inscha Allah*); the correspondent Hebrew name could be יואל. The father of the poet Samuel (who became proverbial for his fidelity) was called *'Adijja*. Delitzsch suggested a translation of אחזיה; but Fleischer (*Lit.-Bl. d. Or.*, 1841, p. 53) goes for this "un-Arabic" name to the Hebrew עדיהו, עדיה. The name עדי is a genuine Arabic one, occurring before Muhammed.

I give now a short list of almost certain translations

of proper names, which will recur in our alphabetical exposition in their respective places:

Hebrew.	Arabic.	
אגור	גמע or גאמע	(original).
אוהב, אהוב	חביב, מחבוב	
אליעזר	מנצור	see below s.v.
יפת	חסן, הסאן	cf. Saadia, Gen. ix. 27, apud Dukes, *Beiträge*, p. 59.
ישועה	פרקאן	
מבורך	מבארך	Meborach b. Natan ha-Levi, a Karaite, see *Hebr. Bibliogr.* V, 30; Zunz, *Lit.* p. 98; Pinsker, App., pp. 62, 139; Harkavy, *Meass. Nidd.*, p. 182.
מובחר	מכתאר	the Hebr. apud Charisi, ch. 46, f. 65 b; the Arab. almost at the same time, apud Benjamin of Tudela.
מצליח	מימון	
נתנאל	הבה אללה	
סעדיה	מרזוק	*Hebr. Bibliogr.* XVI, 61; ordinarily סעיד.—סעדה is a translation of the Italian *Ricca*.
שלום	סלאם	different from סאלם.

It is no wonder, that we do not find translations of *family* names, since these are generally of a later usage. Al-Charisi translates the Arabic name אבן אלפכאר into Hebrew בן היוצר, which is a kind of pun; and the name צרצה was translated into סנה, perhaps to illustrate the anecdote, according to which his death by burning was demanded (מדוע לא יבער הסנה). It is very improbable that Samuel ibn ʿSarʿsa was burnt by order of a Jewish authority.

It is a natural consequence of a name existent in Hebrew and in Arabic, that each of the two names occurs according to the language of the source.

I may here add a curious instance of formation of an Arabic surname out of a Hebrew proper name. The celebrated linguist Jona (also Marinus or Merwan) is called אבן גנאח, "the winged," because יונה is "dove,"—a name

which indeed is better applied to a woman in the German and Jewish "Taube," which reminds us of Song of Songs ii. 14, &c.

8. *Muhammed, Ismaïl, Israïl.*

These three names require a few special remarks.

I believe that no direct prohibition was needed to withhold a Jew or Christian from calling himself *Muhammed*. If a bearer of this name of "the prophet" is said or supposed to be a Jew, we are entitled to suspect some mistake. I do not even recollect a Jew who, with the turban and the Muhammedan confession, adopted that name. The Spanish family of celebrated physicians, called Ibn Zohr, vulgo *Abenzohar*, has passed, up to our time, for a Jewish one; perhaps because some members of it are quoted with respect by Maimonides; but Wüstenfeld (*Gesch. d. arab. Aerzte*, p. 89), showing the groundlessness of that supposition, lays stress also on the name of Muhammed. F. Lebrecht, in his article on the pronunciation of the name *Koreisch* (*Lit.-Bl. d. Or.*, V, 307), says: "We find with Jews and Christians who dwelt amongst the Muhammedans, all the names of the Arabs, only the name Muhammed was probably not allowed to them. A direct prohibition seems not to exist, probably because it would have been superfluous."

In consequence of the preceding argument, we are entitled to exclude from the nation of the Jews some persons who have been said to be such, or might be considered as such on account of various reasons. For instance, one Muhammed, mentioned in a MS. catalogue of the Escurial, quoted by Wolfius (III, p. 680) and Zunz; see my objection in "Donnolo," p. 74 (78); if *Mumet* in the Provence meant *Maomet* (as proposed by the late J. Derenbourg), it could not well be the name of a Jew, as I argued (*Hebr. Bibliogr.*, XVI, 69). I doubt, therefore, "Mahomad al Londi Judio de Valencia," mentioned by Amador de los Rios (*Storia de los Jud.*, I, 304), an author of not much authority, in spite of his erudition. I once thought that I had discovered

a Jew in "Abu Merwan Suleiman ben Isa אלנאשי," but I found in Hammer (*Lit.* V, 307) that the name of his father was Muhammed. By some confusion, the poet Abraham ibn Sahl of Spain (13th cent.) has become Muhammed, which name he did not adopt even after his apostasy (see *Bibliotheca Mathemat.*, 1896, p. 112).

The name JISHMAËL, in its Hebrew form, was not shunned by the Jews, neither before Muhammed—it is the name of a high priest and of a celebrated teacher in the Talmud—nor in later times; but the Arabic form *Isma'il* אסמעאיל is not frequent, and sometimes we doubt whether it designates an individual person, or whether we ought to supply אבן, so that it denotes the family (*Catal. Bodl.*, p. xxii; *Hebr. Bibliogr.*, IV, 64, against the derivation of "Esmel" from Ismaïl; and *ib.* XVI, 64, Salomo b. Schemtob Ismaïl, 1385). Zunz (*Ges. Schr.*, II, 62) quotes four passages for the proper name Ismaïl; but in the *Teshubot* of Simon Duran (II, 117) we read Chajjim *ben* Ismaïl (אסמאעיל *sic*) which might be equal to אבן, viz. a family name. In n. 96, 97, the same person, Ismaïl, is, in a lawsuit, the opponent of ברהון; and a simple proper name represents, in the שו"ת (opinions), commonly not an individual person of that name, but, like Reuben and Simon—with the Arabs Zeid and 'Amr, in Latin casuistics, Gaius et Titus, Petrus et Paulus, and such like—a fictitious opponent; but Simon, in n. 97, joins the name of the abode of the parties. Indeed, the instances of persons named Ismaïl are very rare, and but recently found. The Spanish Arab, ibn 'Hazm (died 1064), mentions two Jewish physicians, Ismaïl ben Junus and Ismaïl ben פראד (Faddad?); Kasmuna, a poetess in Spain, was the daughter of Ismaïl. Ismaïl ben Musa, the monocular, ben al-'Aizar (אלעאזאר), was a physician at the end of the tenth century (O'seibia, II, 86; Leclerc, I, 405).

The name ISRAËL, late in the Middle Ages, became a proper name. Its Arabic form is slightly altered, *Israïl* (אסראיל; on the orthography see Djawaliki in *Zeitschr. D. M. G.*, XXXIII, 212; Sprenger, *Leben Muhammeds*, I, 344), but

it does not occur as a proper name of a Jew; and, what is rather curious, it is not rare among Christians, who, indeed, considered themselves as the "true Israel."

Instances of Christians with the proper name Israïl are:

Israïl ben Zakkarijja al-*Teifuri* (or Tifuri), a physician about 850 (Wüstenfeld, *Gesch. d. arab. Aerzte*, § 51; Wenrich, *De auctorum graecor. version.*, p. 13; Leclerc, *Hist.* I, 120); probably the same as the physician who ordered the Khalif al-Mutawakkil the Electarium of Salmaweih (Avicenna, *Kanon* V, 1, ch. 3, p. 201); the Latin translation of Gerardus Cremonensis gives, "dabat *israhelita* mutagnachil;" the Hebrew printed translation, as it appears, confused by the Latin, gives, קילאטום (!) אמותאואכיל אלמתואכל מרקחת (*sic*) סמונה אל המנוסה הממונה בלומר שלמוניש [in Lat. *relatum*] מחזק . . . והיה משקה אותו הישראלי לממונה ובלטין מותאואכיל; Israïl has become Israelite.

Ahmed ben Israïl (about 842), astrologer and physician of the Khalif Wathik (d'Herbelot, German translation, I, 214, IV, 611), was probably the son of a Christian. Israïl was the name of a bishop and physician, a pupil of Joseph ben Djilan or Kheilan (tenth cent.; von Hammer, *Lit.* IV, 292: "Ben Beschus;" Ibn abi O'seibia, II, 135).

The wife of Abu Na'sr ben Israïl died in Bagdad A. 1012–3 (*Bar. Hebr. Chron. syr.*, p. 221).

A bishop Israël (A. 1274) is mentioned by Potthast (*Regesta*, n. 20900), and by Poole (*Illustrations of History of Mediaeval Thought*, 1884, p. 85).

I proceed to enumerate some *Muhammedan* learned men, called son or descendant of Israïl; and since we are only interested in their name, a mere quotation of the sources will suffice for the purpose.

(A. 877) Musa ben Israïl of Kufa, physician of al-Mahdi (O'seibia, I, 161; Wüstenfeld, § 44; Leclerc, *Hist.* I, 301).

(Tenth cent.) Israïl ben Sahl, author of a treatise on "Theriak" (treacle) (Os. I, 161; cf. *Catal. Arab. MSS. Brit. Mus.*, p. 684 b; not mentioned by Wüst. and Leclerc).

(A. 984) Abu Ja'hja Abd al-Ra'hman ibn Israïl ibn Nubata, a poet, died A. 374 H. (Chwolsohn, *Die Ssabier*, II. 688, cf. MS. Paris, a. f. 450, 451).

(A. 1136–7) Abu 'l-Ma'ali Nadjm al-Din ben Israïl al-Scheibani al-Dimaschki, died A. 531 H. (*Catal. of the Brit. Mus.*). His Diwan exists in MS. 435 of the Escurial; see also Flügel's *Catal. of the Arab. MSS. in Vienna*, III, p. 88 (in the Index, p. 656, Nedschm. Israel).

(A. 1291) Ibn Israïl 'Afif al-Din al-Tilimsani in Flügel's *Catal. Vienna*, I, 471, 478 (twice) seems the same as Suleiman ben Abd Allah al-'Sufi in *Hagi Khalfa*, VII, 1022, n. 797, where the date is to be found.

(Circ. 1320) Ibn Israïl al-'Hariri, a poet, lived at the time of Dimaschki (Chwolsohn, *Die Ssabier*, II, 399).

(1415–6 ob.) Badr al-Din Mahmud ben Israïl, vulgo ibn Kadhi Simawna[1] in *Hagi Khalfa*, VII, 1048 n., 1852 (see the note, p. 676, ll. 6 and 7 from bottom), is called al-*Israïli*, ib. VI, 414 (cf. d'Herbelot, IV, 603, s. v. Varadat), Mahmud ibn al-Israïli in *MS. Lipsia arab.* 206 (*Catal. Fleischer*, p. 478, where the quotation of *H. Kh.* is to be corrected). This "son of the Kadhi" was certainly no Jew, and "Israïli" stands for ibn Israïl.

(About 1550) Ja'hja ben Na'su'h b. Israïl, in the index of *Hagi Khalfa*, VII, 1247, n. 9156 (see I, 503, and in d'Herbelot, II, 796: Ja'hja ben Israel), seems to be the same as Abd al-Madjid ben Na'su'h ben Israïl in the Index, p. 1017, n. 573, erroneously separated from n. 574, Abd al-Madjid ben Na'su'h al-Rumi. The identity of these two authors is evident by comparing I, 249, n. 485, with II, 325, n. 3134, cf. d'Herbelot, IV, 361, s. v. Taalim.

I am not aware of the date of the Imam abu Bekr Ahmed ben Suleiman ben al-Hasan ben Israïl al-Bagdadi (*Hagi Khalfa*, VII, 1053, n. 1011, only once mentioned, II, 597, n. 4083).

I have omitted Man'sur ibn Ishak ben Israïl, given in the

[1] Simawna is the name of the town where the Kadi resided, Flügel's note, l. c.

last edition of the "Catalogus impressorum librorum" in *Bibliotheca Bodleiana*, I, p. 50 a, as the name of the prince to whom the celebrated Rhazes (Abu Bekr Muh. al-Razi) dedicated his work *al-Man'suri* (vulgo, Almansor), because Israïl is a typographical error for Ismaïl.

It seems to me, that in all these instances the name "ben Israel" does not refer to a son of a Muhammedan man called Israïl, but is = ibn Israïl, a surname (*Kunya*). The Koran only mentions the "Banu Israïl" (sons of Israïl) as a gentilicium.

I am quite at a loss about one "Israïli," of whom it will be more convenient to speak below (§ 15).

9. *Byname—Kunya.*

The proper name is commonly accompanied, or even replaced, by another designation, which either refers to the same person exclusively, or to a greater circle or a class of people of which the single person is a member. This is a *byname* in its widest sense, including that species which is called a *nickname*, and of which I have nothing special to remark with respect to the Jews. We have mentioned, in the preceding paragraph, the physician Ismaïl ben Musa "the monocular." Leclerc has entirely neglected this nickname. If the Moslemin had occasion to call some Jews by nicknames, it was, by a special reason, *not* connected with their faith and *origin*, because for the *latter* purpose the simple name *Jew* has sufficed as nickname to all nations and all times.

The Arabs introduce all kinds of bynames by an adjective, which means "*called*," "*known as*," "*designated by the name*," &c., viz., אלמערוף with following preposition ב, also אלמנבוז; perhaps also אלמעלום (*Cat. Bodl.*, p. 1438, 2384), translated into Hebrew (and afterwards in original Hebrew writings) הידוע ב, also המפורסם ב (in Arabic, אלמשהור ב). In reference to the birthplace of a person, we find the past participle אלמנשא (*educated*): this word has been curiously

rendered הנשיא in an extract of the work of Moses ibn Esra (see *Hebr. Bibliogr.* XIII, 107; XX, 21; the error has been repeated by Pinsker, Append., p. 162; Gottlober, *Bikkoret le-Toledot ha-Karaim*, p. 183).

The oldest determination of a proper name was, with other races as well as the Semitic, the designation of a person as son or daughter of another person, and perhaps at first of his *mother*; but I have not the intention to enter here into the question of *matrarchy* [1], or to inquire why the Jews persevere in the custom of naming their mother in some Hebrew prayers, so that we find the names of two compositors with that of their mothers in the midst of a prayer (in a book printed in Amsterdam). The same custom is to be met with in the old heathen Orient. In historical times, we find commonly the formula, "*X* son of *Y* (father)," which is at once a surrogate of a true family name. The word "son" sounds in Arabic originally *ibn*, written אבן, which has become in Europe *Aben*, *Aven*, so that ibn Roschd and ibn Sina became "Averroes," "Avensina," and, gradually, "Avicenna." Geiger (*Moses b. Maimon*, p. 46, n. 9) has shown that the same word, אבן, introduced into Hebrew (see below) was pronounced *Aben*. Wüstenfeld (*Aerzte*, p. xv) believes even that this pronunciation is to be explained only by the Hebrew transcription, and he makes the Spanish Jews answerable for this corruption. But there are some objections to that suggestion. If some Spanish Jews considered the word אבן as Hebrew, they ought to have pronounced it *Eben*. It reminds me of the curious etymology of this word by Joseph Caspi, in his inedited Lexicon, combining בן and אבן in a more philosophical than philological way. Besides that, we must inquire *where* and *when* the pronunciation *Aben* is to be found first,—if in the *mouth* of the people, Christians or Jews, of Spain, or in Spanish transcriptions. The catalogue of the translations of Gerardus Cremonensis (died in Spain 1167) mentions twice (n. 61 and 74, if the titles are counted)

[1] Justi, *Gesch. d. Or.*, pp. 344, 534.

"Aviceni alboali," Canon; and it is very probable that this old catalogue reproduces the orthography of Gerardus himself. This historical question has only occurred to me recently, and I am not prepared to discuss it properly, so it may be dismissed or adjourned; but not without suggesting an explanation of that strange pronunciation by a circumstance which certainly could not be omitted from this discussion.

The Elif of the Arabic *ibn* has originally no genuine vowel; and if a preceding word is pronounced with any final vowel, the Elif is, by the contraction of the two words, almost eliminated, and we hear only the two consonants *bn*. This contraction is indicated by a sign over the Elif, which is like a loop or noose (ٱ), called *Wa'sla* (conjunction), the theory of which has been treated recently by M. Mayer Lambert, in the *Journal Asiatique* (série ix, tome v, 1895). We shall soon find the same contraction of the Arabic article *al* with the preceding word; for instance, Abu'l-Feda = Abu Alfeda, commonly Abulfeda. If the word *ibn* stands between the proper name or a *Kunya* (see below) and the name of the father of the same person, the Elif disappears totally, and only the Hebrew form *ben* or *bin* remains. It is not impossible that the pronunciation *Aben* is derived directly from the Arabic, either orally or in writing, because the first vowel was not consistent, and the *a* was preferred because it is the most simple in pronunciation, and therefore the oldest one.

The word *ibn* was introduced into Hebrew writings; and a curious abbreviation of it contrasts with the common Hebrew abbreviations, which are words curtailed at the *end*, while אבן is curtailed at the beginning, viz. ן׳, the sign of abbreviation corresponding to the Arabic *Wa'sla*, but absorbing even the ב. The Hebrew-Arabic אבן, and its abbreviation ן׳, have in our prints, and even in old MSS., no specific application or designation. The word has sunk to a mere synonym of בן; but probably it was introduced in the meaning of *descendant*, in a more ample sense, and

serving especially to form a family name, wherefore we shall return to it in a later paragraph.

10. *Abu.*

We have seen (§ 2, p. 229) that the Arabs formed with the word *abu* (father) a byname [1], which supplanted even the real proper name. The Jews adopted even this kind of names in their Arabic form אבו, without translating it into the almost identical Hebrew אבי, which is in Arabic the genitive, and אבא the accusative. אבו and אבן are in both languages expressed by letters so similar to each other that, in the course of time, a confusion arose of these two words in scripture, which is very deplorable, with respect to genealogy and history (Wüstenfeld, *Aerzte*, p. xv). Compositions of *abu* are the family names אבודרהם (more correctly אבודראהים) "father of the Dirham," perhaps originally connected with the name Joseph (*Catal. Bodl.*, p. 855), and אביתור, properly *ibn abi Thaur* (*Catal. Bodl.*, p. 1457).

The word *abu* has suffered an aphaeresis of the first letter, and has become *bu* (see the notes to *Ez Chajjim* of Ahron ben Elia, p. 319); and by a "naturalization," as we might say, even foreign words have been transformed; for instance, *Hippocrates* is reproduced in Arabic translations and their Hebrew offsprings as בוקרט *Bukrat*, which leads to a combination, and even a confusion, with *Socrates* (סוקרט). The Arabic philosopher Gazzali, at the beginning of his refutation of the philosophers, finds one of the causes of infidelity in the strange names of "Sukrat and Bukrat," which impose upon the reader (*Die hebr. Übersetz.*, p. 329, cf. p. 888, "The names of the seven sages"). There was no other reason whatever to mention Hippocrates in matters of philosophy but the alliteration.

[1] Cf. *Journal Asiat.*, 1854, t. III, p. 433. An almost complete list of such compositions is given in the book *Al-Muna fi 'l-Kuna*, by Sujuti, edited in the *Zeitschr. d. D. M. Gesellsch.*, XLIX, 233. The metaphorical names of several things are collected in the *Lexica*.

We recognize such aphaeresis in בו עצר (Harkavy, מ׳ נ׳, p.183), in composed family names like בוזיד, בוזגלו, בולאפי *Bolaffi*, a contraction of the renowned name Abu 'l-Afia (אבו אלעפיה); and perhaps we may derive from אבי the modern name ביקייאם (Abi Kajjâm). Of the same origin may be the name *Bulcali* (Lagumina, *Docum.*, n. 518). A specimen of such a Kunya, as a substitute of a real proper name, is perhaps *Busacca*, a name occurring at least twice in Sicily, viz. Busacca Sacerdote (Kohen), A. 1479 (Lagumina, n. 631), and Busacca la (*sic*) Aurifici, maestro fisico in Palermo (Lag., n. 850, the same, apud Zunz, *Zur Gesch.*, p. 522: Zoref, cf. the poet צורף in כרם חמד, IV, 38, Zunz, *Lit.*, p. 599 and p. 730, where it is wanting in the Index[1]; this poet in Provence might have translated the name from the Arabic צאיג, if he was not really a goldsmith). Busacca is probably contracted from Abu Is'hak = Isacco in Italian, not an abbreviation of Zakarijja.

I repeat here my protest against the derivation of בחיי from אבו יחיי, which has no analogy whatever (*Hebr. Übersetz.*, p. 372, n. 27; on בחיאל see *Hebr. Bibliogr.*, IV, 65). The pronunciation *Bahya*, which has become fashionable even amongst scholars, is not much better than the old *Bechaji*, which makes the strange name Hebrew, and with a sense unfit for a proper name; but it has been used some centuries, and may remain so, as long as no other is really proved.

Another similar contraction, proposed by Fürst (*Bibl. Jud.*, I, 3), is also very objectionable. He explains the Spanish family name *Abiob* by a contraction of אבו איוב "Es wird auch Abba Job (אבאיוב) gelesen." The latter reading is strange, but the contraction of the Arabic *abu Ajjub*—which we shall find connected with the proper name Solomon—to Abiob is also without analogy. I confess that I know no sure explanation of this name; while the family name

[1] Rieger and Vogelstein, *Gesch. d. Juden in Rom*, I, 341, derive the name Busacco from a place (town). Our instances do not admit that.

Aboab is easily explained by אבו הב, the ה as an aspirata being suppressed in the contraction.

11. *The Historical Kunya.*

Before we give our list of compounds formed with *abu*, we must discuss a curious singularity, which I briefly mentioned above (§ 2). I propose to call an *historical* Kunya a compound with *abu* (or *ibn*), where the name composed with *abu* is connected with the proper name elsewhere in history, in the Koran, in the legends, &c.[1] We shall, because it concerns the Jews eminently, take our instances from the sphere of *Biblical* names mentioned in the Koran, beginning with the patriarchs; and we shall give some instances from the literature of the Arabs, which prove that the presumed connexion of names is not merely accidental. We shall avoid every minute chronological investigation into the single instances, arranging them according to their second name[2].

1. *Ibrahim* (Abraham) has the Kunya (not "Ehrennamen," as Lebrecht calls it, in *Lit.-Bl. d. Orient.*, 1841, p. 247) *abu Ishak*. A striking exemplification is given in the Index of *Hagi Khalfa*, VII, 1103, n. 3936–3974 (the last number, ibn al-Zarkala, is indeed = 3971), by not less than thirty-seven persons, to which might be added some other abu Is'hak, whose proper name is not given there, and probably some

[1] The Germans would call it "eine Reminiscenz."

[2] Our instances will be selected, for various reasons, principally from the Diwan of Moses ibn Esra (Luzzatto, *Kerem Chemed*, IV, 84; Neubauer, *Catal. Bodl.* n. 1972; Brody in *Festschrift Steinschneider*, Hebrew part, p. 34), the Index of the Arabic work of Moses ibn Ezra, printed in Appendix II of my *Catalogue of the MSS. of the Royal Library of Berlin*, sect. 2, (1897), and from my list of contemporaries of Jehuda ha-Levi (not published) drawn out of his Diwan (now edited by H. Brody, where the inscriptions are translated into Hebrew, not without mistakes and omissions [for instance, n. 71, the name Josua is wanting], cf. Neubauer, *Catal. Bodl.*, n. 1970, 1971). I have but lately received the ed. Harkavy, Warschau, 1895. I refer also to the Egyptian documents (1155–6), mentioned by A. Harkavy (מאסף נחים, pp. 181–3), and the fragments of the גניזה, now in possession of Mr. E. N. Adler (see below).

Ibrahim, whose Kunya is not given in that Index; see also d'Herbelot, I, 104, III, 341, 815, IV, 338; Wüstenfeld, *Aerzte*, § 62, and p. 25, line 5 from bottom.

A few instances out of Jewish literature will show the importance of that connexion. Moses ibn Esra mentions and characterizes abu Ishak ibn Esra, born in Toledo. I have not hesitated to identify him with the well-known author Abraham (*Catal. Bodl.*, p. 1801; against the unfounded conjecture and emendation of Graetz, VI, 591, see *Hebr. Bibliogr.*, XIII, 41). Abu Ishak ibn Muhagir (Mu'hadjir), likewise mentioned by Moses ibn Esra, is most probably no other than Abraham ben Meir, to whom he dedicated his work (*Catal. Bodl.*, p. 1808, against Luzzatto, who neglected the *abu*). Another abu Ishak, mentioned by ibn Esra, אבן באסה or אבן כאסה, is distinctly named Abraham. A fourth abu Ishak, abu 'l-Rabib, to whom Jehuda ha-Levi dedicated a congratulatory poem on his wedding with the daughter of one ibn Mu'hadjir, was probably also an Abraham. A fifth, ibn Matir, is mentioned by Moses ibn Esra without the proper name, a sixth in old documents is ibn al-Tadjir (אלתאגר), mentioned by Harkavy (*Meassef Niddachim*, p. 183).

Amongst the Arabs we find some authors called abu Ishak *Ismaïl* (*H. Kh.*, VII, 1104, n. 3976–7), instead of *ibn* Is'hak, Ismail being the son of Isaac.

I have found also the Kunya *abu 'l-Muna* (מני, that is, "father of the seed") connected with Abraham, the son of Maimonides. I venture to suggest an allusion to Gen. xxi. 12, where the "seed of Abraham" (the phrase is stereotyped, Isa. xli. 8, Jer. xxxiii. 26, Ps. cv. 6, 2 Chron. xx. 7) is none but *Isaac*. Perhaps it is a free translation of אב המון?

2. *Is'hak* (Isaac) is commonly called *abu Ibrahim*, instead of ibn Ibrahim; for instance, Is'hak b. Josef ibn Baron (ברון, *Hebr. Bibliogr.*, XIII, 91, neglected by Geiger, *Zeitschr.* XI, 234) בן שת, probably = abu Ibrahim בן שת (wanting in Brody); ibn Esra (*Diwan of Jehuda ha-Levi*, Neub., p. 644, n. 48, cf. ed. Brody, p. 26, n. 19, who does not give the

original superscription); ibn Benveniste (*Cat. Bodl.*, p. 1806; Geiger, *Jüd. Zeitschr.*, I, 239); ibn Chalfon (or Khalfun, Arab. כלפון, see my *Catalogue of the Hebrew MSS. of the Royal Library of Berlin*, 1897, p. 29, n. 186); ibn Leb (or Labb? *Cat. Bodl.*, p. cix, Add. to p. 1502); ibn משכראן (*Cat. Bodl.*, p. 1804; Zunz, *Lit.*, pp. 218, 718).—But we find also Is'hak with the Kunya *abu Ja'akub* (Index of *Hagi Khalfa*, VII, 1248, n. 9198); for instance (n. 9200), the celebrated physician Isak ben Salomo Israeli (tenth cent.), and the Karaite ibn Bahlul. But the physician *abu Is'hak* Ja'akub, apud d'Herbelot, whom Wolf (*Bibl. Hebr.*, III, p. 578, n. 1209 b) believes to be a Jew, is the Syrian Christian ibn al-Koff (thirteenth cent.).

3. *Ja'akub* is commonly called *abu Jusuf*; to the learned man in the Index of *Hagi Khalfa*, VII, p. 1251, n. 9318–9324[1], we must join, for instance, the celebrated philosopher al-Kindi, who is registered without the Kunya under Ya'kub, p. 1248, n. 9191, and probably erroneously under Ishak ben Ya'kub, p. 1103, n. 3929. Al-Kindi, whose full name is abu Jusuf Ja'akub b. Is'hak, of a princely extraction, has passed for a Jew; and Gesenius, in his article "Arabische Literatur" in the *Encyclopaedie* of Ersch und Gruber, deduces the Jewish origin of the Arabic astrology from this supposed Jew! Indeed, he figures as a Rabbi in Wolf's *Bibl. Hebr.* even twice, viz. III, n. 1054 b, p. 507, according to a Hebrew translation in Paris (now 470[5]), and as Jakob ben Isaac *Alexandri*, t. III, n. 30. We find the same al-Kindi in a *Catalogue of Vatican MSS.*, published by Cardinal Mai, under the curious name of Josef b. Jacob *Aschalmer!* which defiguration I did not venture to explain (*Die hebr. Übersetz.*, p. 562). Such has been the fate of Biblical names, combined to designate Arabic and Christian authors[2], in the hands of the bibliographers.

[1] N. 9320 has found its place in d'Herbelot under "*Jacub* ben Ibrahim" (II, 782 of the German translation); but Reiske and Schultens gave a supplementary article "*abu Josef*" (I, 42): indeed a doublette!

[2] I could quote a whole set of such ill-founded suggestions to be found

Among the Jews we find abu Josef Jakob אבן אלמעלם, a contemporary of Jehuda ha-Levi and others. Another contemporary, abu (אבא is the Arabic accusative) Josef ben Meimun in Cordova, cannot be identified with Josef, the grandfather of Maimonides, as Luzzatto suggests (*Kerem Chemed*, IV, 89); perhaps his name was also Jakob.

The Kunya, abu Jusuf, which the dubious commentator of the book Jezira applies to the name of Chasdai (or Chisdai, viz. Schaprut) ben Isaac (tenth cent.), is probably derived from a real son Josef, since we find that name twice connected with (the family of) Chisdai (*Die hebr. Übersetz.*, p. 356).

4. *Jusuf* (Joseph) is called *abu* (instead of *ibn*) *Jaʿakub*, whereof two instances are given in the Index of *Hagi Khalfa*, p. 1249, n. 9201–2; and I can hardly accept the contradiction of Chwolsohn, quoted by Firkowitz in a note to Gottlober's *Bikkoret*, p. 134 (see also Firk., בני רשף, p. 20).

Abu Jaʿakub are called three old Karaites, named Josef, viz. Josef ben Noah, Josef Kirkisani, and Josef ben Abraham Kohen. Kirkisani is also called Josef *ben* Jakob, probably by mistake. Recently Dr. Harkavy has discovered an Arabic MS. where Kirkisani is called Jakob, and in consequence abu Jusuf. He maintains the correctness of this transposition (which Dr. Poznański has recently found in some quotations in old Arabic fragments), and he explains the constant quotation of two old Karaites, named Josef, by a confusion of Kirkisani with the son of Abraham (see my *Catalogue of the Hebr. MSS. in the Royal Library of Berlin*, 1897, p. 52). I do not deny the possibility of this hypothesis, but I cannot admit its probability, much less its evidence; the transposition in the Arabic MS. and its quotations being just as well explained as its counterpart; I adhere to the old rule, המוציא מחבירו עליו הראיה. The difference of the proper name of Kirkisani is in itself of very

apud Wolf; for instance (n. 3921 of *H. Kh.*), Jakob ben Isaac "Alsakit" (III, p. 507, n. 1054), אלסקים to be corrected אלסכים, and pronounced al-Sikkit, on whom I must not enlarge.

little consequence, but it is a very instructive instance of the fate of such Kunyas.

Sa'adia Gaon was the son of Josef. Mas'udi calls him ibn Ja'akub. Fürst explains this Kunya by referring it to Josef (*Cat. Bodl.*, p. 2158), and perhaps ibn Ja'akub stands for abu Ja'akub.

5. *Musa* (Moses) is called *abu* (instead of *ibn*) *'Imran* (the Arabic form of Amram); but also *abu Harun* (the Arabic form of Aaron)[1], who was indeed the brother of Moses. An obvious instance is Moses ibn Esra (*Cat. Bodl.*, p. 1801).

Ibn Esra mentions "Moses b. Amram ha-Parsi," whom Geiger (*Wiss. Zeitschr.*, V, 278) does not combine with the sectarian "abu Imran al-Tiflisi," but with "Jehuda ha-Parsi" (see Geiger, *Melo Chofnajim*, p. 76). Pinsker (*Likkute*, p. 26) believes even the identity of abu Imran al-Ispahani, whose name would have been corrupted into Zafrani[2], and Jehuda is, according to his opinion=Judsgan. D'Herbelot, III, 596): Musa ben Amran [read Imran], refers the reader to an article "Mamon" (the Khalif), but there is nothing noticed about the sectarian; perhaps he means the article "Mahmud" (p. 258). Abu Imran Musa is the name of Maimonides (*Cat. Bodl.*, p. 1861), and of Mose Levi Abulafia (*Hebr. Bibliogr.*, XIX, 43). Abu Imran בן אלחזאן (son of the cantor?) is quoted in the medical work מנחבב, *MS. Berlin, Qu.* 751 (*Catal.*, p. 96).

Fürst, in his notes on names (*Lit.-Bl. d. Or.*, VIII, 533), writes the following curious lines (here extracted in English): "Mose Okbari, called abu Amran (*sic*), apud Makrizi 'abu Musa,' cannot be identified with Moses b. Amram ha-Parsi (not ha-Babli). Peculiar (*eigentümlich*) is the transforma-

[1] The aphaeresis of the א is mentioned in the Midrasch Cantic., ch. 2, v. 5, שקורין לאהרן הרן; cf. Tosafot, *Aboda Sara*, f. 27 b, s. v. רגלא. הרון בן במיכה was a contemporary poet of Jehuda ha-Levi.

[2] Abu Imran (not עמרן) Musa al-Za'afarani (אלועפראני, which is the correct reading, corrupted in the Index of Jost, IX, 159) is, according to Delitzsch =משוי (*Lit.-Bl. d. Or.*, I, 742), to whom we shall return in another place. Zaafranijja is the name of a branch of the Muhammedan sect Murdjijja.

tion of Moses [which is to be proved] into משוי, Mesui, or Mesuje (*sic*), or Mesweih (*sic*), in Persian manner, apud Hadassi also מישו Mesu (*sic*), therefore (!) apud Ahron b. Elia; משוי העכברי. Both (Ismaïl and Moses) founded together (!) the sect Okbarijja, mentioned by Makrizi." An exact rectification of this medley would require much more space than we can spare for the truth.

We must expunge from the history of our literature "abu Ahron," mentioned as a performer of miracles by the knowledge of the effectual names of God, a Babylonian, who went to Italy, and taught there his mysterious knowledge to some adepts. It is not my purpose to inquire into such reports, which are sacred to the believers, and not worth while to the unbelievers. I protest only against the *abu*, which Zunz has already recognized as a mistake. Dr. Neubauer has recently discovered an old report of Ahron in a legendary family paper, edited in his second collection of mediaeval chronicles, with the title ספר יוחסין, and my friend, Prof. D. Kaufmann, has written a splendid analysis of this somewhat fantastic paper, the historical value of which he overrates, according to my opinion; but he gives some very valuable emendations of the Hebrew text, and we point out one respecting the questionable name. In the text (p. 119, n. 4), we read "ואבו Ahron, who is the same as the above-mentioned Ahron:" Kaufmann (*Monatsschr.*, 1895, p. 471) reads ואכן, which clears this single passage of the strange *abu*, which perhaps only arose out of this dark source. I wonder that Mr. Epstein, in his learned studies upon the Kabbala (I cannot at this moment give an exact quotation) resuscitates the *abu*, which I thought buried for ever.

6. *Harun* (Ahron) is a name not very frequent among the Arabs, although renowned in Europe through the Khalif in the *Arabian Nights*. According to the analogy of the preceding names, the Kunya would be *abu Musa*, but I have neglected to note any instance, either of Arabs or of Jews.

7. *Da'ud* (David), frequent enough amongst the Arabs,

is called *abu Suleiman*; for instance, in *H. Kh.*, VII, 1233, n. 8618 and 8619, to which indeed belongs p. 1063, n. 2358.

Among the Jews, called abu Suleiman Da'ud, were some old Karaites, viz. al-Kumsi (JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, VIII, 681), and ben 'Hasin ('Husein?), author of a curious Karaitic liturgy (*Jew. Liter.*, p. 117). A contemporary of Jehuda ha-Levi is abu Suleiman Da'ud ibn Muhadjir (*Cat. Bodl.*, p. 1809). Possibly we have to exclude here the physician, born 550 H., in *H. Kh.*, Index, n. 2350, whose full name runs, in older sources: Sadid al-Din abu 'l-Fadhl *Da'ud ben* abi 'l-Bajan *Suleiman* ben abu 'l-Faradj *Israil* ben abi 'l-Tajjib *Suleiman* ibn *Mubarak* Israili Kara, i. e. Karaite (see *Hebr. Bibliogr.*, III, 63; Leclerc, *Hist.*, II, 218; cf. p. 162?) We have there, as it seems, a pedigree of five generations, and the Hebrew names would be David b. Salomo b. Israel b. Salomo b. Meborach.

8. *Suleiman* (Salomon, Solomon) is called by the Arabs *abu* (instead of *ibn*) *Da'ud*, see Index of *H. Kh.*, p. 1063, n. 2367 and 2368 (more correctly ibn Otsma), and there was also to be placed (n. 2352) the name of the renowned ibn Djoldjol, being likewise abu Da'ud Suleiman. Another "abu Da'ud" is wanted (see V, 157), perhaps the same as the Jewish astrologer Da'ud (see *Zeitschr. D. M. G.*, XXIV, 386).

It is curious that I have not noticed a Jew called abu Da'ud Suleiman; indeed, the Kunya of some Jews named Solomon is another, taken beyond doubt from the Arabs, viz. *abu Ajub* (or *Ajjub*, father of Hiob). Kosegarten could not find the key to that strange combination. It is now more than half a century since I explained it by the juxtaposition of the two names in the Koran, Sura 6, v. 84 (*Die fremdsprachl. Elemente im Neuhebr.*, Prag, 1845, p. 16, n. 28)[1].

Abu Ajub is the byname of Salomo ibn Gabirol and of

[1] Fürst, l. c. VIII, 521, borrowing my remark about abu Harun, refers to his article "Abu Ajub," which never appeared, betraying thereby his source.

ibn al-Mu'allim (*Cat. Bodl.*, p. 1812; cf. 1929, *Hebr. Bibliogr.*, VIII, 87).

We find, however, abu Ajub Josef b. Abraham ha-Levi 1471, MS. München, 362. (See, also, our alphabetical list under אביוב.)

9. The Kunya which I will next discuss has its origin in the *New Testament*, but the combination of names is to be derived from their juxtaposition in the Koran, Sura 6, v. 85, where *Zakarijja* (Secharja, but spelt זכריא with final א) is followed by *Ja'hja* (Jo'hannes). Hence every Zakarijja may have got the Kunya *abu Ja'hja*, and every Ja'hja the Kunya *abu Zakarijja* (Frankel's *Zeitschr.*, 1845, p. 80). Ja'hja, son of Zakarijja, is, with the Arabs, the name of John the Baptist [1], who, according to the Koran, Sura 19, 8, was the first to whom God gave this name (Geiger, *Was hat Muhammed* etc., p. 26; Gerock, *Christologie des Koran*, p. 18, without reference to Geiger). Did Muhammed mean exclusively the name Ja'hja? And how shall we explain this transformation of Ju'hanna, the Hebrew יוחנן, which certainly was not unknown to the Christians in the near circle of Muhammed? We shall see that the Jews identified the name Ja'hja, not with Jo'hanan, but with *Jehuda*, which is still more strange!

We may learn from these undeniable facts, which perhaps will never be explained, that in the matter of names, besides rules and customs, there are some special cases to be deduced from individual whim or humour, and that the only sure guide in the labyrinth of names is an historical test which does not restrain from the natural inclination to search for reasons.

We find abu Ja'hja Zak. in the Index of *H. Kh.*, VII, pp. 1248, n. 9175–77, to which is to be added Zak. Kazwini, the renowned geographer (p. 1252, n. 9340), who, curiously enough, does not appear under Kazwini (p. 1124, n. 4694).

[1] Is the saint Abu Zakarijja, whose tomb Saladin visited (d'Herbelot, I, 109, IV, 61, German ed.), perhaps John in Damascus?

Of authors named abu Zakarijja Ja'hja *H. Kh.* offers a fuller store, l. c., n. 9343–53.

In Hebrew sources, we find Zakari (זכרי) instead of Zakarijja (Secharja), but Ja'hja is merely Arabic, and answers to the Hebrew *Jehuda*, as if it were a verbal translation! For instance, Jehuda 'Hajjug (Hajjudsch), Ibn Bal'am, Ibn Gajjâth, Ben Abun (Brody, *Diwan Jeh. ha-Levi's*, n. 64), Jehuda Abbas (father of Samuel, *Catal.* p. 2442), and others. Therefore, we must look out for the men called abu Zakarijja, without proper name, first under the Jehudas; for instance, abu Z. ibn יקוא, or יקוי (to which we shall return in the following section of family names).

We are entitled to suspect some error in the double name, viz. Ja'hja and Zak., of the author of מדרש החפץ MS. Berlin (*Catal.*, p. 71). Ought we to read "abu Zak.?" I doubt the correctness of the name Abu Ja'hja ben al-Rab, if his name was indeed Jehuda (*Diwan Mos. ibn E.*, n. 13). Nor am I persuaded by the article of Dr. Harkavy (לוח אחיאסף, 1894–5, pp. 219 ff.) that the correct name of the teacher of Saadia Gaon was Ja'hja *ben* Zakarijja; but the discussion of that would lead me too far from my subject.

A curious illustration of the formation of similar names is "Schueib abu Madjan," the Arabic name of Jethro (d'Herbelot, IV, 193).

12. *Non-Biblical Combinations.*

It is not my intention to exhaust the application of the type of Kunya which I have proposed to call "historical," because it is derived from a supposed or real historical fact; but to select, from the Arabic literature, some striking examples which have been adopted by the Jews, and *perhaps* (I beg to lay a stress on this hypothetical expression) at first by the *Karaites*, who seem to have transferred the Kunyas of the Mahometan sectarian Djubbai and of his son to their teachers, Jefet and his son Levi (*Catal. Lugd.*, pp. 169, 170).

It will be convenient for future reference to continue

my numbering of the Kunyas, but to arrange them according to our alphabet, without repeating the word *abu*.

10. *Ali* (abu) is the Kunya of al-Hasan (*H. Kh.*, VII, 1038, n. 1420–51), also of *Husein* (ib., p. 1039, n. 1453–62), beyond doubt with reference to the two sons of the Khalif Ali, who are considered by the Alides and Schi'ites as martyrs; their death, as is well known, is represented as a drama in Persia and Hindustan.

We have seen that *Jefeth* has been translated "Hasan;" therefore, the Kunya of the Karaite Jefet is abu Ali.

I have found another relation between the names Ali and *'Isa* (Jesus = ישועה, see Virchow's *Archiv für Pathol.*, vol. LII, p. 373; vol. LXXXVI, p. 85), which explains why the old Karaite *Jeschu'a* is called abu Ali (*Catal. Lugd.*, p. 85). In the old fragments which Mr. E. N. Adler (of London) brought from the גניזה in Cairo, and had the kindness to allow me to look over in the summer of 1896, during his stay in Berlin for a few days, I found the name abu Ali *ben* Jehuda. That does not exclude other names; for instance, abu Ali Jecheskiel (the name is wanting in Brody's edition, n. 40) was a contemporary of Jehuda ha-Levi. Abu Ali ben abi Sa'ad lived (?) in Egypt about 1155 (Harkavy, *Meassef Nidd.*, p. 183), and in the same place we find, in a preceding passage, the name abu 'l-'Alâ ben abi Ali. Zunz (*Ges. Schr.*, II, 21) quotes Dod Mordechai, p. 117 (ed. Wolf, f. 11 b, ed. Wien), but there is an error, corrected by Munk (*Notice sur Aboulw.*, p. 11)[1].

11. *'Hadjdjadj* (חגאג) forms the Kunya to the name *Jusuf*, according to my suggestion, with reference to abu 'l-H. Jusuf, the renowned, though cruel, captain. In *H. Kh.*, VII, 1049, n. 2097–3003, the very first man is the pupil of Maimonides, Josef ibn Aknin[2] (*Die hebr. Übersetz.*, p. 406); other

[1] Mordechai b. Nisan, l. c., has Jeschua בן הרב עלי, as if he were a son of a Rabbi Ali (or Eli); and I suppose that two other Rabbi Ali (l. c.) are created out of supposed fathers, like other fathers, who figure in this list of lately fabricated tradition.

[2] Zunz, *Ges. Schr.*, II, 21 has not realized this identification.

instances are ibn Esra, ibn Na'hmias (ib., p. 740). I suspect some error in the name abu 'l-Hadjdjadj ibn לאיר (Diwan of Jehuda ha-Levi, *Cat. Neub.*, n. 35, ed. Brody, n. 15). The simplest conjecture would be מאיר or לאוי (=Levi).

12. *Hasan* (חסן or חסאן) is connected with Ali (see above, n. 10). *H. Kh.* enumerates more than a hundred abu 'l-Hasan *Ali* (VII, 1084, n. 3202–3307); but the proper name *Ali* is scarcely to be found with Jews who adhered to their faith. We find, however, the Kunya abu 'l-'Hasan connected with very different proper names, as David, Esra, Jehuda, Josef, Meir, Salomo, Samuel, to which I have not been able to discover any special relation; so that we are at a loss to guess the proper name of abu 'l-Hasan ben al-Dajjan (son of the Judge), a contemporary of Jehuda ha-Levi.

13. *Omar* (?): that name, written עמר, is not quite sure, but probable. The reading *Amar* (Zunz, *Ges. Schr.*, II, 28) is certainly wrong; עמאר would be 'Ammâr; Neubauer (*Not. sur la lexicogr.*, p. 182; cf. Bacher, *Leben, etc., Aboulw.*, p. 4) reads *'Amr*, which (in the nominative) is spelt Amr*u* (there is one abu Amru Yusuf in *H. Kh.*, VII, 1042, n. 1568, identical with Jemal ed-Din, p. 1116, n. 4335). Abu עמר, in Jewish sources, is commonly some *Josef*, although I do not find one in *H. Kh.*, VII, p. 1193. I have already called attention to that curious combination in the *Hebr. Bibliogr.*, XI, 24, note 2. Here I mention briefly a number of persons called abu עמר Joseph. This number will appear important, if we consider that the men are all contemporaries with Moses ibn Esra and Jehuda ha-Levi (eleventh–twelfth cent.), viz. ibn Baron (or Barun), ibn al-Dajjan, ibn Kamnial (Cambel), ibn Maschkaran (?משכראן), ibn Sahl, ibn Zaddik, ibn יקוי or יקוא, and ibn מתקה or מאתקה. We may add the Wezir (?) ibn Schoschan (ib., XIII, 107).

14. *Rabi'u* (רביע) is connected with *Suleiman* (*H. Kh.*, VII, 1171, n. 7404–7), and, therefore, in Hebrew abu 'l-Rabi'i (if the Jews pronounced the ע at all) is Salomo: instances are given in *Hebr. Bibliogr.*, XI, 136; XX, 108. Why does

Dr. Brody (*Diwan of J. ha-L.*, n. 109) supply Isak, not Salomo, as n. 220 and בן הראש in Mos. ibn Esra? Harkavy (*Poems of Jeh. ha-Levi*, I, 209) seems to deem Rabi a real son.

15. *Walid* (וליד) seems to have some relation, hitherto unnoticed and not yet explainable, to the name *Jona*. Abu 'l-Walid Junus of Badajoz (al-Bataljusi) was a poet at the court of al-'Hakim II, 961–76 (Gayangos, *Hist. of Muhamm. Dynasties*, II, 171; see Index, s. v. וליד Arab.; Makkari's Arab. work I have no immediate access to). Another abu 'l-Walid Junus, Kadi, went from Bagdad, according to Hammer (*Lit.*, V. 23), who does not refer to his source. I almost suppose that a mistake or a confusion has occurred with the Kadi abu 'l-Walid Junus ben Abd Allah ben Muhammed ben *Mugith*, called ibn al-'*Saffar* (not Soffar), who died A. 1037 (Casiri, II, 149), and who figures three times in Hammer (V, 185, n. 3661; p. 194, n. 3671; p. 280, n. 3982; the latter two are only identified at the end of the volume); but the poet "ibn Mugis," A. 970 (p. 792, n. 1823, according to Gayangos, II, 170: I cannot look after this quotation at present) is certainly the poet mentioned above. Two works of the Kadi ben Abd Allah, &c., are mentioned in *H. Kh.*, VII, 1246, n. 9102.

Among the Jews there is the celebrated Jona ibn Gannach (Djannâ'h), who received the Kunya abu 'l-Walid. He is neither the abu 'l-Walid ben 'Hâlidjin, nor the (ibn) abu Merwan (ben) Walid, mentioned by Wolfius (*Bibl. Hebr.*, III, pp. 4 and 5, n. 14 c and 16 d, quoted in *Cat. Bodl.*, p. 1415), both being entirely forged (probably out of ibn Gannach's names) in the MSS. at Paris, n. 1206 and 1207, containing the Kanon of Avicenna (*Die hebr. Übersetz.*, p. 678; the n. 1204–7 are wanting in the *Register*, p. 1075). Nor is the Hebrew linguist to be confused with "ibn Junus," the Muhammedan author of a work on strategy (*Cat. Bodl.*, p. 1415 et Add.).

Another Hebrew philologer, abu 'l-Walid Jona (ben) Chisdai, called ha-Levi by Abraham ibn Esra, is little

known (*Cat. Bodl.*, p. 1415). Abu 'l-W. b. Faradj, named Chijja, is mentioned in the Diwan of Moses ibn Esra.

13. *List of Kunyas.*

To avoid repetition, I gather here the names (proper names or other substantives) which form, with *Abu*, a Kunya, compiled from Jewish sources or designating Jewish persons, arranged according to the Hebrew alphabet and in its way of writing from right to left, omitting the sources, which will be found at their place in the Index of names, if they are not given elsewhere. I shall omit the *Biblical* names, having dealt with them in § 11. We note abu מורשד apud Wolfius, t. III, n. 16 b, as a forgery (MS. Paris, 1224), like two others (see § 12, n. 15), and *Abiuda* (ap. Gaffarelli, Wolf, I, p. 13, n. 28); אבתמדא (*Zeitschr. für Hebr. Bibliogr.*, I, 120) is a problem. Since we do not regard the article אל, we make no difference between *abu* and *abu 'l.* The words are[1]:

בקא [ברי=כיר] גאלב גיד גנדה [דערי=רבי] דראהם האב (?) האשם
וליד חנאג חסן (חסאן) טאהר יחיי כיר מחאסן מנאדם (? מנאדי) מני
מנצור נצר סעיד סעד עלא עלי עמר (עמראן) עפיא (עפיה׳ better)
פאדה פהם פצל פצאיל פרג פתח רביע רצא שרי[2] תור (אביתור in).

[1] The words in brackets are corruptions, with their corrections.

[2] It was a bad pun, when Delitzsch called Julius Fürst "Jusuf al-Sari"(?) and made him a descendant of Spanish Jews.

MORITZ STEINSCHNEIDER.

(To be continued.)

JEWISH RELIGIOUS EDUCATION.

A FEW years ago Dr. Maybaum published a course of lectures on Jewish Homiletics, which he had delivered in his capacity as Docent of the "Lehranstalt für die Wissenschaft des Judenthums" in Berlin. They furnished the present writer with the subject of an Article that appeared in the pages of this REVIEW in October, 1890. From the pulpit to the school-house is an easy step, and Dr. Maybaum has taken it in a recent work on *Jewish Religious Education*[1], which owes its origin to a further series of discourses delivered from his professorial chair. In the former work the needs of the Rabbinical student, viewed as the potential preacher, were kept in view; the present volume appeals to him as the potential teacher. In general interest, however, the later book is manifestly superior. The art and mystery of sermon-writing is obviously a matter that has little concern for any one save those who are already, or hope one day to be, ministers; though there are still laymen, survivals from a bygone age, who think themselves qualified to instruct even the veteran professional in this difficult subject. But religious teaching—that is to say the religious teaching of the young—is something that comes home to all men's bosoms. For a parent there is no subject so interesting as his children, and nothing that bears upon their training can be foreign to his sympathies. Of Jews, in whom parental affection and educational zeal are hereditary qualities, the truth holds good in a special degree. "What sort of religion shall my child be taught,

[1] *Methodik des jüdischen Religionsunterrichtes*, Breslau, 1896.

and who shall teach him?"—this is a question that necessarily forces itself upon the attention of most Jewish parents. And they usually contrive to get some sort of answer, though it is not always an adequate one.

It can hardly fail to be inadequate, seeing that the question itself receives in many cases but scant consideration. Your end-of-the-century Israelite still believes in the importance of religious education, though in too many instances he may have lost the passion for it that has hitherto been the characteristic of his race, and is content to hold it

"Something better than his dog, a little dearer than his horse."

He still makes inquiry into the credentials of the teacher he engages, though he is perhaps more easily satisfied than he would be if he were investigating the character of his cook. But this *laissez-faire* attitude is almost the exclusive note of the prosperous Jew. To the honour of our working-classes it must be said that their ardour for Jewish education continues unabated. The pecuniary sacrifice that a struggling East-end tailor will make in order to secure what he considers ample religious teaching for his boys, is not the least touching element in a situation that is brimful of pathos. But even his well-to-do coreligionist retains some of the ancestral interest in this vital question. It is the one religious topic that must needs have the attribute of vitality for him. He has children, and he cannot altogether rid himself of the thought that they may have immortal souls after all. Perhaps, too, his minister's favourite contention that character is fate, and religion three-fourths of character, is something more than a pulpit-platitude. Many a man owes his interest in religion to the fact of his being a parent; the earliest cry of his firstborn awakens in his breast echoes that may have slumbered since he himself was a child.

And thus it is that this book of Dr. Maybaum's surpasses in interest his previous volume. The average Jew is more

deeply concerned with the training of a teacher than with the fashioning of a minister, in spite of the deceptive noise and heat that are sometimes evolved in the election of the latter. This, of course, is as it should be. The preacher speaks, it is true, to all ages, but his instruction is unsystematic and indirect; whereas the teacher, though he is engaged in the instruction of the young exclusively, has to perform the most solemn of all tasks—to build up by patient labour the edifice of religious knowledge, and to develop the child's spiritual and moral consciousness. A bad preacher is incapable of doing a hundredth part of the mischief that may be wrought by an incompetent teacher; and though Judaism might survive the closing of all the pulpits, the extinction of the religious teacher would be its death-blow. The world of Jewish life and thought, in Rabbinic phrase, rests on the breath of the school-children.

But mortals, even though they be parents, can use only the materials they have. They cannot make the ideal teacher. They may call him from the vasty deep, but will he come? Assuming that they exercise all necessary circumspection in the choice of a teacher, what are the chances of his turning out satisfactory? The volume before us tends to raise some disquieting reflections on this point. The standard of teaching it lays down is high; but it is so high because of an insistence upon quality as well as quantity. How near does Jewish teaching in England approach to this standard, and for its failure to reach it how much are the shortcomings of the teacher responsible? It is thus that we discern the practical value of these lectures. For Anglo-Jewish teachers, and for the governing bodies of our communal schools and Religion Classes, the book is of absorbing interest. It embodies the views of a thinker who is as practical as he is profound. For the author is no arm-chair educationalist; he has formed his opinions in the school-house. Nor have his ideas, exacting as they may appear to some of us, been nourished by an

antiquated intellectual atmosphere. He has not arrived at them by ignoring new tendencies either in Education or Religion. The very contrary is the case. The author of these lectures is modern to the core. His self-identification with the progressive standpoint is occasionally attended with results which would make an old-fashioned Jew positively shudder. The *Zeitgeist* has found in his breast a congenial home. He accepts the principle of the new Biblical Criticism, and does not seem to feel much the worse for it. But all this only makes him more urgent in his demand for a systematic and an enlightened teaching. If the age is scientific, so too must be the methods by which Judaism is taught. Nay, rationalism is not a synonym for irreligion—Dr. Maybaum is himself a proof that it may be its redoubtable foe. If the bacillus of Agnosticism is in the air, so much the more zealously must Jewish youth be fortified to resist its fatal influence. If the religious life has to be lived under new conditions, religion must be presented under new forms, and imparted by new expedients. I say this here for the information of those of my readers who may imagine that Dr. Maybaum asks much from the teacher, only because he imperfectly appreciates the educational or the religious needs of the present day. Let them be reassured on this point. This Berlin Rabbi is quite up to date in every respect. If there are any defects in his system, they do not spring from ignorance of the conditions of his age. He is content to love the past; he does not live in it. For teachers and school-managers, then, his views are worthy of careful study. No one can read this book without feeling a heightened respect for the importance and the dignity of the teacher's office. But no one can read it, too, without misgiving, without a sense of the disparity between the ideal of education therein set forth and the actual commodity which we English Jews are satisfied to accept.

But this is a book on Methodology, and here am I as unmethodical as possible. Dr. Maybaum takes a long

time getting to the point I have already reached. Faithful to Teutonic practice, he begins at the beginning. Just as he commenced his lectures on Preaching by telling the story of the Jewish pulpit, so his first word about Teaching is historical. But while in his earlier work he carried his narrative back to the Talmudic period, and even to more remote ages, in the present volume he practically confines his survey to modern times. Upon the School-system of the Rabbis he is silent. The mediaeval period he dismisses in almost as summary a fashion as that affected by the famous author who set himself the task of discoursing on Irish snakes. "The growth of Jewish Religious instruction in Germany," he affirms, "dates from the time of Mendelssohn. Religious education, as I understand it, presupposes instruction in other and coordinate branches of knowledge. But this condition was wanting in the educational system of the Jews in the pre-Mendelssohnian age." And then he quotes in support from Güdemann[1]:—"The educational ideal of the German Jews was restricted to the knowledge of Hebrew, the Bible and the Talmud. All other subjects of study were forbidden, and for Mendelssohn the task was reserved of removing the ban that had been placed upon them." So that, according to Dr. Maybaum, the history of German-Jewish education in the period previous to the eighteenth century is easily told—there was no Jewish education in those times. But if he is able to deal with the matter in this beautifully brief manner, it is only because he puts his own interpretation upon his terms, and one that will strike some persons as rather arbitrary. He rightly insists upon the necessity of uniting secular teaching with religious training, of blending Jewish instruction with culture; but he is on less firm ground when he denies the name of Jewish education to a system which excluded the secular element. That system may not

[1] *Quellenschriften zur Geschichte des Unterrichts und der Erziehung bei den deutschen Juden*, p. 25.

have supplied a liberal training, judged even from the general mediaeval standpoint, but it was certainly a Jewish education in the sense of being an attempt to imbue the pupil with love and obedience to Judaism, to train the youthful will and conscience in accordance with Jewish ideas.

Having thus disposed of the Middle Ages, our author proceeds to tell the educational story of modern times. The Mendelssohnian influence quickly made itself visible in the altered character of Jewish teaching. In Berlin, Breslau, Seesen, Dessau, Wolfenbüttel, Cassel and Hamburg schools were established by public-spirited men, in which religious instruction was supplemented by secular teaching. At first, the latter was of the most elementary description; it was confined to the "three R's." But by degrees the curriculum was enlarged both in the private schools and also in the communal schools, which were then beginning to spring up. But the admittance of secular subjects into the educational scheme necessarily modified the character of the religious instruction. There was obviously less time for the study of Hebrew, and, as the German Jews were now beginning to exchange the Jewish jargon for the language of their country, less necessity for it. But what the pupil lost in this direction he gained in another. Systematic instruction in the beliefs and practices of Judaism—the subject now specifically known as Religion[1]—together with lessons on Jewish History began to dispute for the place previously monopolized by the Talmud, the Rabbinical commentaries on the Bible, and the ritual law-books. Of these two subjects Religion was the first to establish its claim. During the pre-Mendelssohnian period

[1] Forty years ago the term, as part of the nomenclature of education, was far less familiar than it is now. I remember that when, as a very small boy, I was seeking admission into Jews' College School, I was subjected to an examination touching my acquirements by the Principal, the late Dr. Loewe. "What religion have you learnt?" was one of the questions. I could only stammer in my ignorance, "The Jewish Religion."

the necessity of definite instruction in the theory of Judaism had been only vaguely felt. The German Jews lived virtually in a state of isolation. They enjoyed but few opportunities of intercourse with their Gentile neighbours; and, seeing that they had little occasion to act as the apologists of their religion, they felt no impulse to make themselves acquainted with its leading principles. Their own inclination, moreover, led them to restrict their attention to the practical side of Judaism. Thus it happened that among the German Jews text-books for instruction in the Jewish Religion were almost, if not entirely, unknown before the middle of the eighteenth century, though several works of the kind had already been in use for a hundred years among the Sephardi Jews in Holland and Italy. In Germany the children had been left to pick up their religious knowledge as best they might from the reading of the Bible. The advent of the Mendelssohnian era changed all this. It was a time whose very splendour was a snare. The emancipation of the Jews, so favourable to their social and intellectual interests, threatened the stability of their religious convictions. The youthful Israelite found the barriers that had hitherto separated him from his Christian neighbours suddenly thrown down. Unarmed by any adequate knowledge of the sane and inspiring doctrines of Judaism, he was exposed, without protection, to the alluring influences of Christianity. The result is recorded in the history of German-Jewish apostasy during the earlier part of the present century. The crisis called for energetic measures, and one of them was the publication of school-books on religion, the contents of which took the form of catechisms. The first of these works was Dessau's *Grundsätze der jüdischen Religion*, and its date is 1782. Other books quickly followed, and it has been computed that up to 1884 no fewer than 161 of such works had appeared.

Manuals of Bible History came later. Dr. Maybaum accounts for this fact by the circumstance that the Jewish

pupil formerly had to translate so much of the Hebrew Bible that he was able to get a sufficient acquaintance with the Bible story at the same time. Scripture Histories were therefore less urgent necessities than books on Religion. But is not the comparative easiness of Bible history as an educational subject another explanation? The teachers themselves needed a manual of Religion as a *vade mecum*; for instruction in Scripture History they could rely upon their own resources; or, at any rate, they could teach the subject Bible in hand. However this may be, as the quantity of Bible-translation was gradually reduced, the need of independent and systematic instruction in Scripture History became more imperious. Moreover, the importance of giving a moral and religious training to girls, who were never expected to know as much Hebrew as their brothers, was beginning to receive recognition. And thus the text-book of Scripture History was evolved. According to Dr. Maybaum, the *Or Amunah* by Bär Frank (Vienna, 1820), deserves the honour of being regarded as the pioneer work. This book is a digest of the history of the Pentateuch and, as its title indicates, was compiled "for females." A year later there appeared, also in Vienna, the *Sepher Hayashar Ve-haberith,* "a Scripture History for the Young," by one Moses Samuel Neumann. By the year 1884 fifty-seven text-books on this subject had seen the light.

Post-Biblical history was the last to engage the attention of the school-book writers; but then it was also the last to attract the notice of the schoolmasters. As a part of the curriculum, Dr. Maybaum rightly calls it "ein Kind der neuesten Zeit;" its beginnings go back no further than the time of Zunz and Rapoport, and it is only within the last two or three decades that it has firmly established its claim in Germany to admission as an integral constituent of Jewish teaching. "It is only in recent years, in liberal circles more particularly, that a desire has been manifested to popularize the history of

the Jews in the Diaspora as a new means of animating the Israelite with enthusiasm for his ancient vocation, and of arousing in his breast a feeling of pride with which to oppose the disdain of his enemies. By this expedient the assertion is refuted that since the fall of the Jewish State Judaism has ceased to be a factor in the world's culture, and that its ancient mission has been transferred to another religion. Moreover, the principle of religious evolution finds confirmation in the historical fact that not only the external form of religion, but its indwelling thought, has undergone continuous development, and both in the synagogue and in the outer world has conformed to the ideas which the Jews have acquired from their environment. Thus Jewish history, viewed from the educational standpoint, is to be regarded not as the history of a literature merely, but as essentially the history of the Jewish mind; and only in so far as the development of the religious idea is discernible in them should the literary productions of eminent writers furnish an ingredient of religious teaching. And thus it is that the extension of the scope and importance of religious-historical instruction is, like the creation of Jewish Science, one of the chief merits of the Reform movement among the Jews of the present day." The educational value of Jewish history could not be better conceived or expressed; and deeply interesting and significant is the fact that in Germany its value has found the quickest and the most generous recognition among those of our brethren who belong to the advanced school of religious thought. Of England the same thing can scarcely be said, for the sufficient reason that, as an educational subject, Jewish History has hitherto been treated by Conservative and Reform Jews with equal neglect. In so far as its recognition as an element of general culture is concerned, honours are divided. Neither party deserves a preponderating share of the credit that attaches to the establishment of the Jewish Literature Societies, which, comet-like, have from time to time shot

across the communal firmament, or of the blame for allowing them all to disappear ingloriously. The new Jewish Historical Society of England, again, finds proportionate support from both sections of the community. The Society is common ground where Orthodoxy and Reform unite in promoting a cause dear to both alike; or rather it is one of the many valuable opportunities happily enjoyed by English Jews of forgetting that they have any religious differences. Nevertheless, in the schools the teaching of Post-Biblical History has thus far been *une quantité négligeable.*

But I have not yet done with Germany. The first text-books of Post-Biblical History published in that country were Elkan's *Leitfaden beim Unterricht in der Geschichte der Israeliten* (Minden, 1845), and a *History of the Israelites from Alexander to Modern Times*, again by J. H. Dessauer (Erlangen, 1846). Dr. Maybaum enumerates eight manuals on this subject that appeared in Germany between 1845 and 1889.

One subject remains to be considered: Hebrew. In former times the Primer was practically unknown. Hebrew reading was taught from the Prayer Book or the Bible. But Güdemann tells us that as early as 1658 R. Abraham Model of Oettingen invented a method of teaching Hebrew Spelling by means of movable letters—a device with which, as some of my readers will recollect, the late Mr. A. N. Myers familiarized us in this country. Model likewise appears to have anticipated the modern Primer in his *Sepher Maarechet Abraham*, in which a special typographical treatment of the alphabet enabled beginners to readily master the difficulties of Spelling. He also emphasized the desirability of teaching the pupil Grammar *pari passu* with Reading. But the first systematic text-book was Samuel Detmold's *Moreh Derech*, based on the principles of Pestalozzi. It appeared in Vienna in 1800. By the year 1885 seventy-one such books had been published.

Let us now leave Dr. Maybaum for awhile, and trace in

barest outline the early history of Jewish education in England. Systematic religious teaching in the modern Anglo-Jewish community is as old as the community itself[1]. The foundation of the first communal Jewish school in the post-Expulsion period synchronizes with the establishment of the first Jewish house of prayer. We find the Rabbi of the Sephardi—the pioneer—congregation devoting several hours daily to the instruction of boys[2], under the supervision of a Warden especially appointed *ad hoc*. That was soon after the middle of the seventeenth century[3]. It is not too much to assume, however, that the instruction was restricted in range. A great deal of Hebrew may have been taught, but little Religion, and doubtless less History. The instruction, moreover, was exclusively religious; the time for the community to busy itself with secular teaching was not yet. The children, too, were taught in Spanish, which continued to be the vernacular of the Sephardi Jews in London for several generations. It is certain that Dr. Maybaum would refuse the name of education to these early attempts at instruction. Some seventy years had to elapse before the need was perceived of a change in the crude methods that had satisfied the Jewish settlers under the Protectorate. It was not till 1735 that the Spanish and Portuguese congregation established a "Writing School," where poor children were to be taught the elements of an English education. The sum annually voted for this purpose was just twenty pounds.

Thus the secular element was introduced for the first time into the educational system of the Anglo-Jewish community. But in this respect the Jews of England,

[1] The details in the following two paragraphs are from Picciotto's *Sketches*.

[2] The girls had to wait till 1730, the date of the establishment of the Villareal School.

[3] In a speech delivered at the opening of the new Spanish and Portuguese Schools in Thrawl Street in February last, Mr. Arthur Lindo gave the date of the foundation of the original schools as 1664, i.e. two years after the establishment of the first synagogue.

strangers and sojourners though they were in the land, beat their brethren in Germany by half-a-century. The introduction of secular teaching coincided with an attempt to improve the religious instruction. The effort was not made too soon. In the three divisions of the Sephardi schools the subjects of instruction ranged from the Hebrew Alphabet to the translation of *Rashi*, with translation of the Prayer Book and of the Bible and the rudiments of Grammar as intermediate stages. Nothing else appears to have been taught—neither Post-Biblical History nor Systematic Religion, though no doubt the pupil assimilated certain facts of Scripture history while he was learning to translate the sacred text. The Sephardim, as we have seen, were not satisfied with the existing state of things, but their dissatisfaction was kindled less by the meagreness of the educational fare than by the insufficiency of the system under which it was supplied. Their reformatory endeavours, however, led to nothing. Chacham Nieto, who died in 1773, condemned the schools in unmeasured language. The boys, he declared, were "steeped in crass ignorance." The masters attended irregularly, and the scholars bettered their instruction. Discipline was conspicuous by its absence, as were both teachers and pupils. In 1779 a committee of inquiry reported "that of the total number of sixty-four pupils scarcely one-eighth could even read Hebrew after an instruction of seven or eight years, and nearly all were unacquainted with the daily prayers." The cost of this huge failure was £600 a year, or a trifle under ten pounds per scholar. The drastic changes that resulted from the inquiry possibly did something to ensure the Sephardi Schools the greater efficiency they subsequently attained; but the rapid improvement in the intellectual condition of the Anglo-Jewish community, which had now set in, no doubt did more. The first years of the century found the Ashkenazi Jews in London successfully contending with their Sephardi brethren for the communal primacy. They had rapidly increased in numbers and intelligence, and

a new-born educational ardour was the firstfruits of their improved condition. In 1818 the Free School in Bell Lane was opened, and in mere size alone overtopped at a bound the kindred Sephardi institution with its century-and-a-half of life.

It is right, however, to point out that the educational zeal of the German Jews was a plant of very slow growth. It is a commonplace that in Jewish communities the school is ever the contemporary, if not the predecessor, of the house of prayer. The Ashkenazim in England furnished the exception that proves the rule. In this respect their history certainly compares unfavourably with that of their Portuguese brethren. The latter made the provision of religious teaching a congregational duty from the outset; with the former it was the last to be admitted into the category of communal obligations. By about the middle of the last century the Germans had three synagogues, a Chief Rabbi, a cemetery, a charitable society (the *Chebrath Hachnasath Berith*), but no organized religious instruction. The present century dawned without seeing the deficiency repaired. The synagogues wrangled among themselves about matters of more or less trifling moment, but the great question of ensuring the future of English Judaism by engaging for the religion the affection and loyalty of the young was not considered, or, if considered, was thrust aside as of small importance. Poor boys in those days were left to the training of the streets; "they were educated in the sale of oranges and lemons, cedar pencils and sponges in stony-hearted London[1]." What little instruction they received consisted of "some sort of parrot-Hebrew drummed into them anyhow" by foreign Melamedim[2]. The establishment of the Talmud Torah school about the year 1770 was the only organized attempt to improve matters. But it was at best only a feeble and meagre attempt. The school was intended to give religious

[1] *Jewish Chronicle* for July 16, 1869. [2] Ibid.

instruction to exactly twenty-one boys. Neither the number nor the sex of the pupils ever varied. But about twenty years after the foundation of the school it was decided to extend the course of instruction by adding secular subjects —of course the usual "three R's." In Hebrew, however, the scholars were taken pretty far. Thus at the consecration of the new buildings of the Free School by the Rev. Dr. Hirschell in 1822 the boys of the Talmud Torah, after following the Chief Rabbi and their master in circuit round the school, recited a portion of the Mishnah [1].

The teaching of a score of boys thus represented the entire provision made by the German Jews for the religious education of the poor down to the middle of the first decade of this century. In 1807 the Jews' Hospital was opened, chiefly owing to the energy and educational zeal of Abraham Goldsmid. But this institution was not a day-school, and it accommodated only eighteen children (ten boys and eight girls), so that it was obviously unfitted to solve the great problem which, in spite of the comparative indifference to education that generally prevailed in this country, was beginning to press upon the Anglo-Jewish community with increased force. The solution was found in the establishment, largely at the instance of the Rev. Dr. Hirschell, of the Free School in Spitalfields, hastened, as that event doubtless was, by the recent strictures of Mr. Patrick Colquhoun, on the condition of the Jewish poor [2].

Even the great School was initiated in timid fashion. For its beginnings we are told to go back to a couple of rooms, "bare-walled and rough [3]." It is certain that

[1] The programme of the proceedings lies before me. The earliest minute-book of the Talmud Torah that I have seen dates from February, 1791. Dr. Joseph Hart Myers was then President, and among the other managers of the School were L. B. Cohen; Moses Hart; Abraham, Asher, and George Goldsmid; E. J. Keyser; Naphtali Hart Myers; Alexander Phillips; Michael Samson, and Lyon de Symons.

[2] As to Colquhoun see Picciotto, p. 257 seq.

[3] *Jewish Chronicle*, July 30, 1868. The Free School may be said to have

a modest house in Ebenezer Square, Spitalfields, was the immediate precursor of the building opened in Bell Lane in 1818. Even in that building the curriculum was very limited; it did not go beyond the reading and writing of Hebrew and English and the rudiments of arithmetic, and the 270 boys were taught by one master. When two years later the school was enlarged for the reception of 600 boys and 300 girls, the scheme of instruction does not appear to have been materially widened [1].

The marvellous growth and achievements of the School in more recent times are familiar matters, and need not here be dwelt upon. The establishment of other important schools, not only in London [2], but in the larger provincial

issued out of the Talmud Torah School, which, at first, carried on as a separate establishment under the same roof as the Free School, was subsequently incorporated with it.

[1] The above particulars are taken from the annual Reports of the School for 1835 and 1861. The subjoined extract from the former Report may be interesting:—"The following is the present state of the Boys' School, the major part of which is composed of a considerable number of scholars scarcely more than six years of age. (The total number of pupils in the boys' department at that time was 310.) Hebrew—86 translating the prayers and the Bible; 61 reading the prayers; 76 reading easy lessons; and the remainder in the lower classes. English—130 read the Bible and Mrs. Trimmer's Selections; 91 are in lessons; and the remainder in the lower classes. Arithmetic—20 in reduction and division; 30 in multiplication and subtraction; and 100 in addition and the tables. The Girls' School is attended by 122 scholars, 25 of whom read the Bible, and 35 read Mrs. Trimmer's Selections, the remainder being in the lower classes; 26 translate, and 40 read the Hebrew Prayer-Book, and the rest are rapidly advancing; and 30 are pretty forward in the first four rules of arithmetic. The needlework proceeds with astonishing rapidity. . . . The great use made of the female children among the poor in necessary domestic employment keeps this portion of the establishment thinly attended; on which account, as well as for many other reasons, an Infant School would prove of great importance."

[2] The earliest Jewish School in London, apart from the Free School in Spitalfields, is the Westminster Jews' Free School. The beginnings of this school seem to be known to no man. I have consulted the "oldest inhabitant" on this point, but without getting any definite information. According to the School Reports the institution was founded as far back as 1811; but it would appear that in those early days it was nothing

towns, followed in quick succession. But the voluntary school movement in the Anglo-Jewish community was not destined to enjoy indefinite expansion. It reached its culminating point in 1876, when the Jewish Association for the Diffusion of Religious Knowledge, now the Jewish Religious Education Board, established its first group of classes for Hebrew and Religion at the Board School in Old Castle Street, Whitechapel. This new departure, which was destined to exert an important influence upon the methods and character of the religious teaching of the community, was among the firstfruits of the Education Act of 1870. By that measure the provision of elementary education was recognized as a duty of the State; and the Jewish poor, despite their inherited prejudice in favour of sectarian teaching, were not slow to avail themselves of the educational facilities thus offered to them as citizens. In this step they were encouraged by the attitude of a section of their more prosperous brethren, who considered themselves absolved by the payment of the School Board rate from the duty of supporting denominational schools, or at least from the obligation of promoting the establishment of new ones. Moreover, the increase in the Jewish poor during the last fifteen years has been too rapid to admit of sufficient provision being made, by an enlargement or multiplication of the communal schools, for the new educational needs thus created. Thus the movement initiated by the Jewish Education Board has progressed by leaps and bounds. The group of classes established at Castle Street has since

better than a Talmud Torah, which was carried on at some unknown *locale* in the West End (Drury Lane according to one informant). The precise date when the establishment blossomed into a complete school, with secular as well as religious teaching, cannot be ascertained with precision. The Girls' School was not established till 1846, and for some time was carried on as a separate institution. The earliest extant minute-book of the Schools does not go back further than that year—a glaring instance of that indifference to the preservation of their records, which unfortunately characterized the managers of the communal institutions in former days.

multiplied into nine groups attached to various East-end Board Schools, and the total number of scholars has increased from 400 to nearly 6,000. For good or evil it seems to be fated that no new denominational school will be established in the Anglo-Jewish community. Even the conservative Sephardi congregation have so far yielded to the influence and exigencies of the times as to limit the teaching in their Boys' School to religious subjects, and now trust to a local Board School for the secular instruction of the scholars.

The Elementary School and the Board School Classes, however, do not represent the entire religious educational apparatus of the community. Religious teaching is not the exclusive need of any class. At one time it was quite the fashion for the more prosperous Jews to send their children—their boys more particularly—to Jewish Boarding Schools. Some of these "Academies" have played no insignificant part in the training of distinguished English Jews past and present. They acquired a reputation which has outlived them. Garcia's school at Camberwell, Hurwitz's (afterwards Neumegen's) school at Highgate, Solomon's at Edmonton, Mrs. Belisario's in St. John's Street Road, were at once the earliest and the most famous of these establishments. Other schools, newly come up, have taken their place, but their scholars are chiefly recruited from the lower middle class, the wealthy Jews evincing an increased predilection for an arrangement which enables them to give their boys a Public School training combined with a certain measure of religious instruction. Jewish houses at Clifton and Cheltenham, and a Jewish visiting tutor at Harrow, are quite *fin de siècle* phenomena.

What effect these recent developments will exert upon the future of English Judaism, time alone can show. The present educational outlook is not reassuring. It is more than doubtful whether what advertisers are fond of styling the *élite* of the community maintain their old zeal for

religious education. Religious studies are being slowly pushed to the wall by the ever-growing demands of a system which has the Public School and Competitive Examinations for its chief features. The evil has begun to affect religious instruction pure and simple. As to the teaching of Hebrew, that has already been frankly expelled from the category of necessary studies in certain circles. On the other hand, it is questionable whether the state of Jewish education among the humbler classes is altogether satisfactory. The arrest of the Voluntary School movement, to which allusion has just been made, has not been free from drawbacks. The Board School Classes merely supplement the Voluntary Schools; they cannot, as their managers themselves admit, replace them. The Jewish Education Board does wonders with resources whose inadequacy is a standing monument to the communal niggardliness; but the Board would be the first to confess how meagre is the instruction it is able to impart, especially in the matter of Hebrew. A comparison of the results respectively attained in the teaching of this subject by the Board School Classes and by an organization like the Talmud Torah in Great Garden Street, brings this fact out only too clearly. What seems to be needed is an arrangement which would ensure to boys, at any rate, under the supervision of the Board, more thorough instruction in Hebrew on a modified Talmud Torah system, without interfering with the quality of the religious and ethical instruction now being given by the Board. I am not blind to the defects of the Talmud Torah system. Even the Great Garden Street School, which, after all, is only a glorified *Cheder*, has its obvious limitations. The system is more or less mechanical, and the most sacred things are taught as a sort of drill. Perhaps, too, the charge brought against all such schools, that they involve over-pressure, may have some truth in it; though I believe it to be exaggerated. But the great point is that the Talmud Torah system has the confidence of the parents,

and that, in consequence, the children attend, and, what is more, learn [1].

Nor has religious teaching among the lower middle class been proof against change. Time was when the children of parents in comfortable circumstances, if they were not sent to a Jewish boarding-school, received their religious instruction from a teacher at home. But the private teacher is in less request than he formerly was. He has found, I suspect, a formidable rival in that expedient, at once new and old,—the Congregational Religion Class [2]. Religion Classes are now attached to nearly every London Synagogue that has any pretensions to religious vitality. In effect they are a return to the ancient arrangement which identified the religious school with the synagogue [3].

Following Dr. Maybaum's method of procedure, let us

[1] The Great Garden Street Talmud Torah gives instruction to 600 boys in eleven classes; many children are waiting for admission. The subjects range from Talmud to *Aleph Beth*. The expenditure for 1896 was £923. The children's pence brought in £388, the subscriptions and donations £597. The School is managed by a local Committee. There is an inferior Talmud Torah of about the same size in Brick Lane.

[2] As a matter of communal history I deem it right to state, under correction, that the first Congregational Religion Class, i.e. a Religion Class primarily intended for the children of a particular congregation, and held under its auspices, was that established by my wife at the North London Synagogue in 1873. The first Sabbath Classes, unconnected with a synagogue, were those established and conducted at the Free School in the "forties" by Mrs. Barnett, the first head-mistress of the school. At a later date her daughter, Mrs. Harris, held similar Classes at 14 Devonshire Square (her daughter, Miss Emily Harris, still conducts a Sabbath Class at Hanway Street Schools). The Revs. A. L. Green and B. H. Ascher used to deliver occasional discourses at the meetings in Devonshire Square. Still later Classes were held at the Infant School and at the Borough Synagogue in Prospect Place, Southwark. In the West End a Sabbath School was established by the Countess d'Avigdor and the Rev. Dr. Löwy more than thirty years ago. It was held at various places, the Birkbeck Institute being the first of them.

[3] In the smaller provincial congregations, which are too poor to pay for the luxury of special Jewish schools, what is virtually the primitive system still survives. The children attend an unsectarian school, and then resort, at the synagogue or elsewhere, to the congregational teacher, usually the minister, for religious instruction.

now inquire what has been done by English Jews in the matter of providing suitable school-books. An analysis of Messrs. Jacobs and Wolf's Bibliography[1] will show that by 1888 there had appeared in this country twenty-one text-books on Hebrew (Spelling-books and Grammars); twenty-three on Religion, ten on Bible History, and only four on Post-Biblical history, of which one (Mrs. H. Lucas's edition of Dr. Cassel's *Leitfaden*) is a translation. Judged by quantity alone, the output is not discreditable. The quality is, as a rule, less satisfactory. The earliest work on Hebrew mentioned in the list is a Grammar by one Jehudah Stennett, published as far back as 1685. But we do not meet with a book on Religion until 1815[2], nor with a Scripture history until 1839[3]. Post-Biblical histories, as in Germany, are a bad last. The earliest seems to have been the Rev. A. P. Mendes's *Post-Biblical History of the Jews*, which was published in 1873. When to the translation of Cassel, already mentioned, Lady Magnus' two works are added, the meagre list is, I think, complete. The number of Anglo-Jewish text-books has slightly increased since 1888[4]; but it will bear further extension. A properly graduated Hebrew Primer and an Elementary Grammar, methodically arranged, are crying wants[5].

But it is time we returned to the book under review. From the history of Jewish Education in Germany, Dr. Maybaum passes to Education viewed from the

[1] Publications of the Anglo-Jewish Historical Exhibition, No. 3, 1888.

[2] *Elements of Truth for the Use of Jewish Youth of Both Sexes*, by S. J. Cohen.

[3] *The Guide of the Hebrew Student*, containing an epitome of Sacred History, by Hermann Hedwig Bernard, formerly Howitz.

[4] Notably by the publication of Miss E. M. Harris's *Narrative of the Holy Bible*, Dr. Friedländer's two books on Religion, and Mr. Claude Montefiore's *Bible for Home Reading*, though the author would perhaps disclaim the appellation of text-book for the last-named work. As I am on disputed ground I may also mention the *Mehayil El Hayil*, a series of lessons on Religion by various writers.

[5] Since the above was written the first part of the Rev. Michael Adler's Grammar has appeared, so that there is an excellent prospect of one of these needs being supplied.

pedagogic standpoint. This is his principal theme, and it naturally divides itself into two parts: matter and method, and his treatment of both branches of his subject is at once brilliant and comprehensive. He puts in an eloquent plea for the teaching of Bible history. The moral law, he points out, is universal law; and, apart from the religious truths interwoven in the Sacred Narrative, the ethical spirit which pervades it makes it "a copious well-spring of ethical-religious instruction, at which the young cannot be made to drink too often or too deeply or too soon." But, judged even from the schoolmaster's point of view, the Bible becomes a peculiarly valuable medium for the inculcation of the higher truth. The Bible is a narrative, and experience shows that an axiom, whether religious or moral, sinks with greater certainty into the child's consciousness when it is associated with an event. He sees, so to speak, the consequences of right and wrong-doing in action, and thus he not only learns doctrine, but acquires the practical wisdom which consists in the application of doctrine to life. "Therefore," says Dr. Maybaum, "the Bible history is the most important subject of religious education." We all remember how firmly even Professor Huxley held this view[1]. He considered that its vivid story made the Bible an ethical text-book for young children, which no other could replace.

For Jews, of course, the Bible has a unique educational value. It is the history of their religion, in its earlier phases at any rate—the story of a spiritual development extending from primitive times to the age of the Sinaitic covenant, which, according to Dr. Maybaum's theory, marks the culminating point in the evolution of the religious idea. What remains of the Bible-narrative is undoubtedly a record of growth, but of the growth of the religious *consciousness* in Israel—the growth of the people's power of assimilating the great principles of its

[1] See his article on "The School Boards," in the volume on "Science and Education."

creed, and of realizing the grandeur of its mission. To trace this spiritual development step by step is the business of the teacher. Nor will he omit to draw out the truths imbedded in the narrative. Thus he will use the life of Joseph to illustrate the working of Divine Providence in human destiny. But here certain difficulties present themselves which the teacher must boldly face. He must be prepared to pass over without hesitation those passages which, for obvious reasons, are unsuitable as a basis for the instruction of children. On the other hand, the desire to preserve the continuity of the narrative must not be thwarted even by a regard for modern Biblical criticism. "Certain Scriptural personages have come in recent times to acquire a mythical character; certain Biblical institutions, hitherto believed to be ancient, are now held to be of comparatively late origin; prayers and other utterances are declared to be later than the men in whose mouths they are placed. Considerations such as these must be no stumbling-block to the teacher. The composition of Holy Writ, no matter the age in which it took place, was manifestly undertaken for religious ends; and those ends have been hitherto attained by the Bible, in its traditional shape, so satisfactorily that for the purposes of religious instruction we have every reason to keep its story unaltered." In other words, Dr. Maybaum, while not denying the general truth of the Critical Theory, would seem to rule it out of court in the schoolroom. I word the sentence cautiously because later on, as we shall see, he boldly declares himself in favour of introducing the results of Biblical Criticism into the teaching of the more advanced classes.

From Biblical to Post-Biblical History is only a step. If the former tells how the Jewish people has gradually risen to a complete perception of its mission, the latter traces the progress of the mission towards actual fulfilment. Wandering Israel is now engaged in founding the Kingdom of God among the various nations. The new conditions

thus created give rise to fresh religious developments within the domain of Judaism. These developments, however, are not regarded by the Israelite as really new. He knows how to connect them organically with the old religion; he conceives of an Oral Law imparted simultaneously with the Written Word. Dr. Maybaum's remarks on this point possess so much intrinsic importance, and throw so much light upon his religious position, that I may be permitted to give his *ipsissima verba*. "One hardly knows," he says, "whether to style this notion of an Oral Law self-deception or a sound intuition, seeing that it is both the one and the other, according to the point of view from which it is regarded. For, as a matter of fact, an Oral Law, if not in the sense of the ancients, has been given in every age, nay, a law always older than the corresponding written code, which is only popular custom crystallized in statutes . . . . And thus it is that Jewish history shows us that the law is not immutable, but always in the making (*ein stets Werdendes*). Each epoch places a term upon the religious development of its predecessor, and thus transforms the Oral into a Written Law." And this process is still going on, for it is endless. Here Dr. Maybaum's *Anschauung* stands revealed. He is one of the new school of Jewish theologians, of whom Krochmal and Zunz were the forerunners, and which looks to the religious developments not of one age, but of every age, for the constituents of Judaism. Mr. Schechter has familiarized English readers with the idea in the remarkable Introduction with which he has prefaced his *Studies in Judaism*.

Instruction in Jewish history is, then, to be, above all, instruction in the history of Judaism and of Jewish religious life. Everything calculated to subserve this purpose may be used—the conflict of religious parties in Jewry, the religious labours of the Talmudic doctors, the Rabbinical Codices, the religious-philosophical works, the ethical treatises, the growth of the Liturgy. All other

matters—purely political movements, books whose interest is exclusively literary and the like—must be passed by. As a rule, our author contends, the teacher dwells at excessive length upon the Spanish-Jewish era, and is satisfied to dismiss in a few inadequate words the Talmudic age and, more especially, the period subsequent to Mendelssohn. The procedure should be exactly the reverse.—An unfamiliar view certainly, as notable as it is novel. But is it sound?

At least equally debatable are some of Dr. Maybaum's ideas about the teaching of Hebrew. He thinks that the sole justification for teaching Hebrew to Jewish children is the fact that Hebrew is the language of the Synagogue-service. He ignores the claim which Hebrew possesses upon the reverence of every Israelite as the language of his forefathers and of his literature. He overlooks, moreover, the religious inspiration which a Jewish child may draw from the consciousness of possessing it. If the time should ever come—and Dr. Maybaum does not seem to think the contingency impossible—when Hebrew is expelled from the Synagogue, its disappearance from the School-house would, if his theory is tenable, be a logical and justifiable consequence. It is curious, in this connexion, to find so distinguished an educational authority as the Head Master of Harrow pleading for Hebrew as a subject of instruction in Public Schools. "Nor can I help regretting," he once wrote, "that in Public Schools boys are so seldom permitted or encouraged to acquire the elements of Hebrew. No doubt it would be a mistake to enforce Hebrew on most boys; but considering its special interest and claim, I cannot help thinking that there should be somebody in a Christian school—and why not the Headmaster, as he is generally in Holy Orders?—who is capable of imparting an elementary knowledge of the earliest and the most sacred of the Biblical tongues[1]." The contrast between

[1] *Thirteen Essays on Education*, p. 65.

these conflicting opinions of the Jewish Rabbi and the Christian divine is sufficiently striking[1].

Instruction in the translation, not only of the Prayer Book, but even of the Bible must, in our author's opinion, be regulated with reference to his theory. Only those parts of the Sacred Text—i.e. the Pentateuch, practically—need be translated in the schools, which are read in the course of public worship—an expression of opinion which recalls the *Cheder*, with its emphasis on mere *davonen* and its general subordination of the teaching to the exigencies of prayer, public and private. But here, as elsewhere, Dr. Maybaum shows himself to be a curious amalgam of old and new ideas. The Haphtorah, he is careful to add, need not be included in the scheme of Hebrew Translation, seeing that in many congregations in Germany the Prophets are now recited in the vernacular—a piece of information which is not without practical interest for us English Jews.

The best passages in this part of the book are those dealing with the second division of the *Lehrstoff*: Religion A brief survey of the history of Jewish dogma concludes with the assertion that the theological contents of Judaism cannot be rigorously defined. Here, we are warned, a study of the past is of no service; it simply confuses. "It is the special task of each age *to sift and to delimitate its theology anew*." The italics are Dr. Maybaum's. Thus the principle of growth, which he applies to the Ritual Law, he now extends to the Creed. Each generation makes its Judaism, in its twofold aspect of practice and belief. Schemes of faith, like that of Maimonides, for example, our author considers—in this respect following R. Saul Berlin, whom he quotes from Mr. Schechter's *Studies*—as merely means of emphasizing doctrines specially impugned at the moment. They have no necessary binding force. "In no case is

[1] Similarly Dr. Biber, the biographer of Pestalozzi, recommends Hebrew on pedagogic grounds as the first foreign language that children should learn. See his *Henry Pestalozzi*, p. 421. Matthew Arnold's admiration for Hebrew as an educational subject is well-known.

everlasting salvation dependent upon their reception or rejection. . . . A religion that asserts as an unquestionable principle that the righteous of all nations have a share in eternal bliss cannot possibly make everlasting felicity, in the case of its own followers, conditional on their subscription to any dogma." But then this very logical deduction comes into collision with that awkward passage in the Mishnah (Synhed. 10, 1), with its category of persons who have no portion in the life to come, among them being those that deny the dogma of Revelation and the Scriptural origin of the Messianic idea. Here we have an apt illustration of the danger of generalizing from isolated passages from the Talmud, and of the difficulty that confronts Rabbis of Dr. Maybaum's stamp, who unite with a liberal theology a recognition of the letter of the Talmud as a living authority. But it must not be supposed that Dr. Maybaum altogether excludes the teaching of a Creed from his educational plan. On the contrary, he suggests four leading ideas as texts upon which to found the instruction in Religion. Teachers may be glad to have a list of them. They are 1. God—His Unity, Holiness and Perfection. 2. Man—created in the Divine image, immortal, free. 3. The relations between God and Man—subdivided thus: (*a*) God, the Creator and Father, his rule as manifested in nature and history, in natural law and in the moral law; his revelation at Sinai; and his scheme of salvation for Israel and mankind; (*b*) Man as the child of God; sin and atonement; the effort after holiness and the means of attaining it (under this head comes the ceremonial law); Israel, the servant of God, his mission. 4. The relations of men to each other—brotherliness, mutual love and rectitude, the promotion of the public weal, and the acceleration of the Messianic era of concord and peace.

Such are the broad outlines of Dr. Maybaum's scheme; how he fills it in we shall see presently. But it belongs to this part of the subject to mention that he counsels the

teacher, when dealing with the doctrine of Immortality, to represent the "so-called incongruities of human life" as simply a test of men's obedience, and to avoid degrading the future world by speaking of it as a compensation. He characterizes as "still more preposterous" the argument which would adduce the disparity between deserts and destiny as a proof of the truth of Immortality, an argument which, he contends, is simply an impeachment of the Divine action in this life. He holds that, according to the view he thus denounces, "God's providence, at fault here, is to have an opportunity of repairing its mistakes hereafter"—again a somewhat unconventional idea, which is at least worthy of notice. As to the doctrine of the Resurrection of the body, Dr. Maybaum does not mince matters. He frankly strikes it out of his plan. The doctrine, he contends, rests on false exegesis, the offspring of non-Jewish influences. For ages it overshadowed the doctrine of Immortality. But in these days the teacher must as resolutely ignore the one as he must emphasize the other. Nor should he have anything to say to such ideas as a personal Messiah, or the Return to Palestine, or the Re-establishment of the Jewish State. All these conceptions, we are told, are alien to the Messianic belief, and were only engrafted upon it in response to the shifting hopes of successive ages. And since, moreover, in these days they have already faded out of the religious consciousness of the Western Jews, the Messianic idea must be taught in its pristine purity, as foreshadowing the advent of a time when Israel, the "priest of humanity," will have established, in union with the nations, the universal worship of the One and only God and the reign of love and righteousness upon earth. This is all very interesting, not only as pedagogic counsel, but as a confession of faith on the part of one of the most influential Rabbis in Germany, and one, moreover, who is not a Reformer, in the sense in which the German Jews understand the term. If Dr. Maybaum does not place himself at the standpoint

of his *confrère* Dr. Hildesheimer, the protagonist of German orthodoxy to-day, he is perhaps as far removed from the *Richtung* of Holdheim's *Schul'*, which typifies the opposite view. He represents the *juste milieu* between these two extremes; nay, he represents the Berlin Jewish community. That the development of Judaism, that is to say of official Judaism, has made greater strides in the German capital than in London will become clear to any one who asks himself how many of Dr. Adler's ministers could be found holding, or at any rate avowing, opinions like those expressed in the book before us. I draw attention to this point as a curiosity, not in a polemical spirit.

We pass in the next place from the contents to the methods of religious instruction. This part of the subject is of surpassing interest to teachers. I am glad to find our author pitilessly condemning the religious Catechism. The Catechism, he maintains, is an importation from Christianity. But there are sounder reasons for putting it on the Jewish *index*. Religion is an affair of the heart and the will, and no stereotyped system of questions and answers can make any effective appeal to either. The achievement transcends the powers, indeed, of any mere text-book, unaided by the earnestness, the high character, the personal magnetism of the teacher himself. But of all text-books the least suited to religious instruction is the Catechism, with its dry, formal statements, which kill all spontaneity and enthusiasm in the teacher almost as surely as in the pupil. Catechisms, some one has well said, are written not for children, but for masters who are dunces, and, it might have been added, for masters who are lazy.

Dr. Maybaum has something interesting to say about the mode of teaching Scripture History to young beginners. He would have the Bible taught to them exactly as it is, with all its miracles and anthropomorphisms. Nothing is to be explained away; for the Bible-methods, he holds, are exactly suited to the child, for whom the abstract does not exist. In the case of the more advanced classes, however,

the plan must be modified. Here the intellect is beginning to dispute the mastery with the emotions. Accordingly, the miracles are to be represented in their true light as "myths and legends of the old Israelitish folk-poetry." "But," we are reminded, "even here the naïve form of the narrative must not be needlessly sacrificed. The old legendary dress must be preserved, and only when necessary must the difference between the instructive idea and its external garb be indicated. By thus preserving the simplicity of the narrative a double advantage is gained; the ethical-religious contents of the story impress themselves more deeply upon the consciousness of the pupil, and he comes to perceive and to value its poetic beauty." On the other hand Judaism suffers no injury from a recognition of the mythical element in the Bible. In this respect it has the advantage over Christianity, of which the theological fabric collapses as soon as its miraculous basis is removed. For Jews, on the contrary, "the significance of Israel lies wholly and solely in the saving doctrine of Scripture, which can therefore dispense with miracles, and is all-sufficient in itself." These again are outspoken opinions on the lips of a Rabbi and of one, moreover, who is engaged in the solemn task of giving counsel to teachers. How many teachers in England, or indeed in Germany, will have the courage to accept the advice thus proffered them? Nevertheless the teacher is warned against the rationalistic view which attempts to explain the miracles of the Bible as natural occurrences. Such a method is "a veritable sin against the form as well as the spirit of the Scriptural narrative." Our author will have no half-measures. Of two things one, he says; we must either teach the Bible in the old orthodox fashion, which represents the miracles as historical events, or we must admit that, like all other nations of antiquity, Israel has his myths and legends, and that the Bible is the depository of them. But here, I fancy, the teacher would have been better pleased if his mentor had been a little

more explicit. What are the limits of the mythical in the Bible? At what point may the teacher tell his pupils that they are at length on the *terra firma* of history? Is it at Noah or Abraham or Moses? On this profoundly interesting point Dr. Maybaum is silent. He does not deem detail superfluous when he is treating of other branches of his theme. Why is he content to be vague here? He may conceivably reply that history and legend are inextricably blended in the Bible, and that it is impossible to say where one begins and the other ends. Still the teacher would have been grateful for a little more explicitness. Is the Deluge a fact, or was Huxley right? Did Abraham ever exist, or is he, as some writers maintain, but the personification of a great ethnical movement?

Dr. Maybaum is less disappointing, perhaps, in his remarks about the conflict between the Bible and Science. He counsels the teacher to impress his pupils with the truth that the Bible is an authority on religion and morals, not a scientific manual. Artificial reconciliations between the words of Scripture and scientific doctrine must be eschewed. As to the moral difficulties presented by the Bible story, they must either be evaded by passing over the passages that raise them, or if regard for the continuity of the narrative makes this impossible, they must be turned by generalizations. Thus the temptation of Joseph will be described by saying that Potiphar's wife tried to persuade Joseph to commit a sin. But here again I can imagine the teacher asking for more light. "Suppose," he will say, "some inquiring pupil follows up the communication of the fact by asking 'What sin?'" There are cognate difficulties which our author does not even notice. How, for example, are those parts of the Bible to be dealt with which seem to impugn the Divine justice and mercy? How is the command to exterminate the Canaanites to be reconciled with the goodness of the Supreme? These difficulties, of course, can be met; but Dr. Maybaum does not tell us how. He will doubtless answer that he cannot

prescribe for every case; something, he will urge, must be left to the teacher. "I do not speak," he may plead,

> "to that dull elf,
> Who cannot image to himself."

But the suggested difficulties illustrate the fact that it is not all plain sailing even when the teacher has taken leave of his guide with the intention of following his counsels. And perhaps it is well that he should realize the fact. No lectures, however wise and scholarly, nor text-books, however comprehensive and well arranged, can make the teacher independent of himself. Self-reliance he needs always, but most of all when he is engaged in the task of religious instruction.

I have spoken of text-books. For Bible history these, as we are very properly reminded, are to be used by the pupil at home, rather than in Class. As for the teacher, he must learn to do without them. "*Viva voce* teaching must be the rule even in the highest Classes." No one will gainsay this statement. If the interest of the pupils is to be aroused and maintained, the teacher must fling away his Scripture Histories and "Bible Stories," and trust to his own words to depict the scene or the character, and to enforce its lessons. If he lacks the inspiration or the simple eloquence which the task demands, he is not a competent teacher—of the Bible at any rate.

About Hebrew Dr. Maybaum has less to say, though what he does say is very useful. I miss some hints about the teaching of the alphabet. I have found it a useful plan to teach only the sound of the letters to beginners, leaving the pupil to learn the names at a later stage. This is a great saving of time, and it ensures the more attractive stage of translation being reached more quickly. Further, I always make a point of suggesting to teachers the advisability of dictating the Translation in such a way that the pupil can readily fit the English to the corresponding word in the original. This is done either by

assigning a separate line to the English equivalent of each Hebrew word, or by enclosing it within perpendicular strokes. Dr. Maybaum does not notice such expedients, but he makes the very sensible suggestion that Translation should be taken up as early as possible, and that when once a word has been translated, the pupil should never read it without giving its meaning. For the rest, his ideas are strongly, perhaps too strongly, coloured by his paramount aim, that of enabling the pupil to follow the Synagogue-service as soon as possible. Accordingly he relegates Translation of the Pentateuch, though not without an apology, to a comparatively late stage, and allows the Prayer Book to take its place; and he is in favour of the pupil committing to memory long passages of the prayers, not only the *Shemang*, for example, but the ברכות הנהנין, the daily *Amidah*, אתה בחרתנו, &c., though they may be in total ignorance of their meaning. This is quite *à la Cheder*. More unexceptionable is his thesis that, in the case of beginners, Hebrew Grammar should not be treated as a separate subject, but taught in close connexion with Translation.

There remains, finally, Systematic Religion. This is to be reserved for the most advanced scholars. In the lower forms Religion will be taught as an ingredient of Bible, History and Translation, and therefore unsystematically. An appropriate opportunity for the systematic teaching of Religion is afforded by the preparation for the Confirmation-rite. What is to be the content of this instruction? The subject-matter is usually divided into two sections: Beliefs and Duties. (*Glaubenslehre* and *Pflichtenlehre*.) Dr. Maybaum, however, scents danger in this sharp demarcation of doctrine from duty. It imparts, he thinks, a dogmatic flavour to the religion; and the theology, moreover, has to be justified on philosophical grounds. He shudders at the thought of the "ontological, cosmological, and teleological" proofs usually adduced for the truth of the Divine Existence. They make Religion the dependent of Philo-

sophy, and furthermore they offend against pedagogic canons, seeing that the Religion-school is not the proper place for such explanations. All this strikes me as being somewhat arbitrary and unreal. It is very clear that if you are to teach Religion at all, you must have dogma, and as soon as you begin to teach Religion as a science you must justify your dogma. Dr. Maybaum has his own scheme, as we have seen. But it seems to me open to the objections he himself formulates. According to his plan the pupil is to be told that God exists, that he is one, holy and perfect. These are as truly dogmas as the Incarnation; but unlike the Incarnation, they are susceptible of verification, and verified they must be. It needs a very powerful microscope indeed to discern any real difference between Dr. Maybaum's list of subjects and those he condemns. On the other hand, he argues, the conventional division of the second constituent of Religion—*Pflichtenlehre*—into the duties towards God, towards one's fellow-men and towards oneself, is not sufficiently comprehensive, inasmuch as the dietary laws are necessarily excluded! But surely those laws can, without violence, be regarded as coming within either the first or the third division. They inculcate purity or self-control; and these are duties which are clearly due from the Israelite either to himself or to both [1].

[1] Dr. Maybaum places a note of admiration after his statement that W. Feilchenfeld in his *Systematisches Lehrbuch der Israelitischen Religion* treats the entire Ceremonial Law, not excluding איסור יין ופת ושלקות של נכרים, under the head of Duties towards God. But to my mind there is nothing so very wonderful in this circumstance. Everything depends upon the point of view. A conservative like Feilchenfeld necessarily regards the ceremonial enactments as safeguards to personal purity, and obedience to them, therefore, as a means of showing reverence to God. This is the traditional standpoint. Feilchenfeld, indeed, heads the paragraph treating of some of these prescriptions with the title: "Gottesverehrung durch Heiligen der Sitten." Dr. Maybaum thinks that Feilchenfeld writes, not as an instructor of youth, but as a partisan. His imperfect sympathy has led him into injustice. There is much in Dr. Friedländer's book on the Jewish Religion from which we liberal Jews in England are

In dealing with this part of his subject Dr. Maybaum is far less happy than usual. He would banish philosophy from the School-house, but he perceives that the teacher must adduce proofs for his theological propositions, and he bids him turn for them to the Bible and to Jewish history generally. Thus the truth of the Divine Omnipotence is to be not only illustrated, but *established* by the account of the Creation in Genesis, or by the humiliation of Pharaoh, the Divine Spirituality by the denial of Moses' request to look upon God, and so on! This is extraordinary advice from a writer so clear-sighted and so free from dogmatic prepossessions. What he dignifies with the name of proofs are for the most part but illustrations. The account in the first chapter of Genesis is, as he tells us, to be included in the list of Bible-myths. How, then, can it be used to demonstrate the truth of the Divine Omnipotence, or indeed the truth of any proposition? The events of the Exodus he would place, of course, in a different category. But why should the teacher be constrained to limit his appeal to Jewish history? Does not the downfall of Rome, does not the uprising of England, witness as powerfully to the working of Divine Providence and to the supremacy of the moral law as the punishment of Egypt or the salvation of Israel? May not profane history play as effective and legitimate a part as the sacred story in fortifying the faith of the child? Dr. Maybaum seems, after all, to feel the force of these considerations. History, he declares, in a subsequent paragraph, offers the only real verification of the teachings of Religion. So-called philosophical evidences are out of place in the Religious school; only the proof from experience, which is furnished no less by the individual life than by secular history may, and should, be adduced. But he at once proceeds to rob this statement of much of its value by urging, as its justification,

compelled to dissent. But when we place ourselves at his standpoint we see that his teachings are germane to his purpose, and not a mere bit of polemics.

the fact that "*according to the Scriptural view* the Spirit of God works in the story of the nations also."

We have now all but reached the end of this very useful and suggestive book. A brief concluding paragraph is devoted to some judicious observations upon the *status* and duties of those who have to impart the religious instruction. In regard to the average quality of the religious teacher Germany does not seem very much better off than England. Trained teachers are still at a premium even in that country. In the smaller congregations the religious instruction is, as a rule, entrusted to Readers and *Shochetim*, who have scarcely any acquaintance with pedagogic science; but even in the larger congregations forces are pressed into the service of religious education which are ill adapted to it. The blame rests with the parents, who set no store by an instruction which is not compulsory, with the congregational leaders, who are parsimonious when the cause demands the utmost liberality, and finally, with the secular authorities, who, charged with the duty of supervising education generally, manifest an utter indifference to the religious instruction of Jews. Even in Berlin, where the civic powers seek to do justice to the educational needs of Jewish children, one school-manager, we are told, is notoriously given to appointing Jewish teachers without concerning himself in the slightest degree with their qualifications. He holds that Bible History can be dealt with in the same way "as a bit of an ordinary German reading-book."

This is an interesting revelation, which supplies us English Jews with much food for thought. It shows, in the first place, that the German system, which ostensibly provides religious instruction for children of various denominations in the elementary schools, is not that ideal solution of the religious difficulty which some of us have fondly imagined it to be. In the next place the communal drawbacks from which our German brethren suffer are those with which we are only too familiar in this country.

We too have to deplore a want of good teaching-power. The average Anglo-Jewish teacher is doubtless a more efficient instrument than he was a couple of decades ago, particularly in London and the large provincial towns. He will be more efficient still, if the efforts of the Jewish Religious Education Board to improve his teaching capacity are seconded by the financial contributions of the community. The work recently undertaken by the Board with this object is at least as valuable as the instruction it gives to its six thousand scholars. That the vital question of providing an adequate supply of well-trained teachers for our Religious Schools and Classes should so long have remained virtually neglected, is indeed an anomaly. For years the community was content to maintain important schools without making any organized effort to staff them. The Free School in Bell Lane has long been engaged in training teachers, but the output was scarcely larger than it required for its own use, as the Education Board has discovered to its cost whenever it has had occasion to seek for new teachers. The situation, however, is improving; but it is far from being altogether satisfactory. The question of establishing a normal school for the training of Jewish teachers will, no doubt, have to be faced some day. Outside the Free School little adequate provision exists for instructing teachers in the Jewish elements of their art; the Jewish Board is, however, now endeavouring to remedy the defect. The work done in this direction by Jews' College, even with the examinations of teachers thrown in, can scarcely be deemed a worthy counterpart of that accomplished by the Berlin *Lehranstalt*. We shall have to wait a long time before a course of lectures, like those given by Dr. Maybaum, is delivered to budding Jewish teachers in this country or, if delivered, finds a sufficient number of willing hearers. One obvious drawback is to be discerned in the paucity of the candidates who offer themselves for training as Jewish teachers. The profession of a Jewish teacher is beginning to be well-nigh as unpopular

with our youth as the profession of a teacher is popular. The reason is partly a personal one. A teacher finds that an appointment under the School Board is better paid than a post in a Jewish school. Why, then, should they engage in a course of study which can only be put to practical use by submitting to pecuniary loss? Let Jewish teachers be more liberally treated, and a marked improvement in their number and quality will quickly manifest itself.

The question, then, is simply a financial one. Is the community prepared to recognize the fact, and to make the necessary sacrifice? At present, unfortunately, all the omens are adverse. Here, again, we find ourselves in a similar position to that of the Jews in Germany. There is the same imperviousness to the solemnity of religious education, the same parsimony in responding to its claims. Only unworthy minds will take comfort from the close likeness that exists between the circumstances of the two communities. If we English Jews have not the monopoly of shortcomings, the fact ought not to deter us from doing our best to rid ourselves of our share of them. A deeper conviction of the absolute necessity of religious education, and a greater willingness to bear the cost of it, are among the most pressing wants of the Anglo-Jewish community. The average English Jew needs to be more zealous in his efforts to provide religious teaching for his own children on the one hand, and for the children of the poor on the other. That the Board School Religious Classes and the Jewish denominational schools have alike to appeal periodically for the prime means of existence is no serious reflection upon the community. The discredit springs from the fact that the response to the appeals, especially in the case of the Board School Classes, is so shamefully inadequate, that with extraordinary short-sightedness the community should acquiesce in a state of things which forces within the cramping influences of the *Cheder* hundreds of children who will one day represent the religion and morality of English Judaism.

One can only hope that the proposed Association of Jewish Voluntary Schools, which is likely to constitute for the Anglo-Jewish community the most valuable results of the new Education Act, will be instrumental in remedying this crying evil. But, to end as I began, it is questionable whether this lukewarmness towards Religious Education, as a communal obligation, is not even surpassed by the growing indifference to it as a personal responsibility. That well-to-do English Jews are manifesting a declining appreciation of their duty in this respect, nearly all careful observers will, I think, agree. The Jewish Boarding School continuously draws its scholars from a lower social stratum. Not a few Jewish houses, in which the visiting religious teacher was once a familiar figure, now know him no more. There is an area which the Congregational Religion Classes fail to reach, and it is an ever-widening area. If we except the very poorest, we may fairly say that the tendency to exalt secular studies above the higher knowledge is becoming general. There is an increasing disposition to grudge the time required for religious teaching as so much time taken not merely from the preparation of school-tasks, but even from physical training. Subjects like Hebrew and even Religion have now to compete for favour with gymnastics and dancing, and are too often worsted in the encounter. To say that this state of things is only a symptom of that general decline of religious enthusiasm which is said to be the note of the age, is to label, rather than to explain it. Nor can any remedy for it be suggested short of that complete spiritual revival which will compel the English Jew to restore the things that make for the true life to their rightful position, and which will give him back his fast-vanishing reverence for the beauty of his creed and the dignity of his mission.

MORRIS JOSEPH.

AN ELEVENTH CENTURY INTRODUCTION TO THE HEBREW BIBLE:

Being a Fragment from the Sepher ha-Ittim of Rabbi Judah ben Barzilai of Barcelona.

THE ANCIENT SYNAGOGUE NEAR CAIRO.

About three miles south of the west end of the Muski is Old Cairo, "Masr el Atīka," a dreary mass of ruins on the east bank of the Nile just below Rôda Island. The ruins are those of Fosṭâṭ, the "tent" city founded by Omar's victorious general, 'Amr ibn el-'Aṣi, in 638. The legend goes that more than a thousand years before his time the Babylonian warriors of Cambyses had erected a fortress there, in 525 B.C., in order to secure his Egyptian conquest, and they called it Babylon in affectionate memory of their great metropolis. Traces of an ancient Roman *castrum* can still be identified, and "Babylon" is to this day the name of the Coptic quarter of Cairo[1]. The famous Gaon of the ninth century, Saadia ben Joseph, the Fayyûmi, whose millenium has been recently celebrated, received a call from Egypt to the Gaonate of Sura on the Euphrates in 928; and an American missionary to the Copts assured me of his conviction that the Gaon was called also *Babli*, "the

[1] Strabo xvii. 14, at the very beginning of the Christian era, calls it Βαβυλὼν φρούριον ἐρυμνόν, and Saladin, in a letter to Frederic, King of Germany, quoted in the Itinerary of Richard Cœur de Lion, gives it the same name. When the Crusaders invaded Lower Egypt in 1168 the Saracens set fire to Fosṭâṭ to prevent its falling into the hands of the Christians, and some of our charred fragments may be silent witnesses of that very fire.

Babylonian," because he had once inhabited this Coptic quarter! Anyhow it is beyond question that large numbers of Jews as well as Copts inhabited this part of Egypt for many centuries after the beginning of the Christian era, and perhaps a couple of centuries previously. Some of the Coptic and Greek churches there were evidently built as early as the sixth century, but of all these, to us Jews the most interesting is the Synagogue of Elijah, Ezra, or Moses (esch Schamyân or Kenîset Elijâhu or Kenîset Ezra or כנסת משה). "Of all these," because, though it has been a synagogue for nearly twelve hundred years, tradition, as well as internal evidence, point to its having been originally a Christian church of about the third or fourth century, and its titular saint was Michael. Probably, however, the conquest of Egypt by the Persian Chosroes in 619, or of the Caliph Omar's army a generation later, led to the conversion of many a church into mosque or synagogue. And it is at this date that St. Michael's may have been Judaized into the כנסת משה. Anyhow, for some centuries later the intercourse between Egypt and Bagdad seems to have been of the closest. Their respective rulers intermarried, and the Jews, ever fashionable and courtly, followed suit. The Egyptian Nagid derived his authority directly from the Reschgola or Prince of the Captivity at Bagdad, and indeed, if Sambari's Chronicle (1672 A.D.) is to be believed, it was a Caliph's daughter who, in 984, advised her Egyptian husband to institute in his capital the dignity of Nagid upon the model of the Babylonian Reschgola [1].

This ancient synagogue has always been regarded with almost superstitious reverence by the Jewish inhabitants of Cairo, and pointed out to the traveller as worthy of his pilgrimage. Benjamin of Tudela visited it before 1173, when the surrounding buildings were already in ruins, and the Jews had migrated to the newer and more fashionable

[1] Vide Neubauer, *Anecdota Oxoniensia*, 1887, p. 115, and 1895, p. 129, but see *J. Q. R.* VIII, 552.

Cairo. He says: "From New to Old Misraim (= מצרים הקרמתי, Masr el Atīka) is a distance of two parasangs. The latter lies in ruins, but the sites of the walls and houses may be traced at this day. . . . In the outskirts of the city is the very ancient synagogue of our great master Moses, upon whom be peace. An old and very learned man is the overseer and clerk (פרבם שמש) of this place of public worship. He is called Al Sheikh Abunasar. . . ."

THE GENIZAH.

In the middle of the last century, Simon van Gelderen, Heine's ancestor, tells us in his diary how much impressed he was by the wealth of possibility that lay hidden amid the rubbish of the *Genizot* in the old synagogue near Cairo[1]. But though he seems to have been the first to have looked there for literary treasure, he does not say that he found anything of importance.

In 1864 Jacob Saphir visited the synagogue, and describes the גניזה there in the picturesque Hebrew which makes his אבן ספיר such lively reading. He says that after spending two days ferreting among the ancient books and leaves, and getting covered with dust and ashes, נמלאתי אבק ואפר, and finding nothing of importance, he became sick of the task, but "who knows what may be yet beneath?" Since that date many hundreds of fragments, more or less dilapidated, have percolated thence into the public libraries of Europe. The caretakers of the ancient edifice found that not too scrupulous dealers were prepared to bestow liberal backshish for bundles of "rubbish" from that sacred dustheap. Professor Sayce, in his annual visits to Egypt, has probably been one of the best customers of these dealers, and Bodley's Library at Oxford has, through his good offices, acquired some priceless gems of Hebrew literature. Dr. Neubauer is busily engaged in passing through the press a catalogue of these, which will, it is not

[1] Vide Kaufmann's *Heine's Ahnensaal.*

too bold to prophesy, almost revolutionize our bibliography. The Clarendon Press edition of so large a part of the original text of Ecclesiasticus is a noble harbinger of what we are to look for from this source. The British Museum, like Saphir, thought the fragments less worthy of attention; but Berlin and Cambridge have a good few, the Archduke Rainer has some important ones, and so have Mrs. Lewis and Mrs. Gibson, and especially the future historian of the Jews of Egypt, Professor Kaufmann. A few were offered for sale at public auction at Cologne last year, and Wertheimer of Jerusalem is also a seller. In the fall of 1888 I paid a short visit to Cairo, saw this synagogue in Old Cairo[1] as well as that of Maimonides in the Muski, inquired about the Genizot, but obtained no satisfactory replies. The Cairene Jewish authorities told me that they occasionally buried torn or defaced Hebrew prints and Sifre Torah in their Bet Chajim at Basatni, but that nothing of importance was ever thus destroyed. They were very proud of the Fosṭâṭ Synagogue, and showed me the original firman from the Egyptian Caliph under which they were confirmed in its possession some eight hundred years back, and which is preserved in Messrs. Cattaui's strong room. In that document the synagogue is entitled Ezra's. To my horror I was also told that the community had resolved to have the building cleaned and renovated, and, amongst several other errors, I expressed a confident opinion that nowadays no Hebrew MSS. of any importance are to be bought in Cairo! The community fulfilled their promise, and the synagogue has been restored out of all knowledge. I paid another visit to it in January, 1896, and thanks to the amiable and intelligent Chief Rabbi there, Rabbi Rafaïl ben Shimon ha Cohen, and his wardens, the Messrs. Cattaui, for whose kindness I cannot be too grateful, was conducted by Rabbi

[1] See a description in my series of "Notes of a Journey to the East," which appeared in the *Jewish Chronicle*, Dec. 7, 1888, et seqq.

Rafaïl to the extreme end of the ladies' gallery, permitted to climb to the topmost rung of a ladder, to enter the secret chamber of the Genizah through a hole in the wall, and to take away with me a sackful of paper and parchment writings—as much in fact as I could gather up in the three or four hours I was permitted to linger there. This year Mr. Schechter, to whom I am indebted for a great deal of valuable help in connexion with this paper, has been accorded unique privileges. As might have been expected, he has made the best use of his opportunities, has exhaustively ransacked the Genizah, and returned home to Cambridge laden with the spoils of the Egyptians.

THE FRAGMENT.

Among the contents of my sack—a very Benjamin's sack—were over a hundred historical documents, about one in every four bearing a date varying from the tenth to the thirteenth century. There were also a few larger fragments of works in Arabic and Hebrew. One of these—a small folio of sixteen closely and carefully written pages, each of about fifty lines—is the portion of a long-lost work of a famous author which I have ventured to edit here. The texture of the paper, character of the letters, and orthography of the words, point to a date certainly not later than the twelfth century. There are several corrections in the MS., but hardly such as to justify one in assuming it to be an author's autograph. When I found it, it was sewed together, but apparently pages 3–4 and 13–14 had been transposed. This error has now been rectified. If I am correct[1] in attributing the MS. to R. Judah ben Barzilai of Barcelona, there can be little doubt that it formed part of his ספר העתים, and that it followed closely upon the passage of twenty-three lines quoted *in extenso* by the ר״ש (died 1327) in the הלכות קטנות on the ס״ת which follow the treatise Menachoth in most

[1] For some arguments in favour of this view, *vide infra*.

editions of the Talmud. The same long quotation is made by R. Jerucham b. Meschullam of Provence (1334) in his תולדות אדם וחוה. Halberstam, in his masterly edition of the Barceloni's *Sepher Jezira* (Berlin, 1885), gives a formidable list of authorities who cite the ספר העתים, and it will suffice to refer the reader to his work for further information on the subject[1]. He states that he possessed a considerable fragment of the work in a MS. which he lent to Rabbinowitz who describes and often quotes it in the *Dikduke Soferim* to *Erubin*. The MS. does not appear to be among the Montefiore Codices; perhaps it is in the possession of the Alliance Israélite at Paris (ib. xxii). It would seem to be the second part, and to comprise the "Dinim" or rules as to the Sabbath, the Erub, and the reading of the Law. The first part, Rabbinowitz suggested, dealt with the everyday duties of the Jew, the benedictions[2], the daily prayers, &c. R. Jerucham quotes our author very frequently by name, and apparently oftener still without mentioning him, and perhaps the plan of his book is based on that of our *Sepher ha Ittim*. Of

[1] Vide especially *op. cit.* pp. xviii–xxi, xxiii, and xxv to xxix, and vide Brüll's *Jahrbuch*, VIII, 177–188. To Halberstam's list should be added the references in R. David Conforte's קורא הדורות (Cassell's edition, ח' ב' and מ"ז א'). I have the good fortune to possess the editor's presentation copy to my uncle, Dr. Michael Sachs, with some pages of Sachs' MS. notes. Among these are not only several of Halberstam's references to the Barceloni, but also some not in Halberstam. They are as follows: ר' חסדאי בר אברהם קרישקש בהקדמתו לס' אור ה' ד' ב' א': ולא היו להם חבורים כוללים רי אם חבור ההלכות אל ר' יצחק אלפסי . . . . . והחבור הגדול שעשה ארונינו הר' יהודה הנשיא אלברגילוני באריכות גדול ובמחלוקת הגאונים ותשובותם עכ"ר. גראה שכיוון אל ס' העתים והודיענו מהות החבור הזה היקר אשר נראה שהי' בסגנון ובמתכנת המורים הובאו בו דעות ופסקי הראשונים הפך דרך הרמב"ם בחבורו הגדול אין בו זכרון לראשונים וכאשר הארך גם בעל אור ה' להראות כי דרך הרם' במו"ל לא יהכן וכאשר כבר קדמו הראב"ד ז"ל בתלונה הזאת: . . . . . ומס' העתים מביאהר"ן בפי' על נדרים ד' כ"ב בר"ה אמר רבא א"מ הלכתא פותחין בחושא וכו' אבל הרב הנשיא אלברגילוני ז"ל כתב בשם מר יהודאי גאון ז"ל וכו' עיי"ש: והריטב"א חדושי תענית ד' ה' (ר"א) ע"א במתני' הגיע י"א במרחשון וכו' לענין אי בטלי מגלת תענית: ובהג"א פ' א' דשבת לרא"ש סי' ל"ז ת"ר אין משלחין אגרות וכו' נבמ"מ ה"ל שבת פי' כ"ח הל' י"א: כך מצאתי (הגירסא) בהלכות ובס' העתים עכ"ל. See also the מבוא to the *Machzor Vitry*, pp. 23–4, and pp. 244 and 344 of the *Machzor*.

[2] *Vide infra* as to the תשובות ברכות mentioned in our text.

such a compendium of the whole duty of man the early middle ages afford us other striking examples in the *Machzor Vitry*, written in 1207 by a pupil of Rashi, and the *Etz Chajim*, written in 1287 by R. Jacob[1] ben Judah of London. I venture to date the Barceloni a little earlier than Halberstam allows, for both the chroniclers, Joseph ben Zaddik of Arevalo, in 1467, and Abraham Zakkut ben Samuel, in 1505, say that the Barceloni died in the year 1067[2].

THE IMPORTANCE OF THE FRAGMENT.

Apart from the question of its authorship[3], the date of the treatise from which our fragment is copied can hardly be later than the eleventh century. It is full of quotations, but the latest authority cited is earlier than 1100. These authorities are in themselves interesting, because they are mostly of the early centuries of the Christian era, and our knowledge of the Hebrew writers of that period is all too scanty. Our text is especially rich in the *responsa* of the Gaonim. Two of these, Mar Rab Kimui Gaon bar Mar Rab Achai (circa 650) and Mar Rab Hai Gaon bar Mar Rab David (circa 657), were hitherto only known by name. We have now complete *responsa* from them, as well as from a dozen others. Moreover, one Mar Rab Asaph[4] is quoted as an authority whom I have not been able to identify. He is sandwiched between the Gaonim Kimui and Hilai, which rather points to his having lived in the middle of the ninth century, He is hardly likely to be the

[1] See the extracts published by my brother in the Steinschneider *Festschrift*, pp. 186-208, pp. 241, 242.

[2] Vide Neubauer's *Anecdota Oxoniensia*, 1887, pp. 92 and 102. The "Rif," though not quoted in our fragment, is cited in the סדר יצירה as ר' יצחק ז"ל, and, as he died in 1103, he would appear to have predeceased the Barceloni. But this is by no means an insuperable difficulty. He was a life-long contemporary, for he was born in 1013, and I suggest that ז"ל was added by a pious copyist of Barceloni, and not the Barceloni himself.

[3] See below, p. 679.

[4] Folio 14.

physician Asaph[1], and is certainly not the comparatively late אבי אסף. Can he be the Asaph mentioned in the *Seder Olam* in connexion with the Massora[2]?

There are three Arabic *responsa* quoted—Saadia (2), Hai[3] (12), and anonymous (4)—which may now be added to Steinschneider's list in his *Hebräische Uebersetzungen*[4]. Then we have numerous and full quotations from many Midrashim as well as both Talmuds and in some cases the variants from the editions are both interesting and important[5].

But it is for its contents themselves that the text is most valuable. We know that the Massora was gradually evolved by the *Soferim* between the second and tenth centuries of the present era[6]. Now the text gives us remarkable information as to the state of knowledge of the subject, and the *Din* or practice in the century succeeding that in which the *Soferim* closed their labours. Moreover, it happens that the earliest Massoretic glosses we possess in the Hebrew Bible MSS. are little, if at all, earlier in date[7]. We have here definite rules laid down, with authorities, as to the preparation of the parchment for a scroll of the law, the division between letters, words, and paragraphs, the shape and "Taggin" of its letters and the size of its columns. But we have also something of

[1] Vide Steinschneider, *Hebr. Bibl.* XIX, 35 and *passim*.

[2] Vide Neubauer, *A. O.* I. 174. המסורת הזו שמסר דוסא בן אלעזר בנו של ר' אסף שקבל מר' יהודה הבבלי.

[3] Contrast with this *responsum* of Hai Gaon to the Beth ha Midrash of Nissim Gaon, the famous literary question by Jacob ben Nissim addressed to Hai Gaon and Sherira Gaon, to which we owe the latter's famous response.

[4] §§ 544 and 545. To these may also be added a reference to a *responsum* of Hai Gaon in the Massora Parva of a Toledo Bible Codex of 1492, which I recently acquired at Perim Pasha, near Constantinople. The Codex inserts Joshua xxi. 36, 37, adding: אלין ב' פסו' לא נמצאן בהללי וכן נרא' מתשוב' רבי' האיי גאון ז"ל.

[5] E.g. Text, folio 10 and 16. There are about a hundred such quotations in the text.

[6] Cp. I. Harris, *J. Q. R.* I, 128.

[7] Vide Ginsburg's *Introduction to the Hebrew Bible*, pp. 469 et seq.

still greater importance. We have an almost complete and logical analysis of the action of the Massorah on the text of the Bible. Within the last few weeks Dr. Ginsburg has published an elaborate *Introduction to the Hebrew Bible*, which is a worthy successor to his *magnum opus* on the Massorah. Over a hundred pages of the *Introduction* are devoted to the subject of our text, and only two out of thirteen classes of instances of Massoretic text modification are unrepresented in our MS. Nor are the two omitted classes, "The attempt to remove the application of the names of false gods," and "Safeguarding the unity of the Divine Worship at Jerusalem," either important or undoubted. It is a curious fact that, for the rest of the thirteen classes, our author's and Ginsburg's mode and even order of treatment are very much alike. Indeed, our author anticipated by 800 years much of the work so admirably performed by the great modern Massorete, Dr. Baer, whose death all deplore so deeply.

AUTHORITIES QUOTED.

The following authorities are mentioned and quoted in our text:—

Talmud Babli and Jerushalmi. Boraita de Soferim, ten times. Tosefta de R. Chija. Midrashot de R. Tanchuma. Agadata of Genesis, Leviticus, Song of Songs, Ecclesiastes. Pesikta and Pesikta de R. Eliezer. Sefer Taggin, six times.

The following Gaonim:—

Mar Rav Jehudai ben Mar Rav Nachman,	c. 525, in Sura, cited nine times.
Mar Rav Mattathias,	c. 620, in Pumbadita, cited twice.
Mar Rav Hai פום[1] ben Mar Rav David,	c. 650, in Pumbadita, cited once.
Mar Rav Kimui[1] ben Mar Rav Achai,	c. 657, in Pumbadita, cited once.
Mar Rav Kimui ben Mar Rav Ashi,	c. 829, in Machassia, cited once.
Mar Rav Paltoi ben Abaji,	c. 842–858, cited once.

[1] Of these Gaonim nothing was hitherto known but their name. Of Hai ben David, vide Brüll's *Jahrbuch*, IX, 120.

Mar Rav Natronai ben Mar Rav Hilai, c. 846, in Machassia, cited twice.
Mar Rav Amram[1] ben Mar Rav Sheshua, c. 854, in Machassia, cited once.
Mar Rav Zemach ben Mar Rav Chaim, c. 880, in Machassia, cited once.
Mar Rav Hai ben Mar Rav Nachshon, c. 887, in Machassia, cited once.
Mar Rav Hilai ben Mar Rav Natronai, c. 894, in Machassia, cited twice.
Mar Rav Saadia ben Mar Rav Joseph, c. 926, in Machassia, cited thrice.
Mar Rav Scherira ben Mar Rav Chanina, c. 980, in Pumbadita, cited thrice.
Mar Rav Samuel ben Mar Rav Chofni ha Cohen, c. 960–1034, in Sura, cited thrice.
Mar Rav Hai ben Mar Rav Scherira, c. 969–1038, in Pumbadita, cited three or four times.

Other authorities quoted are the mysterious Mar Rav Asaph, and the great R. Nissim ben R. Jacob, and Rabbenu Chananel of Kairouan[2], who, with Samuel the Nagid and our author, are the representative Rabbis of the generation immediately succeeding the Gaonim—the דור ראשון אחר הגאונות, as Menachem Meiri calls it[3]. References are also made to, and quotations taken from the שימושא רבה דספר תורה[4], the גאונים ראשונים ואחרונים (folio 4), the קדמונים (ib.)[5], the גאונים ורבאתא and the איגרותיהן של גאונים, the בעלי התלמוד and the סופרים; and with regard to these last there is an important passage on folio 9 as to *defectiva* and *plena*. Another noteworthy phrase is קראיין or Karaites, in significant juxtaposition with מעוטי תורה ועמי הארץ (folio 1). On folio 7 we have an interesting comparison of the respective merits of the two Talmuds, and on folio 6 a pretty case of a talmudical "pilpul," winding up with a comforting assurance as to the accuracy of R. Ashi's editorship of the *Gemara*. The rival *Tanaim* and *Amoraim* are pitted against each other

[1] This is the author of the *Siddur*, which forms the basis of the Jewish liturgies of Europe.

[2] c. 1050. They are the latest Rabbis quoted by our author.

[3] Neubauer, *A. O.* II, 228.

[4] As to the authorship, vide Weiss, IV, 21. Query a Gaon or Rabbi called רבא, and the Barceloni cited as to his authority.

[5] That these "early" Gaonim wrote Arabic is notable: vide Steinschneider, l. c.

and their number taken into account in just the same manner as an English lawyer of to-day would balance the authority to be attached to the *obiter dicta* of so many Lords Justices and so many Puisne Judges.

AUTHORSHIP [1].

R. Judah ben Barzilai of Barcelona is known to have written—

1. the פירוש ספר יצירה edited by Halberstam;
2. a ס׳ העתים on various *Dinim*, which is frequently quoted, and of which one part is extant in MS.;
3. a commentary on the Bible.

He lived in the eleventh century; the latest authority he quotes is the "Rif" (*R*abbi *I*saac al *F*asi, who died in 1103), and the chronicles assign 1067 as the date of his death. Enjoying a very great reputation, he is frequently referred to and quoted, not by his own name, but by that of his city, as the Barceloni, as we should talk of *the* Bishop of Oxford. Sometimes he is cited merely as *the* Rabbi *par excellence* [2]. Enough of this great Rabbi's work is extant to enable us to know what are the characteristics of his style. Such are (1) a great predilection for the *responsa* of the Gaonim, shared with him by only two Franco-German Rabbis of the thirteenth century—the authors of the אור זרוע and the כפתור ופרח; (2) a remarkable diffusiveness of style, in which perhaps he is not alone among rabbinical—and other—authors, but in which he is certainly pre-eminent; (3) the use of archaic forms of Hebrew spelling; and (4) modest expressions, such as בעניותי, which were commoner among early writers than among those who lived after the Conquest [3].

[1] For most of the arguments as to authorship I have to thank Mr. Schechter.

[2] E.g. R. Jerucham, *passim*, and compare Wertheimer's *Ginze Jerusalem*, I, 15 and 16, where Rabbenu Tam quotes him, perhaps from our very text, as רביעו ז״ל with regard to שעטנ״ז ג״ץ and the shape of the ח.

[3] But see Zunz, *Gesammelte Schriften*, III, 45.

All these characteristics are to be noted in the author of our text[1]. The date test is absolutely decisive as to his having been at least a contemporary of the Barceloni. The latest authorities quoted in our text are R. Chananel and R. Nissim, both of whom were contemporaries of the Barceloni, and although once or twice ז"ל is appended to their names, that may well have been done by the copyist. Other instances where each is cited as הרב הגדול without ז"ל look as though they had been living contemporaries at the date of composition. Again, our author's references to Arabic as לשון הגרית and לשון טיית are at least consistent with his having lived in Barcelona, which was from the ninth to the thirteenth centuries ruled by a Christian Count, but which, as we know from Benjamin of Tudela and other early travellers, as well as the poet Alcharisi, had intimate commercial and social relations with Greece, Pisa, Genoa, Sicily, Alexandria, and Palestine, and the adjacent countries.

Our author frequently[2] refers to himself and his writings, mentioning by name his ספר הבינות and his תשובות ברכות. The former may well be the Barceloni's Biblical Commentary, the title of which was hitherto unknown. The latter is probably part of the ס' העתים, his largest and most important work, of which, I believe, this text formed part. But perhaps the most convincing argument in favour of this identification is furnished by the two Rabbis previously referred to, R. Jerucham and R. Tam. The former, in his תולדות אדם וחוה[3], says, ור' יהודה ברבי ברזלי' כתב בשם גאון שהן מ"ב וכו', i.e. that the number of lines in each column of a sepher should be forty-two. This seems to be a distinct reference to the citation of Hilai Gaon on folio 14. The latter, in his Rules as to the Sepher Torah above referred to, would also seem to have our very text in view when he

[1] Note, for instance, the archaic forms—הלמאי המלך, באיני, ייננו, קראיין, ראבן, ליו (=לאו), כילו (=כאילו), &c., &c.

[2] Folios 1, 1, 2, 2, 6, 7, 11, 12, 12, 12, 13, and 14.

[3] Edition, Venice, 1552, p. 17 b.

quotes what may well be the remarks on our folio 10 as to the ornamentation of the letters and the shape of the ח. For all these reasons it will probably be conceded that there is a very great probability in favour of our hypothesis as to the Spanish Rabbi's masterpiece having been another instance of resurrection from an Egyptian tomb[1].

E. N. ADLER.

(Fol. 1) שקולפין ממנו לשם תפילין שמענו שחוזרין ומעבדין אותו בעפצא ובלא ספק אי איפשר לו בלא מלח והוה ליה מליח וקמיח ועפיץ · ובמסכת גטין בפ׳ המביא[2] תניא בעניין ההוא גברא דעל לבי כנישתא שקל ספר תורה יהב לה לדביתהו אמ׳ לה הא גיטיך אמ׳ רב יוסף למאי ניחוש ליה או משום מי מילין הא קימא לן דאין מי מילין על גבי מי מילין ופיר׳ מי מילין מיא דעפצא שמעת מינת שכל גויל שלספר תורה עפיץ הוא ולא הוצרכתי לברר כל העיקרין הללו אלא כדי להסיר השיבוש שנמצא בפרשת ואתחנן דר׳ שמו׳ גאון שתהו בו רבים והגויל הזה אם לספר תורה מעבדין אותו אין מקלפין ממנו כלמ׳ דבענן שיהו עבים כדי שיהו הקיפו באורכו שהעורות שלספר תורה כל אימת דהוי עבים טפי מעלו דהא רב אחא בר יעקב כשעשה הקיפו באורכו בעורות שלעגלים כתב הילכך הרוצה לעשות גוילין לספר תורה צריך שיקח את העורות וישיר את השיער שלהן במה שירצה ולעבדן במלח וקמח ועפצא ואם עשה כן כשירין לכתוב עליהן ספר תורה ואם חיסר בעיבודן משלשה דברים הללו כלום לא מיבעיא ספר תורה דלא כשירין ליה אלא אפילו מגלה אסור לכתוב עליהן ואם כתבה עליהן פסולה שכן שנינו[3] לעניין מגלה על הניי(ר) ועל הדפתרא לא יצא ומפרשינן בגמ׳ דפתרא דמליח וקמיח ולא עפיץ הלא תראה ותבין שלא חסר מדפתרא אלא עפצא בלבד ופסלו אותו מלכתוב עליו מגלה כל שכן חיפא שהוא חסר עפצא וקמחא וכל שכן מצה שנקרא בטיית רק שאינו מעובד מאחד משלשה דברים הללו ומה

[1] I wish to express my grateful acknowledgments to Dr. Friedländer who has been good enough to revise the text, which had been ably copied for the printer by Dr. Greenburg.

[2] Gittin, 19.

[3] Megillah, 17.

מגלה אינה כשירה עד שתהא כתובה אשורית על העור והוא הגויל שפירשתי אותו ספר תורה האמור לא כל שכן שלא יוכשר לכתבו על אחת מן העורות השלשה שהיא מצה ו[חיפ]א ודפתרא לפיכך צריך אתה להיזהר מיכן ואילך שלא תסבור כי הקלף שאמרו רבותינו הוא רק הנקרא מצה היא טעות גדולה והינו דתנן במסכת כלים[1] העושה כיס מעור (ה)מצה ומן הנייר טמא שהמצה הינו רק וה(ניי)ר שעיבדו שלם בשלשה מינין הללו הוא הגויל ומצוה מן המובחר לספר תורה אם הניחו שלם וכתב עליו בכל חוקי הגויל ואם קלף ממנו הקלף שלו וכתב עליו ספר תורה בשעת הדחק בדאיעבד כשר הוא לקרות בו שמלאכתו פשוטה ולא הטריחו חכמים בשיעור והינו קלף שאמרנו בתלמודינו[2] שאלו את רבי שיעור ספר תורה בכמה (א)מר להן בגויל ששה טפחים ובקלף איני יודע וכן מה שאמרו בתלמוד ארץ יש׳ ובקלפים לא נתנו חכמים שיעור פיר׳ דהוו להו קלישי ולא מצי הסופר לשער הקיפו כאורכו וכן לעניין הדפין במעוט וברוב כאשר אני עתיד לפרש לפנינו ומר רב מתתיה גא׳ ז״ל נמי פריש הכי אמר להן בגויל ששה טפחים בקלף איני יודע שהקלף דק הוא ואינו הווה ששה טפחים וכללו שלדבר הקלף שכותבין עליו פרשיות שלתפילין הוא שאמר עליו רבינו הקדוש בקלף איני יודע והוא שהתירו (חכמים) לכתוב עליו מגלה וספר תורה בשעת הדחק בזמן שאינו מוצא לכוין ולשער מלאכת הגויל שהיא קשה · אבל העור הנקרא רק ליכא למן דשרי למכתב עליו מגלה כל שכן ספר תורה וכל ספר תורה ומגלה שתמצא כתובה על עור המצה שהוא רק אינן מוציאין מידי חובה ואסור לקרות בהן בצבור ושמא מעוטי תורה או נמי קראיין ועמי ארץ כתבו אותן · ואם תמצא לומר תלמיד חכמים כתב (או)תן שמא בטעות הורוהו ולא ידע מלאכת העור ופסולן והכשי(ר)ן שאין לנו לשנות ממה שלימדונו רבותינו ואפילו מזוזה נמי לא מיבעי למכתבה אלא דוכסוסטום שלגויל והרי אתה מוצא המזוזות הישנות כולן על הגויל שחכמים ראשונים כתבו אותן כהוגן אבל האי עור מצה איני יודע לו הכשר לכלום לא לספר תורה ולא לתפילין ולא למזוזות ולא למגלה ולא יוכשרו אלא למכתב עליהו מכילתות וכתבים להתלמד בהן אבל דבר מצוה לא · ובהדיא שנינו[3] אין בין ספרין לתפילין ומזוזות אלא שהספרין נכתבין בכל לשון ותפילין ומזוזות [אינן נכתבות אלא אשורית] ר׳ שִׁבְנָ אומ׳ אף בספרין לא התירו שיכתבו אלא יונית ואם תאמר הר(י) הספרין [והתפילין והמזוזות] לא בַעוֹ שרטוט הרי לימדונו רבואתא טעמא דמילתא לפי שהתפילין נכתבין על קלף [דק מאוד] כדי שלא יהא כבד ואי משרטט ליה

[1] Kelim, 17, 15. [2] Baba Bathra, 14. [3] Megillah, 5.

מר הוא מתקריע וכן אמר רבנו עמרם בר [ששנה קלף לא בעי שר׳] שאי אפשר לה לקבל שרטוט · הילכך הגויל שכותבין עליו ספר תורה הוא שכותבין עליו מזוזות ותפלין ובגמ׳ דבני מערבא במסכתא דמגלה[1] גרסי׳ ר׳ זעורה בש אמי בר חיננא [בכתב ספרים כן כתב תפילין ומזוזה] ועוד קימא לן מזוזה שבלת עושין אותה תפילין אבל תפילין שבלו אין עושין מהן מזוזי [הלמה שמעלין] בקודש [ולא מורידין] ושמעת מינה שעיבודן שוה ואי מי איתה דמזוזה על מצה מצה לתפילין מי מכשרינן אלא לאו שמע מניה כדקאמרינן דמצות מזוזה להיכתב על דיכסוסטוס שלגויל המעובד ותפילין על הקלף הנקלף ממנו והני מילי למצוה דתניא[2] הלכה למשה מסיני תפילין על הקלף ומזוז(זה) על דוכסוסטוס אבל אם שינה וכתב את המזוזה על הקלף בדיעבד כשר דהכי תריצנה לשמעתא דרב דאמ׳ קלף הרי כדוכ(סוס)טוס מה דוכסוסטוס כותבין עליו תפילין קלף כותבין עליו מזוזה דקימא לן כמעשה דר׳ מאיר דאמ׳ ר׳ שמעון (בן אל) עזר ר׳ מאיר היה כותבה על הקלף מפני שמשתמרת אפילו הכי לא הוכשר במזוזה אלא קלף הראוי לתפילין אב(ל) עור המצה מאן מכשיר ואף שהכשירו במזוזה שנכתבת על הגויל ועל דוכסוסטוס ועל הקלף הני מילי במזוזה אבל (בתפי)לין לא מכשרינן למכת(ב) אלא על קלף בלבד : ובפ׳ אמר להן הממונה[3] גרסי בני מערבא תני עור שעיבדו לשם קמיע מותר לכתוב עליו מזוזה רשב גמליאל אוסר אמ׳ ר׳ יוסי הוינן סברין למימר מה פלגין להדיוט הא לגבוה לא מן מה דתני אבני קדש ובקדש ייחצבו בגדי קדש צריך וגו׳ (fol. 2) אמ הדה אמרה אף לגבוה פליגין עד כן לא פליגי אלא בעור אבל במצה ליכא למן דשרי ורבינו סעדיה גאון ז״ל אמר ופירוש דוכסוסטוס גויל שנקלף ממנו קלף ודבר רבינו סעדיה איצא פי כי תשא פי כתבה אלתורה עלי אלגויל עלה חסנה ק ולמא אד לם ימכננא אן נכתב אלתורה כתאבה תכו מסתויה מן דאכל ומן כארג פלדלך יכתב עלי אלגויל חתי לא תרי מן כארג מקלובה אלבתה · וכל מי שאומר חילוף הדברים הללו צריך להביא ראיה לדבריו ולא ימצא הרי לך פירוש מלאכת הגויל והקלף ודוכסוסטוס בעני(ן) ספר תורה ומגלה ותפילין ומזוזות כמה דסבירא לי וכמה שנתגלה לי בסיעתא דש(מ)יא וסר הספק ואיפסילו להו מצה וחיפא ודפתרא ונשאר הגויל והקלף בהכשירא ואם יוכל הסופר לשער שיעורי ספר תורה על הגויל בכל ענייניו בדוקא וקושטא הוא המצוה מן המובחר ואפילו עזרוהו חכמי דורו שהרי מצינו חכמים ראשונים היו יגיעים בו כדי שיזדמן להן כשיעור [חיו] אינן מקופחין שזכות גדולה היא והריני כותב לפניך כל חוקי מלאכת ספר תורה

[1] Jer. Megillah, I, 11. [2] Sabbath, 79. [3] Jer. Tamid, 7.

ומקבץ כל הלכותיו בראיות ברורות בכל ענייניו · ואם אינו יכול לכוין שיעוריו כי בודאי קשה הוא וצריך חכמה יתירה לפי שמצאתי מר רב קימוי ז״ל שכתב למקצת חכמים ששאלוהו בזה הדבר וכן השיב אותן בלשון הזה מה נעשה שאין בקי לעשות כן ארכו כהקיפו אל ירע לבבם על זאת כי אשר תבקשו הוא נפלא מכם : הילכך אם אי אפשר לו לכוין מלאכת הגויל כתיבתו על הקלף שקולפין מן הגויל המעובד לשמו שהוא קליש טפי עדיף שלא הצריכו בו שיהא הקיפו ששה טפחים כאורכו ולא דקדקו בשיעורי היריעות שלו דגרסינן בפירוש שאלו את רבי שיעור ספר תורה בכמה אמ׳ להן בגויל ששה טפחים ובקלף איני יודע ובני מערבא גרסי לעניין שיעורי יריעות ובקלפים לא נתנו בהן שיעור ומשום רבינו יהודאי גאון ז״ל אמרו ובקלף כל מה שיכול לדקדק ידקדק וכל מה שאינו יכול לדקדק אינו נתפס על כך ורבינו נטרונאי ז״ל התיר לקרות בקלף לכתחלה בצבור וכולם לעיניין קלף שקולפין מן הגויל המעובד לשמו אמרו · ורבינו חננאל הרב הגדול ז״ל אמר ומלאכת כתיבת ספר תורה בגויל צריכה חכמה יתירה לשער שיגיע הקיפו כארכו דהא רב הונא לא נזדמן לו אלא אחד משבעים ומסורת בידינו להיות הגוילים נקיים עבים חזקים וכול ואמר בלשון הזה וא״ג דאמרינן בירוש׳ בקלפים לא נתנו חכמ׳ שיעור וכול ור׳ אמר כששאלו אותו ספר תורה בבמה אמ׳ בקלף איני יודע דמשמע שכותבין ספר תורה על הקלף כיון דלא אשכחן שעשה כך אין מתירין לכתחלה לעשות בקלף בוא וראה שאפילו בדרך ש טפח׳ לא אמרו אלא בגויל כההו דאמ׳ ספר תורה שכתבתי לפל׳ גוילים שלו לא עיברתים לשמן וכו׳ ומכל מקום מצוה מן המובחר אינה אלא בגויל עד כן דברי רבינו חננאל הרב הגדול ז״ל ושמענו מכלל דבריו שמצות ספר תורה לכתבו על הגויל מיהו לא התיר לך לכתבו על הגויל אלא כשיהא ארכו כהקיפו ושיהו כל ענייניו ומלאכתו מכוונת כהוגן · ובמקום הדחק שאינו יכול לכוין הרי התיר הקלף מיהו אינו מן המובחר · והרי הבאתי כל דבריהם שלגאונים ורבואתא ואין בהם מי שפיקפק בספר תורה שלגויל ולא הקילו אלא בשיעור הקלף בלבד · ומדברי כולן כל אחד ואחד לא נתגלה לך בפירוש מלאכת הגויל והקלף וכבר ביררתי אותה לך · וצריך הכותב על הקלף (שי)כתוב במקום בשר דתניא[1] כותבין על הקלף במקום בשר ועל הגויל במקום שיער ואינו רשאי לשנות ושאר כל ענייני ספר תורה שלקלף כל מה שיכול לדקדק ידקדק והנה כל מלאכת ספר תורה מחוברת הלכות ברורות לפניך ·

[1] Sabbath, 79.

שׁמושׁא רבּה דסּפר תורה

ב[ס]מ רחמ

הרוצה לעשות ספר תורה בכל חוקיו וככל משפטיו צריך ליקח עורות שלבהמה טהורה או נמי עורות חיה טהורח ואפילו [טריפ]ות שלהן אבל עורות שלבהמה טמאה ועורות שלחיה טמאה לא הוכשרו ולא מיבעיא ל[ספר תורה] ולא לתפילין ומזוזות אלא אפילו רצועות שלתפילין נמי צריכין עור בהמה טהורה דגרסינן בפרק במה מדליק[1] לא הוכשרו למלאכת שמים אלא עור בהמה טהורה בלבד ומסקנא דלא נצרכה [אלא לרצועו] תיהן שלתפילין אבל תפילין גופיהו הלכה למשה מסיני ורצועות שחורות של תפילין אמרינן בגמ שחורות מי גמירי ובפרק שמונה שרצים במסכת שבת [ק״ח] גרסינן לה סתמא תנו רבנן כותבין תפילין [על גבי] עור בהמה טהורה ועל גבי עור חיה טהורה ועל גבי נבילות וטריפות שלהן ונכרכות בשערן ונתפרות בגידן והלכה למשה מסיני שהתפילין נכרכות בשערן ונתפרות בגידן אבל אין כותבין לא על גבי עור בהמה טמאה ולא על גבי עור חיה טמאה ואין צריך לומר על גבי נבילות וטריפות שלהן ואין נכרכות בשערן ואין נתפרות [אלא בגידין] שאלה שאל ביתוסי אחד את ר׳ יהושע הגרסי מנין שאין כותבין תפילין אלא על גבי עור בהמה טהורה דכת׳ למען תהיה תורת יי׳ בפיך מדבר המותד בפיך אלא מעתה נבלות וטרפות אל יכתבו אמר לו אמשול לך משל למ(ה) (ה)דבר דומה לשני בני אדם שנ תחייבו הריגה למלכות אחד הרגו מלך ואחד הרגו אספקליטור איזה מהן משובח הוי א(ומ)ר זה שהרגו מלך מעתה יאכלו אמר לו התורה אמרה לא תאכלו כל נבלה והיא גזירת מלך שנקראת אמרת מצוה שמעיה אמ׳ ליה קלום והו(א) הדין לספר תורה דבעי עורות טהורות עילויא דבעון למע(ב)ד לתפילין עשינן לספר תורה בפּק דמסכת מגלה[2] בהדיא שנינו אין בין ספרי׳ לתפ׳ ומז׳ אלא שהם פרים נכתבים בכל לשון תפילין ומזוזות אינן נכתבין אלא אשורית רבן שׁבּנא (fol. 13) אף בספרים לא התירו שיכתבו אלא יונית ותניא נמי התם אמ׳ ר׳ יהורה אף כשהתירו רבותינו יונית לא התירו אלא בספר תורה משום מעשה שהיה דתניא מעשה בתלמאי המלך שכינס שבעים ושנים זקנים והושיבם בעבּ בתים וכול׳ מעשה ולמדנו שכל עילוייא דבענן לתפילין כותיה בענן לספר תורה אלא שהספרים התירו לכתבן יונית פיר׳ בכתב יוני ולשון הקדש היכי דאמרי בעלי התלמוד בענין עורות טהורות לעניין תפילין ולא

[1] Sabbath, 28. [2] Megillah.

הוצרכו להזכיר ספר תורה דאתי בקל וחומר אבל בבריתא דספרים[1] תניא בהדיא אין כותבין ספרים לא על עור בהמה טמאה ולא על עור חיה טמאה ואין תופרין בגידן ולא בסערן אבל כותבין על עור בהמה טהורה ועל עור חיה טהורה וכותבין על עור גבלות וטרפות שאל אחד את ר׳ יהושע הגרסי וג׳ ראה היאך הבריתא שכתובה כי עיקרה שנויה בענין ספר תורה וכשהוצרכו ללמד לענין תפילין אמרוה על התפילין להודיעך דלא שאני להו בין ספר תורה לתפילין ועיבוד הגוילין שלספר תורה צריך שיהא עיבוד שלם והוא דמליח וקמיח ועפיץ ולא יחסר משלשה דברים הללו כלום שהרי העור הנקרא דפתרא לא חסר אלא עפצא בלבד ואמרינן לעיניין מגילה כתבה על דפתרא פסולה כל שכן ספר תורה וכבר ביררתי ענייני העיבוד ומלאכתו והטעמים אלו בשאלה שנשאלתי בעניין הגויל והקלף בסייעתא דשמיא ׃

ושאלו מלפני מר רב הילאי גאון זל

ספר תורה שאין לו תגין מהו לקרות בו והשיב אותן כך ראינו שמותר לקרות בו ואין התגין פוסלין אבל העושה תגין הרי זה משובח שקשורות כתרים לאותיות וכל שכן שבע אותיות שצריכות שלשה שלשה תגין דאמ׳ רבא שבע אותיות צריכות שלשה שלשה תגין שהן זיין אלו הן שעטנז גץ סימן שין ועין ונון וטית וזין וגימל וצדי ואם אינו עושה להן תגין אין נפסלות ׃ זה הוא דברי גאון זה זל ובקבלה בידינו מרבותינו דהני זיין לאו תגין נינהו אלא זיין לחוד ותגין לחוד וזיין דשעטנז גץ לאו כמה שאמר קיבלנו אלא שין דשמע ועין דשמע וטית דטוטפות ונ דעיניך וזין דמזוזות וגמל דדגניך וצדי דעל הארץ הני בעינן זיין אבל התגין הרי הן כתובין ומדוקדקין בספר תאני משם את צריך ללמדן ׃ ועוד אמ׳ גאון מר רב הילאי זל ופתוחות וסתומות יש להן מקומות כל אחת במקומה ואין לשנות ולעשות פתוחה סתומה וסתומה פתוחה שכך שנינו פרשה פתוחה לא יעשה אותה סתומה וסתומה לא יעשה אותה פתוחה ׃ ובבריתא דספרים[2] תניא כותבין על הקלף במקום בשר ועל הגויל במקום שיער ׃ וצריך לעבדן לשום ספר תורה ובפרק השולח גט לאשתו[3] תניא רבן שמעון בן גמליאל אומר אף עור בהמה טהורה פסולות עד שיעבדן לשמן ומסתברא כותיה ובפרק הניזקין[4] גרסינן ההוא דאתא לקמיה דר׳ אבהו אמ׳ ליה ספר תורה שכתבתי לפלונו גוילים שלו לא עיבדתים לשמה אמר לו ספר תורה ביד מי אמ׳ לו ביד לוקח אמ׳ לו בשם שנאמן אתה להפסיד שברך כך נאמן [אתה] להפסיד ספר תורה ואחר שמעבד את הגוילין לשמן צריך לשרטט את היריעות

[1] Boraita de Sepharim, I, 1.
[2] Ibid., I, 4.
[3] Gittin, 45.
[4] Ibid., 54.

קודם שיכתוב בהן ולא מיבעיא ספר תורה דבעי שירטוט אלא אפילו הכותב שלוש וארבע תיבות מן המקרא אסור לכתוב בלא שרטוט ובפ׳ קמא דגיטין [1] גרסינן אמ׳ ר׳ יצחק שתים כותבין פיר׳ בלא שירטוט שלש אין כותבין במתניתא תנא שלש כותבין ארבע אין כותבין ומעשה דמר עוקבא דאמרינן שרטיט וכתב ליה אמרתי אשמרה דרכי וג׳ ובמסכתא דמגלה [2] לענין מגלה גרסינן אמ׳ ר׳ חייה בר אבא אמ׳ ר׳ אסי מגלה צריכה שירטוט כאמיתה שלתורה ובבריתא דספרין [3] תניא ואינו רשאי לכתוב אלא אם כן מסרגל כתב את היריעה שאינה מסורגלת פסולה ובגמ׳ דאר׳ יש׳ במסכתא דמגלה [4] גרסי הלכה למשה מסיני שיהו כותבין בעורות ומסרגלין בקנה פיר׳ סירגול הינו שירטוט ובטיית חסטיר לאסטר ותרסימהא ומצאנו איגרותיהן שלנאונים וכתביהן בזמן שכתובין בהן פסוק או פיסוקין מנקדין עליו נקודות מלמעלה ואעפ׳ שאינו משורטט ואיגלי לן מכלל המעשה שעשו דסברי שהנקודות שמנקדין במקום השירטוט עומדין שהרי הכר גדול הוא וקולא הוא דהקילו בש(עת) הדחק שלא לשרטט באיגרותיהן ומסתברא כותיהו ואסור לכתוב ספר תורה או מזוזה או מגילה אלא על הספר בדיו · מגלה מדגרסינן בפ׳ הקורא את המגלה למפרע היתה כתובה בסם בסקרא בקומוס ובקלקנתום על הנייר ועל הדפ׳ לא יצא עד שתהא כתובות בדיו על העור ואמרינן סם סמא קומוס קומא קלקנתום אמ׳ רבא חרתא דאושכאפי על הספר בדיו מנא לן אמ׳ רבא אתיא כתיבה כתיבה כתיב הכא ותכתב אסתר המלכה וכתי התם ויאמר להם ברוך מפיו יקרא אלי את כל הדב׳ האלה ואני כותב על הספר בדיו והוא הדין לספר תורה ולעניין מזוזה תניא בספרי דבי רב וכתבתם על הספר בדיו אתה אומר על הספר בדיו או אינו אלא על האבנים הרי אתה דן בלשון הזה ואני דן בלהז ובעל הדין עמד לחלוק ולומר נא כאן כתב ונא להלן כתב מה כתב שנא להלן על האבנים אף כתב שנ׳ כן על האבנים וחילפתי ובטל החילוף וזכיתי לדין תחלה נא כן כתב ונאמ׳ להלן כתב מה כתב של להלן על [הספר בדיו] אף כתב שנא להלן [5] על הספר בדיו ולא שרי למיכתב ספר תורה אלא או בלשון הקדש או יונית דאמר׳ בפקר מגלה אין בין ספרין רבן שמעון בן גמליאל אומ׳ אף בספרין דת׳ לא הותרו שיכתבו אלא יונית ..... אמר׳ יוחנן הל׳ כרב ..... (fol. 14) ואורך ספר תורה ששה טפחים ומשמא דמר רב יהודאיי גאון ז׳ל נתן טעם כאורך הלוחות וצריך הסופר לשער את היריעות ואת הדפין ואת השטין שכותב בכל יכלו

[1] Gittin, 6. [2] Megillah, 16. [3] Boraita de Sepharim, I, 1.
[4] Jer. Megillah, I, 11. [5] צ׳ל כאן.

במספר ובשיעור כמדת הגויל בעביו ובחזקתו פעמים שהוא צריך להעבות את הכתב ופעמים שהוא צריך להמעיט את הכתב ולהדיקו כדי שיתבונן להיות הקיפו שלספר כארכו שאם הקפנו על הקיפו חוט הוה מדתו ששה טפחים ודבר זה מפורש בפרק השותפין דבבא בתרא[1] תנו רבנן אין עושין ספר תורה לא ארכו יותר על הקיפו ולא הקיפו יותר על ארכו שאלו את רבי שיעור ספר תורה כמה אמר להן בגויל ששה בקלף איני יודע וכבר ביררונו מלאכת הגויל והקלף לאחורן והביאו לנו המעשיות הללו כדי לחבב מלאכת ספר תורה ולהודיענו כבודה דאמרי רב הונא כתב שבעין ספרי ולא איתרמי ליה אלא חד רב אחא בר יעקב כתב חד במשכי דעגלי ואיתרמי יהבו ביה רבנן עינא ונח נפשיה ואין לאדם לזלזל בספר שלגויל מלעשותו כך אם חפץ לכתוב בגויל ומי שרוצה להקל הרי ספר שלקלף אינו צריך כל כך יעשה אותו שאלמלי דבר גדול הוא לא הוה טרחי בה קמאיי כולי האיי הרי רבותינו הגאונים כולם הצריכו זה השיעור למי שרוצה לעשות בגויל ומר רב מתתיה גאון זל אמ ספר תורה כותבין אותו בגוילין טובים וצריך שיהא אורכו ששה טפחים וצריך שיהא הקיפו ששה טפחים ומשמא דמר רב יהודאי גאון זל אמרי נמי וצריך להיות כהקיפו ורבינו חננאל זל אמר ומלאכת ספר תורה בגויל צריכה חכמה יתירה לשער כדי שיגיע הקיפו כאורכו ומקצת קדמונים כתב בלשון טיית הכי אן גלד אלאיל וגלד אלזראפה יתם פיהא הדא והרי מעשה דרב אחא בר יעקב שכתב חד על משכי דעגלי ואיתרמי ואם חכמי תלמוד והגאונים הראשונים והאחרונים לא פיקפקו במלאכת שיעור הגויל מי הוא זה אשר יוכל לפקפק בו בלא ראיה לפיכך אין לשנות דתניא במסכתא דספרים[2] כותבין על הקלף במקום בשר ועל הגויל במקום שיער ואינו רשאי לשנות ובגמ דבני מערבא[3] גרסי ואם שינה פסל ושמעינן מינה שכשם שחוקי הגויל לכתבו במקום שיער ואין לנו לשנות כך כל חוקי מלאכת הגויל אינו רשאי לשנותן אלא בראיה ברורה ולעניין מניין השיטין שבכל דף ודף מצאתי כתוב משמא דמר רב יהודאי גאון זל שאמר ששים שטים כנגד ששים ריבוא שלישראל ואנא בעניותי לא סבירא לי הכי אלא כמה שאמרו בבריתא דספרים[4] וכמה יהא מסרגל ארבעים ושנים ואני מצאתי לה טעם בקצת מדרשות דר תנחומה בפרשת ואלה מסעי שהלוחות שהוריד משה מסיני היו בה מב שרטוט כנגד מב מסעות ומר רב קימוי גאון זל אמר ומנין השיטין צריך שיהיה בכל דף ודף שנהגו ראשונים שדקדקו בדבריהן ארבעים ושתים ויש שמוסיפין וכבר כתבתי

[1] Baba Bathra, 5.
[2] Boraita de Sepharim, I, 4.
[3] Jer. Sepharim, I, 11.
[4] Boraita de Sepharim, I, 4.

טעם מי שמוסיף ומר אסף נמי כך פסק מר שיטין ומר רב הילאי גאון מר שיטין נמי אמר וכך אמר רבינו חננאל הרב הגדול דהוא בתרא ודייק זל ומסורת בידינו להיות ארבעים ושנים שיטין ובחוקי הגויל לעיניין שיעור היריעות והדפין דוקא ורוחב השיטין ועניניה גרסינן בפרק הקומץ רבה (את המנחה) במסכת מנחות[1] תנו רבנן עושה אדם יריעה מבת שלש דפין ועד בת שמונה דפין פחות מיכן ויתר על כן לא יַעֲשה ולא ירבה בדפין מפני שנראה כאיגרת ולא ימעיט בדפין מפני שעיניו שוטטות אלא כגון למשפחתיכם שלשה פעמים נזדמנה לו יריעה בתשעה דפין לא יחלק שלש לכאן ושש לכאן אלא ארבע לכן וחמש לכן במה דברים אמורים בתחלת הספר אבל בסוף הספר אפילו פסוק אחד בדף אחד ובפרקא קמא דמגלה נמי גרסי בני מערבא אין עושין יריעה פחות משלשה דפין ולא מוסיפין על שמונה הדה דתמר בתחלה אבל בסוף אפילו כל שהוא ובקלפים לא נתנו חכמים שיעור וצריך שיהא כותב על הגויל במקום שיער ועל הקלף במקום נחושתו ואם שינה פסל ילא יהא כותב חציו על העור וחציו על הקלף אבל כותב הוא חציו על עור חייה טהורה וחציו על עור בהמה טהורה ושאל מקצת התלמידים לר בשלמא פחות משלשה דפין לא יעשה יש לו טעם דכתי יהלא כתבתי לך שלישים תורה נביאים וכתובים (וכתי) מקרא משׁ ותלמ כהנים לויים ויש ושניתנה תורה לעם תליתאי ביום תליתאי לחדש תליתאי כדאמרינן בגמ דשבת[2] וכיוצא בזה דברים משולשים כגון סין ומשה ולוי וכיוצא בו אלא מה טעם לא ירבה יתר משמונה דפין ולא עוד אלא שאנו חושׁ לזוגות בכל מקום והישבתי מסתברא כנגד הלוחות שהיו כתובים ד דפין בכל לוח נימצאת אומר שמונה דפין בלוחות וסמכתי על מה שכתי לוחות כתי משני עבריהם מזה ומזה הם כתובים דאם על שני עבריהם בלבד הוה סאגו ליה למימר משני עבריהם ולשתוק אלא כיון דהדר אמ מזה שמענו כי ד פנים היו כתובין בכל לוח ולוח הרי ח דפין ומצאתי עיקר זה הסבר מפורש בגמ דבני מערבא במסכת שקלים[3] כיצד היו הלוחות כתובין ר חנניה בר ממל וכול עד ר סימוי אמ ארבעים על לוח זה וארבעים על לוח זה משני עבריהם מזה ומזה הם כתובים טטרגונה ופיר טטרגונה מרובע כלומ שהיה על כל לוח ולוח ארבעה פנים פניו ואחוריו וצידו הימין וצידו השמאל וראיה לדבר כי פיר טטרגונה מרובע כי ההיא דגרסינן בפ מי שמת בבא בתרא[4] תר הריני נזיר הן אחת דיגון שתים טרגון שלש טטרגון ארבע פינטיגון חמש וזה המניין בלשון יון הוא ובגמ דהקומץ

[1] Menachoth, 30.
[2] Sabbath, 88.
[3] Jer. Shekalim, VI, 1.
[4] Baba Bathra, 164 צל גמ פשוט.

רבה[1] תניא נמי שיעור הגילין מלמטה טפח מלמעלה שלש אצבעות
ובין דף לדף כמלוא רוח שתי אצבעות: ובחומשין מלמטה שלש (fol. 5)
אצבעות מלמעלה שתי אצבעות ובין דף לדף כמלוא רווח גודלו ובין שיטה
לשיטה כמלא שיטה ובין תיבה לתיבה כמלוא אות קטנה ובין אות לאות
כמלוא חוט הסערה לא ימעט אדם את הכתב לא מפני ריוח שלמטה ולא
מפני ריוח שלמעלה לא מפני ריוח שבין שיטה לשיטה ולא מפני ריוח שבין
פרשה לפרשה נזדמנה לו תיבה בת חמש אותיות לא יכתוב שתים בתוך
הדף ושלש חוץ לדף אלא שלש בתוך הדף ושתים חוץ לדף נזדמנה לו תיבה
בת שתי אותיות לא יזרקנה לבין הדפין אלא חוזר וכותב מתחלת השיטה
ובפרק השותפין[2] גרסינן ונותן רווח בין חומש לחומש שבתורה ארבע שיטות
ובין נביא לנביא שלשנים עשר שלש שיטות וכול' אמ' רבינו יהודאי גא' ז"ל
ושלא יתערב אות באות ושלא תצא השיטה חוץ לשרטוט יותר משתי אותיות
ומשם הגדול יי' אלהים אדני יהוה שלא יוציא אלא אות אחת בלבד חוץ
לשרטוט ולא שתים ומאלהים יוציא שתים מן השירטוט ואם היה סופר שיודע
לכתוב ואינו בקי בקריאה אסור לכתוב דתניא במסכת דספרים ואינו רשאי
לכתוב אלא אם כן הוא יודע לקראת: הדא אלמשנה שנינו[3] אין בין ספרים
לתפילין ומזוזות אלא שהספרים נכתבין בכל לשון ותפילין ומזוזות אינן נכתבין
אלא אשורית רבן שמעון בן גמליאל אף בספרין לא התירו שיכתבו אלא
יונית הא לענין טומאת ידים ולתפרן בגידין זה וזה שוין וספרין הנכתבין
בכל לשון מטמאין את הידים והרי שנינו במסכת ידים[4] מקרא שכתבו תרגום
ותרגום שכתבו מקרא וכתב עברית כולן אינן מטמאין את הידים עד שיכתבו
אשורית על הספר בדיו והעמדנו הא והא בגופן שלנו שהן צורת כתב
אשורית ופירקנו רב אשי אמ' משנתינו בכל הספרים שלמקרא וכי תנן ההיא
דידים בשאר ספרים זולתי ספרתורה שאין מטמאין את הידים עד שיכתבו
אשורית ור' יהודה דתניא[5] ספרים נכתבין בכל לשון ורבותינו לא התירו
שיכתבו אלא יונית ותניא אמ' ר' יהודה אף כשהתירו רבותינו לא התירן
אלא בספר תורה משום מעשה דתלמאי המלך ופי' תרגום שכתבו מקרא
כגון יגר שהדותא ובמגלה ונשמע פתגם וכל הנשים יתנו יקר לבעליהן נמצאת
אומר שלש מחלקות בדבר לרבנן כל הספרים שלמקרא נכתבין בכל לשון
ולרבן שמעון בן גמליאל לא התירו בכל הספרים עם לשון הקדש אלא יונית
ולרבותינו ולר' יהודה כל הספרים של מקרא זולתי ספר תורה אינן נכתבין

[1] Menachoth, 30. [2] Baba Bathra, 13. [3] Megillah, 8.
[4] Yadaim, 4, 5. [5] Megillah, 9.

אלא בלשון הקדש וכשהתירו יונית לא התירו אלא ספר תורה ׳ ותפילין ומזוזות לדעת הכל אינן נכתבין אלא אשורית ובלשון הקדש אבל מגלה לדעת הכל אינה נכתבת אלא אשורי׳ אבל רבן שמעון בן גמליאל מתיר כתב יוני לכל והלכה כמותו ומותר לקרותה בלעז ללעוזות והיא שכתובה אשורית ולענין פסאקא הלכה כרבן שמעון בן גמליאל דתנן [1] רבן שמעון בן גמליאל אומר אף בספרין לא התירו שיכתבו אלא יונית אמ׳ ר׳ אבהו הל׳ כרבן שמ׳ בן גמ׳ ואמ׳ ר׳ חייא בר אבא אמ׳ ר׳ יוחנן הינו טעמ׳ דרבן שמעון בן גמליאל דכתי׳ יפת אלהים ליפת וישכון באהלי שם מיפיותו שליפת יהו באהלי שם והינו כתב יון דכתי׳ בני יפת גמר ומ׳ ומד׳ ויון וג׳: וצריך ספר תורה להיות שלם ולא מיבעיא היכא דהוה חסר כתב אחד דהיא אות אחת אלא אפילו קוץ אחד לא מיבעי למיהוי חסר דבענן כתיבה תמה ובמסכתא דמנחות בפ׳ הקומץ רבה [2] גרסינן לעניין מזוזות ותפילין ואפילו כתב אחד מעכבן ואמרינן פשיטא פיר׳ דכתב אחד מעכבן ואמ׳ ר׳ יהודה אמ׳ רב לא נצרכה אלא לקוצו של יוד ואמרינן הא נמי פשיטא לא נצרכה אלא לאידך דרב יהודה אמ׳ רב דאמ׳ רב יהודה אמ׳ רב כל אות שאין הגויל מוקף לה מארבע רוחותיה פסולה אמ׳ אשיאן בר נדבך משמא דרב ניקב מתוכו שלהי כשר יריכו פסול אמ׳ ר׳ זירא לדידי מפרשא לי מיניה דרב הונא ורב יעקב מיניה דרב יהודה תוכו כשר יריכו אם נשתייר בו כשיעור אות קטנה כשר אם ל(א) פסול אגרא חמוה דר׳ אבא אינקיב ליה כר(ע)א דהי דהעם בנקבא אתא לקמיה דרב אבא אמ׳ ליה אם נשתייר בו כשיעור אות קטנה כשר ואם לא פסול ראמי בר תמרי דהו ראמי בר דיקולי איפסיק ליה כר(ע)א דוא דויהרג בנקבא את(א) לקמיה דר׳ זירא אמ׳ ליה זי(ל) איתי ינוקא דלא חכים ולא טפיש אי קארי ליה ויהרג כשר ואי לא ייהרג הוא ופסול פיר׳ ויהרג דכת׳ בפרשת והיה כי יביאך ויהי כי הקשה פרעה לשלחנו ויהרג ייי כל בכור וג׳ או בעית אימ׳ בתפילין הוא עסיק ואיפשר לומר בספר תורה הוא עסיק ובכולהו צריך שיהא הגויל מקיף את האות מארבע רוחותיה ובני מערבא נמי בגמ׳ דמגלה [3] גרסי ר׳ זעירה בש׳ רב ניקב נקב ביריכו שלהא אם גורדו ונשתייר שם יריך קטנה כשר ואם לא פסול ר׳ זעורה בשם רב חסדא היה הג מכלא את הגויל אם גורדו ונשתייר שם יריך קטנה כשר ואם לא פסול פיר׳ אם היה הדיו אוכל הגביל ומכלה את הירך שלתבה ר׳ זעורא בר אשי בר נדבה נקב נקב באמצע בית אם היה הגביל מקיפו מכל צד כשר ואם לא פסול וגרסי נמי התם ר׳ ירמיא אמ׳ לה ר׳ זעורה בשם ר׳ חסדא ר׳ יונה ור׳ יוסא תריהון אמרין

[1] Megillah, 9. [2] Menachoth, 29. [3] Jer. Megillah, 29.

ר׳ זעורה בר אשי בר נדבה חברייה אמרין (fol. 6) בש׳ ר׳ חננאל אם היתה דיו יוצא מן הנקבין פסול כיצד יעשה לוחכה בלשונו והיא עומדת פיר׳ קודם שיכתוב וצריך לכתוב בדיו נאה בקולמוס נאה בלבלר נאה על גבי עורות צבאים ולהתנאות בו בכל יכלו דכתי׳ זה אלי ואנוהו דתניא בפ׳ ר׳ אליעזר [1] אם לא הביא אמ׳ ר׳ ישמעאל זה אלי ואנוהו חיתנאה לפניו במצות עשה לפניו סוכה נאה לולב נאה שופר נאה ציצית נאה לשמה וכתוב לו ספר תורה לשמו בדיו נאה בקולמוס נאה בלבלר אומן וכורכו בשיראין נאין ודרשי רבנן חייב אדם לעשות לו סוכה נאה לולב נאה ציצית נאות תפילין נאות ויכתוב לו ספר תורה בדיו נאה בקולמוס נאה בלבלר אומן על גבי עורות צבאיין ויעטפנו בשיראין שנא׳ זה אלי ואנוהו ואם טעה והשמיט תיבות או אותיות מותר לו לתלות דגרסי בני מערבא במגלה נקראת [2] תולין בספרים ואין תולין בתפילין ומזוזות ולעניין מי שטעה והיה צריך לכתוב את השם וכתב מילה אחרת תניא נמי במסכת מנחות [3] הטועה את השם גורד את מה שכתב ותולה את מה שגרד וכותב את השם במקום הגרד דברי ר׳ יהודה ר׳ יוסי אומ׳ אף תולין את השם ר׳ יצחק אומ׳ אף מוחק וכותב ר׳ שמעון שיזורי אומ׳ כל השם כולו תולין מקצתו אין תולין ר׳ שמעון בן אלעזר אומר משום ר׳ מאיר אין כותבין את השם לא על מחק ולא על מקום גרד ואין תולין אותו אלא מסלק את היריעה כולה וגונזה איתמר רב חננאל אמ׳ רב הלכה תולין את השם רבה בר בר חנה אמ׳ רב יצחק בר שמואל בר מרתא הלכה מוחק וכותב ונימ׳ מר הלכה כמר ונימ׳ מר הלכה כמר פיר׳ למה לא אמר רב יצחק בר שמואל בר מרתא הלכה כר׳ יצחק שהרי כדבריו פסק ויאמר רב הלכה כר׳ יוסי שהרי כדבריו פסק משום דאפכי להו פיר׳ יש שמהפך דברי ר׳ יהודה לר׳ יוסי ודברי ר׳ יוסי לר׳ יהודה ועיקר ההפיכה הזאת משכחת לה בבריתא דספרים [4] ר׳ יהודה אומר אף תולין את השם אמ׳ ראבון בר חיננא אמ׳ ר׳ חנינא הלכה כר׳ שמעון שיזורי ולא עוד אלא כל מקום ששנה ר׳ שמעון שיזורי הלכה כמותו ואמרינן אהידי פיר׳ על הידי אמ׳ הל כר׳ שמעון שיזורי או נימ׳ אהא דתניא ר׳ שמע׳ שיזורי אומ׳ כל השם כולו תולין מקצתו אין תולין הא איתמר עלה אמ׳ רב חננאל אמ׳ רב הלכה תולין את השם ורבה בר בר חנה אמ׳ ר׳ יצחק בר שמואל בר מרתא הלכה מוחק וכותב ואו מי איתה פיר׳ אילו הוה ראובן בר חיננא אמ׳ ר׳ חנינא פוסק הלכה כר׳ שמעון שיזורי בזה המקום נימ׳ הוא נמי ויהיו שלשה אמוראין חולקין בפסקא דהא הל וכיון שלא דיבר עמהן שמענו שלא בזה

[1] Sabbath, 133.
[2] Jer. Megillah, 133.
[3] Menachoth, 29.
[4] Boraita de Sepharim, V, 4.

המקום פסק הל כר׳ שמע׳ שזורי אלא על מקום אחר והתחילו לחפס על אי זה מקום ושקלי וטרו כוליה ופליגי בהאי פיסקא דפסק ראבון בסוף שמעתא רב פפא ורב נחמן בר יצחק ומכל מקום ידענו שלא פסק ראבון בר׳ חיננא מש׳ ר׳ חנינא בר שמע׳ שיזורי בזה המקום ונשתייר שם ארבעה תנאין ר׳ יהודה ור׳ יוסי ור׳ יצחק ור׳ שמעון בן אלעזר ואע״ג דתניא בבריתא דספרים[1] סתמא כר׳ שמעון בן אלעזר אין כותבין את השם לא על מקום המחק ולא על מקום הגרד טיפת הדיו שנפלה על הכתב גורדו וייתקינו ובעלי התלמוד לא פסקו לא כר׳ שמעון בן אלעזר ולא כר׳ יצחק אלא חד פסק כר׳ יהודה וחד פסק כר׳ יוסי וההוא פיסקא דסלקא דעתין דר׳ שמעון שיזורי כבר אידחי ליה ונשתייר ר׳ יהודה ור׳ יוסי וצריכין אנו לראות אמאי מיניהו סמכינן או כר׳ יהודה דאמ׳ גורד את החול וכותב שם או כר׳ יוסי דאמ׳ אף כותבין[2] את השם ומיסתברא דכר׳ יוסי דהא קימ׳ בכל דוכתא דלא איפסיקא הילכתא בהדיא ר׳ יהודה ור׳ יוסי [וגו׳] וצריכין אנו לידע פירוש טעמיהו דחמשה תנאיי אילין ומה בין סברא דמר לסברא דמר בתחלה טעמו שלר׳ יהודה דסבירא ליה גורד את החול וכותב את השם במקום הגרד ותולה את החול שגרד סבירא ליה דאין תולין את השם ומותר לכתבו על הגרד ור׳ יוסי סבר כשם שתולין את החול שנשמט כך תולין את השם דאמ׳ אף תולין את השם ור׳ יצחק סבר[3] אף מוחק וכותב סבירא ליה דאם תלה מוטב ואם רצה למחוק את החול ולכתוב את השם מוחק וכותב פיר׳ אחרינא ור׳ יצחק דאמ׳ אף מוחק סבירא ליה דגורד ואם רצה למחוק מוחק שהגרידה לחוד והמחק לחוד הגרידה היא בראש הסכין עד שהגרד מן העור והמחק בזמן שהדיו לח מעביר ידיו הסופר עליו ומוחקו וכותב את השם על מקום המחק והינו דפליג ר׳ שמע׳ בן אלעזר מש׳ ר׳ מאיר בתרויהו על [יהודה שאמר] לכתוב את השם על הגרד ועל ר׳ יצחק שהתיר לכתבו על המחק וכן אמ׳ אין כותבין את השם לא על המחק ולא על הגרד • ור׳ שמעון שיזורי סבר אם לא נכתב מן השם כלום תולין אותו כולו ומותר ואם כתב מקצת השם טעה והשמיט מקצתו כגון שהשמיט הימ׳ מאלהים או יׄמ׳ סבר אין תולין אותו דאין חולקין את השם לפיכך אין תולין מקצתו ובמחיקה לא איירי ור׳ שמעון בן אלעזר אסר לכתוב את השם על המחק ועל הגרד ואסר לתלותו אלא מסלק את היריעה כולה ובעלי התלמוד לא פסקו לא כר׳ יצחק דאמ׳ אף מוחק ולא כר׳ שמעון בן אלעזר שאסר את המחיקה ואת התלייה ור׳ שמעון שיזורי לא נתברר לנו שפסק ראבון בר חיננא מש׳ ר׳ חנינא הל כמותו אלא רב פסק הלכה כמאן דאמ׳ תולין והוא ר׳ יוסי ור׳ יצחק בר שמואל

[1] Boraita de Sepharim, V, 4.

[2] צ״ל תולין.

[3] Above סבר is written דאמ׳.

בר מרתא פסק הלכה כמן דאמ אף מוחק וכותב והוא ר יהודה ומסתברא דהלכתא כמאן דאמ תולין את השם וכמשמע התלמוד שר יוסי הוא דהא קימ לן בכל דוכתא דלא איפסיקא בה הל בהדיא בפלוגתא דר יהודה ור יוסי שהלכה כר יוסי ובזה המקום לא איפסיק לן הילכתא בהדיא לפיכך הדרינן לכללא ולא תיקשי לך מה שאמרנו שיש מי שהופך את דבריהם אעפ כן על גירסא דרבנא אשי סמכינן (fol. 7) שהוא בעל התלמוד דאלמלא קימ ליה בקושטא לא הוה גרים הכי בבריתא ועוד מסתבר טעמיה דר יוסי שאמ תולין את השם שהוא טפי עאדיף מכתיבתו על המחק או על הגרד ועוד מסתייע טעמיה דר יוסי שאמ תולין את השם מדקימ לן כי ציץ נזר הקדש היה השם תלוי בו ובמסכת דשבת בפ במ אש יוצא[1] גרסינן ציץ דומה כמין טס שלזהב ורחב שתי אצבעות ומוקף מאזן לאזן וכתוב עליו בשתי שיטין קדש ל מלמטה ויוד והי מלמעלה ובמסכת יומא בפרק טרף בקלפי[2] ובמגלה נקראת[3] גרסי בני מערבא נמי קדש ל מלמטן והשם מלמעלן ועוד סתמא בבריתא דספרים[4] תניא אין כותבין את השם לא על מקום המחק ולא על מקום הגרד ועוד ר שמעון שיזורי מסייע ליה לר יוסי דאמ כל השם כולו תולין ולא אסר אלא לתלות מקצתו ואעפ שדברי ר שמעון שיזורי תלויין מכל מקום הוו להו תרי תנאי סוברין שמותר לתלות את השם ואי קשיא לך אהיא דגרסי בני מערבא במס דמגלה טעה והשמיט את השם אית תניי תני תולה את השם ואית תניי תני מוחק את החול וכותב את השם ותולה את החול ופסק ר זעיר רב חננאל בשם רב הלכה כמי שהוא אומר מוחק את החול וכותב את השם ותולה את החול ההיא לא קשיא מידי דהא ר חננאל בש רב הוא דפסק בנמ דידן הל כר יוסי דאמ תולין וההוא גירסא דירוש לא סמכינן עליה דכל היכא דאיכא פלוגתא בין תרי אולפאני על גמרא דידן סמכינן ועל מה שפירשו בעלי תלמודינו כי הוא נכון ומסויים יתר מגמרא דבני מערבא והאי דחאזית דגמרינן (קצת) מגמרא דבני מערבא קצת הלכות התם ההוא במידי דלא פליג עליה גמרא דידן הילכך מכל מקום ההוא פיסקא דפסיקנא דתולין את השם פיסקא מעליא הוא ולא תזוז מיניה ועוד מסתייע האי סברא דתולין את השם ממאי דגרסי בני מערבא ר זעיר רב חננאל בש רב אם היה כגון אני יי אלהיכם מותר פיר מותר לתלותו למה מפני שהן שלש תבות או מפני שיש בו חול מה נפיק מן ביניהון אל אלהים יי אין תאמר מפני שהן שלש תיבות הרי הן שלש תיבות ואין תאמר מפני שיש בו חול הרי אין בהן חול

[1] Sabbath, 63.
[2] Jer. Yoma Hal., I.
[3] Jer. Megillah Hal., XI.
[4] Boraita de Sepharim, V, 4.

ליי צריכה בייי צריכה פיר מיבעיו בעו לה ולא איפשיט וכל זה על דעת מי שאוסר לתלות את השם אבל על דעת מי שמתיר אינו צריך שיהא עמו חול ולא שם אחר שהרי הוא מתיר לתלות את השם לבדו ואיכא מרבואתיו מאן דפסק במקום אחד הל כר יהודה דאמ מוחק את החול וכותב את השם וכר שמעון שיזורי דאמ השם כולו תולין מקצתו אין תולין ובידוע כי דברי שני התנאין הללו מפקן מהדדי ולא יתחברו דבריהם כאחד ומי שסובר כר יהודה דאמ מוחק את החול וכותב את השם ואוסר לתלות את השם לא מסתבר ליה כרש שיזורי דאמ תולין את השם ועוד תקשי ליה כל אותן הטעמים שהקדמתי ואני כתבתי מאי דסבירא לי לפי עניותי[1]: גרסינן במס סוכה בפ הישן תניא כותבי ספרין תפילין ומזוזות הן ותגר ותגרי תגריהן וכל העוסק במלאכת שמים לאיתויי מוכרי תכלת פטורין מקריית שמע ומן התפלה ומן התפילין וכו׳ ובתוספתא דברכות בפ שני כותבי ספרים תפילין ומזוזות מפסיקין לקריית שמע ואין מפסיקין לתפלה ר אומ כשם שאין מפסיקין לתפלה כך אין מפסיקין לקריית שמע ר חנניה בן עקביא אומ כשם שמפסיקין לקריית שמע כך מפסיקין לתפלה אמ ר אלעזר בר צדוק כשהיה רבן גמליאל ובית דינו ביבנה והיו עסיקין בצרכי צבור לא היו מפסיקין שלא להסיע מליבן: וגרסי בני מערבא בפ כיצד מפרישין את הבכורים אמ ר אבא ר אחא מפסיק וקאיי פיר שהיה מפסיק ועומד מלפני תלמידי חכמ דו חשש להדא דתני כותבי ספרים תפילין וכול׳ ופיר רבינו נסים הרב הגדול בסוף התשובה שכתבתיה בתשובות ברכות לעניין העוסק בצרכי צבור קודם קריית שמע כלשון הזה הילכך כל היכא דאיפשר להיעשות צרכי צבור וכול׳ התם · והוא הדין לסופר שכותב ספר תורה · והיכא דטעה הסופר וכתב שם במקום שאין צריך לו או אפילו אות אחת מן השם אסיר ליה למחק יתיה דתניא בבריתא דספרים[2] ר מאיר אומ משום ר ישמעאל מנין למוחק אות אחת מן השם שהוא עובר בלא תעשה שנ ואבדתם את שמם מן המקום ההוא לא תעשון כן לייי אלהיכם והיכי עביד מנקד עליו נקודות מלמעלה דתניא הכותב אזכרה פעמים מנקד את הראשון הנקודות שאמרו מלמעלן ולא מלמטן ובפרק שבועת העדות במס שבועות[3] ביררו את השמות שאסור למחוק ואת שאינן אסורין למחוק דתניא התם יש שמות שנמחקין ויש שמות שאין נמחקין ואילו הן שמות שאין נמחקין

אל אלוה אלהיך אלהים אלהיכם אלהיהם אהיה אשר אהיה יה שדי צבאות הרי אילו אין נמחקין ואילו הן שמות שנמחקין הגדול הגבור והנורא והאדיר והרומם והחזק והאמת והעזוז חנון ורחום ארך אפים ורב חסד · תר כל הטפל

[1] Succah, 21. [2] Boraita de Sepharim, V, 4. [3] Shebuoth, 35.

לשם בין לפניו ובין לאחריו נמחק לפניו כיצד לבו מחשך סימ ליי למד נמחק
ביי בי נמחק ויי ואו נמחק מיי מם נמחק היי הי נמחק שיי שין נמחק כיי
כף נמחק לאחריו כיצד אלהינו נון וא נמחקין אלהיכם כף מם נמחקין אלהיהם
הי מם נמחקין אחרים אומ לאחריו אינו נמחק שכבר קידשו השם אמ רב הונא
הלכה כאחרים ׳ תנו רבנן כתב אלף ולמד מאלה [ים] יוד והי מיי אין נמחק
שין ודל משדי צד ובי מצבאות נמחק ר יוסי אומ צבאות אפילו כולו נמחק שלא
נקרא הקבה צבאות אלא על שם יש שנ והוצאתי את צבאותי את עמי וג׳
ואיתה נמי בבריתא דספרים ופירשוהו בגמ דבני מערבא במגילה[1] כללו
של דבר כל ש[כיוצ]א בו שם מתקרי (fol. 8) ולית הילכתא כר יוסי דאמ
צבאות אפילו כולו נמחק שלא נקרא הקבה צבאות אלא על שום ישראל שנ
והוצאתי את צבאותי את עמי בני ישר מא מצ במשפטים גדולים ואף על גב
דגרסי בני מערבא תני ר יוסי אומ של בית חגירה כותבנין אומנין היו
בירושלם והיו מוחקין צבאות שכן הוא שם חול במקום אחר ופקדו שרי
צבאות בראש העם אפילו הכי לית הילכתא כותיה דהא בהדיא אמרינן בגמ
דידן אמ שמואל אין הלכה כר יוסי ובשבועות נמי גרס(ינן) כל השימות
האמורין באברהם קדש חוץ מזה שהוא חול ויאמר יי אם נא מצאתי חן
בעיניך וג׳ חנניה בן אחי ר יהושע ור אלעזר בן עזריה שאמ משום ר אלעזר
המודעי אמרו אף זה קדש וקימ לן כשני התנאין הללו חדא דהא מימרא דרב
מסייע להו דאמרינן כמאן אזלא הא דאמ ר יהודה אמ רב גדול הכנסת
אורחין יתר מהקבלת פני שכינה כמאן כאותו הזוג ועוד הא פסק שמואל
כוותיהו דאמ ר הונא בר חייא אמ שמואל הלכה כאותו הזוג וגרסי בני מער
במסכתא דמגלה כל השמות הכתובים באבינו אברהם הרי אילו קודש חוץ
מאחד שהוא חול כאשר התעו אותי אלהים מבית אבי ויש אומ אף הוא קודש
שאילולי אלהים כבר התעו אותי כל השמות האמורין בלוט חול חוץ מזה שהיא
קדש ויאמר לוט אליהם אל נא אדני הנא נא מצא עבדך חן וג׳ להחיות את
נפשי מי שיש בידו להמית ולהחיות הוי אומ זה הקבה ותניא בבריתא דספרים
אלהי האלהים ואדני האדנים הראשונים קדש והאחרונים חול אלהי אברהם
ואלהי נחור הראשון קדש והאחרון חול ישפטו בינינו אלהי אביהם משמש קדש
וחול יש לאל ידי ואין לאל ידיך כולם חול ולא הוצרכתי לכתוב שאר השמות
האמורין בכלל כל המקרא שלא להאריך כי לעיניין שימוש ספר תודה אנו
צריכין כן וכבר ביררתי כולן בספר הבינות בפרש וארא בענין ושמי יי ואשר
שמעת כי צריך הסופר בעת כתיבתו השם לכנופי בי עשרה לא ידעתי לו עיקר

[1] Jer. Megillah Hal., XI.

בכל התלמוד ומידת חסידות הוא וקדושתא יתירתא וכל מה דאיפשר ליה לסופר לכווני דעתיה ולקדושי נפשיה בכתיבת השם דכל יקוריה טפי עאדיף ואם אפשר לו להיות מתעטף בציצית ומניח תפילין שפיר דאמי אעג דקימ לן שכל העוסק במצותן פטור ממצוה אחרת וצריך לעשות מה שאמרו דבותינו כי הסופר צריך להתכוון ולכתוב את האזכרות לשמן כלומ שצריך לכתוב את השם בכוונה ובקדושה בכל יכלו וכל ספר תורה שלא נכתבו האזכרות שבו לשמן פסול כדגרסינן בפרק הניזקין במסכת גיטין ההוא דאתא לקמיה דר אמי אמ ליה ספר תורה שכתבתי לפלוני הזכרות שבו לא כתבתים לשמן אמ ליה ספר תורה ביד מי אמ ליה ביד לוקח אמ ליה נאמן אתה להפסיד שכרך ואין נאמן אתה להפסיד ספר תורה אמ ליה ר ירמיה נהי דאפסיד שכר הזכרות שכר כולו מי אפסיד אמ ליה שאני אומ כל ספר תורה שאין הזכרות שלו כתובות לשמן אין שווה כלום והקשינו ואמאי ויעביר עליו קולמוס ויקדשו כמאן דלא כר יהודה דתניא הרי שהיה צריך לכתוב את השם ונתכוון לכתוב יהודה וטעה ולא הטיל בו דלת מעביר עליו קולמוס ויקדשו דברי ר יהודה וחכמים אומ אין זה השם מן המובחר פיר נמצאת זו ההוראה שהורה ר אמי שאמ כל ספר תורה שאין הזכרות שלו כתובות לשמן אינו שווה כלום דלא כר יהודה דאי כר יהודה סבירא ליה מפני מה אמר אין שווה כלום והחזרנו אפילו תימ ר יהודה עד כאן לא קאמ ר יהודה אלא בחדא הזכרה אבל בכוליה ספר לא משום דמיהזי כמנומר ובמסכת גטין בהמביא תנינא פרישנן טעמיהו דרבנן שאמרו אין זה השם מן המובחר דטעמיהו דרבנן משום זה אלי ואנוהו והא דתניא בהניזקין (וכול׳) ובדוכתא אחריתי (תניא וכול׳) שנו חכמ בבריתא דספרים הכותב את השם ואפילו המלך שואל בשלומו לא ישיבנו היה כותב חמשה וששה שמות כיון שנומר אחד מהן משיב שאילת שלום כתב את האזכרה פעמים מנקיד את הראשון ומקיים את השני כתב אלף למד מאלהים ויוד הי מיי הרי זה מנקדו הנקודות שאמרו מלמעלה ולא מלמטה ותניא נמי התם אין כותבין את השם אלא מן המובחר כיצד לא יטביל אדם קולמוס שנים שלשה פעמים ויכתוב בו את השם אלא טוב לו פעם אחת וכותב בו את השם י ובירוש גרסי בפ מגלה נקרא רב שֵׁשַׁת בריה דרב חננאל אמר צריך לכתוב הא למטה מארכובתו שללמד הליי תגמלו זאת והא דתניא בהניזקין הרי שהיה צריך לכתוב את השם וכול׳ עיקרה בבריתא דספרים[1] והכי תניא רישה הצריך לכתוב את יהודה ונתכוון וכתב את השם תולה לו את הדלת הצריך לכתוב את השם ונתכוון וכתב את יהודה מוחק את הדלת ומתקן

[1] Boraita de Sepharim, V, 3.

את הי האחרון הצריך לכתוב את יהודה ונתכוון וכתב את השם והרי יהודה לפניו מנקדו וכותב אֹתּ הצריך לכתוב את השם ונתכוון וכתב את יהודה והרי השם לפניו מוחקו וכותב שם אחר הצריך לכתוב את השם וכותב את יהודה וטעה ולא תלה לו דלת ר׳ יהודה אומ׳ יעביר עליו קולמוס ויקדשנו וחכמ׳ אומ׳ אין זה מן המובחר וכבר אוקימנה להא דר׳ יהודה בפרק הניזקין בשם אחד ובדוכתא אחריתי אמרי הטובל את הקולמוס לכתוב את השם לא יתחיל מאותו השם אלא יתחיל מן האות שלפניו (א)סור לכתוב אפילו אות אחת שלא מן הכתב חוץ מתפילין ומזוזות (fol. 9) דגרסינן בפ׳ הקורא את המגלה למפרע[1] גופה אמ׳ רבה בר בר חנה אמ׳ ר׳ יוחנן אסור לכתוב אפילו אות אחת שלא מן הכתב ומותבינן עליה מיהא דתניא אמ׳ ר׳ שמעון בן אלעזר מעשה בר׳ מאיר שהלך לעבר שנה באסיא ולא היה שם מגלה וכתבה מלבו וקראה ומפריק[2] ר׳ אבהו שאני ר׳ מאיר דקאים ביה ועפעפיך יישירו נגדך כלומ׳ שהוא בקי בחסירות וביתירות ובכל ענייני ספרים על פה גמרא גמיר להו ואמ׳ ליה ר׳ אמי בר ברכיה לר׳ ירמיה מדופתי מאי ועפעפיך יישירו נגדך אלו דברי תורה שכתוב בהן התעיף עיניך בו ואינן מיושרים הן אצל ר׳ מאיר ר׳ חסדא אשכחיה לרב חננאל דקא כתיב ספרים שלא מן הכתב אמ׳ לו ראויה כל התורה כולה להיכתב מפיך אלא אמרו חכמ׳ אסור לכתוב אפילו אות אחת שלא מן הכתב ואמרינן מדקאמ׳ ליה ראויה כל התורה כולה להיכתב מפיך מכלל דמיושרין הם דברי תורה אצלו כר׳ מאיר פיר׳ ומה טעם אסר עליו לכתוב שלא מן הכתב והא ר׳ מאיר כתב ומשנינן שעת הדחק שאני אעג׳ דשמעינן מיהא שמעתא דהיכא דאיכא חכם גדול דבקי בחסירות ויתרות ודברי תורה מיושרין אצלו כר׳ מאיר וליכא גביה ספרים לאיכתב מיניהו שרי ליה למכתב וכי שארו ליה למכתב לא שארו ליה אלא ספרים אבל ספר תורה לא מצינן אדם [שה]יה בו כח למכתב ספר תורה שלא מן הכתב דהא ר׳ מאיר מגלה הוא שכתב ורב חננאל ספרים קא כתיב ולא ספרי תורות שכן דרכן שלרבותנו שלא לומר על ספרי תורות ספרים ולא לקרות ספר תורה ספר סתם וכי מעיינת משכחת לה ושאר ספרים דאמרינן הני מילי בדורות ראשונים דהוו חכימין בכל ענייני ובקיאין בחסירות ויתירות ובכל מילי דסופרים אבל בזמן הזה אין אדם רשאי לעשות כן ואפלו בשעת הדחק אסור דאין אנו בקיאין בחסירות ויתירות דהכי גרסינן בפר׳ האשה נקנת לפיכך נקראו הראשונים סופרים שהיו סופרים כל אותיות שבתורה שהיו אומרין ואו דגחון חציין שלאותיות שלספר תורה דרש דרש חציין שלתיבות והתגלח

[1] Megillah, 18.

[2] Above ומפריק is written ומשני.

דפיסוקין עין שליכרסמנה חזיר מיער חצי אותיות שלספר תילין והוא רחום יכפר עון דפיסוקין בעי רב יוסף ואו דנחון מהאי גיסא או מהאי גיסא אמ׳ ליה אביי וניתי ספר תורה ונימנינהי מי לא אמ׳ רבה בר בר חנה אמ׳ ר׳ יוחנן לא זזו משם עד שהביאו ספר תורה ומנאום אמ׳ ליה אינהו בקי[אין] בחסרות ויתירות ואנן לא פקיעינן בעי רב יוסף והתגלח מהאי גיסא או מהאי גיסא אמ׳ ליה אביי הכא ודאי פיסוקי נינהו מיהא ליתיב ולמני אמ׳ ליה בפיסוקי נמי לא פקיעינן דכי אתא רב אחא בר אדא אמ׳ במערבא פסקי ליה להאי קרא לתלתא פסוקי ויאמר יי׳ אל משה הנה אנכי בא אליך בעב הענן וג׳[1] לפיכך צריך הסופר לכתבו ביראה וברתית ולידע כי מלאכת שמים היא ולהזהר שלא לכתוב אלא מספר מוגה ובדוק דאעג׳ דקימ׳ לן דיש אם למקרא אפילו הכי המסורת שבידנו צריכין אנו להתחזק בה בכל יכלתנו שלא לעבור חום ושלום על מאי דכתי׳ לא תוסיפו על הדבר אשר אנכי מצוה אתכם ולא תגרעו ממנו וכולי האי ואולי ננצל מעונש הטעות מקל וחומר מהסופרים הראשונים שהיו בקיאין בחסירות ויתירות והיו דברי תורה מיושרין אצלן כנון ר׳ מאיר וחביריו אפילו הכי היו מפחדין ומרתיעין ממלאכת שמים ויריאין עד למאד מן חעונש אנו העניים העלובים על אחת כמה וכמה ובפרק היה נוטל את מנחתה גרסינן במסכ׳ דסוטה[2] אמ׳ רב יהודה אמ׳ שמואל משום ר׳ מאיר כשהייתי למד תורה אצל ר׳ עקיבא הייתי מטיל קנקנתום לתוך הדיו ולא אמ׳ לי דבר כשבאתי אצל ר׳ ישמעאל אמ׳ לי בני מה מלאכתך אמרתי לו לבלר אני אמ׳ לי בני לך והזהר במלאכתך שמלאכתך מלאכת שמים היא שאם תחסר אות אחת או אם תיתר אות אחת נמצאת מחריב את כל העולם כולו אמרתי לו רבי דבר אחד יש לי וקנקנתום שמו שאני מטיל לתוך הדיו ואמרינן התם מאי קאמ׳ ליה ומאי קא מהדר ליה ואמרינן הכי קאמ׳ ליה לא מיבעיא בחסירות ויתירות דְּפָקְיעָנָא אלא אפילו למיחש ליה לזבוב דדלמא אתי יתיב על תאניה דדל ומחיק ליה ומשוי ליה ריש דבר אחד יש לי וקנקנתום שמו שאני מטיל לתוך הדיו וזה שאמ׳ ר׳ ישמעאל לר׳ מאיר שאם תחסר אות אחת או אם תיתר אות אחת אתה מחריב את העולם מפרשי טעמה דמילתא בני מערבא באגדתא דויקרא ובאגדתא דשיר השירים דאמ׳ ר׳ לוי אפילו דברים שאת רואה אותן כולן שהן קוצין בתורה תלי תלין הן פיר׳ דכתי׳ קוצותיו תלתלים יכולות הן להחריב את העולם ולעשות אותו תל כמ׳ דא׳ א׳ והיתה תל עולם לא תבנה עוד כתוב שמע ישר׳ יי׳ אלהינו יי׳ אחד אם עושה את דר׳ הרי אתה מחריב את העולם כת׳

[1] Marginal note: ובפ׳ במה מומנין [שבת מט:] איבעי ויבא הביתה לעישות מלאכתו ממניאנא הוא או לא.

[2] Sotah, 20.

כי לא תשתחוה לאל אחר אם עושה אתה רד הרי אתה מחריב את העולם כתי ולא תחללו את שם קדשי אם עושה אתה ח ה הרי אתה מחריב את העולם שנ כל הנשמה תהלל יה אם עושה אתה ה ח א מח א העו כחשו בייי אם עושה אתה בנ הרי את מח את העו [1] כתי אין קדוש כייי אם עושה אתה כנ אתה מחריב את העולם ובמסכת שבת בפ הבונה [2] תניא וכתבתם שיהא כתיבה תם שלא יכתוב אלפין עינין עינין אלפין ביתין כופין כופין ביתין גמין צדיין צדיין גמין דליתין רישין רישין דליתין היהין חיתין חיתין היהין וין יודין יודין וין זיינין נונין נונין זיינין טיתין פיפין פיפין טיתין כפופין פשוטין כפופין מימין סמיכין סמיכין מימין סתומין פתוחין פתוחין סתומין פרשה פתוחה לא יעשנה סתומה סתומה לא יעשנה פתוחה או שכתבה בשירה או שכתב את השירה כיוצא בה או שכתבה שלא בדיו או שכתב את האזכרות בזהב הרי אילו יגנזו ועיקרה בסיפרי [3] וההיא דאמ רב חסדא זאת אומרת סתום ועשאו פתוח כשר מותבינן עלה מן הבריתא הזאת ומסקינן ליה בתנאי כלומ שאין דבריו הלכה לפי שהפתוחין והסתומין מסורת לאבותינו הראשונים מפי משה רבינו מפי הגבורה ובריש מסכ מגלה גרסינן אמ ר ירמיה בר אבא ואי תימ ר חייה בר אבא מנצפך צופים אמרום ואקשי צופים [ולא משה והכתוב] אלה המצוות שאין נביא רשאי לחדש דבר מעתה [ועוד האמר ר] חסדא מם וסמך שבלוחות ב[נס] היו [עומדין אין מהוא] ולא הוו ידעי הי באמ צע תיבה [והי בסוף תיבה] (fol. 10) ואתו צופים תקינינהו ואמרו פתוחין בראש תיבה ובאמצע תיבה סתומין בסוף תיבה והדר אקשינן סוף סוף אכתי אלה המצוות שאין נביא רשאי לחדש דבר מעתה פיר והרי התקנה הזאת חידוש ומפרקינן כולהי מהוה הוו ומסורת ממשה רבינו היא אלא שכחום וחזרו ויסדום פיר הצופים חזרו ויסדום: ומקצת התלמידים שאל על עסק הסימן שהוא מנצפך וכך אמר אם על סדר אותיות הוה להו לסמוני כמנפץ והראתי לי בו טעם מסבארא שכיון שהמסורת הזאת שכחום אבותינו וחזרו הצופים ויסדום נקראו על שמן כל מי שיגע בדבר נקרא על שמו וזה הסימן שכתבו חכמים בסדר הזה מנצפך כלומ שדבר זה נשתכח וחזרתה ולמדתה אותה מן צופים ואחר ימים הרבה מצאתי תשובה לרבינו שרירא גאון ורבנו האיי גא זל וכך אמרו אבל אשר אמרתם למה לא שמו רבותנו סימן שלהם על הסדר כמנפץ כך שמענו כיון שהשמועה כך צופים אמרום שמו את הסימן מנצפך כלומ מן צופיך באו אלה ומצאתי עיקרא דהאי סברא לבני מערבא במסכת מגלה והכין גרסי כל

[1] כתיב בייי בגדו אם עושה אתה בנ הרי א מח א העולם:

[2] Sabbath, 103.

[3] Siphri Deut., V, 9.

האותיות הכפולין באלף בית כותב את הראשונים בתחלת התיבה ובאימצע התיבה ואת האחרונים בסופה ואם שינה פסל משום ר׳ מתיה בן חרש אמרו מִנְצְפָךְ הלכה למשה מסיני מהו מִנְצְפָךְ ר׳ ירמיה בש״ ר׳ שמואל בר רב יצחק מה שהתקינו לך הצופים ומאן אינון אילין צופין מעשה ביום סנריר שלא נכנסו חכמי לבית הוועד ונכנסו התינוקות אמרין אתון נעביד בי וועדה דלא יבטל אמרין מהו הדין דכתי׳ מם מם נון נון צדי צדי פי פי כף כף ממאמר למאמר מנאמן לנאמן מצדיק לצדיק מפה לפה מכף לכף מכף ידו שלהקב״ה לכף ידו שלמשה וסיימו אותן חכמים ועמדו כולם בתורה בני אדם גדולים אמרין ר׳ אליעזר ור׳ יהושע הוון מנהון ר׳ ירמיה בשם ר׳ חייה ברבא ור׳ סימון תריהון אמרין תורת הראשונים לא היה לא הא שלהם ולא מם שלהם סתומין הָא סמך סתום ר׳ סימון ור׳ שמואל בר נחמן תריהון אמרין אנשי ירושלם היו כותבין ירושלם ירושלימה ולא היו מקפידין ודכוָתה צפון צפונה תימן תימנה: שנינו בפ׳ הקורא את המגלה למפרע בעניין מגלה היתה כתובה בסם בסיקרא בקומוס ובקלקנתום על הנייר ועל הדפתרא לא יצא עד שתהא כתובה אשורית בדיו על העור · והוא הדין לספר תורה שאם כתבו בכל הני סממאני או על מחאקא או על דפתרא אינו מוציא מידי חובה ובבריתא דספרים כתיב הלכה למשה מסיני שתופרן בגידן וג׳ הלכה למשה מסיני שכותבין בדיו על גבי העור והרי המקרא מסייע ויאמר להם ברוך מפיו יקרא אלי את הדברים האלה ואני כותב על הספר בדיו והני כתרים ותגים הכתובין בספר תאני המסורין אלינו במלאכת שימוש ספר תורה צריך הסופר שיהא זהיר בהם וכל התקנות הכתובין בה אשר העתקנו מאבותינו עליו אין להוסיף וממנו אין לגרוע ואם תאמר (כי) מיכדי כל המצוות שלנו שלימות היא ונמורות בגמ׳ וכשלחן ערוכות דכתי׳ אף ערכה שלחנה אפשר דלא הוו מדכרי עיקרא ד[דבר]ים הללו הרי עיקרא מפורש לפניך במסכתא דמנחות בפרק הקומץ רבה[1] והכין גרסינן התם אמ׳ רב יהודה אמ׳ רב בשעה שעלה משה למרום מצאו להקב״ה שיושב וקושר כתרים לאותיות אמר לפניו רבונו שלעולם מי מעכב על ידך אמר לו אדם אחד יש שעתיד להיות בסוף כמה דורות ועקיבא בן יוסף שמו שעתיד לדרש על כל קוצין וקוצין תילין תילין שלהלכות אמר לפניו רבונו שלעולם הראהו לי אמר לו חזור לאחורך הלך וישב בסוף שמונה עשרה[2] שורות ולא היה יודע מה הן אומרין תשש כוחו פירׁ מיעט את עצמו לפני תורת ר׳ עקיבא ביון שהגיעו לדבר אמרו לו רבנו מנין לך אמר להן הלכה למשה מסיני נתישבה דעתו אמר לפניו רבונו שלעולם יש לך אדם כזה ואתה נותן

[1] Menachoth, 29.

[2] Not in the editions.

תורה על ידי אמר לו שתוק בני שתוק כך עלתה במחשבה לפני אמר לפניו רבונו שלעולם הראיתני תורתו הראיני שכרו אמ׳ לו חזור לאחורך ראה ששוקלין את בשרו במקולין אמר לפניו רבונו שלעולם זו תורה וזו שכרה אמר לו שתוק משה שתוק כך עלתה במחשבה לפני ועיקר זה שאמרו בזה המעשה זו תורה וזו שכרה מפרש בפ׳ הרואה במסכת ברכות [1] שעל הגיון תורה תפסוהו ובזה המקום לא השיב המקום למשה תשובה על דבריו ובסוף אותו המעשה הזכירו כי השיב המקום בה׳ למלאכי שרת אמר להם חלקם בחיים והכי גרסינן התם תנו רבנן מעשה וגזרה מלכות הרשעה על ישר׳ שלא יעסקו בתורה מה עשה ר׳ עקיבא הלך והקהיל קהילות ברבים (וכולי) וישב ודרש עד יצתה בת קול ואמרה אשריך ר׳ עקיבא שיצתה נשמתך באחד אמרו מלאכי השרת לפני הקב׳ה רבונו שלעולם זו תורה וזו שכרה ממתים ידך יי׳ ממתים מחלד אמ׳ להן חלקם בחיים ובמסכתא דספרים [2] גלו טעמ׳ דמילתא עיין ורבינו סעדיה נא׳ ז׳ל בעניין ונכשלו בחרב בלהבה בשבי ובבזה בספר דניאל ובמנחות [3] נמי גרסינן אמ׳ רבה שבע אותיות [צריכות שלשה] זיין שעטנז גץ ואו קשיא לך מפני מה לא הזכירו בזה המקום מכל הכתרים שכתובין בספר תגי חוץ משבע אותיות הללו לא תיקשי לך דהכא במצות מזוזה הוו עסיקי דהא על מתניתין דתנן שתי פרשיות שבמזוזה וג׳ אמרינן לה ואי אתה מוצא באותיות המזוזה שצריך כתרים [4] חוץ משבע אותיות הללו אבל כתרים דספר תורה יש בה ספר בפני עצמו והוא ספר תאני ומאן דבעי למילף יתיה מהתם ילף לפיכך לא כתבתיו בזה המקום ורבינו יהודאי גאון ז׳ל אמר וצריך לכתוב את התגים וגרסינן נמי במנחות אמ׳ רב אשי חזינא להו לספרי דוקאני [5] דחטרי ליה לגגו שלחית ותאלו ליה לבראעיה דהי חטרי ליה לגגו שלחית כלומ׳ חי ברומו שלעולם ופריש מקצת רבואתא שמעלין בראעיה דחית השמאלית למעלה מגגו ונראה כמטה עליה כזה ח וזולתי פירש כזה ח ותלו ליה לברעיה דהי כי דבעי מיניה ר׳ יהודה נשיאה מר׳ אמי מאי דכתי׳ בטחו ביי׳ עדי עד כי ביה יי׳ (צ)ור עולמים אמ׳ ליה כל התולה בטחונו בהקב׳ה הקב׳ה הווה לו מחסה בעולם הזה ולעולם הבא אמ׳ ליה הכי קאמינא לך מאי טעמ׳ כתיב ביה יי׳ ולא כתי׳ כי יה יי׳ אמ׳ ליה כי דדרש ר׳ יהודה בי׳ אלעאי אלו שני עולמים שבראן הקב׳ה פי׳ ב׳ שנים במנין שני עולמים [אחד] בהי ואחד ביוד ואיני יודע אם העולם הזה בהי והעולם הבא ביוד א[ם] העולם הזה ביוד והעולם

[1] Berachoth, 41.
[2] Aboth dirabbi Nathan, c. 24.
[3] Menachoth, 29.
[4] Above כתרים is written זיין.
[5] *Sic.* The 'רבי רב' of the editions is evidently a gloss.

הבא בהא כשהוא [אומר] אלה תולדות השמים והארץ בהה(ברא)ם אל תקרא בהבראם אלא בהי בראם מלמד שנברא העולם הזה בהי למה (fol. 11) לפי שהעולם הזה דומה לאכסדרה שאם הוא רוצה לצאת משם יוצא מאי טעמ תליא כרעא דהי דאי הדר בתשובה מעילין ליה וליעיליה בהך דנפק כולי האי לא מסתייעא מילתא דאמ ריש לקיש מיא דכתי אם ללצים הוא יליץ וג׳ בא ליטמא פותחין לו וג׳ ומאי טעמ קשר ליה תאנא אמ הק אם עושה תשובה אני קושר לו כתר: ולעניין כתיב וקרי דכתי במצחפאות אין כותבין בספר תורה אלא הכתוב בלבד אבל הקרי אין כותבין אותו דעל פה הוא ולא ניתן ליכתב: ובפרק אין בין המודר הנאה במסכת נדרים[1] אמרינן אמ ר׳ יצחק מקרא סופרים ועיטור סופרים וקריין ולא כתיבין וכתיבין ולא קריין הל למשה מסיני: ובסוף מסכ דמגלה[2] גרסינן תנו רבנן כל המקראות הכתובין בתורה לגנאי קורין אותן לשבח כגון ישגלנה ישכבנה בעפלים בטחרים וכול׳ מכלל דמיבעי ליה לסופר למכתב יתהון הכי כדכתיב דהני דקריין ולא כתיבין חובת הקורא הן בלבד שיאמר אותן על פה ולא ניתנו להיכתב: וגרסינן בפרק יש בקרבנות הצבור[3] במס תמורה דרש יהודה בר נחמני מתורגמאניה דריש לקיש כתי כתב לך את הדברים האלה וכתי כי על פי הדברים האלה לומר לך דברים שעל פה אי אתה רשאי לכתבן דברים שבכתב אי אתה רשאי לאמרן על פה והני דכתיבין ולא קריין קרו לה רבנן מסורת והני דקרן ולא כתיבי קרו לה מקרא ואיפליגו ביש אם למקרא ויש אם למסורת בגמ וצריך הסופר להיזהר במלאכת הפרשיות הסתומות והפתוחות המסורין אלינו ואיתה בספר תאגי נמי דגרסינן בשבת[4] פרשה סתומה לא יעשנה פתוחה פתוחה לא יעשנה סתומה ובבריתא דספרים[5] כתיב פתוחין שעשאן סתומין וסתומין שעשאן פתוחין לא יקרא בו ואילו הן פתוחין כל שמתחיל מראש השיטה סתומין כל שמתחיל מאמצע השיטה וכמה יהא רווח מתחיל בשיטה וגומר בסתם כדי דבר שלחמש אותות ובשבת[6] דגרסינן או שכתבה כשירה או שכתב את השירה כיוצא בה או שכתבה שלא בדיו או שכתב את האזכרות בזהב הרי אילו יגנזו ובמסכת ספרים בריתא כתיב ספר שכתבו כמין שירה שכתבה כמין ספר לא יקרא בו ואי זה הוא ספר שכתבו כמין שירה כגון שירת הים ושירת דבורה רצוף שעשה מסורג מסורג שעשאו רצוף לא יקרא בו ואי זה רצוף זה שכתוב כהילכתו מסורג כגון האזינו וספר תילין איוב וממשלות ושמעינן מינה תיקון שירת האזינו (שתהא) שצריכה להיות מסורגת לשני

[1] Nedarim, 37. [2] Megillah, 25. [3] Temurah, 14.
[4] Sabbath, 103. [5] Boraita de Sepharim, I, 14. [6] Sabbath, 103.

סטרים[1] ומקצת רבואתא אמ׳ בה טעמ׳ דמסתבר וכך אמר מה טעם דשירת האזינו נכתבת שני סטרים כעדת הלויים שהן עומדין לכן ולכן בשיר ובשני עולמות וסייעתא לזה הטעם לפי ששירת האזינו היא שירה שלמוספי שבת דגרסינן בפרק יום טוב שלראש השנה[2] במוספי דשבתא מאי אמ׳ רב חנן בר אבא אמ׳ רב הַזִּינוּ לָךְ ובאגדתא דקהלת אמרי ר׳ יוסי ביר׳ אבון בש׳ ר׳ שירת הלויים אין פוחתין אותה מששה קריות ומהו סימנה הַזִּינוּ לָךְ ולעניין שירת הים גרסינן בפרק מגלה נקראת[3] אמ ר׳ חנינא בר אבא דרש ר׳ אלעאי איש כפר תמרתא כל השירות כולן נכתבות אריח על גבי לבינה ולבינה על גבי אריח עשרת בני המן ומלכי כנען נכתבין אריח על גבי אריח ולבינה על גבי לבינה מאי טעמ׳ אמ׳ ר׳ אבהו כלומ׳ אין תקומה למפלתן ובפרק בני העיר[4] פרישו בני מערבא הא דאמרינן הכא כל השירות בשירת הים ושירת דבורה בלבד דגרסי התם בהדיא ר׳ זעירא ר׳ ירמיה בשם רב שירת הים שירת דבורה וכתבין אוריח על גבי לִבֵּינה ולבינה על גבי אוריח עשרת בני המן ומלכי כנען נכתבין אוריח על גבי אוריח ולבינה על גבי לבינה כל בניין דכן לא קאים מה היא כדון למצוה לעיכוב פיר׳ עד כען שמענו שואת התקנה צריכה שתהא כעניין הזה למצוה ועדיין צריכין אנו לשאל אם כתב בדאיעבד שלא כדרך הזאת מאי מעכב את המצוה או אינו מעכב אמ׳ ר׳ יוסי לר׳ חנניה בר אחוי דרב הושעיה נכיר[5] את כד הוינן קיימון קודם חנותיה דרב הושעיה חביבך ועבר רבא בר זבדא ושאלנן ליה ואמ׳ בשם רב לעיכוב ושמעינן מיהא שמעתא שאם שינה בשירת הים ובשירת דבורה ובבני המן ובמלכי כנען פסל ומעכב המצוה ואיתה נמי באגדתא דקהלת רבתי ומקצת רבואתא פריש טעמה דשירה וכן אמר ויש בשירת הים שלשה עשר פתח כנגד שנים עשר דרכים שנקרע הים לשנים עשר שבטים ואחד כנגד שכינה וראש הדף יתחיל בו חמש שטים וסימניך הבאים ביבשה יי׳ מת במצרים אז ישיר בראש שיטה וסופה ויאמרו עשרה מילין בשיטה כנגד עשרת הדברות ורבינו [יהודאי גזל] אמר אילו הן ראשי שורות שלשירה אז : לאמר : ורוכבו : לישועה : אבי : שמו : שלישיו : אבן : יי׳ : קמיך : אפיך : נוזלים : אויב : נפשי : ברוחך : אדירים : כמוכה : פלא : בחסדך : קדשך : אחז : אדום : כל : ופחד : יעבור : קנית : לשבתך : ידיך : בא · וצריך לשלשו ויהיה סתום בתחל ובתכל ובתוך אריח על גבי לבינה והני ראשי שורות אשר כתב רבינו [יהודאי] עיקרה בספר תאני ואם לא יעשח הסופר כתקנה הזאת לא יתכן לו שיעשה אוריח על גבי לבינה ולבינה על (גבי אוריח)

[1] Above סטרים is written ענרים. [2] Rosh Hashanah, 31.
[3] Megillah, 16. [4] Jer. Megillah Hal., VIII. [5] אולי צל דניר.

גרסי בני מערבא במסכתא דמגלה אילו שמות שאין נחלקין עמיאל עמישדי צוריאל צורישדי גמליאל פדהאל פדהצור אינן נחלקין ואילו שמות שהן נחלקין בית אל בית אבן חרה אף וחרה אפי בת פוטיפרע וצפנת פענח וצ(רי)ך הסופר לחלוק בת היענה דתרי מילי נינהי אפילו לפסקן בשֵׁנֵי שיטין בת בסוף שיטה והיענה בתחלת שיט(ה) ואין לו לעשות כן כאת בדרלעומר שאין לו לפסוק כדר בסוף שיטה לעומר בתחלת שיטה ואעג דפסיק להון בשתי תיבות אבל בשתי שיטין לית ליה למיפסקייהו דגרסינן בסו(ף) אילו טרפות[1] [שאני] בת הי(ענ)ה מדפסיק ליה ספרא בתרי תבות שמע מנה דתרי מילי נינהו אלא מעתה כדר לעומר דפסיק ספרא בשתי תיבות בתרי (fol. 12) שטין לא פסיק להי הכא בשתי שטין נמי פסיק להו: ומיבעי ליה לסופר לעשות תרי נונין הפוכין לפרשת ויהי בנסע הארון שהיא מסורת בידֵנו נמי ויש לה טעם גדול ובפרק כל כתבי הקדש במסכת שבת[2] משכחת עיקרה מפורש והכי גרסינן התם תנו רבנן ויהי בנסע הארון ויאמר משה קומה יי׳ פרשה זו עשה לה הקבה סמאנות מלמעלה ומלמטה לומר שאין זה מקומה רבי אומ לא מן השם הוא זה אלא מפני שספר חשוב בפני עצמו כמאן אזלא הא דאמ ר שמואל בר נחמ אמ ר יונתן חצבה עמודיה שבעה אילו שבעה ספרי תורה כמאן כרבי ובאגדתא דבראשית ובאגדתא דויקרא דרשי נמי הכי ובבריתא דספרים תניא ויהי בנסע הארון ויאמר משה קומה יי׳ ויפוצו אויביך וינוסו וג׳ ויהי העם כמתאוננים עשה להם הכתוב סמאנות מלמעלה ומלמטה וכל כך למא שלא יהיו ישראל מצטערין מחמת הדרך שהיה קשה להם כלומ שזה הסימן להם שהפך להם הקבה צער הדרך שלא יצטערו בה ל כיוצא בו יורדי הים באניות עושת (!) מלאכה וג׳ המה ראו וג׳ ויאמר ויעמד וג׳ יעלו שמים וג׳ יחוגו וינועו וג׳ ויצעקו וג׳ שופך בוז וג׳ עשה להם הכתוב סמאנות מלפניהם ומא וכל כך למה כדי לעשותן כאבין ורקין שבתורה לומ לך יש צועק ונענה יש צועק ולא נענה כיצד הצועק לפני הגזירה נענה לאחר הגזירה אינו נענה ואיתה להא בריתא במסכת ראש השנה בארבעה ראשי שנים הן ובמקצת מדרשות דרשי טעמ אחרינא ואמ מה ראו חכמ ליתן נונין הפוכין על ויהי העם כמתאוננים אלא אמרו חכמים כל התורה כולה מיוחדת לנבואת משה חוץ מאילו שני פסוקין שהן מנבואת אלדד ומידד לפיכך סיגן בנון כפוף ונטפל בתירה ושבעה מהן בספר תילין מן יורדי הים ו נונין על ו פיסוקין עד ויצעקו יקם סערה ולמה הן נכפפין שכל רוכב הים אינם מאמינים בחייהן ואמונתן נכפפין לאחוריהן להודיעך שאין חייהן חיין והן כופרין באמונת בוראן

[1] Chullin, 64. [2] Sabbath, 115.

ולפיכך הן נכפפין לאחוריהן ועל שופך בוז נון כפוף שכל התועה במדבר כתועה בים מה הים אין בו לא זרע ולא אילן ולא מיני מאכל ולא מים כך המדבר ולמה נידמו ישראל לרוכבי הים אלא מה רוכבי הים רואין את הגלים ואומרין על כל גל וגל בזה אנו שוקעין ובזה אנו שוקעין כך היו הולכי מדבר לפיכך נון כפוף על נדיבים[1]: ואסור לנקד את ספר תורה וספר שהוא מנוקד פסול דתניא בספרים ספר המנוקד לא יקרי בו אעפ שגורד את הנקודות שבו לא יקרא בו ואמ רבינו יהודאי גא זל ולא יעשה שני נקודות בסיום הפסוק ואם עשה יגרוד אותן והשיב רבינו האי גא זל לבית המדרש שלרבינו נסים זל בלש הגרית והכי קאמ ופי ספר תורה מנקוט קמצין ופתחין קד כנא כתבנא איצא הדא אללפט פי הלכות סופרים ספר תורה המנוקד אין קורין בו בציבור ואעפ שגרד נקודות שבו ואדא אכרג ירד ויכרג גירה ולם יבלא בפנמו פאנה קד כרג מן שרוט ספרי תורה: ואותיות רברבי ואותיות זעירי כדכתי בספר תני ויש בידינו מסורת מאבותינו עשר נקודות בתורה דתניא בבריתא דספרים[2] עשר נקודות בתורה ישפט יי ביני וביניך נקוד על יוד שביניך ולמה נקוד אמ ר יוסי מלמד שלא אמרה שרה אמנו לאברהם אבינו כדרך שהאשה אומרת לבעלה ישפט יי ביני וביניך אלא כך אמרה לו גרש האמה הזאת ואת בנה אמר לה מפני מה אמרה לו שהרי אני רואה את ישמעאל שהוא בונה במוסין וצד חגבין ושוחט ומעלה עליהן אמ אם ילמד את יצחק בני כך וילך ויעשה כן לא נמצא שם שמים מתחלל אמר לה וכי מאחר שזכין לקטן חבין לו מאחר שעשינו הא גבירה ועשינו הא מילתה ונכנסה לתוך גדולה זו נעמוד ונטרדה מבתינו מה יהיו הבריות אומרין עלינו ולא נמצא שם שמים מתחלל בדבר אמרה לו הואיל ואני אומרת חילול שם שמים בדבר ואתה אומר חילול שם שמים בדבר יכריע המקום מדברי לדבריך מיד הכריע המקום על דברי אמינו שרה שנא כל אשר תאמר אליך שרה שמע בקולה ובפרק החובל בחבירו[3] פירשוהו מסורת דין · ויאמרו אליו איה שרה אשתך נקוד על אלף ועל יוד ועל ואו ולמה נקוד אמ ר יוסי מלמד שמלאכי שרת היו יודעין ששרה באהל אבל אברהם לא הרגיש בהם אם מלאכי שרת הם ואם לא שהיה עומד ומיטפל במצוה מתחלה ועד סוף ובפ השובר את הפועלים[4] גרס ויאמרו אליו איה שרה אשתך וג לא ידע בשכבה ובקומה נקוד על וו האמצעי שבקומה שלבכירה ולמה נקוד אמ ר יוסי מלמד שבשכבה לא הרגיש ובקומה הרגיש וירץ עשו לקראתו ויחבקהו ויפל על צוארו וישקהו נקוד על וישקהו

[1] Above נדיבים is written שופך בוז.
[2] Boraita de Sepharim, VI, 3.
[3] Baba Kama, 32.
[4] Baba Mezia, 86.

ולמה נקוד אמ׳ ר׳ יוסה מלמד שלא היתה נשיקה זו אלא נשיקת שנאה [ואיבה] אמ׳ לו ר׳ יהודה וכי בכף מי היתה בכף עשו או בכף יעקב בכף אוהב או בכף שונא שנ׳ יען היותך איבת עולם ותגר את בני ישר׳ (על) ידי חרב בעת אידם בעת עון קץ הא למדת שלא היתה נשיקה זו אלא נשוקת שנאה ואיבה ואומ׳ פלגי מים לב מלך ביד יי וג׳ וילכו אחיו לרעות את צאן אביהם נקוד על את אמ׳ ר׳ יוסי מלמד שלא לרעות את הצאן הלכו אלא לאכול ולשתות ולהתפתות ואעפ שלא היתה מחשבתן מלפני המקום כך הם נתכוונו לכך והלא דברים קל וחומר ומה תקלה שבאתה על ידי צדיקים כך היתה בה מחייה לדורות המצער עצמו על התורה ועל המצוות על אחת כמה וכמה · כל פקודי הלוים אשר פקד משה ואהרן נקוד על ואהרן ולמה נקוד אמ׳ ר׳ יוסי מלמד שלא היה אהרן מן המניין · או בדרך רחוקה נקוד על הי שברחוקה ולמה נקוד אמ׳ ר׳ יוסי מלמד שלא היתה רחוקה אלא מאת [קו]פת העזרה ולחוץ ואיתה נמי בפרק מי שהיה טמא במסכת פסחים ונירם אבד חשבון עד דיבן ונשים עד (נפח) אשר עד מידבא נקוד על ריש שבאשר ולמה נקוד אמ׳ ר׳ יוסי מלמד שלא היצדו את הכל אלא ששירו שם מקצת ובפרק המוכר את הספינה[1] · · · · · בעניין ונירם אבד חשבון פירושא מעליא עיין · עשרון עשרון לכבש האחד לשבעת הכבשים נקוד על וא אמצעי שבעש שליום טוב ראשון של חג ולמה נקוד אמ׳ ר׳ יוסי מלמד שלא היה שם אלא עשרון אחד בלבד אמ׳ לו ר׳ יהורה · · · בר · · · · · · · · · · · · · · עשר כבשים ובמסכתא דמנחות (fol. 3) גרסינן בפרק שתי מדות[2] תניא דרש ר׳ יוסי למה נקוד על וא שבאמצע עשרון שבעשרון ביום טוב הראשון שלחג ראשון שלא ימדוד לא בשלשלשה לפר ולא בשלשנים לאיל פיר׳ אלא מודדן עשרונית כאשר שנינו במשנה לפי שנ׳ עשרונים לפר לא היה מודדן מידה אחת אלא ג׳ מדות ובן שני עש׳ לאיל: הנסתרות ליי אלהינו והנגלות לנו ולבנינו עד עולם נקוד על לנו ולבנינו ועל עין שבעד ולמה נקוד אמ׳ ר׳ יוסי אמ׳ הקבה ליש׳ בני כשם שאני תופס אתכם על האונסין כך אני תופס אתכם על הגלויין אמ׳ לו ר׳ יהודה והלא כשקיבלו תורה מסיני לא קיבלוה אלא גלויין שנ׳ מימינו אש דת למו אלא כך אמר להן כשם שאיני תופס אתכם על האונסין כך איני תופס אתכם על הנסתרין[3] ועוד נשארו ארבע נקודות בנביאים ואחת בכתובים ארבע בנביאים אחד דספר שמואל ויאמר אל המלך אל יחשב לי אדני עון ואל תזכור את אשר העוה עבדך ביום אשר יצא אדני המלך מירוש׳ לשום המלך אל לבו למה נקוד על יצא יש מי שפירש דקסבר שמעי שביון

[1] Baba Bathra, 78. [2] Menachoth, 87 b. [3] Sanhedrin, 43.

שיצא דוד מירוש׳ כבר יצא מן המלכות לפיכך התיר לעצמו לקללו ולא ידע שדוד לא יצא אלא לקבל גזירתו שלחקבה בתחלת מלכותו יצא לא פלש ברח מפני שאול ובסוף מל מפני אבש׳ וכבר קידם משה רבינו אשר יצא לפניהם ואשר יבא לפניהם : והשני בישעיה [מד ט] יוצרי פסל כולם תהו וח׳ בל יועילו ועידיהם המה למה נקוד על המה ללמדך שאפילו הכומרין שלעז המה בעצמן מעידין שהן תהו בענין דכת׳ על כן יזבח לח׳ ויק׳ למ׳ כי בהמה שמן חלקו והשלישית ביחזקאל ההיכל נקוד כולו ולמה ללמדך שלא היה אלא במראות אלהים שלא נתכונן ההיכל עדיין לפי שיחזקאל בגלות הראהו הק׳ דכת׳ בעשרים וחמש שנה לגלותנו והרביעית ביחזקאל נמי ומהקצעות (sic) נקוד עליה שמעתי שהיו החצרות הללו קטורות תלויות על ארבע עמודים ותחתיהן לשכות ולא נתאמת לי עדיין ואחת בכתובים דכת׳ לולא האמנתי לר׳ בט׳ ה׳ ואמרינן בגמ׳ דברכות למה נקוד על לולא וכו׳

גרסינן בפרק הקומץ רבה במנחות [1] אמ׳ רב יוסף הני תרתי מילי אמ׳ רב בספרים ותניא תיובתיה חדא דאמ׳ רב ספר תורה שיש בו שתי טעיות בכל דף ודף ייתקן שלש ייגנז ותניא תיובתיה שלש ייתקן ארבע ייגנז תנא אם יש בו דף אחת שלימה מצלת על כולו פיר׳ מצלת אותו מן הגניזה אמ׳ רבי יצחק בר שמואל בר מרתא משמיה דרב והוא דכתיב רוביה דספרא שפיר פיר׳ שיה(א) רוב חוקי ספר תורה כתובה בו שפיר אמ׳ ליה אביי לרב יוסף אית ביה בההוא דף שלש טעיות מאי אמ׳ ליה הואיל ואיתיהיב לאיתקוני ייתקן ולא אמרן אלא בחסירות אבל ביתירות לית לן בה חסירות מאי טעמ׳ אמ׳ רבי כהנא משום דמיחזי כמנומר אגרא חמוה דר׳ אבא הוה אית ליה יתירות בסיפריה פיר׳ יתר על שלש טעיות בכל דף ודף אתא לקמיה דר׳ אבא אמ׳ ליה לא אמרן אלא חסירות פיר׳ לא אמרו ארבע ייגנז אלא בחסירות דצריך לתלות אותיות למעלה ומיחזי כמנומר אבל יתירות לית לן בה פיר׳ שיכול למחקו ובני מערבא בעו לה מיבעי במסכת מגלה [2] הכי מה שלים שאין בו טעיות או שלם שאין בו ארבע ופיר׳ הא דאמרינן אם יש בו דף אחת שלים מציל על כולו הא דאמרת שלימה שלימה מן הטעות לגמרי או שלמה מלהיות בה ארבע טעיות ולא איפשיטי להו ההיא בעיא אבל בגמ׳ דידן לקולא פשטינן לה והינו דאמ׳ ליה אביי לרב יוסף אית ביה בההוא דף שלש טעיות מהו אמ׳ ליה הואיל ואיתיהיב לאיתקוני ייתקן ושמעינן מינה דשלימה שאמרו שלמה מלמיהוי בה ארבע טעיות ואידך דאמ׳ רב הכותב ספר תורה ובא גומר אפילו באמצע הדף ומותבינן עליה דרב

[1] Menachoth, 29 b. [2] Jer. Megillah, I, 11.

הכותב ספר תורה ובא לא יגמור באמצע הדף כדרך שגומר בחומשין אלא מקצר ועולה פיר׳ מרחיב בין שיטה ושיטה עד שמגיע סוף הדף ואתינן לפרוקי כי קאמ׳ רב בחומשין ולא קם הדין פירוקא דהא אמ׳ רב יהושע בר אבה אמ׳ רב גדל אמ׳ רב לעיני כל יש׳ באמצע הדף באמצע שיטה הילכך הויא הא בריתא תיובתיה והילכתא כבריתא שצריך הסופר לכוין עד שכותב לעיני כל יש׳ בסוף הדף והא דפסק רבינו יהודאי לעניין שיכוון לעיני כל ישר׳ בסוף שיטה לא סבירא לי הכי דהא בהדיא איתמר רבנן אמרי אף באמצע שיטה איתמר רב אשי אמ׳ אמצע שיטה דוקא והילכתא באמצע שיטה דוקא וכיון דהכי פסקינן בגמ׳ באמצע שיטה דוקא צריך הסופר לכוין ולכתוב לעיני כל יש׳ באמצע שיטה דליכא פירכא על פסקא דגמ׳ ואני כתבתי בעניותי מאי דסבירא לי ובגמ׳ דבני מערבא מקשי קושיא על הא דתניא ספר שיש בו שלש טעיות בכל דף ודף ייתקן ארבע ייגנז והא תני ספר שיש בו שמונים וחמש טעיות כפרשת בנסע הארון יתקן וקורא בו פיר׳ מיכלל דיתר מחמש ושמונים ייגנז ומפרקי אר׳ שמי כן בספר גדול וכן בספר קטן פיר׳ ספר קטן לא ייגנו אלא אם כן יהא בו ארבע בכל דף ודף וספר גדול ביתר מויהי בנסע הארון ויאמיר ספר גדול שהוא שלגויל יש בו תקנות הרבה ודקדוקן וספר קטן הינו קלף דקליש ולא צריך לדקדוקי ביה ולא בהיקפו ובמסכת מכות באלו הן הגולין[1] איתמר ספר שתפרו בפשתן ר׳ יהודה ור׳ מאיר חד אמ׳ כשר וחד אמ׳ פסול למא דאמ׳ פסול דכ׳ למען תהיה תורת יי בפיך ואיתקש כל התורה כולה לתפילין מה תפילין נתפרין בגידין אף כל לתופרן בגידין למאן דאמ׳ כשר לדבר המותר בפיך איתקוש ולא איתקוש ולהלכותין לתפילין (in the MS. צל׳) אמ׳ רב חזינן להו תפילין דבי חביבי דתפירי בכיתנאן ואמ׳ מר רב פלטיוי ג׳ ז״ל כל מי שתופר יריעות של ספר תורה ושאר כתבי הקד״ש לא יתפור יריעה לחברתה מתחלתו ועד סופו אלא משייר שיעור גילין משת יאצבעות למעלה ולמטה ותופר את האמצעין . . . . אמר הל למשה מסיני לתופרן בגידין של בהמה טהורה ונקרא בטיית . . . ולעניין שיור התפר גרסינן בפרק הקורא את חמנ למפרע אמ׳ אבא בריה דר׳ חייא בר אבא אמ׳ ר׳ יוחנן שיור התפר הלכה למשה מסיני ומאחו לה אמוחא לא אמרו אלא כדי שלא יקרע ובמערבא [תני] להא שמ׳[2] מגלה נקראתבר׳ בון ברי׳ ר׳ דר׳ חייה בר בא [ר׳] חייא בש׳ ר׳ יוחנן הלכה זה שהיא תופר צריך שישייר שלא יקרע אלא אם הלכה למה שלא יקרע ואם כדי שלא יקרע למה הלכה ופטורין ותניא מטילין במטלות מדובקין . . . .

[1] Maccoth, 11.

[2] Jer. Megillah, I, 11.

(fol. 4) והאי דקא גרסי בני מערבא וטולן במטלית מפרש בבריתא דספרים דתניא ספר שנקרע מלמעלה תופרין אותו מלמטה תופרין אותו מלמעלה ומלמטה תופרין אותו חוץ לכתב אין טולין עליו מטלית ואין דובקין אותו בדבק ר׳ שמעון בן אלעזר אומ׳ טולין עליו מטלת ודובקין אותו בדבק ושוין שאם תפר כל שהוא שטולין עליו מטלת ודובקין עליו את הדבק ספר שהותר תפר שלו יחזור ויתפור שנייה יחזור ויתפור שלישית לא יגע בו ופירש מר רב האיי גא׳ פום בר מר רב דויד ז״ל הכי ספר תורה שנקרע טולה עליו מטלת מבחוץ היאך טולה עליו מטלית מכוין קרעים וכתב שבהם זה בעד זה ועושה מטלית ממין הספר ושורה קימוס במים ונותן על המטלת ומדביקה על הקרע במידתו מבחוץ ומחזקו ובמנחות[1] אמרינן אמ׳ ר׳ זעיר אמ׳ רב חננאל אמ׳ רב קרע הבא בתוך שתי שיטין יתפור בתוך שלוש לא יתפור אמ׳ ל׳ רבה זוטי לרב אשי הכי אמ׳ רב ירמיה מדופתי משמא דרבא הא דאמרת בתוך שלש לא יתפור לא אמרן אלא בעתיקאתא אבל בחדתאתא יתפור ולאו חדתאתא חדתאתא ממש ולאו עתיקאתא עתיקאתא ממש אלא הא דאיפיצן והא דלא איפיצן והני מילי בגידין אבל בגדדין לא ופיר׳ גדדין כההיא דגרסינן במסכת סוכה[2] עשאה מן הקוצין ומן הגדדין ומן הנימין פסולה ופיר׳ שירי המסכת שמשייר האורג מן הבגד כשהו חותכו בעי רב יהודה בר אדה בין דף לדף מהו בין שיטה לשיטה מהו בין תיבה לתיבה מהו תיקו ולחומרא עבדינן והא דאמ׳ רב הכא בתוך שלש לא יתפור לטעמיה דאמ׳ לעניין טעיות שלש ייגנז אבל לטעמא דבריתא דתניא שלש ייתקן מיבעי למימר הכי בתוך שלש יתפור בתוך ארבע לא יתפור דקימא לן בבריתא דמותבינן מינה אדרב והאי טעמה מיפרש בגמ׳ דבני מערבא דגרסי התם במגלה נקראת טעה והשמיט פסוק אחד אם יש בו שתים שלוש שיטים מתקנו וקורא בו ארבע אינו קורא בו ר׳ זעיר בש׳ רב חננאל אף בקרע כן ובפרקא קמא דמגלה[3] שנינו אין בין ספרין לתפילין ומזוזות אלא שהספרים נכתבין בכל לשון וג׳ ואמרינן הא לעניין טומאת ידים ולתופרן בגידים זה וזה שוין והתם נמי בדוכתא אחריתי[4] גרסינן אמ׳ ר׳ חלבו אמ׳ רב חמא בר גוריא אמ׳ רב מגלה נקראת ספר ונקראת אגרת נקראת ספר שאם תפרה בפשתן פסולה וג׳ ושמעינן מינה כי ספר תורה שתפרו בפשתן פסול ושמעינן נמי דתפירת ספר תורה צריכה שתהא שלימה מלבד שיור התפר דכי אמרינן אם הטיל בה שלשה חוטי גידין כשרה הני מילי לעניין מגלה דלדבר זה נקראת אגרת אבל לספר

[1] Menachoth, 31.
[2] Succah, 9.
[3] Megillah, 8.
[4] Ibid., 19.

תורה לא סגיא בהכי וגרסי בני מערבא במסכתא דמגלה[1] נמי ר׳ זעורה בש׳ רב חננאל בש׳ רב תיפורה הלכה למש׳ מסיני תניא בפרק השותפין בבא בתרא[2] כל הספרין גוללין לתחילתן וספר תורה ניגלל לאמצעיתו ועושה לו שני עמודין אחד מיכאן ואחד מיכאן אמ׳ ר׳ אלעזר כך מנהגן שלאנשי ירושלם שהיו עושין לסיפריהן כך ובמגלה[3] גרסי בני מערבא ועושין עמוד לספר בסופו ולתורה מיכאן ומיכאן לפיכך גוללין את הספר לתחילתו ואת התורה לאמצעיתה ר׳ שמואל ר׳ זעורה בש׳ ר׳ חייה בר יוסף ואפילו שתי ירעות פיר׳ האי דאמרינן לאמצעיתו לאו לאמצעיתו ממש אלא אפילו שתי יריעות מצד אחד ושתי יריעות מצד אחר סגיא ר׳ זעורה שמואל בר שילת בש׳ כהנא ובלבד במקום התפר וגרסינן בפרק בני העיר[4] אמ׳ ר׳ שפטי אמ׳ ר׳ יוחנן הגולל ספר תורה יעמידנו על התפר אמרי לה משום חילא ואמרי לה כדי שלא יקרע ואמ׳ ר׳ שפטיי אמ׳ ר׳ יוחנן הגולל ספר תורה גוללו מבחוץ ואינו גוללו מבפנים ובשהו מחדקו מבפנים ואינו מחדקו מבחוץ פיר׳ בשהו גולל את הכרך החיצון שאוחזו בידו שאם יגלול על הכרך הפנימי בשהו בחיק נמצא נופל הכרך החיצון על הארץ ובשהוא מחדק מחזקו והכרכין שניהם נתונין בתיק ומקצת הגאונים פירש פיר׳ בשהוא מניחו בחיקו לגלול יזדהר ויגלול מן הכרך שאצל ארכובותיו ולא מן הצד שכלפי לבו שאם יעשה כן יפול הכרך החיצון ויתגלגל לחוץ ואמ׳ ר׳ שפטי אמ׳ ר׳ יוחנן עשרה שקראו בתורה גדול שבכולם גולל ספר תורה דאמ׳ ר׳ יהושע בן לוי עשרה שקראו בתורה הגולל ספר תורה מקבל שכר כנגד כולן וב(ברי)תא דספרים [ג׳] תני הגולל ספר תורה גוללו כנגד התפר אבל לא כנגד היריעה ולא ישמיט אדם ספר תורה מתיקו ויחלֵצנו אבל מח(דק)ו מאחוריו והנותן ספר תורה לחברו לא יתננו אלא בימין והמקבלו לא יקבלנו אלא בימין שבשניתנה תורה למשה בסיני לא ניתנה תּוֹרה אלא בימין שנא׳ מימינו אש דת למו ומיבעו ליה לסופר לאיזדהורי במלאכת ספרים כי מלאכת שמים היא ולהתכוון לשם שמים לא לשם ממון[5] שלא יהא מצפה לשכר ולרווחא דחיישי שלא יאבד טובה הרבה אי לא יגלגל במזונותיו כי טוב מעט לצדיק ויתחזק ויאמין ואל ירפו ידי(ו) כי השכר גדול לפעולתו וכי נאמן בעל מלאכתו לשלם לו שכרו משלם ויתבונן בלבו כי לא יעשיר משכר סופרים לעולם והכי גרס׳ בפ׳ מקום שנהגו במסכת פסחים[6] תנו רבנן ארבע פרוטות אין בהן סימן ברכה ואילו הן שכר הכתבים ושכר המת(ור)גמנין ומעות שליתומים ומעות הבאין ממדינת הים

[1] Megillah, 19. [2] Baba Bathra, 14. [3] Ibid.
[4] Megillah, 32. [5] Above ממון is written האח. [6] Pesachim, 50.

ואמרינן בשלמא שכר המתורגמנין משום דמיחזי כשכר שבת מעות יתומים נמי דלאו בני אחולי נינהו מעות הבאין ממדינת הים דל[או כל יומא] רחיש ניסא אלא שכר הכתבים מאי טעמ כדר׳ יהושע בן לוי דאמ׳ ר׳ יהושע בן לוי עשרים וארבע תעניות [קבעו אנשי] כנסת הגדולה על כותבי ספרים ותפילין ומזוזות שלא יתעשרו שאם מתעשרין אין כותבין ותנן רבנו כותבי ספרים תפילין ומזוזות הן ותגריהן ותגרי תגריהן וכל העסוקין במלאכת שמים לאיתויי מוכרי תכלת אינן רואין סימן ברכה ואם היו עסוקין לשמה רואין ועיקר בריתא דא בסוף מסכת ביכורי(ם) ובמגילה בפ׳ בני הע(יר) גרסינן אמ׳ ר׳ יוחנן מש׳ ר׳ מאיר אין מוכרין ספר תורה אלא ללמוד תורה ולישא אש(ה) ביבמות[1] (בקידושין) גרסינן אין [לו בנים] נושא אשה דבת פר(יה) ורב(יה) [יש לו] בנים נושא אשה דלאו בת פריה ורביה ונפקא מינה למכור ספר תורה ו . . . ופ׳ . . . גא׳ אין לו בנים מוכר (ספר) תורה ונושא אשה דבת פריה ורביה יש לו בנים נושא אשה דלאו בת פריה ור(ביה) אמר מין גלילי קובלין אנו עליכם פרושים וכולי אין מניחים ספרים . . . . . עלי . . . . . אמר ר׳ עקיבה . . . . (fol. 15) ובמנחות[2] גרסינן אמ׳ רב יהושע בר אבה אמ׳ רב גידל אמ׳ רב הלוקח ספר תורה מן השוק כחוטף א[ותו] מן השוק כתבו מעלה עליו הכתוב כאילו קיבלו מהר סיני אמ׳ מר יהודה אמ׳ רב ששת אם הגיה בו אות אחת מעלה עליו הכתוב כאילו כתבו: ואסור למיקרי בחומשין בציבורא ולא עוד אלא אפילו ספר תורה שחסר יריעה אחת לא מבעי לן למיקרי ביה בבי כנישתא ובפרק הניזקין[3] גרסינן שלחו ליה בני גלילא לר׳ חלבו מהו לקרות בחומשין בשבת בבית הכנסת לא הוה בידיה אתה שאיל בי מדרשא פשטוה מיהא דאמ׳ ר׳ שמואל בר נחמני אמ׳ ר׳ יונתן ספר תורה שחסר יריעה אחת אין קורין בו ובאנו לדחות ולא היא התם פיר׳ ספר תורה שחסר מחסר במילתיה הכא פיר׳ החומש לא מחסר במילתיה ופסקינן רבה ורב יוסף דאמרי תרויהו אין קורין בחומשין בשבת בבית הכנסת משום כבוד הציבור · ומשמא דמר רב צמח בר חיים ז׳ל אמרו ששאלוהו הא דאמ׳ ר׳ שמואל בר נחמני אמ׳ ר׳ יוחנן ספר תורה שחסר יריעה אחת אין קורין בו משום דמחסר במיליה היכא דאכלי עכברים מיריעות שבו ולא מחסר במיליה כלום לא בכתב ולא באותיות אלא בגוילין בלבד קורין בו בצבור או לא והשיב כך ראינו שאם אכלו עכברים מן הספר עד שפחת אורכו מששה טפחים או נמי שפחת גליון שלו מכשיעור שאמרו

[1] Jebamoth, 61. In text בקירושין.

[2] Menachoth, 30.

[3] Gittin, 60.

חכמ שיעור הגיליון מלמטה טפח מלמעלה שלוש אצבעות נפסל מלקרות בו בציבור ואם אכלו עכברים דבר מועט מן הגליונות בין מלמעלה ובין שלמטה שכשאתה מודד את הספר אתה מוצאו לאורכו ששה טפחים ובגיליון של מלמטה טפח ומלמעלה שלוש אצבעות מותר לקרות בו בצבור וכן הלכה ולעניין הפסולין לכתוב ספר תורה שנינו בפרק השולח במסכת גטין[1] אין לוקחין ספרים תפילין ומזוזות יתר על דמיהן מפני תיקון העולם אמ ליה רב ביריא לרב אשי יתר על דמיהן הוא דאין לוקחין הא בכדי דמיהן לוקחין שמעת מינה ספר חנמ(צא) ביד גוי קורין בו ומפריק דילמא לגונזו אמ רב נחמן נקיטינן ספר תורה שכתב מין ישרף כתבו גוי יגנז נמצא ביד מין יגנז נמצא ביד גוי אמרי לה ייגנז ואמרי לה קורין בו ספר תירה שכתבו גוי תני חדא ישרף ותניא אידך יגנז ותניא אידך קורין בו לא קשיא הא דתניא ישרף ר אליעזר היא דאמ סתם מחשבת נכרי לעב זר ועיקר דברי ר אליעזר בפ השוחט במסכתא דחולין[2] שכן שנינו במשנתינו השוחט לנכרי כשירה ור אליעזר פוסל אמ ר אליעזר אפילו שחטה שיאכל הנכרי מחצר הכבד שלה פסולה שסתם מחשבת נכרי לעב זר והא דתניא יגנז האי תנא הוא דתאני רב חיננא בריה דרבה מיכשרוניא ספר תורה ספרים תפילין ומזוזות שכתבן מין אסור אשה קטן עבד גוי כותי וישראל משומ(ד) פסולין מאי טעמ אמ קרא וקשרתם וכתבתם את שישנו בקשירה ישנו בכתיבה את שאינו בקשירה אינו בכתיבה הא דתניא קורין בו האי תנא הוא דתניא לוקחין ספרים תפילין ומזוזות מן הגוי ובלבד שכתבן כהלכתן מעשה בגוי אחד שחיה כותב ספרים תפילין ומזוזות בצידן והתיר רבן שמעון בן גמליאל ליקח ממנו ומקשינן השתא רבן שמעון בן גמליאל עיבוד לשמן באעי כתיבה לשמן לא באעי מאי איהי דתניא ציפה עליהן עור בהמה טמאה פסולות עור בהמה טהורה כשירות ואעפ שלא עיבדו לשמן רבן שמעון בן גמליאל אומ אף עור בהמה טהורה פסולות עד שעיבדן לשמן וקימא לן כרבן שמעון בן גמליאל דבענן עיבוד לשמן מההוא מעשה דהנזקין דההוא דאתא לקמיה דר וקימא לן מעשה רב פיר ומכל מקום קשיא דרבן שמעון בן גמליאל אדר שמעון גמליאל דהתם אמר עיבוד בעי לשמן והכא כתיבה לשמן לא בעי ואתא רבה בר שמואל לאוקימה בגר שחזר לסורו ואמרינן כל שכן דהוה ליה מין ואוקמה רב אשי שחזר לסורו מחמת יראה פיר היה מתירא מן הגויים שלא יהרגוהו אבל לבו לשמים לעולם ספר תורה שכתבו גוי גמור אסור וקימ לן כההיא בריתא מציעיתא דאמר ספר תורה שכתבו מין ישרף

[1] Gittin, 45. [2] Chullin, 38.

כרב חיננא דהל כותיה דאמ ספר תורה שכתבו מין ישרף כתבו גוי יגנז נמצא ביד מין יגנז נמצא ביד גוילא יגניז ואמרי לה קורין בו ועוד דהא בריתא מציעיתא עדיפא מכולהו דקמיתא [דסתם מחשבת] נכרי לעז ורבנן פליגי עליה ולית הל כר אליעזר ובתריתא [מוקימנה] כרבן שמעון (בן גמליאל) דאמר לוקח ספרים מן הגוי אעג דאוקימנה בגר שחזר לסורו מחמת י(רא)ה[1] . . . . . תאני רב חיננא בריה דרבא מיכשרוניא וכול׳ ועוד דהא מברר טעמא [כל] שישנו בקשירה ישנו בכתיבה ועוד דרב נחמן מסייע לה הילכך . . . . . סבירא . . . . . סוף שמעתא דרב נחמן דאמ נמצא ביד גוי אמרי לה יגנז ו(אמ)רי לה קורי(ן) . . . . . הרב הגדול טעמ דמאן דאמ יגנז דחישינן שמא גוי כתבו הולכך . . . . . ידועה בענין בזה וילל וסתם דעתא שלא גוי כתבו ליכא חשש וקורין ביה . . . . . שכן לדעת מאן דאמ קורין בו לכתחלה ולעיניין ספר תורה שכתבו [מין . . . . . שאמ רב נחמן מין לעבו זר ובפר כל בתבי הקדש . . . . . וספרי מינין אין מצילין אותן מפני הדליקה ר . . . . . שורפן . . . . ר טרפון אקפח את בני שאם יבואו . . . . . אתרין להכישו נ . . . . . בו ועליהן (?) . . . . . יש . לע . . . . . (fol. 16) תכלית שנאה שנאתים וג׳ וכשם שאין מצילין אותן מפני הדלקה כך אין מצילין אותן לא מן המפולת ולא מן המים ולא מכל דבר המאבדן ופסק רבינו האיי גאון זל דהני ספרי מינין ספרי תורות דכתבינון מינין אינון ולאו ספריהון שחיברו אותן הן ופירוש הגיליונין בשנויים כן הגוילין שלספרי מינין שאין כתוב בהן כלום דהכי קאמרינן התם הכי קאמר וספרי מינין הרי הן כגליונים דידהו [מה גלי]ונים דידהו לית בהו מששא אף ספרי מינין לית בהו מששא ובריתא ששנויה כן בפרק כל כתבי הקדש עיקרה בבריתא דספרים אבל הגליונים שלנו מצילין אותן מפני הדליקה

ולעיניין כבוד ספר תורה גרסינן בפרק בני העיר[2] אמ ר פרנך אמ ר יוחנן כל האוחז ספר תורה ערום נקבר ערום בלא אותה מצוה פיר לפי שעבר על מצוה דרבנן ועל הא שמעתא דר פרנך סמכי רבנן דגזרי על הידים הבאות מחמת ספר תורה והיא גזירה אחת משמונה עשר דבר שגזרו בו ביום ובמסכתא דשבת בפרק יציאת השבת גרסינן התם והספר ספר מאי טעמ גזרו ביה רבנן טומאה אמ רב

[1] Jer. Hal., 24. [2] Megillah, 32.

משרשיה כתחלה היו מצניעין אוכלין דתרומה אצל ספר תורה אמרי האי קדש והאי קדש כיון דחזו דקאתו לידי פסידה גזרו ביה רבנן ט[ומא]ה וידים מפני שהידים עסקניות הן [אמרו] אף הידים הבאות מחמת ספר תורה פוסלות את התרומה מאי טעמ משום דר׳ פרנך דאמ׳ ר׳ פרנך כל האוחז וכול׳ ובפרק בני העיר[1] גרסינן אמ׳ ר׳ ינאי בר בריה דר׳ ינאי סבא משמיה דר׳ ינאי רבה מוטב תיגלל המטפחת ואל יגלה[2] ספר תורה : ופירש מר רב הונאי בר יוסף דקאמרינן האוחז ספר תורה ערום נקבר ערום אלא גוללו במטפחת ואם תאמר נכנסת המטפחת בין גויל ונגללת עם ספר תורה וצריך להוציאה בידו מבין הגוילין ויש לו לספר תורה כען ביזויין מוטב שיגלל מטפחת ואל יגלה ספר תורה ושמעת מינה דעיקר גזירה משום כבוד תורה הוא ומשום חיבתה ולא מיבעיא ספר תורה דאסור למינקטיה ערום אלא אפילו כל כתבי הקדש מטמאין את הידים ובמסכת ידים[3] במשנתינו שנינו אומרין צדוקין קובלין אנו עליכן פרושין שאתם אומרין כתבי הקדש מטמאין את הידים וספרי המירס אינן מטמאין את הידים אמ׳ ר׳ יוחנן (יוחנן) בן זכאי וכי אין לנו על הפרוש אלא זו בלבד הרי הן אומרין עצמות החמור טהורין ועצמות יוחנן כהן גדול טמאין אמרו לו לפי חיבתן היא טומאתן שלא יעשה אדם עצמות אביו ואמו תורודות אמר להן אף כתבי הקדש לפי חיבתן היא טומאתן וספרי המירס שאינן חביבין אינן מטמי(א)ין את הידים ולא מיבעיא כתבי הקדש למטמא את הידים אלא אפילו הגיליון שבספר נמי מטמא את הידים שכן שנינו במסכת ידים נמי גיליון שבספר שמלמעלה ומלמטה ושבתחלה ושבסוף מטמא את הידים ר׳ יהודה אומ׳ שבסוף [אינו] מטמ(א) [עד ש] יעשה לו עמוד ואפלו תיק שלספר תורה והתיבות נמי מטמא את הידים ואסור [לאחזם] ערום ובתוספתא דר׳ חייא משכחת לה דתניא תיק שלספר ותיבה שלספר ומטפחות ספר . . . . . טהורות מטמאות את הידים בפרק בני העיר[4] גרסינן אמ׳ ר׳ זירא אמ׳ רב מתנא הלוחות והבימות אין בהם משום קדושה ופירש רבינו חננאל ז״ל החלק שלמעלה ושלמטה ושלבין . . . . . (ק)דוש(ה) כלומ׳ יכלה ויגנוז ויחתך החלק שבו אין בו משום קדושה . . . . . ספר שמלמעלן ושמלמטן וכול׳ ואני בעניותי סבירא שפיר׳ ש . . . . . ש . . . ע . . גדולה וממה שאמרנו בסופה (?) ובימה שלעין ומסתייע . . . פירוש . . . . . בפרק בני העיר ר׳ יהודה בש׳ שמואל בימה ולווחין אין בהן . . . קדושה . . . קדושת בית הכנסת על האי פירושא בתרא סמכינן ובבריתא . . . . . .

[1] Megillah, 32.
[2] Not as in editions, יגלל.
[3] Yadaim, IV, 6.
[4] Ibid., 32.

חדש . . . . . שלהן מותר ישנים מקק שלהן יגנז וגרסי בני מערבא
. . . . . הני מטפחות ספרין אין מכבסין אותן במי רגלים
אבל מכבסין . . . . . גרסינן בפרק בני העיר[1] אמ מר זוטרא משמיה
דרב ששת מטפחות . . . . . מצוה וזו היא גניזתן אמ רבא האי ספר
תורה שבלה גונזין . . . . . רב אחא בר יעקב ובכלי חרש שנ ונתתם
בכלי חרש . . . . . האומר לאומן עשה לי תיק של ספר
או נרתיק . . . . . מש בהן חול מ . . ש . . . ש . . . . . .
. . . . . תפילין ומזוזות . . . . . .
. . . . . .

[1] Yadaim, IV, 26.

THE INSTALLATION OF THE EGYPTIAN NAGID[1].

...אלהי לטובה עלי ועל נגידי מלפני אשר ישבתי בשבת (ב)תחכמוני ראש השלישי זה כמה פעמים ודרשתי בדברי אלהים חי על ראשי עם קדש בפרק החגים והמעדים וכאשר שמעו כל ישראל כי נתתי אמרי שפר בתורת מורשה ובינותי פשר דבר בכל מענה סתום ועמום יראו מפני כי ראו כי יי אלהים נתן לי לשון למודים לדעת לעות את יעף דבר וגם אלהי היה עם פי והורני את אשר דברתי ׳ ודעו מדת צדקה כי לא מלכנו מלך חסד לבדו תכון ממשלתו הורישני משרת נגידי באמרו זה יעצור בעם יי אחרי וגם לא הוא לבד קראני גגיד בעמו כי אם מלפניו משנים רבות מימי נגידי בעוד נשמתו בו ורוח אלוה באפו החל נשיאנו נסיכנו (אבן) חסדאי הנשיא הגדול ראש גליות כל ישראל אליו פונים בכל שערי הארץ תכון ממשלתו עד כי [ת]אתה הממשלה הראשונה ממלכת לבת ירושלם לעשות לו שם כשם הגדולים אשר בארץ קראני עטרת השרים ומהיום ההוא והלאה צלחה רוח המשרה עלי ואהי משכיל בכל דרכי וידעו כל ישראל כי נאמן בית נגידי להיות לפני יי עד עולם וכי אני עוצר בעם יי אחריו ברשיון אדוננו ראש הגולה אשר אנחנו וכל ישראל באים תחת שבט מלכותו וכולנו מתחזקים באלהי אמן ובשער נשיאותו ירומם וגם אדוננו ראש ישיבת ארץ הצבי תכון משרתו לנצח בא אחריו ומלא את דבריו וסעד באומץ משרתו משרתי והכינני על כסא נגידי ויקם על סלע שררותי רגלי כונן אשורי זאת נחלת עבדי יי וצדקתם וזה מנת חלקם וכוסם וכה אמר המשורר שמר תם וראה ישר כי אחרית לאיש שלום ושלומכם עדת הצדק להקת יושר המון היראה אשר בהם נכללו כל מדות השבח יגדל מים

[1] The Nagid referred to is probably Samuel ben Paltiel, and we may supplement Dr. Lazarus' pedigree of the Reschgolas in the ninth volume of Brüll's *Jahrbücher*, by naming on p. 117 Judah's son Chisdai III, and inserting between XVI and XVII Chisdai's son Daniel as the seventeenth Prince of the Arab period. Chisdai II ruled about 865 to 890, and is obviously too early either for Sambari or my documents. Sambari mentions (Neubauer, *Mediaeval Chronicles*, I. 123) yet another Reschgelutha Chisdai as having been in 1160 teacher of the famous David Alroy.

עד ים ומנהר עד אפסי ארץ ישע רב: אחרי [שלחנו] אל אדירינו אנשי גאולתינו הכתב הזה הגיע עדינו כתב מינוי משובח.

... להלוך לפני בחוצות ארץ מצרים ונצא ביום ההוא בשפעת סוסיה גדולה ותעבור הרנה בארץ ותצעדנה בנות עלי שור לראות במשרתי הנתונה לי מאת מלכי כיד יי הטובה על נגידי ויקרא [פתשגן הכתב] אשר נכתב בשם המלך בשערי [ארץ מצרים] ותנתן דת לבלתי עבור [הנגידות ממני] ויעבר כל ישראל אשר תחת מלכותו תחת שבטי ויצוה לעשות לי שם כשם הגדולים אשר בארץ ולרדות בנגיד כשם נגידי וארוחתי ארוחת תמיד נתנה לי מלפניו מדי חדש בחדשו כל ימי חיי וישמחו בי כל ישראל וארץ מצרים שקטה וידעו כן עניי הצאן השומרים אותי כי חסד נגידי עמד בפני למען לא יכרת מביתו איש עומד לפניו כל הימים כי חפץ יי בידו צלח כל ימי חיי והשליך את נפשו מנגד להגדיל תורה ולהאדיר · בכן חלק לו ברבים ואת עצומים חלק שלל תחת אשר הערה לתורתו הקדושה נפשו הטהורה ואת פושעים נמנה וחטא רבים נשא ותחל רוח הנגידות אשר היתה על נגידי להאצל עלי ותחזק בי ותעמידני על עמדי ותאמצני כדי לעמוד בהיכל המלך ולצאת ולבוא [לפניו] לכל חפציהם ולכל אודותם [בזכות נגידי] ובזכות גאוננו · ואמנם לגאוני יכון [לנצח] בארץ צבי הנה מכתבו הקדוש הממלל ברור מאליה יורה שאלמלי לא החזיקה לי יר המלכות משרת נגידי היתה יד הגאונות מחזקת ומאמצת משרת נגידי לאהבת נגידי אשר נפלאתה מאהבת בן יחיד לטוב רואי כל שכן כי יד המלכות החלה להסב אופן המשרה אלי על מכונתו ובאה יד הגאונות אחריה בכל מאמצי כח והסכימה על דעת המלכות גם זאת מעם יי צבאות יצאה הפליא עצה הגדיל תושיה · אשרי מי שזכו לו אבותיו אשרי כל מי שיש לו יתד להיתלות בה · וכל אשר צוה גאוננו יכון לנצח · עלי ועל חכמי תושיה

... May God requite this to me and to my father the Nagid, my teacher, whose place I filled aforetime on several occasions, ofttime discoursing of the word of the living God to the heads of the holy people on high days and festivals. And when Israel heard that I gave goodly words of the law which is our heritage, and that I could make clear that which was hidden and difficult, then they had reverence for me, for they saw that the Lord had given me the tongue of the learned that I should know how to sustain by a word him that is weary. Moreover, my God was with my mouth, and did teach me what to speak.

Now know ye the measure of God's kindness to me. Not alone did

the Caliph, our gracious king, may his dominion be exalted, cause me to inherit the post of Nagid, and declared, "This is the man who shall rule over the people second to me." Nor hath he alone entitled me Nagid over his people, but before his time, many years ago, in the days of my (father the) Nagid, while he yet lived and the spirit of the Lord was in him, I began to be called the crown of princes by our Nasi and prince (Daniel ibn) Chisdai, the Great Prince, Head of the Captivity of all Israel, to whom all faces turn from all corners of the earth, may his dominion be established, until kingdom come to the daughter of Jerusalem as of yore, and may his name be as the name of the great ones of the earth. And from that day onward, the spirit of dominion hath flourished in me, and all my ways have prospered, and all Israel knew that the house of my (father the) Nagid is sure to be before the Lord for ever, and that I do rule the people of the Lord after him, with the sanction of our lord the Resh Golah, under whose rule we and all Israel come. We all remaining faithful to the God of truth, and to the Nasi, exalted be he.

Moreover, our lord the Rosh Jesheeba of the Pleasant Land—may his rule continue!—followed his example and confirmed his words, and by his office lent support to mine, and confirmed me on the Nagid's throne, and established my dominion on a rock, and guided my footsteps. This is the inheritance of the servants of the Lord and their righteousness, and this the cup of their reward. For thus saith the Singer, "Mark the simple man and watch the upright, for the end of that man shall be peace[1]."

To you, O ye righteous congregation, in whom is found everything that is good and worthy of praise. May peace increase from sea to sea, and from the river to the ends of the earth. May God's salvation be great!

After we had sent this letter to our lords, our brethren there reached us from them an excellent letter of appointment.

... [The Caliph appointed runners] to go before me through the streets of the land of Egypt, and on that day we went out with a mighty procession of horses, and there was a sound of gladness throughout the land, and the little girls stood on the wall to see the state which had been granted me of my king, according to the hand of the Lord as it had been good to my father the Nagid, (and a copy of the mandate) which had been written in the name of the king was read out in the gates (of the land of Egypt), and the law was proclaimed that the (dignity of Nagid) should not pass away from me, and that all Israel under his dominion should come under my

[1] *Or*, "There is a future to the man of peace."

rule; and he commanded that I was to have a name as the name of great ones who are in the land, and was to hold dominion as Nagid[1] even as did my father the Nagid, and for my diet there was a continual diet to be given me of the king, month by month, all the days of his life. And all Israel rejoiced in me, and the land of Egypt was quiet. Then the poor sheep that watched me knew that the grace bestowed on my father the Nagid was a blessing unto me continually, in order that there should not be cut off from his house a man to stand before him all the days; for (the Torah) the pleasure of the Lord prospered in his hand all the days of his life, and verily he gave up his soul to magnify the Law, and to adorn it. Thus did he divide him a portion with the great, and with the strong he divided the spoil, because he has poured out his pure soul unto death for his holy Law, and he was numbered with the transgressors, and he bare the sin of many. And the spirit of princedom (Nagiduth) which was upon my (father the) Nagid hath begun to come upon me, and it hath waxed strong within me, and hath caused me to stand firm, and it hath strengthened me, and enabled me to stand within the Caliph's Palace, and to go out and come in before him, for all the needs of Israel and for all their affairs. [All this I owe to the merit of my father the Nagid] and the merit of the Gaon.

And as regards the Gaon of the Pleasant Land, may his rule be established, behold his letter, which speaks clearly for itself, shows that even had the Caliph not confirmed me in my office of Nagid, the Gaon would nevertheless have lent me support and strength because of his love for my father, which wondrously exceeded even that of Jonathan for David[2]. How much the more so, now that the Caliph's own hand hath turned the wheel of dominion toward me in all due form, and the Gaon's authority hath followed his, in all its strength, and hath agreed with the royal decision. This also cometh from the Lord of hosts, who is wonderful in counsel and excellent in working. Happy is he that rejoiceth in the blessing of a good father. Happy he who hath that on which he can be sustained. All that the Gaon, may he live for ever! hath commanded me and the wise men of the law [shall surely be performed].

E. N. ADLER.

[1] A play upon words, cp. "domineer" and "dominate."

[2] The Hebrew text is here somewhat difficult and perhaps corrupt.

NOTE ON THE MEGILLAH,

J. Q. R., VIII, p. 541.

THE Bodleian Library has lately acquired from Rabbi S. Wertheimer of Jerusalem a leaf written on one side (probably in scroll form), which gives the beginning of this *Megillah*. On the left-hand side the fragment is defective, more or less. The title, as the reader will see, is not מגלת פורים. Insignificant though the fragment be, it is at any rate a step towards recovering the complete text of the treatise.

A. NEUBAUER.

בש רח

מגלת זוטא הרשע

אחבר מגלה לעין עם סגולה׳ היותה מגולה ולכל פשוטה
תחלה אהודה למציל ופודה ושולט ורודה במעלה ומטה
פעליו אשנן ונגדו אחנן וחסדו ארנן בכל פה ומבטא
מחבש לשבר ותקוה וסבר וציין עוז ואבר ליונה מרוטה
והיותה בראשון שמורה כאישון בשוט עם ולשון חבויה ול[וטה]
ג
ושר הוד והדר בכל עת בסדר מנהל לעדר שארית פלי[טה]
א
במיטב פעלים ושבת אהלים כאשת חיילים ובלתה כש[וטה]
ב
וחמדת בגדים ויופי רדידים יקרים חמודים לבושה ו[עוטה]
והיום חשובה בעוצם משובה כאשה עזובה בדינו ש . .
בגלות כלואה מעונה נכאה עדי כל תלאה לנגדה מע . .
מסורה למבאיש מבוזה חדל איש מתועב ומביש מכ . .
בפנים כאיכה מלאים חשיכה עליהם סבכה באופל . .
ונמאס ונגעל במראה ומפעל כונב לשועל וכלבה . .
ואילו יהי צאן הכי לא לרצון ונזבח בחיצון כמו ש . .
להרע במצעד אבל לא למסעד בשוע כשור עז ו . .
קשה לב ועורף בשוחד וטרף כחיה בטרף . .

For the continuation see *J. Q. R.*, VIII, p. 544, fragment 1.

THE HYMN OF WEEPING.

(From the Neilah Service of the Day of Atonement. By Amittai. End of eleventh century.)

"The Lord, the Lord, a God full of compassion and gracious, slow to anger, and plenteous in mercy and truth; keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin, and acquitting. . . . And pardon our iniquity and our sin, and take us for thine inheritance[1]."

LORD, I remember, and am sore amazed[2]
To see the cities stand in haughty state,
And God's own city to the low grave razed;
Yet in all time we look to thee and wait.

Spirit of mercy! rise in might! awake!
Plead to thy Master in our mournful plaint,
And crave compassion for thy people's sake;
Each head is weary, and each heart is faint.

I rest upon my pillars—Love and grace,
Upon the flood of ever-flowing tears;
I pour out prayer before his searching face,
And through the fathers' merit lull my fears.

O thou who hearest weeping, healest woe!
Our tears within thy vase of crystal store[3];
Save us; and all thy dread decrees forgo,
For unto thee our eyes turn evermore.

NINA DAVIS.

[1] Exod. xxxiv. 6, 7, 9. [2] Ps. lxxvii. 3. [3] Ps. lvi. 8.

THE UNITY OF GOD.

MR. CLAUDE G. MONTEFIORE, in his article on "Unitarianism and Judaism," in the January number of the REVIEW, says: "I believe that we Jews have much to learn from you (Unitarians). We have to learn that the doctrine of the Unity has, if I may say so, somewhat different opposites and somewhat different implications to those of fifteen centuries ago. The Unity of God means more than that there is one God only. It means more than that there is, and has ever been, but a single divine self-consciousness. Take one of these additional meanings as an example. If the One God either is, or can be, subject to localized conditions of space, then to the modern mind he is still, in the highest sense of the word, not truly One."

May I be pardoned for pointing out that we need not learn this doctrine of the Unity from Unitarianism, and that it is not only to the modern mind that a deity "subject to localized conditions of space" is abhorrent? In Maimonides' *Guide of the Perplexed*, Friedländer's translation, vol. I, p. 182, occurs this passage: "It is quite clear that there is no relation between God and time or space;" and in the same volume, on p. 206: "The same is the case when we say God is the First to express that he has not been created; the term 'First' is decidedly inaccurate, for it can in its true sense only be applied to a being that is subject to the relation of time."

We may have much to learn from Unitarianism; but as to "the doctrine of the Unity," it is doubtful whether Unitarianism can put the matter in truer or clearer words than it is set forth on p. 207 of the same volume: "We use 'One' in reference to God to express that there is nothing similar to him, but we do not mean to say that an attribute of unity is added to his essence."

CYRUS L. SULZBERGER.

NEW YORK, *Jan.* 21, 1897.

CRITICAL NOTICES.

JEVONS' "HISTORY OF RELIGION."

An Introduction to the History of Religion, by F. B. JEVONS. (Methuen).

THIS is in many ways an important as well as an interesting book. Its importance consists in the fact that it focuses on the problem of the origin of religion several lines of investigation which have dealt with isolated problems in the way of folk-lore and anthropology. In other words, it summarizes and connects Mr. Fraser's *Golden Bough* and Robertson Smith's *Religion of the Semites*. But it would be doing injustice to Dr. Jevons if we were to represent his book as only doing this. Not to mention several independent suggestions, as, for example, the suggestion that the domestication of animals and plants was an indirect result of their worship as Totems, Dr. Jevons has been the first to apply the new searchlight all round, and discuss all the main points from this new standpoint. And, above all, he has approached the subject in an altogether sympathetic spirit, which can scarcely be said of some of the inquirers into the primitive origins of the feelings most sacred to many of us.

Dr. Jevons' theme is the origin and history of natural religion as opposed to the consideration of the positive religions—Buddhism, Christianity, and Islam. I do not quite know where Dr. Jevons would place Judaism, since his definition of a positive religion is "the outcome of the teaching of an individual venture," and designed to supersede the existing religions, which, being practised as a matter of custom and tradition, may be called "customary religions." Now the Judaism that has made religion, as the modern world conceives it, was practically the work of the Hebrew prophets. Yet, on the other hand, it was not intended entirely to supersede the customary creed and practice of the Israelites. Truly these were a peculiar people, even, or perhaps, one may say, particularly with regard to their religion.

Dr. Jevons fully recognizes and emphasizes this point; indeed, it is one of the novel points of his book, the emphasis he lays upon the "revelational" character of Hebrew religion. Two of the most

interesting novel chapters of his book deal with the Greek mysteries, which Dr. Jevons attributes to Semitic, by which it would appear he means Hebrew, influence. One would have been glad to have had some evidence on which this somewhat startling statement is based. Robertson Smith, to whom he refers, is equally emphatic, but he is equally reticent about the facts on which his emphasis is based. Here, as elsewhere, one finds Dr. Jevons accepting Robertson Smith practically without criticism.

Thus he takes from Robertson Smith the two keys with which that thinker thought he could unlock the mysteries of all the mythologies. Taboo and Totem are invoked to explain all the problems of ancient ritual and belief, or rather they are the two opposing forces by which religion progresses and produces morality. Social morals are a supernatural selection from Taboo. Here, as elsewhere, Dr. Jevons practically confesses the inability of the science of religion to explain origins. Such a confession is, perhaps, a necessary stage in a young science where the first process must be to determine the unknown quantities, but it is too early to despair so dogmatically as to the possibility of solving the problem of Taboo.

While with Taboo Dr. Jevons is too dogmatic, in his agnosticism with regard to Totemism one cannot help thinking he follows Robertson Smith in an opposite kind of dogmatism. In my *Studies in Biblical Archaeology* I have pointed out on what a slender basis of fact Robertson Smith rests his view that sacrifice is a common meal of a clan and its Totem. Practically the only evidence on which this view is based is afforded by a passage in Nilus, a writer of the fourth century A. D. It would be indeed strange if no other trace could be found for this source of all religious feeling. Indeed, both Robertson Smith and Dr. Jevons have to own that in historic times there is no proof that sacrifice was resorted to with the conscious idea of restoring communion with the Totem or the god. If so, the *second* origin of the idea of communion is the important moment in the history of religion, and is one requiring explanation. From this point of view the mystery of the mysteries is the true unknown quantity, and one of the most important and novel contributions of Dr. Jevons' book consists in having brought this out so clearly.

The attractive part of Robertson Smith's theory of sacrifice is that he traces religion back to love and communion rather than, as with other anthropologists, to fear and aversion. And Dr. Jevons emphasizes this point at every stage of his analysis, but lays stress upon the fact that in so-called savage tribes there is a remarkable display of altruistic feeling within the tribe. He might have supported his contention by reference to Prince Krapotkin's remarkable papers in *The Nineteenth Century*, in which he shows that, both in animal and

in early human societies, mutual assistance must be postulated as a balancing force in the struggle for existence. But we want more evidence that the trust and confidence which savages display towards their fellow-clansmen is always shown at an early stage in the clan god. The attitude of the child-mind towards the supernatural is strong against the view.

Perhaps the most striking part of Dr. Jevons' book, the one indeed which will probably attract most opposition from his fellow anthropologists, is his final chapter on the evolution of belief. This seems strangely akin to the earlier views of those who held that there was a primitive revelation to all men of the One God. One cannot help thinking that Dr. Jevons is here playing upon the double meaning that may be attached to monotheism. A tribe may worship only one god, it is true; but yet they may recognize that the gods of other tribes exist equally with their own god, even though they do not worship him. It is merely playing with the etymological meaning of the word to call such a state of belief monotheism. If I remember rightly, Professor Max Müller has suggested "henotheism" to represent that phase of belief, and possibly "monolatry" may be used in the same sense. It is somewhat remarkable that Dr. Jevons should have fallen into this error, since in his penultimate chapter he lays such stress upon the fact that only the Jews, of all the nations of the earth, attain to true monotheism. Here again he refuses to go behind the facts for an explanation; his contention seems to be that genius, whether in art or religion, is incapable of explanation, and is in some degree a divine source of "revelation" of new beauty, new truth, or higher morality. Dr. Jevons thus confirms me in the words I wrote three years ago as to the present attitude of comparative religion towards the religion of the Bible: "Generally speaking, there is a marked retrogression, if I may call it so, to the position which assigns a certain amount of uniqueness to the religion of the Hebrews" (*Studies*, XVII). It is in his frank, and, one may say, scientific recognition of this plain fact, that Dr. Jevons' book will be of supreme interest to Jewish readers. It is not so long ago that Dr. Gruppe, in his *Study of Greek Myths and Cults*, came also to the same "revelational" position, much to the discontent of the anthropological school, who will have now to meet the more formidable corroboration of Dr. Jevons, who uses their own materials and yet refuses to explain the supernatural by naturalistic means. Dr. Jevons' book is one which will have to be reckoned with.

JOSEPH JACOBS.

M. FRIEDMANN'S "ONKELOS AND AKYLAS."

Onkelos und Akylas (III. *Jahresbericht der israelitisch-theologischen Lehranstalt in Wien für das Schuljahr* 1895–1896). By M. FRIEDMANN. (Vienna, 1896. vi + 135 pages. 8vo.)

THE learned author, whose name has become known to the public by his editions of the Mechilta, the Sifre, the Pesikta-rabbathi, and by other works, treats in the essay under discussion on several questions relating to the Bible. The title says, on the one hand, too little, the first of the four chapters being, as a sort of introduction, devoted to the problem of Bible translations, and dealing with the Septuagint, the Aristeas letter and several other topics. But, on the other hand, the title is too wide, in as far as the next three chapters, in spite of their comparative comprehensiveness, do not exhaust the subject. Thus one looks in vain for a description of the character of Aquila's version, and the author leaves the principal source, the Hexapla, quite unnoticed. We shall see in the course of our discussion that the author has no proper idea of it, and that he draws his material exclusively from Jewish literature.

After the introduction, the author produces in the second chapter the Jewish traditions about Akylas; passages from his translations are quoted, and other points discussed. The third chapter is devoted to the Targum-Onkelos and to the institution of translation at large, whilst other matters, relating more or less to the principal theme, are taken account of. In the last chapter, the Rabbinical traditions about Onkelos and the critique on them up to the present day are passed in review, and the results of the whole inquiry are summarized. This brief summary of the contents—the author gives a very minute one—shows that by a more compressed treatment chapters two and four might have been united, and thus many repetitions and cross-references avoided. The essay would have lost in bulk, but by no means in intrinsic value.

A brief exposition of the various opinions on the questions under discussion would have facilitated a survey of the whole, instead of which Friedmann gives too frequent quotations from modern works, often filling whole pages. If the author had also deemed the most recent works worthy of consideration, his essay would not have remained, in many points, behind the present state of investigation. This refers especially to the first part of the essay, as will be seen presently.

Friedmann, at the very commencement of his essay (p. 2), gives it as his opinion that there existed, beside the Greek and Aramaic versions,

also an Egyptian, Median, Elamite, and Iberian version. He quotes Sabbath, 115 a, and Megilla, 17 a; and also observes that עברית לעבריים could not have been an error instead of ערבית, and adds: "I therefore conjecture that Iberia is meant here." Friedmann has taken no notice of my introduction to the Old Testament (*Zur Einleitung in die Heilige Schrift*), which appeared in the year 1894. I endeavoured in that work, pp. 84–99, in a chapter headed "Lost Versions of the Bible," to prove, from a number of expressions occurring in the tradition and from other data, the former existence of translations into several languages of antiquity, and not only into those mentioned. *Acta Apost.*, II, 5–11 (*Zur Einleitung*, p. 97) is also particularly instructive. The still existing Coptic Bible is probably of Jewish origin (ibid. 92 sq.)[1]. *Hebrew* Bibles, written with foreign characters, may also have existed in antiquity[2] (ibid. 80–84). Thus, the second column of the Hexapla, which, as it is known, contains the Hebrew text in Greek transcription, hails from Jews, and not from Origen. The latter has found it ready to hand in the same way as the Greek versions. The conjecture that עברית had to be altered into ערבית was made by Prof. Bacher and Prof. Strack (*Magyar Zsidó Szemle*, 1894, pp. 520 sqq. and 641); that עבריה meant Iberia was conjectured by Krauss (ibid. 1895, p. 493).

All Talmudical passages on the biblical versions were cited by me in my essay, and a reference to p. 84 sqq. would—to say the least—have done no harm, and Friedmann's information on pp. 15–21 could, in that case, have been said in much less words. On p. 19 reference ought to have been made to Masechet Sefarims, i. 8 in שלשה ספרים נפתחים ed. S. Schönblum (Lemberg, 1877), where we read כתב בכל הלשונות בכל הכתובין כולם אין קורין בו (*Zur Einleitung*, p. 81, note 3). Friedmann should also have mentioned, in this connexion, the sayings about the reading of the Megilla, and not have confined himself to 20, note 1 (cf. ibid. 70 sqq.). We look also in vain on p. 20 for a reference to Joel's acute observations in *Blicke in die Religionsgeschichte* (Breslau, 1880), where the Talmudic statements on the Greek versions of the Bible, and the "various views of the doctors of the Talmud about the Greek language" are discussed. That dissertation is not noted by Friedmann at all, neither in this place nor in the last part of his essay

[1] J. Bachmann published in 1893 a book entitled *Die Klagelieder Jeremiae in der Aethiopischen Bibelübersetzung*. That version also seems to have been made after the original Hebrew text.

[2] Even though I consider my explanation of Sabbath, 115 a (*Zur Einleitung*, 81), open to objections, sufficient proof still remains of my assertion.

where he mentions a summary of the "opinions on the Onkelos-Akylas question" (pp. 105–131). I cannot enter, within the limits of a review, upon the material differences on this point, and must leave it to the reader to compare the works quoted with that of Friedmann. It certainly cannot be justified that previous inquiries were disregarded, especially when a summary of them is being offered, and thus the author's work is already antiquated on its very appearance.

Nor can the rest of Friedmann's observations in this chapter be called happy. To give only a few examples. We read, p. 19, the following words about the Beraitha, Megilla, 9 a, which contains the well-known narrative of the alterations made by the seventy-two wise men for Ptolemy: "If this passage be read without the discussion that precedes it in the Talmud, no trace can be detected which pointed to a translation, &c." But how, in that case, is the alteration of ארנבת into צעירת הרגלים to be explained? If the Greek "lagos" be not alluded to, which might have been considered to reflect on the royal family of the "Lagides," as expressly stated in the Talmud (מפני שאשתו של תלמי ארנבת שמה), the original designation of ארנבת as an unclean animal might have safely been retained (Lev. xi. 6 and Deut. xiv. 7). Cf. on the whole narrative Geiger, *Urschrift*, p. 439 sqq. Friedmann persists, on the ground of the Talmudical source, that the seventy-two scholars had written for Ptolemy a Hebrew copy of the Bible. He also finds a proof for this opinion in the well-known passage: שלשה ספרים נמצאו בעזרה אחד של מעונים ואחד של היא ואחד שנקרא ספר זעטוטים (Sifre, II, p. 148 b and elsewhere). Without being able to explain what זעטוטים means, he makes of it a Hebrew-Alexandrian copy, which found its way into the temple, where standard copies were preserved! "The quoted passage proves that much with certainty, that the alterations were made in the Hebrew text, and not merely in the translation" (ibid.). He who reads the Talmudical narratives with an unprejudiced mind will notice at once that they are an echo of the letter of Aristeas. Since Friedmann considers this letter to be genuine, one cannot understand why he takes all that trouble. The "clinching proof" from Sifre, § 148, p. 104 a, ed. Friedmann, finds a better explanation for every critic according to Geiger, *Urschrift*, p. 446.

The author turns next to the question (pp. 25–29) whether the weekly portion was read in Alexandria from the Torah, and, if so, in which language? I have shown in *Zur Einleitung*, p. 86 sq., that the weekly portion was read in the Greek language, also in the Graeco-Jewish congregations of Palestine. Besides other sources, I referred to Tosefta Megilla, 4, 13, where we read that

"in the synagogues of those Jews who spoke a strange language, they commence and conclude with Hebrew if there is anybody who can read to them; but if there is no one who can read (=Hebrew) to them, in that case only one reads." The further proofs for this rendering, and the inferences drawn from it, are given ibid. note 2. This Tosefta escaped the notice of Frankel, and of Friedmann also. It is quite erroneous to refer the injunctions of the Mishnah in respect to לעזות to foreign Jews, as is done by Friedmann also, p. 27, because Jews of different nationalities lived in the Holy Land itself, which appears from the passage in *Acta Apostolorum*, quoted above. There were Hellenistic-Jewish congregations, especially in the numerous Hellenic towns of Palestine. (Cf. Schürer, *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi*[2], II, 51–131, on the Hellenic cities.) Friedmann arrives, by means of a bold imagination, at the following propositions:—"The Greek version was, as we have shown, introduced by Ptolemy from political motives. The original text was, as a matter of fact, excluded from public worship. Private copies were then composed, for the most part, from the official copy of Ptolemy, it not being generally known that it did not accord with the original text. When a change took place in the political conditions, and especially after the Maccabean restoration, a healthy reaction made itself felt, supported also by continuous fresh emigrations from Palestine, and people turned again to the original text. The Septuagint was made use of in teaching, in lectures, in private reading, and in intercourse with heathens" (p. 29). Friedmann has not given any historical proof of a single one of these propositions; they are one and all without foundation.

The author suffers himself to be carried away by entirely modern situations and opinions when he assumes the Septuagint to have been prepared by order of the king on the ground of political motives. He says, pp. 14–15: "This enigma finds its solution in the assumption of a pressure from without having been brought to bear on account of political motives; which consisted in a desire of Hellenizing the Jews and turning them into complete Greeks. This would tend to strengthen the Egyptian government, to neutralize their gravitation towards Palestine; otherwise inducements might be held out to them from Syria to gain them over to the Syrian schemes. It is most likely that Jewish brains may have assisted to cause this idea to appear plausible in the eyes of the government. The mode adopted in Egypt was to make the Jews feel flattered by it, and to make it appear to them as a glorification of their religion, as a Kiddush-Hashem. But this is the weakest point in the character of the Jews, and the most assailable, for the Jew is vain of his

religion. Every one who reads the Bible with open eyes will find out this vanity. For this very reason it is quite natural that this translation was, from a non-Jewish side, encircled by a halo."

I will not enter upon his defence of the genuineness of the Aristeas letter on the ground that the opposite opinion, as expressed especially by König, in agreement with all scholars, was quite illogical and only contained attacks on the Jews (p. 7). It is a pity that a scholar like König in Rostock, who takes all possible pains to give a chance to Jewish literature also, who has never uttered a word in disparagement of the Jews, is met with the innuendo that his conclusion, if expressed in the style common in modern times, would sound: "The whole story is nothing but a Jewish swindle"[1]. Friedmann forgets that both in ancient times and in the Middle Ages an enormous pseudo-epigraphical literature was produced, without exciting much censure against the Christians or the Jews. Frankel also declared the letter in question as a "pious fraud." It is true Friedmann asks on p. 11, "But why a *pious* fraud?" It is to be hoped that this is no *pia fraus* on his part.

The author's notion about the extensive use of the Aramaic language in Palestine is antiquated. He touches the subject twice. He asserts that the Jews had brought the Aramaic language with them from Babylon[2] (p. 57). "We see that in later times Aramaic had become entirely the popular language by constant immigrations from Babylon, and Meturgemans were universally employed for the interpretation of the weekly portion" (p. 13). This was the opinion of de Rossi, Zunz (*Gottesdienstliche Vorträge*, p. 7 sq.), and others; an opinion which was long since refuted by modern scholars. The Aramaic dialect of Palestine was not the East-Aramaic, but the West-Aramaic dialect; and it was impossible for the Babylonian exiles to bring with them from the land of their captivity a language that was not spoken there at all. For further information about this question, see particularly, Kautzsch, *Grammatik des Biblisch-Aramäischen* (1884), p. 4 sqq.; Schürer, *Geschichte*[2], II, p. 8, note 26; Dalman, *Grammatik des Jüdisch-palästinensischen Aramäisch, Einleitung*, particularly 31–33.

[1] It is painful to find criticism reproached with "declaring Tradition *a priori* to be a swindle and a deception" (p. 27). Friedmann often allows himself to be carried away by his ardent temperament, e. g. on p. 26, and it is to this that we ascribe the biting reflections on Rappoport, Frankel, and other scholars that have highly distinguished themselves in learning, and I hope that the learned author will not have any followers in this particular direction, although he had plenty of predecessors.

[2] Cf. also p. 128, where Friedmann considers Aramaic to have been the language of the educated classes in Palestine.

The reader is peculiarly impressed in reading further, on p. 57, that the idiom imported from Babylon had been "corrupted by the Palestinian Sorsi—סורסי." Thus the Palestinian-Aramaic language of the land continued to exist, but corrupted by the influence of the Babylonian-Aramaic dialect.

The extent to which the author draws on his imagination can be seen on p. 58, where we read literally: "We possess a report in the Talmud (Sanhedrin, 21 b, in the name of מר זוטרא or מר עוקבא), that Ezra had intended to deliver the Torah to the people in Aramaic—the Hebrew text was to be preserved by the priests in the temple. But the Israelites insisted on the original text being delivered to the people—ביררו להן כתב אשורית ולשון הקדש." Nothing of all this is said in the Talmud; there it is said only "that the Torah had been revealed the first time in Hebrew writing and in the holy language, and the second time, at the time of Ezra, in Assyrian writing and Aramaic language; upon this Israel preferred having Assyrian writing and the holy language, leaving the Hebrew writing and Aramaic language to the *Ioliotoi*." This assertion of the Amora is nothing but a reproduction in a pleasant form of Tannaitic references, as I have shown in *Zur Einleitung*, pp. 52–57. Friedmann, after having smuggled the above statement into the Talmud—another description is unsuitable to this mode of interpretation—takes a bold step forward and infers from this Talmudical passage "that the whole of the Aramaic translation was already in existence at the time of Ezra's return from Babylon" (ibid. note 2)[1]. But even this does not satisfy him, and he asserts that this whole proceeding is contained in Neh. viii. 1, 2 sqq. But this is nothing but the passing off of homily for science.

Having discussed those points of the third chapter that belong to the subject dealt with in the first, we now turn to the second chapter which deals with Akylas. One would expect here studies from the Hexapla, the third column of which contains, as is known, the version of Aquila; but no such thing. The author has no proper idea either of the fragments that are still extant of that version or of the Hexapla. He says, on p. 50: "Only scanty remnants of this work (the Hexapla) were preserved in *Quotations of the Fathers of the Church*[2]. Origen lived after the author, about 300" (ibid.). It seems that Friedmann had not before him the two copious volumes of Field's *Hexapla*.

[1] Does Friedmann believe, on the ground of a simple assertion in Baba Kama, 82 a, that Ezra introduced the ten institutions mentioned there? The narrative of an Amora, 700 years after the event, cannot be taken as historical evidence.

[2] The italics are mine.

As to the main questions concerning that version, I consider all conjectures that are proposed without a thorough study of the existing fragments as idle talk. A correct judgment about the method applied in Aquila's version and its sources can only be arrived at after a systematic comparison of Akylas's translations with the information contained in the Jewish tradition; especially with the Tannaite texts as given in Mechilta, Sifre, Sifre Zutta, Sifra, in both Talmuds, in the other Midrashim, and in the Targums. I am thoroughly convinced that a fresh and complete inquiry of the material in the direction designated here, including the question which of the Tannaites was chiefly followed by Akylas, would throw much light on the subject. I have investigated the divergences between Akylas's first and second version from this point of view, but the data at present at hand are too few to make a correct estimate possible, particularly since in the Jewish tradition also only fragments of the Tannaite exegesis are contained. For that which was considered as plain commentary found no place in the Talmud, in the first place, because it was not controversial, and, in the second place, because it was known to every one. But even the researches that have hitherto been made ought to be sufficient to prove the correctness of the assumption that Akylas translated in Akiba's spirit. For, in the first place, he translates *etymologically*, and, secondly, he translates *every syllable and every letter*, as was already pointed out by Jerome (*Epist.* 57, ad Pammachium, c. 11 = Vallarsi i. 316; the character of Akylas's version is fully described by Field, *Hexapla*, pp. xvi–xxvii). This method can only have its origin in the style of Akiba's exegesis, which "derives large numbers of Halachot from every little stroke" (Menachot, 29 b). The inference, therefore, that Aquila had translated in the spirit of R. Akiba, is not merely drawn from the fact that he translated the *nota accusativi* את with σύν, but from the *whole method of his hermeneutics*. In the face of this fact there is no reason whatever to doubt, as Friedmann does (p. 33), the accuracy of the statements of the Talmud, j. Kiddushin, i. 1, and of Jerome, *Comment. in Isaiam*, viii. 11, according to which Akylas had been a disciple of R. Akiba. For Friedmann holds that the words "Akylas translated before Rabbi Akiba" do not prove that he had been his disciple, but that it only showed that they were contemporaries. But in the note he admits that "the expression תרגם לפני only expresses that Akylas deported himself in regard to R. Akiba like a disciple." This is playing with the words. If Akylas translated before Akiba, it does not only mean that he *occasionally* translated *one* word, but that he translated frequently, although the Talmud had no occasion to communicate several translations.

Further, since Akiba did not need a Greek translation of the Bible, the phrase "he translated before him" cannot mean anything else but that Akylas wished to have the accuracy of his version tested by Akiba, a thing which would not very well have been possible without a knowledge of Akiba's method of exegesis. It must also be observed that, in the Talmudical sense of the word, a pupil need not be younger than the master, a fact very well known to Friedmann, for the word did not in those days mean the same as "pupil" in the present day, a person who had instruction from his master in the lower, middle, or higher school, but the designation applied to any one who went to the house of study of a master whom he recognized as superior to himself and whose lectures he attended. If then Friedmann insists (p. 33) that the particle את had already been interpreted before R. Akiba, and that therefore the translation of את with σύν does not prove that Akylas had been Akiba's disciple, he disregards, firstly, that the proof was not merely based on that translation of את, but, as we have shown, on the whole mode of translation in a scrupulously literary manner, of which that translation of את and the construction of σύν with the accusative are merely characteristic instances; and, secondly, that it is a long step from the first dawning of an exegetical method to its conscious and consistent application. If, on the one hand, it must be admitted that all methods of interpretation were not invented by R. Akiba, it must be admitted, on the other hand, that it was Akiba who referred the laws back to the Bible, in a manner that was even admired by Joshua, and assigned through this to the scriptural word and all its peculiarities such a significance that the thought needs must arise of causing the Greek version also to reflect the original text of the Bible[1].

Friedmann conjectures also that "Aquila's version owed its origin to didactic motives." "He undertook a pedagogical translation, i.e. a translation which was to produce an easy understanding of the Hebrew word, and a quick mastery of the language" (p. 49). "This translation was then introduced in all congregations that were ignorant of Hebrew, and was probably used also by parents who wished their children to be taught the Bible in Greek" (p. 50). It is the same surmise which Friedmann expresses in reference to the Aramaic version, namely, that it owed its origin to motives of instructing the youth. In spite of this he assumes the former existence

[1] Krauss (*Festschrift zum* 80. *Geburtstage Moritz Steinschneiders*, p. 150, n. 1) *en passant* also denies all connexion of Akylas's version with Akiba's exegesis. But he adduces no special reasons for this repudiation of a connexion believed in by all modern scholars.

of an Aramaic version of the whole of the Bible, ordained by Ezra, which, it is true, had fallen into oblivion (p. 60). In the same way, the previously rejected surmise that Akylas's version owed its existence to polemical motives is reinstated, although in different words, by a whole series of arbitrary assumptions in reference to that version (pp. 49–50), a fact of which any one who reads Friedmann's essay can convince himself. My own opinion is that the overwhelming praise which Eliezer and Joshua bestow upon Akylas can only be understood if the latter's translation was capable of rendering material services to the defence of Judaism. A written translation for the use of elementary teaching was not needed at that time, the teachers being, with few exceptions, in possession of the Hebrew tongue and perfectly well read in the Bible. Once the children had mastered a rudimentary knowledge of the Bible, the latter was taught them so that they knew it by heart. Modern conditions and educational machinery must not be transferred to those ancient times.

Space forbids entering upon other details of that chapter. I therefore observe only briefly that in the large note, p. 34, where נחמיה העמסוני is mentioned, a reference to Derenbourg, *Essai*, p. 314, and to Bacher, *Agada der Tannaiten*, I, 63, notes 1 and 2, would have been of use to the reader.

In the third chapter Friedmann is quite at home, and gives several noteworthy and new details[1]. The principal proposition, with which I have already indicated my inability to agree, is that Ezra ordained a Targum to be made which had fallen into oblivion. His scientific courage grows as the author goes along in his inquiry, and thus, on p. 81, he is able to describe minutely the historical development of the Targumim. He says that "since Ezra the Pentateuch was read to the congregation in Hebrew and translated into Aramaic. The contents of the Pentateuch were interpreted to the people by means of the translation. They possessed for this purpose the authorized translation, of which already Ezra had made use." An Aramaic translation must, consequently, have existed already before Ezra, for it must have taken some time before it acquired authority. Now we will admit that a Targum could have been written in a very short time and authorized by—we do not know which—authorities. But we should like to have even a single historical proof of such occurrence. Friedmann holds that מפורש זה תרגום is an historical proof pointing to Ezra's time. In this way a proof could be given that the weekly portions were already read at the time of Moses.

[1] V. instances of valuable comparisons, e. g. on p. 62, n. 2; p. 65, n. 1; p. 70, n. 2. (Differences between the Massoretic text and the Midrash and Targum, &c.)

If Friedmann swears by every *dictum* of an Amora he renounces scientific research.

We only point out the following details. About the names of the Jewish-Aramaic, cf. Dalman, l. c., p. 1, where the material is given much more completely. The designation לשון הקדש means, according to Friedmann (p. 58), "the language of the Holy One, i. e. the religious language," and is a Hebrew translation of the popular designation לשון קודשא (Targum Jon. Gen. xi. 1), which again is a shortened form for לישן בית קודשא (ibid. xxxi. 57, xliii. 23, and elsewhere). "It would be wrong to translate it 'the holy language,' for the expression is לישן קודשא, and not לישן קדיש." If Friedmann were consistent he would, in accordance with this, be obliged to translate לשון הקודש "the language of the sanctuary," a translation which I remember reading in an older author. Both translations are wrong, and arise from a misconception of the idiomatic use of the *status constructus*, which is often applied to express the adjective; cf. Ex. xvi. 23 שַׁבַּת קֹדֶשׁ, xxii. 30 אַנְשֵׁי קֹדֶשׁ and many more; in the Concordance s. v. קֹדֶשׁ. The word קֹדֶשׁ is used in the same way in new Hebrew, for instance, in the expressions כתבי הקדש, רוח הקדש, which clinches the question[1]. We shall therefore be able henceforth to persist in translating the expression as "the holy language." Jonathan may have given in his "language of the sanctuary" a popular etymology of the phrase.

Friedmann says, p. 58, note 1, "that the Rabbinical Hebrew had its origin in Aramaic, as we shall show later." That exposition consists of an attempt to prove (pp. 67–68), in a few cases, in which Targum and Midrash agree, the priority of the Targum, because the word in question is of Aramaic origin, e. g. בּוֹרְיוֹ, בוריה, מְנָיָן, מנין. Friedmann confuses here Targum with Aramaic; he seems to think that the Aramaic existed for the Tannaite—as in the present day—only in the Targum and not as a living language. The new Hebrew language did not originate with the Aramaic, as little as the language of Job arose from the Arabic; the one was only influenced and coloured by the other. Surely Friedmann would not maintain that whenever the word מנין occurs in the tradition it was always

[1] Cf. also Mishna Yadayim, 3, at the end: שכל הכתובים קדש וכו׳. On כתבי קדש, cf. *Zur Einleitung*, 12 sqq., according to the explanation given there the translation "divine language" would also be admissible. At any rate it is erroneous to lay stress on the substantive and not to translate it adjectively. This is also proved by the contrasted expression לשון חול (cf. Berliner, *Beiträge zur hebräischen Grammatik in Talmud und Midrasch*, p. 5).

taken from the Targum. As long as there are no proofs to the contrary, it must be assumed *a priori* that the Tannaites composed the material of their teaching in Hebrew, and spoke Aramaic only in their intercourse with the people. They first pronounced their opinions in the schools in the new Hebrew language, which they then caused to be transferred into Targum for the use of the people. This disposes of the author's proof of the age of the extant Targum.

Friedmann is not very fortunate with his linguistic observations. He explains, p. 65, note 1, דבר אחר as דִּבֵּר=דיבור אחר, and refers to Mechilta, at the commencement, note 1. It is not clear from the author's words whether דִּבֵּר אחר should be read. However, the explanation is wrong. It is true that הַדִּבֵּר occurs in Jer. v. 13, but there it applies to the Divine speech to the prophet; and Fürst[1], in his Hebrew dictionary, translates it "the Speaker, i. e. the Divine Spirit, which speaks through the prophet." In the Mechilta, at the commencement, and elsewhere it is also only used of the Divine speech. Instances ought therefore first to be given of דִּבֵּר being the same as דָּבָר. But even then דבר אחר could not be identified with it, because its explanation is much more simple. Namely, in many passages in the tradition דָּבָר means sentence, theorem, e.g. Aboth, iii. 8: הלומד מחברו פרק אחד או הלכה אחד או כל השוכח דבר אחד ממשנתו וכו׳; vi. 3 אחת או דבר אחד או אפילו אות אחת It is evident that a פרק is divided into הלכות or into דברים, and the latter again into אותיות, which latter does not necessarily mean "letters," as is commonly assumed, but a part of a הלכה or of דבר. In the concluding sentence דבר corresponds with פסוק. It seems, therefore, that דבר formed a subdivision of פרשה, as הלכה of פרק; i. e. when Midrash was concerned they used to speak of פרשיות and דברים, and when Mishnah in a more special sense was mentioned they talked of פרקים and הלכות. But let this be as it may. The meaning of דָּבָר becomes clear from Sifre, II, 48. There we read: כך תלמידי חכמים למד ב׳ או שלשה דברים ביום, ב׳ וג׳ פרקים בשבת, ב׳ וג׳ פרשיות (בחודש) וכו׳. We see therefore that דבר is a part of a larger whole[2]; and דבר אחר is nothing else; and is quite correctly translated "another word," or, as is usually done, "another explanation." On p. 55, note 4, we read

[1] In Gesenius' *Hebrew Dictionary* דִּבֵּר is not given; Kimchi, *Shorashim, radix* דבר, quotes in this sense also תְּחִלַּת דִּבֶּר ה׳ (Hos. i. 2) and gives Tseri as the vowel.

[2] Since פרק is never applied to a part of a פרשה, and the word בחודש is only inserted from the Yalkut, I assume that in our passage ב׳ וג׳ פרקים (=ב׳ וג׳ פר׳) is a mere repetition of ב׳ וג׳ פרשיות.

"נמר was formed from רגם by transposition and means to learn." Such etymologies are no longer in fashion.

The last chapter deals with the principal question of the whole inquiry; namely, whether Onkelos and Akylas must be considered as one and the same person, or as two persons. The harbinger of modern critics, Azarjah de Rossi, maintained, in *Meor Enayim*, c. 45 (pp. 233–239, Vienna), that there were two translators; a Greek translator, Akylas (Aquila), and an Aramaic translator, Onkelos. Friedmann arrives at the same conclusion. The reasons given by de Rossi in support of his *new* theory are repeated by Friedmann for the purpose of upholding the *old* theory against the new criticism. The historical fact is as follows:—(1) The Palestinian sources quote on ten or eleven occasions (Friedmann, pp. 44-46; Steinschneider'sche *Festschrift*, German part, pp. 151 sqq.) Greek translations in the name of Akylas (עקילס). (2) The Tosefta and the Babylonian Talmud do not mention an Akylas, but an Onkelos, of whom several things are narrated, but no translations are quoted. (3) R. Jirmia's information, given in the name of Chija bar Abba, about the Greek version of Akylas in the Palestinian Talmud, Megilla, i. 9, occurs, with some alterations, in the Babylonian Talmud, Megilla, 3 a. (4) The Talmud does not know of an Aramaic Targum under the name of Onkelos, and the first quotations under this name occur only in the works of the later Gaons (Berliner, *Targum Onkelos*, II, p. 176, note 4).

Therefore, while Aramaic translations were known in Talmudical times, and are frequently quoted in the Talmud, but never under the name of Onkelos; and our Aramaic Targum is called the Targum of Onkelos only several centuries after the conclusion of the Talmud, and is anonymous even to commentators of a later period; there remains in support of Onkelos's authorship of an Aramaic translation only the one passage in Megilla, 3 a. None of the other data about Onkelos mention a version. The answer to the whole question turns therefore upon one single passage. Let us compare the two reports. In Jerushalmi we read: ר' ירמיה בשם ר' חייה בר בא תרגם עקילס הגר התורה לפני ר' אליעזר ולפני ר' יהושע וקלסו אותו וא"ל יפיפית מבני אדם. In Babli the same report runs: ר' ירמיה ואיתימא ר' חייה בר אבא תרגום של תורה אונקלוס הגא אמרו מפי ר' אליעזר ור' יהושע ותרגום של נביאים יונתן בן עוזיאל אמרו מפי חגי זכריה ומלאכי ונזדעזעה ארץ ישראל וכו'. A comparison shows that Jerushalmi gives an historical report, for Akylas' version actually exists, although only in fragments, up to the present day. The word התורה, as in several passages in traditional works, comprises not only the Pentateuch, but the whole Bible (*Zur Einleitung*, p. 16 sqq.). Babli gives the same information, only עקילס has become אונקלוס, and תרגם התורה, תרגום של תורה. The

cause of this alteration is obvious. The Babylonians knew no Greek translation, they thought therefore of the Aramaic translation, and, having heard of Jonathan ben Uziel's translation of the Prophets, they added תרגום של נביאים. This addition about the Prophets, as well as the narrative of miraculous commotion of the Holy Land, shows that this is not an historical report. They would have referred the Targum of the Torah also to an older authority if they had not possessed a reminiscence about the report of Chija bar Abba. But the tradition has already become dimmed, as is evident from the circumstance that they made "Jirmiah, or, as some say, Chija bar Abba" from "Jirmiah, in the name of Chija bar Abba." The correctness of the Jerusalemite report is further shown by the circumstance that Chija's Agadic sentences were most frequently delivered by Jirmiah (Bacher, *Die Agada der palaestinensischen Amoräer*, II, pp. 178). I consider the whole report of the Babylonian as being of a later date, for the question and answer attached to this report appear anonymous. All these circumstances lead to the assumption that the report in the Babylonian Talmud has its origin in a misunderstanding of Chija bar Abba's words, and therewith collapses every historical information about an Aramaic version by Onkelos.

But Friedmann endeavours also to uphold de Rossi's opinion, that there had been two Onkelos, an older and a younger one. The only passage alleged in support of this is Aboda Zara, 11 a, and its parallel passages in which it is told that the proselyte Onkelos had burned seventy Mana of frankincense in honour of Gamliel I (גמליאל הזקן); but this passage is not sufficient for the creation of a second Onkelos. Gamliel II must therefore have been meant. It is true, Herzfeld, *Geschichte*, II, p. 61, made the objection that "it cannot be that the younger Gamliel had had such an expensive funeral, because it is told of him (Ketubot 8 b, Moed Katon, 27 b) that he had ordered that he should be buried in as simple a manner as possible." Friedmann attaches great importance to this objection, without considering that the burning of frankincense at a funeral was at all events a Pagan, and not a Jewish custom. Even if it were Gamliel I, Onkelos must have been induced to do what he did by his Pagan notions. If, therefore, he could act in a way opposed to Jewish usage, he also might have disregarded Gamliel's injunction against luxury at funerals.

I think that even after this most recent essay on the subject we may retain the identity of Akylas and Onkelos, as also the other results of modern inquiry discussed here, which are no glittering hypotheses against which youthful students ought to be warned, as Friedmann avers at the end of his essay. I felt more anxious to

subject the opinions expressed in this essay to a searching investigation because I, in common with so many others, have a high regard for M. Friedmann's achievements in all fields connected with the history and elucidation of Jewish literature.

LUDWIG BLAU.

Budapest.

RATNER'S "SEDER OLAM RABBAH."

סדר עולם רבה, *Die grosse Weltchronik. Nach Handschriften und Druckwerken herausgegeben und mit kritischen Noten und Erklärungen versehen*, von B. RATNER. (Wilna, 1897.)

I NOTICED some time ago in this QUARTERLY (*J. Q. R.*, VII, 348) the excellent introduction by Herr Ratner. I am happy to see now the text of this ancient chronicle, edited by the same author, with the variants of the MSS. and quotations from Talmudic literature. These supply the variations of the Munich MS. of the Talmud, which we could not furnish for the text of the *Seder Olam* in the *Mediaeval Jewish Chronicles*, II, pp. 26-67. Herr Ratner has thus filled up a lacuna, besides adding many quotations from printed books, bearing upon our subject. I should have liked to see a table of abbreviations of the titles of the works quoted, which many readers will find a difficulty in deciphering, more especially as Ratner's work will remain for a long time the standard edition. Perhaps a table of abbreviations might be published separately.

BACHER'S "EXEGESIS OF MAIMONIDES."

Die Bibelexegese Moses Maimûni's, von Prof. Dr. WILHELM BACHER, Budapest, 1896. (Jahresbericht der Landes-Rabbinerschule, 1895-1896.)

PROF. BACHER is indefatigable; his minimum yearly production is a volume of essays or the equivalent. The present monograph of 176 pages is an instalment of the programme for the year 1891-1892, with the title of *Die Bibelexegese der jüdischen Religionsphilosophen des Mittelalters vor Maimûni*. Both are interesting by themselves, as well as separately; it is to be hoped that it will be continued some other time, so as to have the subject complete. Our author is well known for accuracy in his statements, depending on texts and expanding them until the meaning comes forth by itself. He calls as his witnesses the very words of Maimonides, be it in Arabic or in Hebrew, for Prof. Bacher is master of both languages. By this learned method Maimonides' exegesis, if we may call it so, becomes

palatable in its mystico-philosophical garb. The matter is comprised in the following chapters:—(1) the study of the Bible; (2) allegorical exegesis; (3) anthropomorphic expressions in the Bible; (4) the different rules of exegesis; (5) the exegesis of the *Midrashim;* (6) that of the Targums; (7) explanation of words, viz. the synonyms, homonyms and metaphors, verbs and their derivatives, &c.; (8) the names of God; (9) angels; (10) prophecy and the prophets; (11) the theory of visions; (12) miracles, the revelation on Sinai; (13) Divine providence, free-will; (14) the biblical commandments, and the reasons for them; (15) the biblical narratives; (16) on Gen. i; (17) on Ezek. i; (18) on the book of Job; (19) explanation of special passages of the Bible; (20) the Hebrew language, and the language of the Mishna; (21) sources of Maimonides' philology and exegesis, supposed exegetical writings by him. The last two chapters are the sections which will be most useful to students of the Hebrew language. The reference to other exegetes and grammarians is exhaustive, and very valuable for those interested in Jewish theology as it appears in the Bible. The style is clear and concise, a rare talent possessed by Prof. Bacher. The subject is thoroughly treated and, I believe, in a lasting manner, so that this study of Maimonides will remain for generations. Prof. Bacher has now supplied the preface to the *Dalalat*, which Munk intended to write if he had lived out his time. I congratulate the author on having satisfied a want.

HEBREW WRITINGS IN AMERICA.

1. RABBINIC literature was transplanted to America by my lamented friend, Dr. A. Kohut. Besides his own monographs on Yemen MSS. (see *J. Q. R.*, III, p. 620, and V, pp. 338 sqq.), he stimulated Dr. Margolis to follow him (*J. Q. R.*, V, pp. 340 sqq.). I am happy to state that the tradition will continue, and, curious to say, even American immigrants are carrying on the practice of writing in Hebrew. The following monographs reached me by the kindness of the authors:—(*a*) Concerning the biography of Leon (Judah) Modena, by Nehemiah Samuel Libowitz, with the title of ר׳ יהודה אריה מודינא בדמות וצביונו (Wien, 1896); (*b*) additional notes by the well-known M. Friedmann, by Judge Sulzberger in Philadelphia; (*c*) by Dr. H. Brody, Berlin, edited by the author of (*a*), Newark, New York.

2. The well-known traveller, E. Deinard, issued a catalogue of MSS. and books in the possession of Judge M. Sulzberger, mentioned above (Newark, 1896). No. 9 of the MSS. is the מדרש עזירי, of which it is not yet certain if it is another redaction of the מדרש הגדול.

HESSELING'S "NEO-GREEK PENTATEUCH."

Les cinq livres de la loi (le Pentateuque): traduction en néo-grec publiée en caractères hébraïques à Constantinople en 1547, *transcrite et accompagnée d'une introduction, d'un glossaire et d'un facsimile*, par D. C. HESSELING (Leiden and Leipzig, 1897, 8vo).

ONLY very few learned Jews in the Occident knew that there existed a printed translation in modern Greek in Hebrew characters, with vowel-points, and yet it exists in eight copies, as far as I know at present. This translation, together with that in Spanish, was most likely intended for the schools to which the Greek Jews went, and for the exiles from Spain, not for the synagogue, since the prophetic lessons are promised on the title-page in the same volume. In this century of philological research, the Jewish-Greek is sure not to escape notice. Indeed, M. Legrand in Paris, and M. Lazaro Belleli of Corfu, have drawn attention to the printed Greek Pentateuch, and our author, in the present volume, not only publishes the Hebraeo-Greek text in Greek characters, but gives a preface which is exhaustive in all respects, in three chapters. I. On the polyglot Bible of Constantinople, and the description of it (giving more detail than M. Belleli), the number of copies of the Constantinople edition and the places where it is found. Dr. Hesseling follows the copy of the Rabbinical school in Breslau, where are found printers' corrections which are not found in the others. This kind of correction, to be found in one copy and not in another, is not uncommon in the sixteenth century. When a mistake was shown to the printer, he did not re-issue the sheet, but had it corrected. In the second chapter, Dr. Hesseling treats of the writing of Greek in Hebrew characters. III. treats of the fidelity of the translation, and of foreign words in the Jewish-Greek translation, viz. Latin and Romance, Slav and Turkish, dialects borrowed from the nations among whom the Jews dwelt. In the fourth chapter, our author treats of grammatical peculiarities in the Graeco-Jewish dialect, which are mostly derived from the Jonah MS. in the Bodleian Library and that of Bologna. This text, as well as some others written in Hebrew characters, will, I hope, be prepared for the press by the help of our author, and then we shall have an *apparatus criticus* for the Jewish-Greek dialect in the Middle Ages. The reproduction in Greek characters, from the Hebrew in the Constantinople edition, follows, with variants from the editions mentioned above.

P.S.—Since the above was in type, M. Belleli, who came to Oxford to examine the Hebraeo-Greek Pentateuchs in the Bodleian Library, has called my attention to certain slips in transcription in Dr. Hesseling's edition. For instance, in segolate proper names the second ε is wrongly omitted, as Ἰέφθ, Πέλγ, Πέρτς, for יִפְתָּ, פֶּלֶג, פֶּרֶץ. In Gen. xlix. 16 and 17, Dr. Hesseling takes the proper name דָּן for the Greek conjunction ὅταν, thus destroying the sense of both passages. In Num. xxx he gives ἐχώρισε several times for ἐμπόδισε (הֵנִיא) through misreading ב as כ and ד as ר in the Hebraeo-Greek text. Again we find αὐτὴ (הִיא) for αὐτοὶ (הֵם) as well as ἔφυγε for ἐπῆγε, φάῃ for πάῃ and vice versa. In Gen. xxx. 8 the editor reads δόσε where the Hebrew (תְּנוּ) shows δότε to be correct. Most of these faults might have been avoided if Dr. Hesseling had been assisted by a Hebrew scholar when engaged in preparing his text.

BUBER'S "AGADATH ESTHER."

אגדת אסתר. *Agadische Abhandlungen zum Buche Ester nach einer Handschrift aus Jemen, mit Vergleichungen einer zweiten Jemener Handschrift aus der Oxforder Bibliothek, Cod. e.* 57, *zum ersten Male herausgegeben und mit Anmerkungen versehen*, von SOLOMON BUBER. (Krakau, Fischer, 1897.)

THE well-known critical editor of Midrashim continues his very useful work with a Midrash on the book of Esther according to a Yemen compilation. I regret to find by his dedication that he has lately lost his son Meir, born in 1850; may God console and continue to him strength to pursue his learned work, more especially in the publication of the *Yalkut Makhiri* on the Psalms, which is in preparation. The present Midrash is carefully edited, as Buber's editions usually are, from two Yemen MSS., the one in his own possession and the other in the Bodleian Library. Both were written in the seventeenth century; the second is the more complete. The compiler made use of the Talmud and the usual Midrashim, except those of the *Rabbâ*; the Midrash Abba Gorion (see Buber's ed. Wilna, 1886) occurs only in the Oxford MS. Many unknown Midrashic pieces occur in the Yemen MS. The date of the compilation of the present Midrash, says Herr Buber, is difficult to fix; all one can say is that the compiler used Alfasi's and Maimonides' writings, both of which indeed were frequently copied in Yemen. It seems to me that the work was compiled in the fourteenth century at the earliest; in that century many such compilations

were made, among others the famous *Midrash hag-Gadol.* The commentary on the text is as full as those which Buber appended to his edition of the *Tanḥumâ, Pesikta,* and minor Midrashim, which he has so ably edited. The place at which the Oxford MS. was written is, according to Buber, הצן בני קרכז"ש, which he explains as צנעא. The right reading, however, is חצן בני קחאטיר, a name which I do not find in the Index Geographicus to D. H. Müller's edition of Al-Hamdânî's *Geographie der Arabischen Halbinsel.*

GROSS'S "GALLIA JUDAICA."

Gallia Judaica: dictionnaire géographique de la France d'après les sources rabbiniques, par HENRI GROSS; *traduit sur le manuscrit de l'auteur* par MOÏSE BLOCH. Paris, 1897 (Léopold Cerf, Paris).

SINCE I have had the pleasure of knowing Dr. Gross, Rabbi at Augsburg (Bavaria), and that is more than thirty years, he has been working at the history of the French Rabbis in the north of France. His results he communicated mostly to the *Monatsschrift* (Frankel-Grätz), and also a few to the *Revue des Études Juives.* The results of his labours and researches are now put down in his present important works. He, or rather his translator from the German into French, classifies the matter under three heads—namely, (1) the identification of all the French geographical names mentioned in Rabbinical literature of the Middle Ages; (2) a notice of the history of the Jews in the places or provinces indicated by such names; (3) a literary notice of the Rabbis and Jewish writers who were born in, or bore the name of such places. Our author shows how difficult it is to identify the geographical names in Jewish writers, since they are sometimes corruptly quoted, or in other cases are written in the ancient form, e.g. נרמיזא Worms, אבריוק York. Attempts were made to identify French geographical names by Zunz, Carmoli, by the regretted Isidor Loeb, as well as by the writer of this review, the last being still in MS. Our author does not mention the difficulties concerning towns caused by a Hebrew translation of the name, e.g. כוכבי from Estella (see p. 52) במות, not identified yet (p. 20). As to mistranscription, a better instance would have been Troyes in Champagne, transliterated rightly טרוייש, which became later טריוייש, and was taken for Trees (Treviso in Italy). Dr. Gross plucked up courage to publish his interesting volume under the auspices of the *Société des Études Juives.* His method is the following:—the names of

the town or locality according to the Hebrew alphabet, with the name in Latin, Old and Middle French, followed by the present name and the department in which it is now situated. An example will explain better. Article I, "אבגוסטה *Autun.* En vieux français Austiun, en Latin Augustodunum. Ville de Bourgogne, Département de Saône-et-Loire." The historic evidence is that, in a document of 1300, a certain Salemin d'Autun is mentioned. No Rabbinic School is known in this town. In the following article, which treats of Avignon, there follow, after the historical facts, the names of rabbis who resided and held schools in it. Thus, Dr. Gross's work is a kind of history of Jewish literature. Of course, our author had to take a great part of his data from Vols. XXVII and XXXI of the *Histoire Littéraire de la France;* of the latter, our author seems not to have had time or opportunity to make adequate use.

The arrangement of the towns and localities in *Gallia* ought to contain the Rhine, which we do not find in Dr. Gross's book, while York (אבריוק), strange to say, is comprised among the localities of Gallia.

Dr. Gross had no opportunity of continuing his researches into MSS., as he had begun, and there are many lacunae. But such difficult studies cannot become exhausted. The old geography itself is not yet on a firm basis. An important feature in Dr. Gross's interesting studies are the many formulae of letters of divorce, which not only mention the localities, but also the river or rivers near it. The MSS. of Paris (Nat. Lib.), not very skilfully described, have many names of localities mentioning the transfer of them from one person to another, omitted in the catalogue by Zotenberg. The same is the case with the MSS. of the Vatican, Parma, Vienna, and many minor collections. For general purposes in Jewish literature this work will be found useful, more especially for the ample index at the end (1) of the geographical names in Hebrew which are found in the book; (2) of names of persons and families which are not found in the preceding index; (3) of the names of persons, towns, and countries; (4) of Hebrew works made use of; (5) of abbreviations; (6) of Hebrew books quoted; (7) works in other languages.

MINOR LITERATURE.

I. A NEW edition of the *Massorah zum Onkelos* (first issue in the *Isr. Letterbode*, edited by the late M. Roest), by Dr. S. LANDAUER, with additions from the MS. Vat. 448, according to Dr. Berliner's copy. I think that the monograph will be welcomed by students of the Targums.

II. *The Biography of Joseph Caro*, according to the documents, by H. D. FRIEDBERG (Drobitsch, 1896).

III. A new monthly with the title of השלח, I, 1. Rather popular than learned; no new documents (Berlin).

IV. "The Jews in China," by M. NOROLLAH, in the *Jewish Missionary*, where the author tries to explain the Persian in their prayer-books (see *J. Q. R.*, VIII, 123 and 362).

A. NEUBAUER.

WIJNKOOP'S "HEBREW SYNTAX."

Manual of Hebrew Syntax, by the Rev. J. D. Wijnkoop, translated by the Rev. Dr. C. VAN DEN BIESEN. (London, 1897.)

WHETHER this Manual of Hebrew Syntax supplies a real want, as stated in the preface, or not, it has its merits, and will undoubtedly prove useful to all who will seek instruction at its hand. The author is devoted to the study of the Hebrew language with zeal and success. Of his several writings, I will only mention the learned and interesting treatise on the retrogression of the accent (דרכי הנסיגה). For the present Manual the author claims no originality, except with regard to the treatment of the infinitive and the participle of the verb. He adopted "a simpler theory, arising from their unique twofold character, of *verbum* and *nomen*." The treatment is, in fact, simple and comprehensive. The two forms of the infinitive, the absolute and the construct, are rightly treated together in one and the same chapter. As, however, the two forms are not quite identical, and a certain difference exists between them, there being cases in which only the one, and other cases in which only the second form can be used, a paragraph might have been introduced on the right use of either form of the infinitive. On the other hand, the rules might have been simplified, if they had been developed more systematically from the properties of the verbal noun. E. g. the use of the infinitive instead of the finite verb is treated in two separate paragraphs, viz. (*a*) when preceded, and (*b*) when not preceded, by a finite verb. Unless the author intended to give two different explanations, the division is purposeless. On p. 44, Rem. 1, the author explains the use of the עתיד without *vav* conversive, where a past tense is required, by assuming an extension of the force of a *vav* before another verb which precedes or follows. A similar explanation is therefore expected with regard to the use of the infinitive in the place of a finite verb. Here the force of the finite element in one verb may likewise be extended to other verbs. Such an explanation would apply to most of the instances

quoted by the author. Although the finite verb in Hebrew combines the idea of the root and that of the determining, finite elements in one word, the two ideas are separable in the mind of the speaker, and the finite part may serve also to determine other verbs. In this manner, the force of the sign for the third person in the singular, and the past tense of וַיַּרְכֵּב (Gen. xli. 43), "and he caused to ride," is extended to the infinitive וְנָתוֹן "and he set." The two infinitives רָנוֹם (Num. xv. 35) and נְשָׁלוֹחַ (Esther iii. 13) belong to class *b*; in class *a* they are out of place.

The instances quoted from the Bible should have been translated literally, in accordance with the rule which they serve to illustrate. If this had been done, the author would not have quoted the sentence גַּם עָנוֹשׁ לַצַּדִּיק לֹא־טוֹב "also to punish the righteous is not good" (Prov. xvii. 26), as an illustration of an infinitive employed "as a pure substantive without the grammatical character of the verb." It is possible that this mistake is the translator's fault, and not that of the author. It would rather seem that the latter had a special object in the selection of the examples; he probably desired at the same time to give his interpretation of difficult biblical passages. Thus he illustrates the use of the infinite Kal for emphasizing a verb of another conjugation, by the sentence עָרְיָה תֵעוֹר קַשְׁתֶּךָ (Hab. iii. 9). But if he adheres to the rendering of the A. V., he must discover in this instance a difference in the roots, in addition to that of the conjugation; עָרְיָה being infinitive Kal of ערה, and תעור future Niphal of עור. The possibility of both forms being of the same conjugation (Kal) and of the same root (ערר) escaped him altogether. A few more instances of this kind: הָאִשָּׁה (Eccles. vii. 26) is quoted as an example of the use of the definite article in the sense of "all," although the determining relative sentence which follows clearly indicates that Koheleth only speaks of the wicked woman, and not of all women. The addition of a pleonastic pronoun in apposition to a noun is exemplified by the following sentence: וְכֹל אֲשֶׁר יִקְרָא־לוֹ הָאָדָם נֶפֶשׁ חַיָּה (Gen. ii. 19); the pronoun לו, though masculine, is assumed to be in apposition to נפש חיה, which is feminine; but as, according to ver. 7, האדם and נפש חיה are identical, it is but natural that the same should be assumed for ver. 19. אִם, as a rule, introduces the second part of a double question; but exceptionally it takes the place of הֲ. Such an exception the author finds in Is. xxix. 16: אִם־כְּחֹמֶר הַיּוֹצֵר יֵחָשֵׁב "shall the potter be counted as clay?" This translation is not according to the Massoretic text, and besides, it is doubtful whether we have here a question at all (comp. A. V.), and if we have, it may be the second part of a double question.

The double negation in מִבְּלִי אֲשֶׁר לֹא יִמְצָא (Eccles. iii. 11) is by no means necessarily intended "to strengthen the negation," as the author believes; it may be equal to the Latin "fieri non potest quin" (comp. *J. Q. R.*, I, p. 36, note 4).

The second chapter, for which the author claims originality, contains the rules concerning the use of the participle. Like the infinitive, the participle is considered as a noun, and is frequently placed by the side of the subject without the copula; the latter must be supplied, and its tense and person must be determined by the context. It is, however, not necessary that the same tense should be supplied which the preceding or following verb has. All possible cases are enumerated, and illustrated by numerous examples.

For the other chapters of the book no originality is claimed; they are in treatment and arrangement similar to the corresponding sections of the ordinary text-books of the Hebrew Grammar. One point may, however, be noticed. There is a peculiar wavering between the old and the new nomenclature of the tenses and the *vav* which modifies their meaning. The author seems to follow the rule recommended by Koheleth: טוב שתאחז בזה וגם מזה אל תנח ידך. Instead of the English terms, he has the Hebrew עבר and עתיד, translated in parenthesis by *actio perfecta* and *actio imperfecta*. The Latin agrees with the modern "perfect" and "imperfect"; the Hebrew with the old and more correct "past" and "future." The same wavering is noticed with regard to the *vav* before the finite verb; it is called *vav* conversive, but its force to effect a *change of the tense* is not openly admitted.

Notwithstanding these few criticisms I recommend the book to students of the Hebrew language; it testifies not only to the author's perfect mastery of the Hebrew Grammar, but also to his skill in explaining and teaching its peculiarities.

M. FRIEDLÄNDER.

ST. WILLIAM OF NORWICH.

"*The Life and Miracles of St. William of Norwich*," *by Thomas of Monmouth.* Edited by A. JESSOPP and M. R. JAMES. (Cambridge: Pitt Press.)

THIS admirably edited book is notwithstanding in some way a disappointment. This is in no sense due to the editors, who have performed their respective tasks with a skill and thoroughness which might have been anticipated from two such experts as Canon Jessopp and Dr. James. The text of the unique MS. discovered

under romantic conditions has been edited with such care that scarcely a single passage has been left doubtful, and the translation is both faithful and readable, while the notes and introduction give almost all the supplementary information the reader could desire. The document thus restored to us is full of interest to the student of English history, and even more so to the few interested in Anglo-Jewish history. It must always remain a memorable monument of English scholarship, and would add, if that were possible, to the reputation of its distinguished editors.

But, from the particular point of view in which the book must be regarded in these pages, it fails to satisfy the expectations which its discovery raised. One had hoped for a flood of light on the social conditions of the Jews of the time, a period for which we have scarcely any temporary record. Instead of this, there are but a couple of Jews mentioned by name; and what is said of them and the other Jews, apart from their connexion with the so-called martyrdom, is not particularly significant or instructive. But, above all, we are disappointed in the hope that this publication would throw full light upon the circumstances attending the death of the boy William, and the rise of the myth of the Blood Accusation which has had such fatal and tragic results ever since. It is true that, as will be seen, the volume shows the flimsy character of the evidence on which the local Church, if not the Papacy, accepted the theory of martyrdom. It shows how frail are the foundations on which this huge structure of malice and hatred has been erected, but the very failure of evidence makes it more difficult to understand the rise of the myth, and, though we may guess, we cannot be certain as to whom we are to credit with its erection.

In the first place, the book, though seemingly at first sight a contemporary record of the facts, turns out to be written by a stranger who was not in Norwich at the time of the alleged martyrdom, and even his account was composed nearly thirty years after the event. For the author of *The Life and Passion of William of Norwich*, was one Thomas of Monmouth, who appears to have been transferred to Norwich somewhere about 1150, six years later than the death of the little lad. He was thus absent from Norwich during the whole time when any sort of investigation was made into the disappearance of the boy William, and all he reports to us is based on hearsay evidence of the most unsubstantial character. Nor are his motives in compiling the book above suspicion. His position in his monastery was that of sacrist to the martyr, some of whose relics he confesses to have stolen. It was therefore to his direct interest to enhance the sanctity of the particular services on which he

was engaged; and it is for this reason that he enlarges much more upon the miracles than upon the martyrdom.

Nor were the sources from which Thomas got his hearsay evidence less disinterested than himself. For it appears that when the lad's body was discovered by one Henry of Sprowston, on Saturday, March 26, 1144, which was the first day of Passover in that year, he did not even take the trouble to carry the body to Norwich, and only returned on the following (Easter) Monday to give it casual burial. The first suggestion of a "martyrdom" comes from the relatives of the boy, who had missed him in the interim. The family afterwards told a curious story, given by Thomas, to account for the absence of the lad from their house. On Monday, March 21, a mysterious emissary had induced the boy's mother, a widow, to let him go to become a scullion to the Archdeacon of Norwich. This does not agree with another statement which emanated from the family that the boy was seen to enter the Jews' quarter. At any rate, it was not till nearly a week after the boy had left his mother's house that his uncle, his brother, and his cousin, go out to Thorpe Wood to see if the boy whose body had been discovered and already buried, was their little relative. Then follows a most remarkable circumstance. When they removed the earth which had been thrown lightly upon the body it was distinctly seen by them to move twice. This renders it extremely probable that the boy, when found on the Saturday, was not dead at all, but in some cataleptic fit. This is strongly confirmed by the fact, noticed at the time, that there were no signs of decomposition about the body, though, if he had been "murdered" on the preceding Wednesday, almost a week had elapsed. The same idea, indeed, seems to have occurred to the spectators of this striking incident, the boy's own relatives. Yet they took no steps to resuscitate him, but, merely satisfying themselves with his identity, covered the body up again. It is thus probable that the true authors of the death of William of Norwich were his own relatives. Shortly afterwards, Godwin Sturt, the boy's uncle, in open synod of the diocese, accuses the Jews of having murdered little William, and it is at once seen what ecclesiastical capital can be made out of such an accusation. Aimar, Prior of Lewes Priory, at once begs the body for his own priory, and that at once draws the attention of the Norwich authorities to the valuable property they might possess in the lad's remains. They refuse Aimar's request, and give the body burial in the monks' cemetery. The boy's relatives also find their account in the sanctity which little William had acquired. His brother Robert obtained a post in the monastery on the strength of his connexion with the martyr, and his mother had ultimately the distinction of

being buried in the monks' cemetery, much to the scandal of the more sober-minded of the monks. Godwin, the boy's uncle, traded for years on the possession of a gag with which he alleged the boy had been gagged by the Jews. Later on, the same Godwin seemed to have done a thriving trade in providing sacred candles for believers in the martyrdom of St. William. There is a very significant passage on page 192 of this volume in which Godwin, before allowing the teazle or gag to be used, demands to know from a poor woman what offering she had brought to obtain his help. It was thus, undoubtedly, to Godwin Sturt's interest that the death of the boy William should be interpreted as a case of martyrdom, and it is significant that the whole accusation comes from him in the first instance.

When the accusation was brought against the Jews before the Sheriff, he, in accordance with all the law of the time, refused to submit them to the jurisdiction of the Dean and Chapter of Norwich; they had the right to be judged by the King and his judges. They were then asked to submit themselves to ordeal, to which they seemed willing, but only demanded a delay, as was natural, considering the inflamed passions of the mob. The delay was refused them, and the whole of the Jewry of Norwich was taken into the castle for protection. No attempt at any legal proceedings against them was ever afterwards made, a most significant proof to my mind of their entire innocence. The editors have, I think, missed a point with regard to the attitude of the Sheriff towards the Jews. If they had been guilty of murder, it was as much his interest to convict them of it as it was to the interest of the boy's relatives to prove a martyrdom. One of the earliest items relating to Jews in the Pipe Rolls refers to the enormous fine of 2,000 marks paid by the Jews of London for killing a man. The Sheriff would have been able to pay the whole ferm of his county if he could have convicted the Jews of Norwich of murder. The fact that the Sheriff and his brother were afterwards shown to be deeply indebted to the Jews was another proof that it was not from motives of interest that the Sheriff defended the Jews, and persisted in declaring their innocence.

The evidence against them which Thomas of Monmouth was enabled to scrape together is indeed of the flimsiest possible character. The lad was said to have been seen by a cousin of his entering the house of a Jew named Eleazer, afterwards murdered by one of his debtors. That fact is just possible, though the family source of the statement renders it somewhat suspicious. Then a Christian woman, name not given, is said to have caught sight of the boy, crucified, through a chink in the door, and to have

supplied hot water for washing of the body. But this unnamed witness was never produced in any of the proceedings, and readers of *Silas Marner* will remember how rustic witnesses get to believe they have seen whatever they have been asked *if* they have seen. On the other hand, there is a touch of verisimilitude about the hot water which Jews use to bathe dead bodies. Next there is the statement of one Aelward Ded, that he had met some Jews carrying the corpse in a sack to Thorpe Wood. This statement was only made on his deathbed five years afterwards, when Ded explained his intermediate silence by threats from the Sheriff, though the said Sheriff had been then dead three years. Now the finding of the body in Thorpe Wood is to my mind one of the strongest points against any connexion of the Jews with the deed. Thorpe Wood is on the opposite side of the town from the Jewry, and to convey the body there the Jews would have had to pass through the whole of the English burg, whereas it would have been much easier for them to have deposited the body in the grove on their side of the town. If Aelward Ded did actually make such a deathbed confession, it is almost the sole hint we have of the true author of the mischief which threw little William into a state of catalepsy. If the family story was true that William had gone as scullion to the Archdeacon of Norwich, that would, at any rate, account for the boy being in Thorpe Wood. Finally, we have the statement of Theobald, a renegade Jew of Cambridge, that it was the custom among Jews to sacrifice a boy for Passover in some European city fixed by lot, and that the lot, which had been taken at Narbonne, had fallen upon Norwich. It is this statement that is the foundation of the myth of the Blood Accusation.

I observe that Mr. Zangwill, in reviewing the book, cast doubt on the very existence of this Theobald of Cambridge, but there is one point in his so-called statement which could scarcely have been invented by Thomas, for the latter was not likely to have known that Narbonne was the chief seat of Jewish learning at the time. Our editors have a suggestion that the only previous case known of Jews murdering a Christian lad, and mentioned by Socrates, the ecclesiastical historian, was possibly part of a Purim frolic. Now I should imagine that the statement which Thomas puts into Theobald's mouth might have been a wilful misunderstanding of some such reference. On his part, Theobald may have stated that the Jews pretended to hang boys as Haman, but really in mockery of Christ. Both Thomas and William's family would have found it to their interest to describe it as a custom of the Jews to hang Christian boys in mockery of Christ. Altogether there seem two alternative

explanations of the facts, as far as we can extract them out of the mixture of hearsay and concoction given us by Thomas of Monmouth. Either the lad William really became a scullion of the Archdeacon, and fell into a cataleptic fit while taking a walk in Thorpe Wood, perhaps on being frightened by the appearance of Aelward Ded, or he fell into the fit while visiting Eleazer's house in the Jewry, and the Jews, in fear of complications, removed his body to Thorpe Wood. Against the former supposition is the absence of any evidence that he ever did make his appearance in the Archdeacon's house; against the latter view is the unlikelihood of the Jews carrying the lad's body right across the city when they could just as easily have deposited it just outside the Jewry. The editors seem inclined on the whole to think that something was done to the boy by the Jews either by accident or in some grim jest. But they have not taken into account the difficulty of the place of discovery, if the Jews had anything to do with it, nor do they attach sufficient significance to the probability of the boy being alive even on the Easter Tuesday, though they appear to think it probable (p. lxix). The difficulty of the whole case is, as the editors observe, attribution of the crime, if it was a crime, as a ritual murder to the Jews. If the myth had already been in existence, one could easily understand it being applied afresh to the Norwich Jews with the disappearance of the lad William. Now the myth was started by William's family, who were all ecclesiastics. The boy's body is found, with the head shaven or tonsured, and with marks of punctures by thorns, on the Saturday after Good Friday. The probability of some form of crucifixion having been gone through with the body is considerably raised by this fact, if we can trust to it. Now, if Jews resorted to such a measure, it could only be out of mere wanton cruelty and hatred; but cannot we imagine fanatical Christians, of a low degree of culture, deriving from their crass views about the crucifixion that salvation will be brought down upon a lad and his family by undergoing the *form* of crucifixion on Good Friday? Cases have been known even of men committing suicide by crucifying themselves, and it is a well-known principle of folklore that the folk-mind considers a form as good as the reality. Suppose such an idea to have existed in William's family, suppose them to have gone through the form of crucifixion with the little lad on Good Friday, and a cataleptic fit to have supervened while the poor little lad was on the cross, almost all the facts of the case would be explained. The lies told by the family to account for his disappearance, the attribution by the family to the Jews of an idea which would be unfamiliar and repugnant to the Jews, but quite familiar and natural to themselves, the tonsured

scalp, the discovery the day after Good Friday in Thorpe Wood, near the boy's own home, the callousness with which no attempt was made to resuscitate the boy after rumours had been spread about attributing his disappearance to the Jews, and the absence of any pressure on the part of the family to bring the Jews to any form of trial involving the taking of evidence. One can also understand from this point of view how the family would attempt to get from some converted Jew or other some plausible support for their concocted accusation. On the whole this suggestion seems to me to account for more of the facts than the view favoured by our editors —that the lad had fallen a victim to some ill-treatment on the part of the Jews. This does not account for the crucial difficulty of the whole question, the rise of the myth; for one does not see why William's family, in that case, did not accuse the Jews of murder pure and simple. If they had themselves attempted some form of crucifixion-ritual, with which they would be perfectly familiar, why should they have attributed it to the Jews?

On the whole the probabilities, to my mind, are that the lad William of Norwich was not directly murdered by any one, but fell into a cataleptic fit while undergoing the form of crucifixion at the hands of his own relatives, who thought they were increasing his and their sanctity by going through the process with him which, to their minds, had brought salvation and sanctity to the whole world. When the mock crucifixion seemed to have turned into a real one, owing to the boy's fit, they determined to remove suspicion from themselves by attributing to the Jews a travesty of the feeling in their own mind. William was indeed a martyr, but a martyr to Christian, not to Jewish, bigotry.

The fact that the boy was alive when reburied by his relatives throws, to my mind, a flood of light upon the whole problem. Whoever shaved his head, and crowned him with thorns, and gagged him, must have done so without any ultimate intention of finally silencing him by murder. They must therefore have had confidence in being able to preserve the boy's silence, even after he had been released from the cross, supposing him to have gone through some form of crucifixion. Now the Jews could have had no hold upon the boy, and would have been obliged to have silenced him by murder if the accusation of the family were true. But William's own relatives might have felt confident that they could keep him quiet, or might quite readily have been willing for the boy to tell his tale, if they thought that that would add to his and their sanctity. If therefore the boy was alive when reburied on the Tuesday by his relatives, it could only have been his family who had gone through the process

of crucifying with him, if any such process was undergone by the poor little lad.

JOSEPH JACOBS.

STRACK'S "BIBLICAL ARAMAIC."

Grammatik des Biblischen Aramäisch mit den nach Handschriften berichtigten Texten und einem Wörterbuch, von PROF. DR. HERMANN L. STRACK. Leipzig, 1897. (38+46 pp.[1])

IT need only be said of this little volume that it fully confirms its author's great reputation as a practical scholar and teacher to ensure it a hearty welcome. For in whatever mood we find the Professor—whether as a controversialist relentlessly hostile to Jew-baiters in general and to ex-Court-Chaplain Stöcker in particular, or shattering with one mighty blow the whole fabric of the Blood Accusation myth, or in his quieter moods as Hebrew grammarian, exegetist, Talmudist, or palaeographist—all his works are stamped with the well-known impress of German learning. In the wonderfully cheap, compact, and scholarly book before me Prof. Strack has furnished students with ample material for the study of the Aramaic portions of the Old Testament (Ezra iv. 7–vi. 18 and vii. 11–28; Dan. ii. 1–vii. 28; Gen. xxxi. 47; and Jer. x. 11). In the preface our author informs us that as long ago as 1879 he formed the idea of writing a Biblical-Aramaic Grammar, but postponed his work for fear of clashing with the work of his friend, Prof. Kautszch. His fears were groundless; both grammars are entirely independent of each other, and are, in fact, treated from a different standpoint. Strack's grammar is intended for beginners, whilst the elaborate grammar of Prof. Kautzsch, with its detailed study of the syntax and full introduction to the comparative study of the Aramaic group of languages, caters for advanced students. Our text is based upon that of Baer's edition; when the readings differ, Strack's is superior. Baer's variants are given in the foot-notes. Our author has, however, omitted to mention that Baer gives תְּעֲרֵה (with ה) in Dan. vi. 13, and בְּשִׁפְרַפַּרָא (with small and large פ) in Dan. vi. 20. The two editions should be used side by side. Baer gives a fuller list of paradigms, and a complete account of the Massoretic notes and variant readings of Ben-Asher and Ben-Naphtali. Strack does not give the tonic accents, nor does he vocalize the numerous *Kethibs* which abound in the Books of Daniel and Ezra. The new edition has two more paragraphs in the grammatical portion of the work—§ 1, which is

[1] A review of the first edition of this work, by Prof. Bacher, appeared in *J. Q. R.*, vol. VIII, p. 505.

introductory and gives the literature upon the subject, and § 11, on the prepositions. The literature is fairly complete, although it is surprising that such names as Pusey, Cheyne, and Driver, are omitted. A third edition will probably be called for, when our author may find occasion to insert three new paragraphs on the adverbs, conjunctions, and the agreements and disagreements of the Aramaic of Daniel and Ezra, such as the exclusive use by Ezra of the pronominal forms לְהוֹם and לְכוֹם, הִמּוֹ, דֵּךְ, and by Daniel of הִמּוֹן, דָּא, אִלֵּין, דִּכֵּן, the employment of the adverbs אָזְפַּרְנָא and אַדַּרְזְדָא by Ezra, and the reason why Daniel uses נְוָלִי and Ezra נְוָלוּ. Many scholars have regarded the pronominal forms with *mem* as Hebraisms, but the Nabataean Inscriptions have הום, corresponding to the forms in Ezra, whilst the Palmyrene Inscriptions use הון, as we find in Daniel. The use of the Hofal Conjugation and of final ה (for א) proves that these forms were in use in some of the Aramaic dialects, and that it was only when the language became well worn that ה was weakened to א, and מ to נ. We have no more right to call such instances Hebraisms than to dub the O. E. *ich* a Germanism. On page 13 attention is drawn to the fact that שׁ is more original than ס, which almost supersedes it in the Targum. The two letters had originally different sounds, but were soon confused. The Palmyrene Inscriptions and the Sendschirli make use of שׁ. We may also compare the miscellaneous use of שׁ and ס in the Phoenician Inscription of King Eshmunazar and in the Marseilles Votive Table, in which we find עַסַר, יְשָׁא, וְהַשְׁלָבִים, and יַעֲמָם side by side. Bevan (*The Book of Daniel*, p. 39) has pointed out that Prof. Kautzsch was mistaken in regarding the use of שׁ in Daniel and Ezra as due to Hebrew influence. Biblical Aramaic is naturally affected to a certain extent by Hebrew, but the influence has been greatly exaggerated. The use of Sheva Compositum and the few traces of the Pausal influence are distinct Hebraisms. But we must be very cautious. Who would think that such apparently pure Hebrew forms as אָנֹכְ, גַּם, הָרַג, בְּפֶן, נָתַן (the Targums always use יְהַב for the perfect; cf. my Targum of Onkelos to Genesis, p. 69), אָשָׁם, אָלָה, זָר occur in the Aramaic Sendschirli Inscription? A very important addition is the collation of the British Museum MS. Or. 2,374. This is one of the celebrated MSS. from Yemen with superlinear vocalization. It is of very great importance for the criticism of the text. Some time ago I compared this MS. with Baer's edition, and found about 150 variations, mostly slight, but some of importance. This MS. pays no attention to the *Kethib*, but inserts the *Qere* in the body of the text. Thus in Daniel ii. 33 this MS. reads מִנְהוֹן, whilst our texts have מִנְהֵין (*Qere*) and

מנהון (*Kethib*). This would go towards proving that in the Aramaic of the Bible and the Targums the suffixes הון and כון, as well as the suffix of the third person plural of the imperfect ון. are really of common gender. Unfortunately, Prof. Strack was only able to make use of this MS. in the grammar, the text being already in print before he received the collation. But as it is unique in more ways than one (cf. Dalman's note on p. 56 of his grammar), it is advisable to use it for the text too. On p. 5 of the preface our author promises us a new edition of the text, when this MS., as well as others, will be collated. The following table exhibits some of the differences:—

Or. 2,374.		Strack.	
דִּילֵיהּ	(Dan. ii. 20)	דִּי־ לֵהּ	
מָאנְדִי	(ii. 28)	מָה דִּי	
מִכָּל	(ii. 30)	מִן־ כָּל	
דִּילָא	(Dan. ii. 34)	דִּי לָא	
וְגָלָא	(ii. 48)	וְגָלָה	
with Patach: וּצְלַם	(iii. 19)	וּצְלֵם	with Tzere
with Patach: יְרוּשְׁלַם	(vi. 11)	יְרוּשְׁלֵם	with Tzere
פּוּקוֹ	(iii. 26)	פְּקוֹ	
with Qametz: עָל	(ii. 26)	עַל	with Patach
with Qametz: זְמָן	(ii. 26)	זְמַן	with Patach
with Qametz: רַעְנָן	(iv. 1)	רַעֲנַן	with Patach
יְדִי	(iii. 15)	יְדִי	
יַדְעַת	(iv. 6)	יְדַעַת	
שַׁמְתָּ	(iii. 10)	שָׂמְתָּ	
עַמִיקָתָא	(ii. 22)	עֲמִיקָתָא	
כַּרְבְּלָתְהוֹן	(iii. 21)	וְכַרְבְּלָתְהוֹן	
וְעָפְיָה	(iv. 9)	עָפְיֵהּ	

And there are other differences. It is advisable to warn the reader to master the abbreviations on page 47 before commencing to read the grammar, for they are indeed a little bewildering. It is remarkable that our author has managed to find space for the insertion of some of the latest results obtained by the decipherment of the Aramaic inscriptions, and for frequent references to Syriac. The text of Daniel and Ezra is printed in clear, bold type, and the footnotes are not only of critical, but also of historical and literary interest. I had occasion to look into twenty MSS. of the Hagio-

grapha, which are among the British Museum treasures, and was surprised to find how they differed. The verse I examined was Daniel vii. 23. The punctuation of some of the scribes appeared, at first sight, to be entirely arbitrary; to choose the best requires an endowment of exceptional critical discernment. I merely mention this to show what industry and ability is compressed into this little volume. The author refers for Targum readings to Merx's *Chrestomathy*, but this is a work which must be used with the utmost discretion on account of the number of copyists' errors it contains. I have made a full list of corrections which Prof. Merx hopes soon to publish as an appendix to his book. If the instances could be found in Dalman's *Aramäische Dialektproben*, it would certainly be preferable to use that compilation. In the lists of the interchanges between Hebrew and Aramaic consonants our author might have included ב and פ as in בַּרְזֶל and פַּרְזֶל, ו and ב as in נְוָלִי and נָבָל, and א and י as in יֵשׁ and אִיתַי, אוֹתָם and יְתָהוֹן. The vocabulary is for beginners only; there is little, if any, attempt at etymology. Is אַרְקָא (Jer. x. 11) merely a hardening of אַרְעָא, which is itself a softening from אֶרֶץ (Arabic أَرْضٌ with ض)? This interchange of ע and ק occurs in the Sendschirli Inscription, and Kautzsch compares the Aramaic עֲטַר, to smoke, with the Hebrew קְטֹר for a similar interchange. But perhaps עֲטַר = Hebrew עָשָׁן, just as תְּרִין = Hebrew שְׁנַיִם. The interchange of ת and ט as in Hebrew קָטַל, Arabic قَتَلَ, is fairly common. But probably such questions as these are beyond the modest scope of this work. Our author agrees with Meinhold and Bevan that the forms לָהֶוָא, לָהֶוֵה, לָהֶוֹן, לָהֶוֶן, are written with ל to avoid writing the Tetragrammaton. According to Gesenius the ל is here a particle meaning "that," "in order that," after which the י is dropped. The foreign words are noted, and a *circulus criticus* placed over those words which are quoted in the vocabulary, but do not occur in the text. The method of the grammar is, on the whole, thoroughly practical, although it would be preferable to arrange the paradigms in vertical, instead of horizontal, columns. Apart from such trifling details, the grammar may be cordially recommended to beginners. It is a marvel of cheapness, learning, lucidity, and conciseness, and supplies a real and long-felt want.

H. BARNSTEIN.

ERRATUM.—Throughout the article beginning on p. 491 read David di Rossi for Moses di Rossi.