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THE ZIONIST PERIL.

It is no light thing to undertake the indictment of a great movement inspired by indubitable public spirit and singleness of purpose. I may therefore be forgiven if I venture to say a word or two of the circumstances which have gradually made of me a convinced and uncompromising anti-Zionist.

I began with an open mind, but one in which the bias was not indistinctly favourable to Dr. Herzl. When doubts of the practicability of the idea began to dawn upon me I abstained from expressing them, because I felt that the enthusiasm and racial solidarity stimulated by the movement should not be lightly discouraged. Since then, however, the energy of the Zionists and their aggressive realism have forced into the foreground of Jewish politics certain practical aspects of the question, which must lead every Jew to ask himself whither the new enthusiasm and its resultant racial solidarity are leading. Is the scheme itself possible or desirable? If it is not possible, how is the striving for it affecting our present position in the world and our more manifest destiny? When the inevitable crash of disillusionment comes, will it leave us better or worse off? These and similar questions have much exercised my mind during the last few months, and I feel they are questions to which no Jew who has a real interest...
in his people, in their history and their mission, should postpone a definite answer.

Two practical aspects of the Zionist movement first induced me to enter the field of controversy against the followers of Dr. Herzl. Both were essentially tactical, and neither at first sight involved a decision on the main issue. The first was the attempted raid of Mr. Zangwill—the confessedly irresponsible and irrepressible "Dr. Jim" of Herzlian politics—on the funds of the Jewish Colonization Association (I.C.A.), picturesquely described as "The Hirsch Millions." The second was the scheme for the establishment of a Jewish Ghetto in East Africa under the guise of a "Nacht-Asyl für Jerusalem." Of the East African scheme I shall have something to say at length presently.

The raid on the I.C.A. could not but arouse my antagonism, because in the first place I knew that the case by which it was supported was founded in error, and in the second place I viewed with alarm the possibility of squandering, on vague and nebulous political adventures, funds which were expressly excluded from such application both by the letter of the endowment and the intention of the founder, and which were already doing much practical good, and were capable of a great deal more in the visible future. It seemed to me that as between the substance and the shadow no practical man ought to hesitate. Mr. Zangwill supported his demands by two main allegations, both of which I denied. The first was that the I.C.A. was a failure, that it was doing virtually nothing, and that the proposed extension of its functions was in itself a confession of incompetency. In denying these statements at the time, I relied merely on a comparison of the reports of the I.C.A. with those of the Zionist organizations—on the one hand, together with the acknowledgment of many inevitable difficulties and disappointments, a splendid record of fruitful activity in the shape of agricultural colonies actually established, numerous schools founded and subventioned, many loan banks in
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beneficent operation, and gigantic streams of emigration methodically organized, equipped, and directed; on the other, only a number of sterile debating societies and Dr. Herzl's ever recurring Mañana. Since then I have had an opportunity of looking more closely into the matter, and quite recently, in Roumania, I have seen the I.C.A. at work. It is not too much to say that already that great work has brought the Roumanian question—one of the main perplexities of the Jewish people during the last forty years—within measurable distance of solution, and this is not merely my opinion, but the universal opinion of the Jews of Roumania themselves. This is one of the things that the I.C.A. has been doing while the Zionists have been dreaming.

Mr. Zangwill's second contention was that, in a more or less unconscious way, Baron de Hirsch was himself a Zionist, and that had he lived to know Dr. Herzl's scheme, and to witness its progress, he would have unhesitatingly given his millions to the Zionist exchequer. Only quite recently, I see that on the strength of a good-natured letter to a Palestine Colonization Association, something of the same idea has been repeated, and conclusions have been drawn from it which are absolutely unwarranted. When I placed against this assumption the evidence of Baron de Hirsch's reiterated statements to me and others, I was informed by Mr. Zangwill that the Baron could have known nothing of Zionism, since it was not invented until after his death. Let me once for all put an end to this error. Dr. Herzl's scheme existed long before the death of Baron de Hirsch, and Dr. Herzl even consulted Baron de Hirsch in the summer of 1895 with regard to it, and solicited his support. The documents and correspondence relating to this negociation are still in existence, and I do not make this statement without having seen them. I refer to this controversy, however, not so much for the purpose of establishing an historical fact as of illustrating the sort of practical experience which must
necessarily force the Jewish community to make up its mind on the Zionist question. The effect of the I.C.A. controversy, so far as I am concerned, was to awaken in me a keen sense of the danger of wasting in wild and impracticable dreams energies and resources which are required, and are being fruitfully used for the solution of more urgent problems. The East African scheme carried me still more deeply to the perils of the whole movement.

The starting-point of any satisfactory inquiry into the validity of the case put forward by the Zionists—setting aside the barren arguments based on highly controversial questions of Biblical prophecy—must be a clear perception of the leading principles of Jewish history during the last hundred years, and a definite answer to the question whether the main strivings of the Jews during that period have succeeded, or whether they have failed as disastrously as Dr. Herzl's followers—rather than Dr. Herzl himself—would have us believe.

A hundred years ago a new hope dawned in Jewry. Its objective was indicated by the famous treatise "Über die bürgerliche Verbesserung der Juden," written at the instance of Moses Mendelssohn, by Christian Wilhelm Dohm. Its means were illustrated by Mendelssohn himself in his still more famous translation of the Bible into classical German. These two works pointed the way to the new life. They virtually bade the Jews accept their dispersion as, humanly speaking, an irrevocable fact, and to give the only possible logical effect to it by demanding political rights and social incorporation at the hands of the nations among whom the inscrutable accidents of history had distributed them. At the same time they recognized that the success of emancipation largely depended on the Jews themselves, and they consequently urged the necessity of practical steps in the way of social assimilation. It is worth noticing that this teaching was no sensational panacea advertised from the housetops by practised demagogues. It grew slowly and unostentatiously
out of the irresistible nature of things, and it manifested itself less by showy expositions of its aims than by its material fruits. It was through the silent influence of Mendelssohn's fine character on men like Lessing and Lavater, through the educational schemes of Hartwig Wessely and the school system of Herz Homberg, through the stimulus given to Jewish culture, and to a more public-spirited discretion in the conception of Judaism itself by David Friedländer, Isaac Enchel, Solomon Maimon, and Lazarus Bendavid, that the new departure established itself almost without the consciousness of a wrench.

Those who to-day would hint a doubt as to the value of the services rendered by these men will do well to bear in mind the evils from which they rescued the Jewish people—evils which have a very decided bearing on the possible failure of the new Zionism to-day. It was the period so graphically described by Graetz as that of the "Allgemeine Verwilderung." The last attempt at the re-nationalization of Judaism by Sabbethai Zevi had failed disastrously, and even ignominiously. Despair had fastened on the whole of Jewry. Its denizens looked blankly to the future and saw no glimmer of hope. The fine intellects which had produced the poets and philosophers of the Middle Ages, which even in the bitterest anguish of persecution had flung the gauntlet in the teeth of a persecuting world by means of Piyutim palpitating with defiance and instinct with poetic beauty, and by polemical defences of Judaism courageous to the verge of blasphemy, were now running riot in Cabalistical extravagance, were palsied by an ingrowing and stagnant bigotry or were engaged in mumbling the catchwords of misunderstood litanies as a sort of spiritual soporific. Renationalization had been the only hope, and it had proved a mocking phantom. It had been shown to be impossible, not only for political reasons, but because the Jews themselves had ceased to possess the elements of a revival of their national life. They were scattered, divided, and polyglot. Even
where they chiefly congregated their Ghetto experiences had transformed them into a people quite different from that which had migrated from Judea eighteen centuries before. Their habits, their customs, their very vernaculars were so many badges of a status which had no place in the existing constitution of society or in the scheme of historic progress. They were, in short, at the turning-point of a road which led direct to barbarization. It was from this terrible situation that what we call to-day the Mendelssohnian Movement rescued us. The remedies it employed were, in the domain of religion, a new steadiness founded in reasonable theology and historical study, and, in the domain of politics, local assimilation and emancipation. These have been the ends for which the last three generations of Jews have mainly striven.

Now what we are asked by the Zionists of the practical school to believe is that these aims have proved the emptiest of delusions. At first we were told that the appeal for nationalization did not necessarily address itself to the Western Jew who felt secure in his emancipation; but this assurance was only a lingering relic of Dr. Herzl's original scheme, which contemplated a prosaic refuge for persecuted Jews without any essential Zionist significance, and it has long ago been abandoned at the bidding of the zealots, and under the influence of the romantic pessimism of Dr. Nordau and Mr. Zangwill. The new Zionist postulate is that Judaism is decaying; that emancipation is a fraud, and that assimilation is an ethnical impossibility. Are these contentions justified? Have we really made no substantial progress since the "Allgemeine Verwilderung" of a hundred years ago? Can it honestly be said, as we count up the gains of that period, that what we have won was not worth fighting for, that we are none the better for it, that there is no hope of a final triumph, and that once more we must perforce turn Jewish history topsy-turvy if we are to save Judaism and the Jewish people from extinction?
I think we need only state the question in some such terms as these to realize its inherent absurdity. Think for a moment what we have done in these hundred years. Our legal emancipation has been won in every civilized country in the world except Russia, Roumania, and Turkey, and in those lands we are refused our political rights only by virtue of a retrograde doctrine of nationality, which is itself one of the chief inspirations of Zionism. As for the alleged unreality and possible reversal of these emancipations we may easily reassure ourselves. Broadly speaking our victories were due, not to any special tolerance or sympathy for the Jewish people, but to a revolution in the conception of nationality which is fundamental to the modern constitution of society. Religious toleration and the acceptance of naturalization in lieu of the old doctrine of the indelibility of allegiance were the principles which governed Jewish emancipation. They established a sort of economic Brotherhood of Man in place of the old theologico-racial classification of nations. Consequently it is impossible to repeal the emancipations of dissenting religious communities, or even to hinder their full development without seriously imperilling the new and already deeply rooted national principles.

There is of course a Zionist answer to this argument. It generally takes the complimentary form of a more or less implied assimilation of the Jewish problem to the Negro and Chinese problems in the United States. Once the nations realize, it is said, that the Jews are as un-assimilable as the Black and Yellow races, they will assuredly exclude them from all terms of political and social equality. This is, no doubt, true, but what is not true is that the contingency here contemplated is ever likely to arise. The conclusion is accurate enough, but the premise is illusory. The Jews are certainly not as unassimilable as the Black and Yellow races, for the simple reason that nature has made them white men, and given them physical and mental characteristics closely
resembling those of many of the European races among whom they dwell, while history has made them Europeans of nearly two thousand years' residence. This at once opens an indispensable door to assimilation which the Black and Yellow races do not possess.

Nevertheless it is urged that the Jews are "anthropologically a separate race," and that as long as they do not marry with non-Jews it is hopeless to expect their complete emancipation with their fellow citizens of other races and creeds. It is a pity that the gentlemen who formulate these crude statements do not dip occasionally into some elementary manual of anthropology. What is an "anthropologically separate race"? The anthropologists themselves have never been able to tell us. Is the Jewish race "anthropologically separate" from what is known as the Aryan race? The scientists are as a Babel of controversy on the question, although every Zionist platform orator thinks himself competent to formulate an affirmative answer as axiomatic. Nevertheless the balance of evidence is against the separate race theory. So far as the Bible can guide us, it distinctly shows that the Jews were of Aryan origin, and that anthropologically they were in a state of flux until after the return from Babylon, when Ezra and the High Priests organized Judaism. What happened to them then has happened to every organized religious community in the world since. A centripetal anthropological movement set in. In this way what is called "the Jewish race" was formed. But strictly speaking it is not a race. It is merely a religious community of great antiquity, which in consequence of intermarriage during some two thousand three hundred years has acquired a more fixed physical type than younger religious communities of white men. Given the same age and the same harsh history, and other religious communities would develop for themselves a racial identity not less marked than that of the Jews.

The European Jews then are a religious community of
white men not essentially different from the European Roman Catholics and Protestants. Still we are told by the Zionists that their complete assimilation as Europeans must be impossible as long as they set their faces against mixed marriages. The etymology and sociology of the Zionists are apparently not less crude than their anthropology. They have yet to master the meaning of the word "assimilation," of which they talk and write so glibly. They have an idea that assimilation and fusion mean the same thing. No sensible man dreams of requiring the Jews to fuse with the Christians. Even M. de Plehve told me that he did not contemplate such a thing, or regard it as indispensable to the solution of the Jewish question in Russia. All that assimilation means, is that the Jews shall become good citizens in the same way as Roman Catholics are good citizens in England and Protestants are good citizens in France. That is that they shall adopt the social manners and customs, and share in the unsectarian interests, traditions, hopes, and ideals of their non-Jewish fellow citizens. Intermarriage is no bar to this assimilation. If it were the English Roman Catholics who were "spaniolized," as Cromwell said, by persecution in the seventeenth century, and the French Protestants who were the sans-patries of the sixteenth century would still be outcasts in their respective countries. For it must be remembered that the prohibition of mixed marriages—that is of anthropological fusion—is common to all the great religions, and to many of their subdivisions. Thus in Germany to-day 953 Protestants and 882 Roman Catholics out of every 1000 marry Protestants and Roman Catholics respectively, while the proportion of Jewish intermarriages is not more than 961 in every thousand. In other words, the intensity of the so-called racial separatism of the Jews is a question of eight per mille or four-fifths per cent. It is on this minute difference that the portentous Zionist theory of our unassimilability is founded!
But the most conclusive answer to the doctrine of Jewish unassimilability is the proof the Jews have already given of their facile adaptation to new environments. The modern Jew, even in the most grotesque caricature which the anti-Semites draw of him, bears but little resemblance to his Western Asiatic ancestors. The evil qualities and strange customs which are held to illustrate his unassimilability are not Asiatic, but exclusively European. They are the results of his long seclusion by methods which are part and parcel of European history. He wears garments which are a relic of arrested assimilation at the moment when the days of Polish liberty were violently ended. His dialects are largely formed of the German of the Minnesingers which had become his vernacular before the Ghetto closed upon him, or the archaic Castilian which his forefathers spoke before Torquemada hounded them out of Spain. His very cookery-book is a patchwork of recipes gathered from every European country in brighter days. Under oppressions which would have extirpated a less assimilable race, he has turned successively from agriculture to industry, and from industry to trade. He has even made himself a new literature out of the unpromising materials of his Ghetto history and jargons, covering the whole gamut of human emotion and thought. Is not all this a triumphant demonstration of his ready adaptability to his European environment? And has he shown any symptoms during the last hundred years of a decay of this extraordinary faculty of assimilation? Weed out from the Jewish communities of the West the Polish immigrants who are still in their first generation and judge for yourselves. Only a hundred years, remember, since this emancipation movement began; scarcely fifty since the last Ghetto gates were for ever levelled with the dust; and look at the part he has played in the national lives of the countries which have allowed him to imbibe their spirit! If Germany honours Heine as her greatest poet since Goethe, if France declares Catulle Mendès to
be the literary heir of Victor Hugo, if England venerates 
the memory of Lord Beaconsfield as the illustrious states-
man who preserved the historic continuity of British 
political institutions in the age of Democratic revolution, 
are not these all unimpeachable certificates of the assimila-
bility of the Jew, and of his congenital sympathy with 
the highest forms of the civilizations with which he is 
brought in contact? I will say nothing of the cruel irony 
which has made Theodor Herzl the most popular feuille-
tonist in Central Europe, and which ranks Israel Zangwill 
among the half a dozen leading novelists of the Anglo-
Saxon world, for they are both friends of mine, and I 
should be sorry to indulge in personalities which might 
cause them pain. But the fact remains that the assimila-
bility of the Jew is far beyond the reach of reasonable 
doubt, and if we may judge by our experience of the 
last hundred years it will soon be beyond the reach of 
wrongheaded cavil.

But I have not yet done with the case of the Zionists 
against the Mendelssohnian settlement. An ounce of 
fact, they will doubtless say, is worth a ton of theory. 
Even though it might be disastrous to do anything which 
would discredit the liberal principles in virtue of which 
the Jews have been emancipated, and though it might 
also be difficult to refute the evidence of the right of the 
Jews, legal and moral, to the privileges of citizens and 
the courtesies of social recognition,—still the European 
public do not think so, and this is demonstrated by the 
rise and progress of anti-Semitism in Western Europe 
during the last quarter of a century, and by the tenacity 
with which the Jews are still refused any status but that 
of helots in Russia and Roumania.

I am not daunted by this argument. The anti-Semitic 
movement in Western Europe is very largely artificial. 
It is the outcome of conditions which are essentially 
transitory—the interaction of the nationalist Romanticism 
which was stimulated by the wars of the second half of
the nineteenth century, and the retarded assimilation of the Jewish element let loose by the sudden political emancipation only some fifty years ago, and by the continuous renewal of the unassimilated contingent ever since from over the Russian frontier. The old-world prejudices thus revived have been fomented by political factions for their own purposes rather than because of any genuine belief in the Semitic peril. There is nothing in all this to cause serious alarm, and certainly no reason to despair of a favourable solution. Already the signs of decay in organized anti-Semitism are very pronounced, as measured by its parliamentary representation, and this notwithstanding that the assimilation problem still presents difficulties. Moreover, the hard-shell nationalist movements are romantic anachronisms very much akin to Zionism itself, and they are bound eventually to give way to the dominating economic forces which are making everywhere for the greater tolerance of the stranger, and consequently for mixed nationalities. The real difficulty is, of course, with the continuous migration from Russia where the Pale of Settlement is one huge reservoir of Jews in a condition of arrested assimilation. But here also I am not without hope.

Before I deal with the Russian and Roumanian questions it will be convenient to sum up briefly the conclusions at which I have so far arrived. I pointed out in the early part of this paper that Zionism is an avowed negation of the policy of local emancipation which has been the leading principle of Jewish history during the last century, and that it is attempted to justify it by the contentions that the Jews have proved an unassimilable element among the non-Jewish nations, that consequently their emancipations are imperfect, and can never be completed in the spirit, and that as a further result Judaism itself has degenerated into little more than a fetish. So far as Western Europe is concerned I think I have adduced good reason for believing that the first and second of these
Zionist contentions are unfounded. The Jew has brilliantly vindicated the wisdom of the emancipation policy by the most remarkable demonstrations of his assimilability. Politically emancipation is a solid reality which is not likely ever to be disturbed, and there is every reason to hope that with time its social completion will become not less perfect. Of the belief that Judaism itself is decaying I have so far said nothing, because, as I will presently show, the whole Zionist theory is largely based on a misconception of the evolution of the religious mission of Israel. For the moment I will content myself with pointing out how completely the vaticinations of the early emancipation pessimists in regard to Judaism have been exploded. Was it not Boerne who compared the orthodox Jew under persecution to a wayfarer who draws his cloak more closely round him the more furiously the wind blows and who prophesied that as soon as the storm of persecution abated, and the sun of freedom shone, the same Jew would cast his cloak of orthodoxy from him? Well, a hundred years have passed in the sunshine of growing freedom, and the Jew still wears that cloak, more proudly, more earnestly, more intelligently than in the old days. Mr. Zangwill has accounted for this phenomenon by saying that it is a wretched thing for a religion to be saved by its fools. The gibe is not complimentary to many earnest and convinced Jews, who are not only among his most attached friends, but are also in the foremost rank of his intelligent admirers.

Russia and Roumania constitute the strongest cards of the Zionists. It is in those countries that they find the larger part of their membership, and that they seem to perceive the most convincing proofs of the hopelessness of the emancipation movement, and of the ingrained un-assimilability of the Jews. The fact that the Zionists are comparatively numerous in Russia is scarcely surprising, for there are six millions of Jews in the country mostly orthodox. I am tempted to requote Mr. Zangwill's
Carlylean definition of the orthodox Jew to which I just referred as a further reason for the Zionist strength in Russia, but as a matter of fact the orthodox Jew in Russia is an anti-Zionist.

With regard to emancipation and assimilation, my first reason for refusing to acquiesce in the Zionist contention in regard to Russia is that that Empire is not exempt from the law of political progress by which the whole of the Western world is governed. It is, of course, possible that Prince Uchtomsky's dream of a reversion of Russia to its primitive Asiatic condition may one day be realized, and, in that remote contingency, it would be difficult to forecast the lot of the Jews; but even then it is interesting to note that Prince Uchtomsky has realized that a Russian domination of Asia can only succeed on the condition of complete toleration for all Asiatic religions. Hitherto, however, this has not been the path on which Russia has been travelling. She lags half a century or so (perhaps more) behind Europe, but she is not marching in the contrary direction. So far as the Jews are concerned she is very much in the same position as was Central Europe previously to 1830. She is governed on the principles of which Metternich was then the most conspicuous exponent, and as a consequence she is honeycombed with revolutionary elements precisely in the same way as was Austria three-quarters of a century ago. The parallel is completed by the fact that the Jews are heart and soul with the revolutionary propaganda, and that their own revolutionary organization, the famous Bund, is among the most formidable agencies at work in the transformation of the present régime. During my recent visit to Russia I paid considerable attention to this aspect of the Jewish question, and I regret that the scope of this paper will not permit me to give the results of my investigations in detail. Of this, however, I assured myself: the agencies of progress and liberty in Russia working on the traditional lines of European political
evolution are in an exceedingly hopeful state, and, although in the changed conditions of militarism we cannot expect an exact reproduction in Russia of the events of 1848 in Western Europe, the beneficent results of those events will, I am confident, be attained within a reasonable period of time.

At any rate the Jews themselves do not regard their political prospects in so desperate a light as the Zionists paint them. The idea that there is a powerful demand for Zionism in Russia is altogether a delusion. In the first place the great mass of the Russian and Polish Jews are Chassidim, and they are anti-Zionists to a man. The next most numerous class are the Miznagdim or Conservatives who differ in many things from the Chassidim, but entirely share their aversion to "forcing the hands of Providence" in regard to the destinies of the Jewish people. Both these classes belong, no doubt, to Mr. Zangwill's category of fools, but none the less the fact remains that they form the great majority of unemancipated and unassimilated Jewry, and they will not hear of Zionism under any circumstances. Then there are two schools of Jewish nationalists of considerable influence. The first has for its object the revival of a specifically Hebrew culture as the medium of Jewish life in all its aspects. The second, led by Peretz the jargon poet, refuses to go back to Hebrew culture or to go forward to assimilation with the Gentile, but claims that the Jews in their captivity have developed a new Yiddish culture of their own which ought to be fixed, fertilized and developed. Both these schools have Zionist possibilities, but Zionism is an open question with them and they are quite prepared to work out their destiny in Russia itself.

There remain the great mass of the uneducated and indigent lower classes and the educated middle and upper classes. The lower classes do not understand the question or care to understand it. They have enough to do to scrape together the few kopecks weekly which stand
between them and starvation, and Zionism does not help
them in that quest. The middle and upper classes differ
in their views according to the provinces of the Pale in
which they are domiciled. In the Russian provinces the
middle classes are very largely Zionists and it is there that
Dr. Herzl finds his chief support. But it is not because
they hanker specially for Jerusalem or because they are
conscious of their own unassimilability with the Gentile
that they have embraced Zionism, but because they have
never known any other form of nationality. The Russian
Jews have always been outcasts from the Russian national
life. Zionism has awakened in them an instinct which
hitherto has found no means of expression, and even then
this instinct is less a consciousness of Hebrew nationality
than an indignant protest against the refusal of the
Russians to admit them to Russian nationality. When
I told some well-informed Jewish friends of mine in
Warsaw that M. de Plehve had told me that he counted
on the spread of Zionism in Russia to check Jewish Social-
ism—that is the Jewish striving for political emancipation—
they smiled and assured me that while most of the
Socialists were strong anti-Zionists there were very few
artisan Zionists—as for example the so-called Poelitzin—
who were not affiliated to the Bund. Indeed at the recent
Rabbinical Conference at Grodno the Zionists were all
formally condemned as allies of the Socialists. As for the
upper classes of Jews in Russia they are all confirmed
assimilationists. They believe in civil and religious
emancipation as the only possible solution of the Jewish
question and as a certain means of transforming the
Russian Jew into a Russian patriot. Do not imagine
that the men who hold this view are deficient in Jewish
spirit. Their leader, Baron Horace de Guensburg, is at
once one of the most cultivated of men and one of the
staunchest and most orthodox Jews in the world, a man
whose every heart-throb is with his down-trodden brethren.

How true it is that Zionism has been adopted only as
a factitious substitute by the middle-class Russian Jews,
and that there is really no foundation for the theory of the
unassimilability of the Jewish subjects of the Tsar is shown
by the feebleness of the Zionist movement in Poland. You
have to seek for your Zionists in Warsaw, which is the
largest Kehilla in Europe. Not one of the sixteen Rabbis
of the City favours the movement, and the educated classes
are, almost without exception, aggressively against it. The
reason of this is exceedingly curious. It is not generally
remembered in the West that the Polish Jews have already
a nationality to which they are ardently attached. They
are, in short, Polish citizens. They are proud to remember
that they have a history in Poland, that for centuries they
played a part in the national life of the country, that they
fought gallantly for its independence and that in the most
tragical period of its history when their blood was mingling
with that of their Christian neighbours on the battle-field,
they were made Polish citizens by a Polish Ukase which
has never been repealed although the Russians have chosen
to ignore it. Thousands still living lost fathers and
brothers in the insurrection of 1863. To them Zionism
offers no attraction. The independence of Poland is their
political ideal. They speak only Polish among themselves,
and they use every effort to teach it to their children, and
to the Yiddish-speaking children of their poor, although the
language is almost excluded from the schools. They are
sturdy assimilationists, but only as far as Poland is
concerned; and they persist in this patriotic attitude in
spite of the anti-Semitism which is officially stimulated
and nursed by the Russian authorities in Poland, and in
spite of the fact that if they chose to throw in their lot
with the Russian Government it would certainly bring
them much material advantage. I know of no more
eloquent vindication of the assimilability of the Jew than
the really heroic attitude of our Polish coreligionists.

These, then, are the results of my Russian investigations:
The chances of emancipation are by no means desperate,
and the capacity of the Russian Jew for assimilation is in no way inferior to that of his Western coreligionists. The local demand for Zionism is comparatively small, and what there is of it is confined to the Russians, as distinct from the Poles, and they would become Russian citizens to-morrow if they had the chance. But even were the situation otherwise, the magnitude of the Russo-Jewish question excludes Zionism or any other scheme of emigration from the category of effective remedies.

In Roumania, I am sorry to say, I omitted to take any notes of the Zionist movement. There was the less necessity to do so, however, since on all hands I heard that the situation of the Jews had greatly improved. The fact is that the Roumanian question is a manageable one. The agitation organized by the Jews in Western Europe in 1902-3 was very effective and taught the Roumanian Government a lesson which is likely to be remembered. This lesson has been emphasized by the I.C.A., which, besides undertaking colossal schemes of relief and education, has during the last few years reduced the Jewish population by 15 per cent. through emigration. M. Sturdza, the Premier, affected in a conversation with me to be very pleased with this diminution of the number of Jews in the country, although he referred somewhat bitterly to what he called the "theatrical" way in which it was organized; but Sir John Kennedy, our minister at Bucharest, assured me that in view of the sparseness of the population of the country the magnitude of the emigration was causing the Government no small anxiety. The Minister of Finance had indeed not disguised his alarm at the loss of 40,000 persons, all producers and consumers and many of them tax-payers. Hence it is apparent that in Roumania even less than in Russia is Zionism required as a solution of the Jewish question.

I have dealt at such length with the main question as to whether Zionism responds to an obvious and crying want in the present situation of Jewry that I will not
at this moment linger over a consideration of the further question whether, even if the need existed, Dr. Herzl's scheme is reasonably feasible. I will only say that the more closely I have studied the political difficulties, the more thoroughly I have convinced myself that they are insuperable and that, as far as human foresight can reach, there is no conceivable development of Eastern or international politics which is likely to render the realization of the scheme practicable. Moreover, even if realized, it could never prove such a revival of the Hebrew Commonwealth as would respond to the dreams of those who most earnestly support; it and if it fell into the hands of an advanced party under Mr. Zangwill, who I see has been proposing in the American Sunday School Times to abolish the marriage restrictions of Ezra and Nehemiah, it would assuredly fall to pieces with abiding scandal to the Jewish people. In either case it would fail because no state nowadays can be founded on a racial basis, and no religious community can be kept together on mixed marriages and the consequent secularization of the marriage tie. For a prophetic glimpse of the disastrous effects of such a failure we need only look back to the "Allgemeine Verwilderung" which followed on the fall of Sabbethai Zevi and from which the emancipation movement a hundred years ago happily rescued us.

This fortunately is a remote peril, but the Zionist movement as it stands to-day in its preliminary propaganda is not without considerable danger to the security and happiness of the Jews throughout the world. These perils could not be more strikingly exemplified than by the new scheme of an autonomous colony in East Africa. The very conception of the scheme illustrates the retrograde and alien spirit—alien, that is, to the spirit of British citizenship—which Zionism itself has already generated in the bosoms of its English neophytes. Let me in the first place point out to you how it justifies the reproach that the Zionists would rather dream of the creation of an
impossible political organism than avail themselves of any practical chance that presented itself of giving immediate relief to the sufferers from persecution. Any addition to the existing Jewish agricultural colonies of the world, under favourable auspices and in a new country, would always be a relief to persecuted Jewry. Well, the Zionists have the chance of creating such a colony in East Africa. The British Government has generously offered the land, and the "Hirsch millions" are at Dr. Herzl's disposal on the sole condition that the colony shall offer a reasonable prospect of success, and shall not be made to serve any political end. One would have imagined that in these circumstances the Zionists would have jumped at the opportunity of doing a little practical good pending the coming of the Messiah. No, they refused the I.C.A.'s terms and declared that either they would have their autonomous Nacht-Asyl or, so far as they were concerned, there should be no colony at all. I need not comment on this incident, for its disagreeable moral lies on the surface.

That the approval of the scheme by English Jews shows that their appreciation of Jewish as well as British interests has been stunted by their Zionism is also, to my mind, abundantly clear. The scheme aims at the creation of a Ghetto in the British Empire. It is consequently an ungrateful repudiation of the advantages and distinction of British citizenship, and hence is calculated to promote or justify doubts as to the sincerity of the much vaunted patriotism of the Jews and the reality of their faculty of assimilation. Here then is a direct incentive to anti-Semitism. But it is not the only one. I have already shown that the Ghetto is the real parent of anti-Semitism, inasmuch as it crystallizes the strange customs of the unassimilated Jews whom it segregates. I have been much attacked for saying that these customs, besides being strange, are disagreeable, and Mr. Zangwill has begged me to note that even segregation when there is plenty of room
and the Government is liberal is not injurious. My reply to Mr. Zangwill is that if he will examine the state of affairs in Austrian Galicia where all the conditions he enumerates exist, the results will be found precisely as I have described them.

From the Imperial point of view the scheme is not less objectionable. It is not to the interest of any country to obstruct or postpone the assimilation of its subjects. The Downing Street idea that this settlement would be a Hebrew colony is a delusion. It would most certainly be a jargon colony and hence predominantly German. Autonomy and the supreme direction from Vienna would crystallize this Germanism, and in course of time this might easily become a source of embarrassment to the whole British Protectorate just as the influence wielded by the 41,000 jargon-speaking and Germanophil Jews in Jerusalem has become an embarrassment for Turkey. But of course there is a Zionist answer to this. The settlement, it is said, is only temporary; it is a Nacht-Asyl für Jerusalem. Well, tell Lord Lansdowne that. Tell him that the colony is to be a "jumping-off ground" for Palestine, and see what the Law Officers of the Crown have to say to it.

As for the pretension that autonomy is required in the interests of the national customs of the Jews, that is a gratuitous reflection on the orthodoxy of the non-Zionists. When I challenged Mr. Zangwill in the Times to produce a list of these national customs which cannot be observed in a British colony without political autonomy, I was referred (not by him but by somebody else) to one only—the Sabbath. But there is no essential restriction on the observance of the Jewish Sabbath or on the substitution of Sunday work for it in England; and where Jews mostly congregate, as in the East End of London, the observance is fraught with little or no inconvenience. The only restrictions that emancipated Jews have to observe are that they cannot make the stranger within
their gates observe the Sabbath or stone to death the Jew who desecrates it. I do not imagine that the \textit{Nacht-Asyl} is designed to correct these anomalies. Latterly Mr. Greenberg has given us another national custom for the observance of which we are said to require a political free-hand—the Jewish law of Marriage and Divorce. May I ask him what law? Is it the Deuteronomic or the Rabbinic law of Divorce? Is it the ancient Polygamy which lingered among the Italian Jews as late as the seventeenth century, or Rabbi Gershom’s monogamous “custom of the Gentile” of the tenth century, or Mr. Zangwill's recent repudiation of the marriage regulations of Ezra and Nehemiah which even the Paris Sanhedrin upheld? In most of these cases I should tremble for Judaism in the \textit{Nacht-Asyl}, though in some of them the settlement would no doubt enjoy for a time a certain remunerative vogue as a Jewish Gretna Green.

The perils revealed by the East African scheme, especially in regard to the development of a general \textit{Anschaunung} distinctly alien to the spirit of the nations among whom the emancipated Zionists now dwell, are typical of the whole Zionist propaganda. I am certain that if this continues it must lead to serious trouble. It will certainly give a new lease of life to the anti-Semitic agitation, which otherwise must pursue a downward course. There can be no question, for example, that in Russia the hope that Zionism will reduce the difficulties of the Jewish problem by spiking the guns of the Jewish Socialists and promoting emigration has already tended to relax the efforts of statesmen to find a solution in more liberal legislation. Mr. Zangwill discovered the other day that anti-Semitism had made its way into Great Britain. I think he is mistaken; but if he is right it must be admitted that there is a significant coincidence in its following so closely on the heels of Zionism.

To sum up, then: the characteristic peril of Zionism is that it is the natural and abiding ally of anti-Semitism
and its most powerful justification. It is an attempt to turn back the course of modern Jewish history, which hitherto, on its political side, has had for its main object to secure for the Jewish people an equal place with their fellow citizens of other creeds in the countries in which they dwell, and a common lot with them in the main stream of human progress. It is essentially an ignorant and a narrow-minded view of a great problem—ignorant because it takes no account of the decisive element of progress in history; and narrow-minded because it confounds a political memory with a religious ideal. It is hypnotized by the crude popular apophthegm that history repeats itself. History never repeats itself on the main line of its advance. It uses the same materials and applies the same law of cause and effect in the solution of new problems at every stage of its ever-widening, ever-progressive march; but there is no turning back. Nothing that is once destroyed is ever really restored. The temporal power of Judaism was a stage in the religious progress of the world, the product of conditions which have passed away for ever. To try to reproduce it now would be like trying to breed fish in an exhausted watercourse. The Jewish state subserved the Jewish religious mission. It trained and concentrated the moral forces of the people for the miraculous work of converting the world to a higher spiritual life. It thus enabled it to fertilize both east and west and made it the male parent of Mahommedanism on the one hand and of Christianity on the other. The same drama has been enacted on a higher plane in our long captivity, which was again the product of conditions for ever vanished. But, like the national life, it has also subserved the spiritual mission. Meditation and martyrdom have given us a new force and a wider and nobler aspiration. We have emerged from the Ghetto better fitted to cope with the problems of that civilian life which is now the ideal of the modern world than almost any other people. Is it possible, even if it were desirable, to bottle
up these forces in the squalid blind-alley of Theodor Herzl's Judenstaat?

What, then, is our duty? Mr. Zangwill says "Denationalization or Renationalization." I can imagine that that was the cry of Jesus, and again I say that history will not repeat itself precisely in the same way. The doctrine of dogmatic proselytism is exploded, and consequently our choice is no longer between Denationalization and Renationalization. Our mission is the Mendelssohnian Mission as laid down in the famous letter of Moses Mendelssohn to Lavater. We have to show an example to the nations. We take our stand on the lofty toleration and real universalism of the Talmudic axiom that "the pious of all nations have their place in the world to come." Our highest traditional ideal is undoubtedly national, but it is not the nation of a kept principality but the holy nation of the Kingdom of priests. Having given to the world the fundamental laws which have made the most advanced races what they are, we have to complete the work in our providential dispersion by leading the way in the most fruitful application of those laws. That is the real Jewish Nationalism, the only true Zion.

Lucien Wolf.

[Since this paper was written, the gifted founder and leader of the Zionist movement, Dr. Theodor Herzl, has passed away. It would be a poor tribute to his memory to imagine that the great movement he founded had any reason to shelter itself under the pathos of his early death; and I feel, too, that it would be an evil reflection on my own method of controversy were I to change, by a word, the criticisms of his work I wrote in all honesty and read in public while he was living. The above paper is consequently left precisely as I wrote it last May. I would only]
wish to add that no Zionist can mourn Dr. Herzl more sincerely than I do. His fine character, his brilliant attainments, and his personal charm have left an ineffaceable impression upon me, as upon all who knew him. It is some satisfaction to think that his memory cannot die, for in the few years he devoted to the Jewish question he wrote a large and imposing chapter in Jewish history—a chapter which even in spite of his critics, and his followers, will remain an imperishable monument to his genius.—L. W.]
ISAAC PULGAR’S “SUPPORT OF THE RELIGION.”

In 1215 arose the order of Preaching Monks, the Predicants or Dominicans, founded by Dominic de Guzman (born 1170, died 1221). One of the chief aims of the order was to place at the disposal of the church the invaluable aid of skilled disputants, who should revive the drooping spirits of the faithful, and by the assaults of rhetoric and passion subdue the stubborn intellect of the unbeliever. Against their will, unoffending rabbis, men of books and of peace, were ferreted out from the safety of their obscurity, and forced to defend their religious teachings in the presence of kings and princes. The disputations of Rabbi Jehiel with Nicolaus, in Paris, in 1244; of Nachmanides with Friar Paul in 1263; of Meir ben Simon with the Archbishop of Narbonne, 1245; as well as others belong to this era, and were brought about by the activity of the Dominicans. Not trusting to themselves alone in this war of words, the ecclesiastical authorities called in the aid of some who had previously been Jews themselves.

Abner of Burgos, a profound Jewish scholar of the latter half of the thirteenth century, was one of a band of authors whose works and perhaps whose names are practically unknown outside a limited circle now, though at one time they occupied very greatly the thoughts of their contemporaries and immediate successors. They were, or represented themselves as, the disciples of Nachmanides. From the study of the mysteries of the Kabbala, wherein words and letters are made the foundations of mystic

1 See Jellinek, Beiträge zur Gesch. der Kab., pp. 48 and 49.
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notions, and all things elude the grasp, the solid foundation of study passes away, and while all things can be easily proven, so too can all things be easily negativized. Abner was not only a Talmudist and Kabbalist of repute, he was a médecin, too,— so at least says Carmoly, who at the same time sums up in a few sentences most that we know of Abner. According to this account, Abner was born at Burgos in 1270, but it was at Valladolid that he followed the practice of medicine. He died in 1346, in the seventy-sixth year of his age. It was as a man of sixty that Abner left the faith of his fathers, and he became one of the most determined enemies of the religion he had discarded. From the stores of his extensive knowledge he wrote book after book wherein he exhibited, to the delight of his new patrons, and to the horror of his flesh and blood still strong in their allegiance to the citadel he had quitted, the weak points in the armour of Zion. While yet a young man Abner had composed several Hebrew works, among which is a commentary upon one of the writings of Ibn Ezra. His later works are devoted, however, to the defence of his new faith or to attacks upon Judaism. He put aside all that could remind him of Judaism, and he adopted the name of Alphonso after the reigning sovereign Alphonso XI. As a convert he wrote a book entitled ספּה מַלְשֹסִית מַצָּה (The Book of the Wars of Duty), directed against the סְּפּה מַלְשֹסִית הַגּ (The Book of the Wars of God) of Joseph Kimhi; another called סְּפּה מַלְשֹסִית קַמָּה (The Offering of Zeal) in defence of the Christian religion, and סְּפּה מַרְיָמ (The Book of Miriam, i.e. Maria) for the same purpose. Other writings of Abner are the מַרְיָם זַעְמָה (The Righteous Teacher), La Concordia de las Leyes (The Agreement of the two Testaments), while he is credited with being the Alphonsus Bonhominis, who translated a polemical work from Arabic into Latin. Reggio in his edition of the בַּעֲרָת תֶּקֶלֶת, Goritiae, 1852, quotes a work of Abner’s containing a number of criticisms

1 See Revue Orientale, 1861, p. 519, quoting Ferrara, Hist. gén. d’Espagne.
2 Wolf, IV, p. 786.
of the decisions of the Tur, *Hoshen Mishpat*, see XIII, pp. 51, 193. Bedarride says Abner that wrote a book in Spanish on the plague\(^1\). Abner went further than this. He presented charges against the Jews before the king in regard to their prayers, and a public investigation of the matter was held at Valladolid.

These attacks of Abner met with many a rejoinder\(^2\), and of these the following may be called to mind: Joseph Shalom, Isaac Nathan, Moses Narboni in his *אמסר היהוהיה*, Shemtob Shaprut in *אמסר ה zmqח*, § 14, Moses Cohen Tordesillas (1375) in his *אמאדה עניוה*, and Isaac of Acco in *םדמעת תכלה*, ed. Venice, 1587, p. 56, gives an account of an interview between Abner and Nachmanides, when the latter discovets his opponent with an apt quotation from the Bible. Another rejoinder to Abner's attack is the *Ezer ha-Dat* (*the Support of Religion*) of Pulgar, the subject of the present notes.

The MS. of the *Ezer ha-Dat*, of the Montefiore College, Codex 94 (in the recently published *Catalogue of the Montefiore MSS.* the MS. of the *Ezer ha-Dat* bears the number 285), is a small 8vo volume of 91 leaves, written on both sides of the leaf, in a Spanish hand. It belonged formerly to the valuable Halberstam collection, which Dr. Gaster's care and foresight secured for the use of students in England. It is interesting to note that the MS. was formerly the property of a convert to Judaism, for on a fly-leaf we find the following איגי החסן והעניי אברים בן אברים אברים, liber est meus, est Deus illum querit hoc Nominerit Abraham natus Prinze. The MS. is clearly written, and shows by the notes on its margin that it has been read with care, for we meet with glosses and suggestions that seem to be in the handwriting of Prinze himself. Graetz’s quotations from the *Ezer ha-Dat* are from the Breslau

---
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Codex, No. 53. A part of the work has been printed in the Ashkenazi, Frankfurt am Main, 1854 (corresponding with ff. 28 b-41 a of the Montefiore Codex). Another and much smaller fragment appeared in the Revue des Études Juives, 1889, p. 64 (corresponding with ff. 74 a-76 a, and ff. 77-80 of the Montefiore MS.). With the exception of a line or two in Graetz's Geschichte, vol. VII, p. 443, nothing else has appeared in print of this valuable and interesting contribution to a literature, which to the present day stands second to none in holding its own in the affections of readers and students.

The author of the Ezer ha-Dat was Rabbi Isaac Pulgar, or more fully Isaac ben Joseph ben Pulgar, of whose personal history but little is known. The usual authorities quote each other, but add little themselves to the scanty stock of information. Graetz tells us that Pulgar was a common family name in Castille, and quotes a Fernando Pulgar, who was secretary of Ferdinand and Isabella, and author of a royal chronicle. Ibn Shaprut calls our author ת"א וט ר"א, and Steinschneider, Isaac Ibn Polqar. Here I follow Graetz, and adopt the form Pulgar. As has been said little is known of Pulgar, but an attentive study of his work reveals him as a profound scholar with wide attainments, in touch and sympathy with the busy life around him, and possessing an intimate knowledge of almost every branch of science then cultivated. His knowledge of Talmud is thorough, and this is especially seen in the Dialogue on Astrology, wherein Pulgar is called upon to square contradictory passages from the Talmud in regard to that pseudo-science. He possessed likewise an excellent acquaintance with

1 If Alphonse died in 1346, at the age of seventy-six, and if it was as a man of sixty that he left Judaism, I think we may for all necessary purposes assume that the Ezer ha-Dat was composed somewhere about 1335 to 1345.

2 Carmoly, R. O., I, p. 327; Wolf, I, p. 687; compare also Steinschneider's Pseudepigraph. Literat., p 32.
Arabic literature, and he quotes or refers to, as the case may be, in approval or otherwise, Ibn Gazali, § 41 a, 52 a; Ibn Zaled, 42; Ibn Sina, 80 a; Ibn Hamad the Ismaelie e, 61 a; Betalmius (= Ptolomeus) 48, and Aristo are referred to § 35, 64 a, 66; Isaac ben Balag, § 52; Ibn Ezra, § 54; R. Jehudah ha-Hasid, 54; and a certain renowned Cabbalist Maistre Marcus, 75 a; a book on witchcraft; the works of (= Hermes) and (= Appolonius) on magic and yogi; an “Egyptian” work, El Falah el Nabit, § 50; and works on the names of angels and demons, &c. From the MS. we gather that Pulgar composed a commentary on Genesis, § 9; one on Ecclesiastes, often quoted, e.g. §§ 53, 53 a, &c., and another on the book of Psalms, § 59. He wrote also a book entitled הבוררות המוסר בינה הנשים והאנונימית, § 54, a copy of which is in the Vatican Library—a in all five works. To these we add Pulgar’s works enumerated by Graetz, viz. a continuation of Albalag’s works; the monoth drink against Abner’s monoth drinath; a Spanish work against astrology (though this perhaps may be the hitherto undiscussed mentioned above), and the three now before us—or nine works in all.

Pulgar was an old and intimate friend of Abner’s (§ 8 a), and it is not difficult to imagine something of the feeling of surprise and disgust with which the news of Abner’s conversion must have moved Pulgar. Geiger, in his Dichtungen, pp. 51, 52, gives specimens of the war of words, in the form of rhymed expostulation which took place between the two men. At length, no doubt, all intercourse was broken off. Abner, now an official of the Church, was drawing upon the stores of his knowledge to attack and defame his ancestral faith, while Pulgar, urged by friends around, girded up his loins to meet the attack. But Pulgar’s views and wishes, his outlook and his ambition

1 The sign § refers to the pages of the Montefiore Codex.
2 See Wolf, I, p. 687.
were wider. Abner's was but one of the many attacks which Judaism had to bear in those unhappy days. Besides it would have been impolitic, even dangerous to have answered Abner point by point. In his treatment of Christianity he was reserved, had to be reserved. He is careful. He is more outspoken when he deals with astrology, with the worship of images and the invocation of saints. But yet withal genial and fair. Judging from the *Ezer ha-Dat*, the Jewry of Pulgar's day was a busy one, with its contending parties, from the extreme on the one hand, of the deniers of all faith to the opposite, i.e. those that believed childishly in imposture of every description. Arranged between in endless gradations were the careful, cautious men, holding fast to the faith and religious practices they had received from their elders, but holding on also with equal tenacity to the study of natural science. In the world which we view in Pulgar's work, we meet the ignorant and learned, the rabbi, the doctor, the astrologer, the Kabbalist, the wizard, the witch, the gambler, the toiler working in the sweat of the brow, mentally indolent, supporting all quackery, and at the background, as a sinister reminder of evil omen, the renegade and convert, ready to turn all he knew to the lowest of purposes—to blacken the faith of Israel and to besmirch the fame of its teachers—to inform upon a brother's deed, and to spy upon a father's word.

The *Ezer ha-Dat* is written in bright, vivid, racy Hebrew, if I may use the expression, by a man who well knew how to use the pen. It abounds in passages of rare beauty, passing on to others of playful sarcasm and profound scholarship, and withal a rare devotion to the truth. There is also in it the same happy use of Biblical phrases in new setting that is met with in many other writings of the period and which strikes the reader with such pleasure, like the meeting of old friends unexpectedly; the same easy-flowing,exhaustless torrent of clever ingenious phraseology, that charms and hurries us along in the pleasant
company of the genial writer. A large part of the work is written in the so-called "rhymed prose," chiefly known to most as the vehicle of Alcharizi's Tachkemoni, of the Hebrew work, Ben ha-Melech ve-ha-Nazir (The Prince and the Derwish), Ibn Hasdai's adaptation of the Arabic, the Mashal ha-Kadmoni, &c. There is likewise in the Ezer ha-Dat the similar system of prologue and epilogue of verse, the latter being put into the mouth of the disputants, or the victor of them, or in the mouth of the judge or umpire. The dialogue form, so much admired in old writers, is used, and promising to be fair to all sides, Pulgar more than keeps his word.

Let us turn now to the work itself, and as far as space will permit, call in the aid of the actual words of Isaac Pulgar in order the better to elucidate his arguments.

**Introduction**

In his introduction Pulgar deals with five classes of opponents. Firstly, those who argue with the equipment of but a superficial knowledge of Scripture, לַא הַשְּׁמָלָה לָא הַתְּשֵׁלָה בְּכָלֶתְּמָלָה מְשֵׁרִי הַקְּרֵס וַחֲבֵרוֹי וְהָיְיָתָוֹ לָא בְּמַעֲשָׂה יְהַעֲרָבָה. The second class comprise the "Epi-koros." The third are the believers in astrology, הָוָיָכֵי שִׁמָּי הַחָסִים בְּכָלֶתְּמָלָה, בִּלְּכָלְּ פְּרָם שִׁמָּי הַחָסִים נְבוֹרִים מְנוּרִים שֵׁמוֹהוֹי מִשָּׁה מְשֵׁרִי הָיְיָתָו. The fourth are superstitious people, eager for what is abnormal, וְהָשֵׁמֵעֲקָמֵי לְשֵׁמֵעֲקָמֵי אָבָל שֵׁמֵעֲקָמֵי שֶׁמֶרְיָי מְשֵׁרִי הָיְיָתָו וְרָאשָׁן אָשֶׁר צֵאֲשַׁאֲשַׁאֲשַׁוּ בָּם. The fifth are infidels, among whom are included those who deny the future life of the soul, and of doctrine of reward and punishment, ויִהלָל בְּרֵי וְיַעֲמֵרִי לָיֵי לְאָלִי אָלִי. To combat these, and to show forth something of the glory and majesty of the Jewish religion, Pulgar composes his work, the subject to be treated suggesting the title נָרְאָה שֵׁמֵעֲקָמֵי שֶׁמֶרְיָי עַזְּרָה וַחֲבֵרוֹי, אָזָרָה שֵׁמֵעֲקָמֵי שֶׁמֶרְיָי עַזְּרָה וַחֲבֵרוֹי. As we may naturally expect, the book is divided into five parts, each part professing to deal with one class of the above-mentioned opponents. Part I deals with the pre-em-
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nence of the religion of Israel; part II, the consonance of religion with true philosophy; part III, the worthlessness of the claims of astrology, because things run in a natural manner, entirely independent of the position and movements of the stars; in part IV Pulgar refutes the believers in prodigies, and in part V discourses on the immortality of the soul. To render the work pleasant and easy reading, Pulgar promises to introduce short poems, riddles, and Agadic narratives, and further he says that due prominence and a fair hearing shall be given to the views of his opponents, and the better to do this, he will introduce the dialogue form.

Part I.

Pulgar laments the evils brought upon Israel by renegades who defame their old associates. He has often expostulated personally with such men with varying results, and at last at the request of those to whom deference is due, takes his pen in hand. The chapter or treatise—was likely enough the one object of Pulgar's pen, and doubtless the success it met with and the encouragement Pulgar received, led him to go further and endeavour to deal with other classes of critics. This treatise is divided into eight paragraphs, and deals with such matters as the necessity of revelation, for man's nature needs it, the excellence of the Torah, that Moses is the chief of the prophets, the future life, the coming of the...
Messiah, &c. I pass all this by, except to remark that through these pages runs the cheery optimism of the devout Jew—the נ ד ו ו—making the best of persecution, and clinging as proudly as ever to the belief that the possession and obedience to the Law of God is the highest nobility and happiness of man. But as an example of his method let us see how Pulgar proves that Moses is worthy to be considered the chief of the prophets, the burden of the seventh principle of Maimonides, as well as his treatment of the question of a future life. First, in respect of Moses, twelve are the characteristics of the true leader and guide of men, the possession of which in such a leader justifies mankind in placing confidence in him. They are as follows: (1) he should be healthy and strong, physically; (2) with a due knowledge of his powers and the calls of nature upon him; (3) of a retentive memory; (4) logical, able to educe the unknown from what is known; (5) fluent in his speech; (6) anxious to assist others from the stores of his own knowledge; (7) a lover of truth; (8) temperate, abstemious; (9) animated by a becoming self-respect; (10) independent, possessing a sufficiency, yet using wealth only as a means to an end; (11) a lover of justice and a friend of the innocent; and lastly, (12) self-reliant, because animated by the purest of motives. These are the characteristics desiderated by the Philosopher.

Pulgar adds, however, a thirteenth, that such a legislator and leader should be animated not by a love of men only, but by feelings of respect for them also. Yet says our author, where shall we find such a prodigy, what would be the life of such a man in this world of misery and sorrow? His good qualities would be but the instruments of his own undoing. But there would remain a sense of comradeship between such a man and those around him, and this link is the existence of the spiritual life which exists in all men, be it ever so weak and small. It is this which is common both to them and to him, and which would enable him to influence them, to guide and
cherish them, according to their ability to receive his instruction. Engaged in so noble a task, such a man would not willingly contemplate the extinction of his influence, both from a virtuous pride in his own power, and again by reason of the love he bears to mankind in general, extending to nations yet unborn.

In the character and history of Moses, alone, do we find all these great qualities combined, and Pulgar, with evident satisfaction, goes carefully through the list of thirteen points, and indicates, in the words of Scripture, how each and all are to be found in Moses, Israel's great lawgiver. The paragraph dealing with the future life is one of the most eloquent in the entire work. We look up to the heavens and planets, and we see, but know not what we see: we turn to the earth, and perplexity fills our hearts. The plants live till the span of their life is reached, and then fade, and animals live but to seek to satisfy the means by which they live, their elements separate, and they are as if they never had been. The fate of man is equally sad. We pass to the various expectations which men have formed concerning the state and joys of the world to come. There are those who look upon death but as a passage or transition, and that the pleasures of this world will be increased a thousandfold, and eating and drinking, with eternal appetite, will be men's lot in
the elements of which our bodies are composed separate, and then, exactly as with animals and plants, they join the constituents of nature from which they severally came; we can neither aid nor impede this; for the heart which palpitates with righteous aspirations nothing remains; without choice man comes, without responsibility he disappears. But a fuller examination of the matter, says Pulgar, relieves our minds from this load of sadness. The future life is that state when, freed from all low and ignoble influence and desire, the divine spirit will be no longer held captive within the folds of the body. The human body is not an essential element of life; the body is but the instrument and tool of the divine spirit within.

This divine impulse generates in man the good inclination, while its passivity, owing to man's wilfulness, gives use to the bad inclination. It is not the aim of his work, says Pulgar, to develop these theories. Enough, however, has been given to show the position of Jewish philosophers in regard to the condition in the Future Existence. Lightly touching on the sad state of Israel, Pulgar passes on to the subject of the Messiah. His treatment of the matter is similar, for instance, to that of Albo. The belief in the Messiah is not so much a dogma of Judaism as a necessary consequence to the belief in the veracity of the Scriptures, i.e. it is a matter which depends upon individual explanation of the text of Scripture.
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The belief is valuable, though it does not portend any alteration of nature, for as the rabbis have told us, the belief is valuable, though it does not portend any alteration of nature, for as the rabbis have told us, a phrase which our author quotes with much satisfaction. But though believing that the Scriptures foretell the coming of the Messiah—though an open mind would perhaps better describe his position—Pulgar goes on to prove that so far the Messiah has not come, and he takes us through all the well-known Messianic passages to support his argument. Whoever Jesus was, whoever he claimed to be, or his disciples and followers claim on his behalf, Jesus, says Pulgar, was not the Messiah foretold by the prophets. It is here that we get an introduction to Abner, the former friend of Isaac Pulgar, who, we are told, challenges Pulgar, and offers to prove from the Talmud itself the necessity of a further revelation, or, in other words, the necessity of the New Testament. Having thus agreed upon a common foundation and basis of argument, Abner, we are told, challenges Pulgar, and offers to prove from the Talmud itself the necessity of a further revelation, or, in other words, the necessity of the New Testament. The answer of Pulgar deserves the utmost consideration, as it shows us not only the manner by which he meets this challenge, but also because it doubtless reveals the standpoint from which the Jewish sages in Spain viewed the serious matter of conversion in the constant controversies of the time. By reason of their by no means too secure position and from the fear of offending the ruling powers, the rabbi had to be wary. He had to weigh his words. He had to be careful not to use words that might even be construed by the
mischief-maker into sentiments of disrespect to the faith of the people, the practices of the priests, and the acts of royalty. He must needs conduct a war of defence. Pulgar proceeds to justify the Oral Tradition by showing its need. The Torah, he says, deals only with questions of faith and theory. But at the same time it refers to matters of daily practice, wherein its authority is supreme. The Torah, therefore, constantly needs elucidation and commentary before its behests can be put into practice. The men of the great Sanhedrin, in their piety and wisdom, had shown us how, notwithstanding the perplexing variety of each day's events, to keep the spirit of the Torah and as many of its commands as circumstances require. The course of events rendered it necessary to commit to writing as many of the dicta of the sages as could be got together, and they exist for us, though with but little care for order or proper arrangement, in the volumes of the Talmud. But the Talmud contains also a mass of material, dealing with every conceivable subject, important and the contrary. משלו, שנברו את הה_TABX, את ת"זר אמצעי, ואת המקרא מק"זר, ואת העיון מק"זר, § 26. This great work of codification of the Talmud was undertaken by Maimonides, who has arranged in his master work, the המצות והויר, all that is essential for our faith and religious life from the vast material to be found in the Talmud. Those matters, however, which are essential neither to the elucidation of the doctrines of our faith nor the needs of our religious duties are omitted from this work, and they do but engage our attention either by reason of our respect and affection for their authors or for their purely intrinsic value. The valuable elements in these we take, the rest we leave, either because, it may be, they seem opposed to our faith, or because the real meaning of the sage is not clear to us. עני מסורות על התורה. Turning now to Abner, Pulgar thus continues: As for thy challenge, let this suffice thee. Though we greatly respect the sages our guide is the Torah and Reason. What is opposed to the Torah (Deut. xiii. 2–6) we will not accept. What is opposed
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to Reason and Experience we will not accept either. What is contradictory to Nature or to Reason can find no room amongst us. What is contradictory to Nature or to Reason can find no room amongst us. Judaism is founded on the Torah, and is agreeable to Reason, and in Pulgar's opinion, not indeed expressed, but clearly implied, Abner's new faith is neither the one nor the other.* A living tradition is ever aware of the needs of a living community, and therefore provides for all. In the Talmud are to be seen explanations suitable for all, especially for the simple and undoubting nature of the student who takes things in their literal sense. The Torah, we read, has no less than seventy explanations. Yet we know the Torah is one, and has no second. The phrase is, therefore, only a hint to the teacher to render his teaching comprehensible to the simplest as well as to the most refined intelligence, that all men may learn of God. How truly admirable, explains Pulgar, must have been the character of those revered men who could take so large a view of mankind, and arrange so well for all!
Part II.

The larger portion of this part of the erva had already appeared. It was printed in the mash Hashem tovas of Israel Ashkenazi, Frankfurt a. M. 1854, pp. 12-19, from a Paris MS. This fragment occupies over twenty pages of the Montefiore Codex, namely, from fol. 28 a to fol. 41. Ashkenazi's extract is complete in itself, and is an excellent specimen of vivid Hebrew dialogue. Only one who has gone through it can become aware of all the interesting points of the argument—the fairness with which both sides, the divine and the philosopher, get their hearing. Its beauty grows with renewed acquaintance. The opinion of the reader as to the relative merits of the disputants inclines first to the one side and then to the other. Pulgar enlivens the discussion, as is his custom, with wit and humour. The sarcasm is rich. A knowledge of the Hebrew Bible and an acquaintance with the many Talmudical phrases is required if the reader is to grasp the give and take of the arguments as they are bandied about. The picture of the two men is very skilfully drawn. The ancient venerable divine, bearing his years lustily, with his withering contempt for his young antagonist, conscious that so far the world is on his side, is well contrasted with that of the young philosopher, full of new knacks and notions, a little flighty too, and with loud assertion of his ability to reconcile Faith and Science, a labour which the divine thinks unnecessary, and if performed entirely useless. But the Montefiore Codex has much more in this second part than is contained in Ashkenazi's fragment. For after the hearer and narrator (הכור) has returned home the argument is, as it were, resumed between the narrator ו甦י and a philosopher והטלות (the argument before, we ought to explain, was held between a ו and a ו), in which the opinions of various Arabian philosophers become the subject of a conversation concerning Free-will, the Eternity of Matter, God's interference and interest, or otherwise, in mundane affairs. The
final decision will perhaps be made all the clearer by a short résumé. It appears, as already stated, that a report of the original controversy was brought by the hearer to his native town, which report itself gives rise to a further discussion. Gazzali’s arguments against the philosophers are mentioned, when there arises a man, Abraham, who reminds the bystanders that Gazzali’s strictures of philosophy have already been met and answered by the counter-arguments of Abu Alzalid and by R. Isaac ben Albalag (§ 42 a) (our MS. has the word Isaac, written and marked out and דִּרְויָם inserted). The man Abraham proceeds then to sum up the whole lengthy discussion in something like the following manner: Is it not the better plan to hold fast to the belief in the continuity and permanence of the creative act rather than to say that God’s power was, as it were, brought to an end at the termination of the week of creation? In other words, God did not endow Nature with a continuous generative faculty and power of adjusting Matter. The Universe is continually renewed by God, who exerts to-day a power and control over Matter equal to that when he first called the world into being. God is constantly at work in the world God reneweth every day the works of the creation. Thus the act of prayer is a logical one, and its hope of fulfilment a becoming one for a philosopher to stand by Nebeshet hashavah דִּרְויָם וְכֶסֶף אֲבֹתָה, תֵּיתָה, חַבְּרָהָה סַכָּכָהוֹתָה, § 42 a. But the subject of the prayer, or rather the object prayed for, must be a possible one; it must be within the bounds of what God in his absolute untrammelled free-will fixed as proper, that is, possible. God knoweth what is possible, and what is not possible or proper נבשחש השואל אתי אתי וְכֶסֶף אֲבֹתָה שָׁלֹה בֵּיתָהוֹת לא יכֵּשֶׁר. Now, says Pulgar, the possible is twofold. What is possible in action אתי אתי וְכֶסֶף אֲבֹתָה, and what is possible in the “acted” אתי אתי וְכֶסֶף אֲבֹתָה. God’s will and God’s power are alike unlimited, but in order to benefit mankind God has placed a limit to his own unrestricted power.
Power is responsibility, if we may say so, even in the case of God, and this world is governed by a moral Governor, and not by an irresponsible tyrant. It would be tyranny to rule sentient creatures in a captious, capricious, constantly changing way. Pulgar, fearing perhaps that he is becoming too dogmatic, says further that this abstention on the part of the Divinity is voluntary, and that occasions have arisen when God has directly interfered with the usual order of Nature. This explanation brings about the result we expect. The opposition is disarmed, and harmony reigns supreme.

Part II concludes with praise to God:

חיה ית תוריה באהת
משטורות הפניקות לכלולה
אותית שקרבנות שומחת
chershem ושתוקותין

PART III.

This part deals with the question of Astrology, a matter which occupied so great a position in the Middle Ages that we are bewildered when we observe the talent that was devoted to its study, and the greatness and fame of the men who were guided by the oracles of the astrologers. The great mediaeval rabbis were nearly all enthusiastic believers in this pseudo science, which finds a thoroughgoing defence in some commentaries, and a place in the liturgical compositions of the time. Sachs, in הָדָע, I, p. 61, suggests that the belief of the rabbis in Astrology was rather in the nature of an attempt to make a compromise between the apparent Talmudic support of the belief and their own more rationalistic methods of exegesis. Ibn Ezra, perhaps

1 See Steinschneider, "Jüd. Lit.," in E. u. G.'s Encycl., p. 441; Sachs, משה, I, pp. 59-93; and Zunz's Relig. Poesie, p. 250. The literature on the subject is a large and interesting one.
the most devoted, certainly the most famous of the many followers of Astrology (though Pulgar, § 54, protests against the practice of regarding Ibn Ezra and Jehudah the Hasid as believers), mentions Jacob Ibn Tarik and Andruzagar ben Zadi Faruk, and among others may be mentioned also Shabattai Donolo, 913–970, Abraham ben Hyya, Abraham ben David of Posquières, Jehudah ha-Levi (in Kuzari, IV, 9, but see also Kuzari, IV, 23), Abraham Ibn Daud, author of the Emunah Ramah, Albo (see Ikkarim, IV, 4), Isaak Arama, author of the 'Akedah, Shelomoh b. Aderet—all of whom show the influence of the current belief in their writings. Maimonides, however, opposed the belief, asserting that it bordered on idolatry, see the Yad, Akkum, XI, 8. The reader may also turn to Harizi's polemic against astrologers in his Tachkemoni, chap. xxii. A study of this part of the text will show us the vigour and independence of Pulgar as a thinker. He attacks Astrology. He pours ridicule on the pretences of the astrologers. He laughs at its dupes. He shows it to be a source of imposture, depressing the brave, and enervating the hopeful. He asserts that the astrologers do but repeat each other, and repetition and not justification is the source and foundation of their belief. And going to the very front and forehead of the science, the original and much lauded authorities upon whom astrologers relied, and whom it is sinful to criticize and question, he asks who are these men that so much reliance should be placed upon their opinions. Neither should we rely upon the reports of the ignorant mob

Neither should we rely upon the reports of the ignorant mob

Pulgar, it is apparent, had a fine, healthy contempt for wonder-mongers. Our author discusses the matter in a dialogue between two speakers—an Astrologer opposed, a thinker (Haber), and an interesting, even amusing debate it proves to be. In the market-place of a populous town stands the Astrologer addressing the large
crowd gathered before him. At his side stands his table covered with the various instruments of his science, the astrolabe, circles, sun-dials, mathematical tools, books of charts, &c. He has before him a scholar, covered with books and other instruments of his science, the astrolabe, circles, sun-dials, mathematical tools, books of charts, &c. As a matter of fact, he is a life-like sketch. Among the crowd stood a scholarly man unarm’d. After listening to the speech of the Astrologer for some time he stepped forward and took up the challenge on behalf of true science, and the discussion commences. It is witty and clever, and heavy blows are exchanged between the champions. The fortunes of the day vary, both speakers earning their fair share of success. The Astrologer, as we may suppose, is much shocked at the levity of the Haber, who answers that in his attitude of criticism he does but follow the examples of Abraham and Moses, who in their generation sought to uproot the superstitions of their contemporaries. The success of these men of the Bible was but partial, and much remains to-day upon the surface of the earth which debases truth. Astrology, asserts the Haber, is forbidden to us alike by the Torah and Reason. He then proceeds to explain that there is nothing occult or mysterious even in the case of prophecy. Ordinary men argue on the basis of probability. So, too, does the prophet. Wherein, then, consists the difference? The difference is slight, though in another sense profound. The data of the prophet’s reasoning are fuller and wider. The prophet takes into account the immutable laws of God’s morality, and his earnestness is based on his conviction that if those laws be disobeyed certain disastrous results follow, as sure as cause and effect. The prophet is statesman in the exercise of the highest functions of the latter. The view of a statesman is often limited; that of the prophet never.
Yet even the predictions of the prophet are at times put aside, e.g. the repentance of Nineveh and the warning of Jonah. The discussion now passes to an examination of the question of Free-will and Necessity, that problem of the ages, always new and always old. The Astrologer argues, of course, against Free-will, the Haber in favour of the same; there we get the interesting note that Pulgar had written a study on Kohelet, § 53, ובשע יאפרית בpiryישל אל חולת, and further יוהות והעם יברחי בpiryיש, § 53 a. The text referred to is Eccles. v. 7. This verse the Astrologer had quoted, and the following is the Haber's explanation given in his work: "The great aim of Solomon's book is to point out the mutability of all earthly things. Nothing is permanent. All things hasten to change their external forms. Yet let not man be too greatly distressed at this, for similar changes await the view of all generations, and to be distressed then at a necessary condition of life is absurd. Nevertheless, the spectacle of constant change will generate in the heart of man a becoming reverence and fear of God. God must be man's hope, the one permanent Being, and not the false appearances to which the Astrologer directs the gaze of his dupes. Again, let no man be unduly depressed at the sight of misery and oppression. Tyranny is but the act of a mortal, here to-day and in the grave to-morrow, and the actor and the action alike doomed to pass away, and the righteous shall inherit the earth. 'Boast not thyself of to-morrow,' said Koheleth, 'for thou knowest not what a day shall bring forth.' Shall astrology then claim Solomon as authority for its false prognostications?" The Astrologer then avers that the sages of the Talmud inculcate the belief in astrology—מל מ yansı מיתל • יפיסר • Hóaל חבי • במל and undoubtedly, admits the Haber, some of the ancients believed in astrology. David sought to know the day of his death. It was hidden from him, and from all mortals too, including astrologers. Rab and
Shemuel spoke against the practice. So did Akiba; so did Natan bar Yitzhak, Rab bar Nahman, and others. And so the discussion proceeds. Anon the combatants attack the insoluble problem—the prosperity of the wicked and the unfortunate state of the pious. The Bible, says the Haber, teaches us to follow the good and forsake the evil. He who follows this does well, and vice versa. Take an example. Two men travel. They come upon a deep, wide river, which blocks their progress, and, alas, without a bridge at hand. A man sitting upon the bank informs them that lower down there is a bridge. "Go there," said he, "and cross in peace." The wise man, using his brains, seeks out the bridge, and crosses in safety; the other distrusts the advice, and is drowned in his attempt to swim across. Safety and danger more often than not, says the Haber truly enough, are in our own hands, and we bring most of our misfortunes upon ourselves. And even in the midst of misfortunes the good man sees subjects for intense satisfaction, and he is never entirely overwhelmed. Pulgar speaking as the Haber tells the Astrologer to read up his (Pulgar's) work on the Psalms (רמך יחיה תיריס, §59), says he has shown that there is no real contradiction between the theory that God cares for the righteous and the reality of the ills that befall them. The Haber is not to have it all his own way. "Suppose," says the Astrologer, "all the arguments are on your side. Nevertheless, facts are against you. Events have been foretold. What then?" The Haber denies it. His opponent, holding to his first opinion that events have been foretold, says that where predictions have been falsified the reason was because the prognosticator was not qualified, and did not understand his business. "Oh," says the Haber, laughing, "you put me in mind of the story of the fisherman. He had bought putrid fish, and exposed it for sale in the market. The crowd drew back at the fearful smell. 'Come on,' said he, 'come and buy, my fish is good. It is I that am putrid!'" At this the Astrologer's patience gives out, and
he declines to continue the argument. The Haber thereupon proceeds to formulate certain weighty reasons to justify his opposition to astrology. Incidents arise from natural causes, i.e. we know what will be the result of the depredations of locusts upon vegetation. Let no man believe what some philosophers have taught, that matter possesses endless possibilities, because since the Creator has impressed his will upon matter its potentialities are necessarily limited by the control of such will. The Creator has chosen to impress upon matter an order and form—i.e. it has become "natural." The forms of matter, it is conceivable, are not limited, or not yet complete, but the act of creation renders the process orderly and not arbitrary. Again, it is universally acknowledged that the superior governs the inferior; how then shall the planets, purely material bodies, influence and control the decisions of the mind of man? All the stars in the heavens could not make a three-sided figure anything but a triangle. Further, we observe around us an orderly procession of facts and incidents, everywhere but in the mental sphere. Men hesitate. They are often undecided. They are free. If you assert that mental acts are controlled and inevitable, as are physical results, what becomes of the soul and the freedom of the will? Here the Astrologer begins to give way, and acknowledges the weight and value of the Haber's arguments, who therefore continues, perhaps in a little more complacent mood. It may be that certain changes result from the position of the stars; such as atmospheric changes. But man is endowed with energy and industry. He can, as it were, put aside such influence, or act as to counterbalance their weight. He is master of his fate. He may, if he will, become as a skilled equestrian that can control the fiery steed, which, however, would throw an inexperienced rider. Both men at last shake hands, swear eternal friendship, and the disputation is at an end. But the crowd around was angry. "If the stars will
not help us, what shall become of us all?” they cried in anguish. “They have taken away his God, what can he do now?” The answer from the two friends is the old answer. God will help those that help themselves. They must not depend upon the stars and lead a life of idleness. They must put their shoulders to the wheel. The stars in heaven will not weed their fields, nor gather in their crops. Work brings wealth; indolence spells ruin. But far better than a material prosperity is the equanimity of the mind based on study and the friendship of the wise. At these words joy came to the congregation (the Kahal—observe the subtle touch, not to pan the crowd, the mob is always foolish), and they, too, praised God. The narrator, the man that witnessed and reported the discussion, hereupon comes forward, and in a singularly beautiful poem repeats the lesson of responsibility, industry, and fearlessness in well doing. God’s mercies are daily renewed for the benefit of mankind, therefore let not the fear of plague or misfortune enervate a man in his daily work. With all the charm in his pen Pulgar sings the old text: Work, and God is faithful to compensate. As a specimen of Pulgar’s verse I place the following before the reader:—

ר"א אלכמ אקרא א시스פ תבורים
בכאמר בל חותן על טירם
כל בכסיים מכם ואחריים
איל תמים ברבים הם נוירם
לאו יושב אדות על פינכם
במעון אתו רכינו טפיקים
ריה כי אימים אתו תוחר
במעון מותיכי בל שחר
אשל פירא אפריר ויימראים
ותיכע אנות אלעיה ת לפנות
놀 שאלת הודו אלו באהר
כומי שאלת מסכלות לבינימ
 cdrושי אלו וה⏪ות מסכלות
אשל תוחת ממידי בלladığı
In an appendix, which Pulgar calls the "narrative of the confused" (?), many amusing instances are educed to show the disappointments that have awaited the dupes of the astrologers, but the space at my disposal does not allow me to linger any further upon this part, interesting though it is, and looking forward to the time when I may enjoy the good fortune to publish the work in its entirety, I pass on to Part IV.

**PART IV.**

This contains a defence of the study of philosophy and natural science. From a careful study of the work and our knowledge that Pulgar was a doctor, it may reasonably be inferred that he devoted much time and attention to scientific research, as it was understood in his age, and that he, in this part of his work, is defending himself against the complaints and criticisms which such pursuits undoubtedly received from many of his contemporaries, who looked upon a too curious investigation into the working of natural laws as signs of a weak faith and of indifference to the practices of religious piety. Returning to the text before us, we read that the author complains of the annoyance and the irritation to which men of knowledge are subjected by reason that the most foolish of men take
upon themselves to attack the doings of their betters. Not, however, that this is a matter for surprise. Solomon has told us (Prov. xxix. 27) that the perfect way is the abomination of the wicked, &c. From the oft-quoted confession of Akiba (Pesachim, 49 b) we know how severe and bitter is the contempt and loathing which the wise man bears towards the wise man. Pulgar says he feels impelled to come forward and defend those studies which conferr so great a benefit upon mankind, and he divides the opponents of the study of natural science into four classes. The first class comprises those who look upon themselves as the only good and pious ones, the only true defenders of religion. These men cast a slur upon students, and not, as Pulgar feels bound to acknowledge, without some just cause. For it must be owned that we do find men, with much pretension, but with little or no real claim to scientific culture, who speak disrespectfully of the Torah and its behests. He who claims to be the only good and pious one, the only true defender of religion, is cast a slur upon students, and not, as Pulgar feels bound to acknowledge, without some just cause. For it must be owned that we do find men, with much pretension, but with little or no real claim to scientific culture, who speak disrespectfully of the Torah and its behests.

§ 74. A little knowledge is a dangerous thing. But such a man is the Epikoros. The truly wise man acts differently. He scrupulously observes every precept great and small, and, his knowledge and investigations throwing much light upon the reasons for the precepts, he is enabled to perform his religious duties with a truer devotion than would otherwise be the case. He uses the great gifts of God—knowledge, thought, reason—to justify the ways of Heaven to man. The second class of objectors are the Kabbalists. The Kabbalists will have it that all their traditions and practices are derived, unaltered and untainted, direct from on high. They forget that it was the constant practice of the sages to keep the text of Scripture free from all addition and alteration, and that notwithstanding all their solicitude and care discrepancies have crept into the sacred text.

§ 75. If time has, then, left its mark
even upon the word of God, how far-fetched is the claim that the strange practices of the Kabbala should have reached the present generation without blemish. Two faults in particular Pulgar finds in the books of the Kabbalists—the first being the introduction of strange, uncouth words and expressions, and, secondly, an utter absence of precision and logic, leading in some cases to a positive denial of the Unity of God (§ 75 a). The Kabbalists claim that they understand mysteries hidden from other men, and that they possess the power by means of charms to change the course of Nature. Pulgar relates the following little incident as related to him by a certain Kabbalist, Maistre Marcus by name (§ 75 a), who when a youth was the pupil of a renowned scholar living in the German isles. The savant, jealous lest his disciple should, when his studies were completed, have acquired as profound a knowledge of the mysterious as he himself, refrained from imparting to the youth as much of his knowledge as the latter desired. Our student was driven to strategy. One night, whilst his master was sleeping, the enterprising seeker after knowledge took from beneath the pillow of his teacher, where it had been placed for greater security, a certain famous work the perusal of which had hitherto been denied him. The fates, ever on the side of the brave, caused the master’s sleep to be prolonged until the student had the time not only to make a copy of the work, but likewise to replace it beneath the pillow of the unsuspecting pedagogue. What was the reward of the student’s action? He made his way homeward, and by the help of one of the incantations found in the book he made a journey of four months in the third part of one day. This, says Pulgar, as it were triumphantly, is the trash taught, and alas unfortunately believed by

1 On the criticism of the language of Kabbalistic works the reader is referred to Luzzatto’s ידיעת קבליות ; and on the alleged denial of the doctrine of the Unity of God to Jellinek’s Beitrag, Leipzig, 185 a, p. 52.
some of the most honoured of our people (§ 76). On passing from this subject, Pulgar asks his reader to turn to his book  

Who are the third class of objectors? This class comprises the men who elevate the laws of Nature, which are but the desires of Heaven, until they consider them the equals of God, aye, even as the enemy of the Creator and therefore deny the omnipotence of God and the possibility of miracles. Pulgar explains the word - which, generally translated as Nature, or material, denotes the channel and instruments of God's desires operating upon matter, the laws of Nature are the agency, call this agent as you will or , or , or anything else you wish. The important thing to remember is that it is not an independent agent. It is dependent and subordinate to God and, too, can suspend and destroy this activity whenever he wishes it. Such is the teaching of true philosophy. Nature is one of the agents of Heaven, carrying out the work of a Power outside itself—subject to Heaven, and to Heaven alone. In the same way that God controls Nature, so too does man control himself, and Free-will is the gift of God to man. This leads us to the fourth class, i.e. those that believe in wizards, witches, the power of incantation, and the like—all of which, he says, are numerous indeed to-day among us. We are told that such a witch has
done this, and such a witch has done that. And there is no end. On this point the Torah is clear. She that claims to be a witch—suffer her not to live. The belief in witchcraft results from the bad influence of a belief in astrology. Pulgar gives us a quotation from a work on witchcraft as follows (§ 78):

If you desire a certain woman to love you, act as follows: Go to the market on the market day. Buy a mirror, and pay for it the first price asked by the vendor. Speak neither going nor when returning home. Hold the mirror in front of the woman in question before you put it away from your hand, and that hitherto obdurate female will find you irresistible." Again, once there was a man gambling, and he had a spindle (טול) beneath him. He won at the gaming. Therefore, say these foolish ones, to win at gaming don't forget the spindle. But, says Pulgar, these people go beyond this. They have prayers formed to the names of angels and demons. From this dangerous practice arises the suggestion that idol worship is not entirely false, for they go on to say that having secured the intercession of God's favourites, the Deity will be loath to deny requests backed up by the supplications of saints and angels (§ 78 a). The aid of God alone, protests Pulgar, we seek, this and the cultivation of the world in which he has placed us. We rely upon him and upon the energies and the brain he has given us. For food we till the ground, to cure our pains and assuage our infirmities we study and practise the science of medicine, &c. It is said that it is impossible for us ever to get into the inner mysteries of nature. It may be so. It is not derogatory for a scientist to acknowledge this. Yet
though there be many things we do not know, nevertheless much have we found out by research. We reason from effects back to causes, and although we cannot be sure of the precise nature of the cause, the important thing is that we can fairly well predict the nature of the result. We do not know, says Pulgar, why fire is heating, nor the causes of magnetic attraction, yet in both cases we have a good working knowledge, and this knowledge we use with certainty and for our benefit. Pulgar does not deny that there are more things in heaven and earth than are dreamt of in our philosophy. He does not deny, he says, that there may be matters subject to mental effort at present beyond our vision on the surface. In such matters a philosopher pleads ignorance. He does not know; he becomes an agnostic.

It is against practices absolutely forbidden by the Torah that the author lifts up his voice in resolute and unceasing protest.

**PART V.**

This, the concluding chapter of the work, though not without interest of its own, is less likely to engage the attention of the historical student than other parts of the *Ezer ha-Dat*. It deals with an old question, i.e. the attraction which a certain class of men find in depreciating the world in which they live, and in building up charming castles in the air in respect of their expectations of a future and happier existence. Having weaned his thoughts from the attractions of this world, the author once during his wanderings found himself in the company of an aged man clad in the garb of an anchorite or hermit. To him the author opened his heart. The hermit was all kindness, and led him to Mount Gilboa, where they reached the graves of Desire (מהות החשוכל). In the modest hut or cave the two
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men shared the frugal meal, and then, resting after the repast, they heard the conversation of immortal spirits. In the words familiar to those acquainted with the eschatological phrases of the Talmud the one spirit said to the other, "Sister, let us not converse here, for living men listen to the words of immortal spirits." The hermit thereupon arose and besought the invisible speaker not to remove hence, for indeed, he said, it is to learn from you that we have come hither. A conversation then ensued between the hermit and the spirit, to which the author listens, an edified spectator. The joys and energies of the body are passed in review between the speakers, the hermit in praise, the unknown on the other hand bent on showing how all physical joys become the source of sorrow, shame, and weakness. Passing from the discussion of the merits or otherwise of the attractions of the body, the hermit seeks to gain from the spirit the admission that the nether world contains nothing so exquisite as the ambitions and gratifications of the mind in the contemplation of its creations and victories. No, answers the spirit, imagination is illusion, and because of the contrast the greater source of disappointment. The Living are as in a net; the Dead alone know what is existence, for they alone have reached "the rest and the knowledge." They alone are free from the trammels and limitations of the body. They have put off the mortal coil, and live eternally. The angel is here introduced, and reconciles the views of the disputants. The scale, or degree of importance, of living is threefold. The first, or lowest, is that found among ordinary, even ignorant folk. These appreciate only what is material. They do not comprehend, indeed they despise all mental discipline, and spiritually they are dead. The second is an advance over the previous. They are able to reason from the material to the mental, from the coarse and visible to the finer and invisible. But they do not. Knowing the better way they are yet content to follow the worse. The third and highest stage is that of the מְשׁכֵּלוּם והָעַנִּים, those in a state...
of constant wisdom. Freed from the limitations of the body they are united and are at one with the Active Intelligence. The author finds himself compelled to own that the Dead had won the day. For it is clear that none attain this life while still swathed by the cerements of earth, and in truth no man sees God while alive. In a beautiful poem, the author, addressing his soul, bids it rejoice in the contemplation of its glorious future, and hearing this the Dead too give utterance to the praises of God.

Such in outline is the *Ezer ha-Dat*, the Hebrew text of which I hope soon to publish, and from these notes may perhaps be gleaned something of the power and character of its author. Isaac Pulgar is a name but little known to the present generation, but undoubtedly its possessor was a man fit to take his seat among the greatest of Israel's sons that shed lustre and fame upon the communities of the Iberian Peninsula.

G. BELASCO.

1 Comp. Buxtorf's *Lexicon*, p. 2391, קַוָּיָּה הַשְּׁכָרָה = Habitus intellectualis.
THE ORIGINS OF THE RELIGION OF ISRAEL

PRELIMINARY; THE CRETAN ZEUS; BABEL AND BIBLE.

With the progress of archaeology it becomes every year more clearly manifest that the life and thought of Rome and Greece and Israel took their rise out of a far older world, out of a civilization, a social and mental state, diffused over a wide area, and common to many races—Aryan and Semitic, Egyptian and Chaldean, "Hittite" and "Mycenaean"; and that the characteristics of this state are best understood by comparison with those of peoples still, in more recent times, at a corresponding stage of development.

The common civilization of antiquity was correlated with a common religion. Similar elements of thought and worship recur continually in different connexions. The sky and the heavenly bodies are common to all. Pastoral tribes, at the animistic stage, will necessarily reverence a spirit of the herd or of the flock, which will be conceived as male or female according as the tribe itself has reached a system of male kinship or remains in the matriarchal state. Agricultural peoples will seek their prosperity from a spirit of vegetation. The specialized cult of one among the greater gods is a synthesis of many such elements. It may be compared to the basin of a river, in which countless tributary streams combine to swell the

---

1 This article forms a continuation of the essay which appeared in J.Q.R., April, 1900; vol. XII, p. 381.
main channel, and we are at a loss when among all these we endeavour to discern the authentic source.

Thus Dr. Frazer has clearly shown that Osiris was alike a spirit of vegetation, a bull-god, and a moon-god. All these are elements which enter into the concept of Osiris, and all of them enter, in like manner, into the popular and traditional concept of Jahveh. But this triple coincidence does not presume transmission. These are materials furnished by the common religion of the ancient world to the growth of special cults. And we must not allow such resemblances to blind us to the essential distinction that Osiris is before all things a god of the dead, but Jahveh above all a god of the living.

The religious usages and traditions of ancient Crete present remarkable points of resemblance, and perhaps of contact, with those of Israel. "It is the early religion of the Semitic world which affords the most illuminating commentary on what we are able to reconstruct from remaining records of the Mycenaean tree and pillar cult.... It is indeed especially from biblical sources that this form of worship receives its grandest illustration." The term βαινο or βαινιων, perhaps the Hebrew בַּיִי, was "applied in a special way to the stone which, according to the Cretan legend, was swallowed by Kronos under the belief that it was his son. But this stone, as Lenormant has well pointed out, is in fact nothing else than the material form of the Cretan Zeus himself." This Cretan Zeus was a god of the sky, the mountain, and the cave; he gave or withheld the rain; he was also a bull-god, and the altars of Cretan worship were surmounted by conven-

1 The Golden Bough, and ed., II, 153, 154, and 312, 313.
2 Evans, The Mycenaean Tree and Pillar Cult, &c. (reproduced from the Journal of Hellenic Studies), 1901, p. 34.
3 Observe that βαινο represents a more primitive form than the biblical מ or מ. Cf. Gesenius-Kautzsch, E. T., § 84 a, p. 239, מ [abs.] "from זא-it, the i passing into the corresponding consonant." Note also the Sept. בֵּית.
4 Ibid., pp. 14, 15.
5 Cf. 1 Kings xix. 9, וַיֵּחֶר.
tional "horns of consecration," which at other times are shown in connexion with his symbol the labrys, or double axe, or again represented at the base of the sacred pillar.

These features have their familiar parallels in the religion of Israel. But it is as a source of revealed law that the god of Crete is most interesting to biblical students. "The code of Minos became the source of all later legislation. As the wise ruler and inspired lawgiver there is something altogether biblical in his legendary character. He is the Cretan Moses, who every nine years repaired to the Cave of Zeus, whether on the Cretan Ida or on Dicta, and received from the God of the Mountain the laws for his people. Like Abraham, he is described as the 'friend of God.' Nay, in some accounts, the mythical being of Minos has a tendency to blend with that of his native Zeus."

In J. Q. R., XIII, pp. 588 et seq., Mr. Tyler has pointed out the channel by which, in the age of David, or in the period of Philistine domination which preceded it, these religious traditions may have affected Israel, viz. the known worship of Zeus Knērayēnēs, under the epithet of יטבת, at Gaza. He even fetches from this source "The Origin of the Tetragrammaton," and to confirm this hypothesis cites a coin conjecturally assigned to Gaza, and to the date circa 400 B.C., in which a figure, "easily identified with Zeus," is surmounted by Phoenician characters corresponding to יה. I think, however, we must consider, firstly, that many, and perhaps all, the analogies which the traditions of Crete present with those of Israel may prove to consist in, or be derived from, elements common to all the ancient world; secondly, that Crete itself may owe much to Semitic influences in an early age; thirdly, that before the fourth century Gaza may have borrowed from Israel, or rather Judah, no less than Israel from Gaza, and, lastly, that it is the most improbable thing in the world that at the epoch of bitter


struggle crowned by successful revolt against their oppressors the Israelites should have borrowed from the latter the name of the deity to whom they ascribed their deliverance.

In J. Q. R., X, 662 et seq., the present writer put forward the hypothesis that in accordance with the analogy of Hebrew tribal names, and consistently with many biblical allusions, יוהי, = “he will be,” may legitimately be interpreted as the elliptic form of the invocation of the ancient Israelite warrior-god, to be completed by יהוה and בני, i.e. “God will be with us.” And this suggestion has since received a double confirmation from the occurrence of the names לארשי and ת đo, in the forms la-a’-ve-ilu, la-ve-ilu, and Ilu-ittia, “among the old North Semitic tribes who settled in Babylonia about 2500 B.C.” Parallel in grammatical formation and religious significance with לארשי are the contemporary names Iamlih-ilu and Iarbi-ilu. There can be no sufficient reason to translate the former Jahve is God, but the latter names as God sits in command, Great is God. “God will be” (with us) is an utterance of faith of essentially the same nature as the rest. And as among the tribal and urban names of Scripture we find, side by side with similar assurances expressed in the indicative, jussives such as יגד = “God increase” (the flock), and יבר = “God build” (the city), so here too beside the indicative, יארשי, we encounter the jussive לארשי, Iahd-ilu, the same thought now taking shape in prayer = “God be” (with us). And, as we all know, these two forms continued to subsist throughout the biblical history long after they had by established usage exchanged the signification of predicates for that of attributes, and from “verbs” had passed into “nouns.”

1 I avail myself of the convenient summary in E. B., art. Names, § 113, n. 5.
2 Babel and Bible, by Prof. Friedrich Delitzsch, Eng. trans., pp. 70, 71, 131.
3 Ibid., p. 124.
4 Ibid., pp. 131, 137.
5 Ibid., p. 140.
It may be held that this change had begun as early as the remote period under discussion. For the Babylonian scribe has rendered נִבר by ִיָּא-עַ-עֵ-עֵ-י-לֻו ¹, as if he regarded נִבר as a noun, and therefore appended the mimiation ². But it is to be remarked that the scribe was dealing with names which were to him foreign ³, and further that a confusion of m and w is characteristic of the Babylonian dialect ⁴. Probably the writer heard נִבר, the וַאֱע retaining something of its consonantal force, as in וַאֱע.

In the interpretation of these data the learned Assyriologist has been, I think, misled by a very natural preconception, the more persistent because almost unconscious, but alien and antagonistic to ancient religious thought. It is natural for us moderns to regard the "name" of an antique god as a "noun" by which the being so conceived may be referred to in converse or in writing. For his worshippers it was nothing of the kind. The name of a god was in the first instance the sacred epithet or formula by which he was directly addressed and effectually invoked, to which he was expected to respond, and which for that very reason was to a great extent avoided in common speech. This is the fundamental canon for the interpretation of divine names, and until its significance is fully grasped no scientific treatment of them is possible. This is the reason why in Homer a whole group of titles of gods and heroes presents the vocative form even when these terms are employed as nominatives ⁶. This is why the name of the guardian deity of Rome was kept a profound secret, lest the enemies of the republic might lure him away, as the Romans were accustomed to do when they besieged a city ⁶. This is why in biblical usage the

¹ Babel and Bible, pp. 71, 138. ³ Ibid., p. 135. ² Ibid., p. 123.
⁴ See the Assyrian Grammar of the same scholar, translated by Kennedy, 1889, § 44.
⁵ Monro, Homeric Grammar (1891), § 96. "These are in reality vocatives which have been turned into nominatives."
⁶ Frazer, Golden Bough (1900), I, 446.
term הָיוֹלַח habitually employed in proper names—since these are invocations or ascriptions—is in ordinary speech replaced by the abstract periphrasis שֵּׂעֵר, i.e. "divinity." It is for this reason that the Israelite was at the same time forbidden to utter the name of the God of Israel for a vain cause—לְזָרַע—i.e. apart from the purposes of religion, and to use the name of any other god at all—since to name a god is to invoke him. The formal question at issue between Elijah and his opponents was precisely whether the national deity should be invoked in sacrifice by the name of הנְחָית or by that of בָּשָׁם; and it is decided by the divine response. The same principle supplies the reason why, over a wide area of folk-lore, the names of gods, of kings, and of the dead are shunned in speech, since to pronounce them is regarded not merely as irreverent, but as dangerous—it is to evoke a divinity. And in many cases even the names of ordinary living persons are kept secret or employed with great reserve, since the knowledge and use of a man's name gives the power to call forth his soul. With these facts in mind we shall be prepared to understand the dependence of the divine blessing upon the employment of the divine name in such passages as Ex. xx. 24 and Num. vi. 27, and to comprehend how expressions such as בֵּית יָהָדוֹת or יִזְדָּמָן (עֶבֶד)—the former a creed and the latter a prayer—pass in time into "names" of God. That this change came about at an early period I am myself inclined to believe, for I still think it probable that the immemorial antiquity ascribed to the Name in the Judaean source (Gen. iv. 26), its adoption by Moses, and the tribal name הנְחָית, may all be accounted for by the supposition that the last is in fact, as is suggested by Gen. xxix. 35,

1 Exod. xx. 7, as translated by Addia.
2 Exod. xxi. 13.
3 1 Kings xviii, esp. vv. 24, 25, 26, 32, 36-9.
4 See Frazer, G. R., vol. I, pp. 403-47. Mr. Clodd's little volume Tom Tui Tot, may also be read with pleasure and instruction.

* Read רַע = "thou shalt invoke."
a contraction of מַעְלָה וְלֹ. But the Divine Subject of such predicates, the El thus implored or praised—what God was he? Was he but one among the "gods many and lords many" of antiquity? Or was he the One above the many? Was he, as Mr. Spencer or Mr. Grant Allen would have supposed, the spirit of some ancestral chief? Or was he the Moral Supreme Being of primitive imagination described by Mr. Lang? Or, yet again, the Power, indeterminate except as spiritual, "whose pressure we feel, but whose motives are a riddle"? We have no other answer to these questions than such as is furnished by the predicates employed. El tells us no more than Ba'äl; we know neither its origin nor its meaning. When the ejaculations by which the god is evoked in war set him vividly before us as engaged in conflict (בַּעַל), at hand-grips with his antagonist—(בַּעַל)—or in the act of tripping him up—(בַּעַל)—it is plain that we are concerned with a hero of legend or of myth. So, too, when we translate Bab-ilu by "Gate of God," we must admit that the god in question was no other than Marduk. The ancient names cited by Prof. Delitzsch do not, then, suffice to prove a monotheistic creed. On the other hand, they afford a vivid illustration of what is perhaps of more real importance than the beliefs of those who bore or bestowed them—the disposition of their minds towards the object of their religion.

The religious faculty does not rest quiescent in the contemplation of an object received ab extra, but tends ever

1 J. Q. R., XI, 248; but rather than וְ or וַ, is the true subject of מַעְלָה.

2 Mark Pattison. In the phrase of Prof. Delitzsch "the Divine Essence . . . viewed . . . as a unity" (op. cit., pp. 70, 133).

3 It will be seen that I distrust the etymology advanced in Babel and Bible (pp. 69, 125). The reference to Hos. xi. 7 rests upon an error. Here, as in chap. i. 9 (read מַעְלָה; cf. ii. 18), chap. vii. 16 (for מַעְלָה read מַעְלָה), for ו read וְ.


5 "The character and value of this monotheism cannot be estimated with our present sources of knowledge."—Babel and Bible, p. 133.
to mould, to glorify, and to transform into an ideal that which it has thus received. In the great temples alike of Egypt and Chaldea the tendency existed to exalt the local god to supreme rank, to ascribe to him the work of creation, and either to identify with him or subordinate to him the other members of the national pantheon. A striking instance of this process is supplied by the tablet in which Marduk in several aspects is identified successively with Ninib and Nergal or Zamama, with Bel, Nabû, Sin, Shamash, and Addu. I am far from saying that such speculations and the emotions associated with them do not merit our respectful attention; but they must not be cited as evidence of popular belief, or of an original monotheism.

If only (one is tempted to exclaim) it had been possible, while there was yet time, for the Egyptian and Chaldean priests and scribes, the thinkers and the writers of those lands, to exchange their cumbrous scripts for the alphabet of Phoenicia, and to lay aside what was merely particular and local, with the survivals of savagery, in their religion! This they could not do. Their creed was a synthesis of traditions. Like that of the Roman Church, it grew by accretion. They could not reject. Their conservatism enabled them to preserve and to transmit through periods of time unparalleled in the history of mankind the records of history, the documents of literature, the traditions of religion. And then, when this transmission could no more take place, the whole system, incapable of adaptation, ceased to be, and history, literature, and religion were alike buried in oblivion.

Grey Hubert Skipwith.

2 Ibid., pp. 75, 143.
3 Further articles on the subject of the "Origins of the Religion of Israel" will follow.
THE ARABIC PORTION OF THE CAIRO GENIZAH AT CAMBRIDGE.

(Seventh Article.)

XX.

Paper, one leaf, 14 x 21 cm.

Of the three fragments, from the Taylor-Schechter Collection, published in this article, the first consists of the beginning of "Prolegomena of Al Iskandarâni." This name, "Alexandrian," not only suggests Philo, but a brief examination reveals the fact that the fragment belongs to a work which contained a condensed translation of Philo's treatise on the Ten Commandments. I believe that this is the only instance of a work by Philo being introduced into Jewish-Arabic literature. The very fact of his name being mentioned is interesting from various points of view, and shows that the Egyptian Jews under Moslem rule not only endeavoured to enrich their own literature by original works, but also to render older works accessible to the reading public.

T-S. 13 Ka.¹

(Recto.)

¹ For a quotation from Philo by Saadyah see my Third Article, vol. XVI, p. 103.
Chapter I. Prolegomena of the Alexandrian.

He says: Why did the Creator give the Ten Commandments to the children of Israel, as well as the rest of the Torah in the desert, and why did this not take place in a town? The answer is that this was done on account of the idolatrous practices which took place in the cities. God considered his Torah too exalted to be revealed in a place where such things were carried on, and gave it in the desert which was free from them, and on a sanctified mountain. Another answer is that when God . . . desired to present them with the land [of Canaan] and wealth . . . . This is compared to a man who has a son. He desires to love him, and to hand over to him all his property. But before doing so he must be educated and taught, and the property is, then, given to him . . .

XXI.

Paper, four leaves, 18.5 x 14 cm.

This fragment contains part of a commentary on the Book of Esther, probably by Saadyah. The writing is so faded, and the whole fragment in so dilapidated a condition, that the examination of this question must be deferred. The colophon, however, I cannot refrain from publishing at once, as it is one of the earliest to be found in a Jewish MS. The writer mentions the year 4765. The name of the month is not legible, but the day was the 20th, and a Wednesday, as may be gathered from the remaining letters המ. The month was probably Kislev, and the whole date corresponds to Dec. 6, 1004, which was a Wednesday.
Paper, two leaves, 12 x 14.5 cm.

The third fragment offers greater technical difficulties, the text being broken to such an extent that it is untranslatable. The fragment deserves, however, publication because it introduces a new name into Jewish-Arabic literature, viz. that of Isaiah Hallévi b. Mishael. This man seems to have lectured on Philosophy, and as the superscription of the fragment tends to show, compiled a book on the human soul on the basis of works of Gentile scholars. The fragment only consists of the usual preface of religious character and part of the introduction.

On the basis of Ps. civ. 4 the author discusses the nature of angels. Here are a few passages: "God is the creator of the angelic spirits, which are simple [substances] or abstract souls without any material component part."

"The substance of the soul is a simple one, and constantly in motion." "The word הַלְוָי [of the verse in question] expresses the movement of the soul, because it is a glittering spark and constantly moving." The author evidently drew upon Ibn Sinā's Psychology, but in the manner of Jewish Aristotelians he interpreted the same ideas into the text of the Bible.
HARTWIG HIRSCHFELD.
AMERICAN AUTOS.

In the Transactions of the American Jewish Historical Society original documents in my possession and other materials as to the establishment of the American Inquisition in 1569 and its subsequent history will shortly be published. In order, however, to add to the lists of autos already collected here, I append the dates of thirty-four celebrated at Lima and fifty-four at Cartagena de las Indias. The sources and other particulars of these are given in the Transactions.

**AUTOS DE FÉ AT LIMA.**

| Nov. 15, 1573 | Aug. 11, 1635 | Dec. 21, 1720 |
| April 1, 1578 | Aug. 17, 1635 | July 12, 1733 |
| Oct. 29, 1581 | Jan. 23, 1639 | Dec. 23, 1736 |
| Nov. 30, 1587 | Nov. 17, 1641 | Nov. 11, 1737 |
| April 5, 1592 | Jan. 23, 1664 | Oct. 19, 1749 |
| Dec. 17, 1595 | Feb. 16, 1666 | April 6, 1761 |
| Dec. 10, 1600 | June 28, 1667 | Sept. 1, 1773 |
| March 13, 1605 | Oct. 8, 1667 | Feb. 18, 1800 |
| June 1, 1608 | March 16, 1693 | Aug. 27, 1803 |
| June 17, 1612 | Dec. 20, 1694 | Sept. 10, 1805 |
| Dec. 21, 1625 | Nov. 28, 1719 | July 17, 1806 |
| Feb. 27, 1631 |

**AUTOS DE FÉ AT CARTAGENA DE LAS INDIAS.**

| Feb. 2, 1614 | June 6, 1655 | May 30, 1688 |
| July, 1618 | Oct. 1, 1656 | Dec. 11, 1689 |
| March 13, 1622 | Sept. 16, 1657 | April 29, 1691 |
| June 17, 1626 | May, 1669 | March, 1695 |
| Aug. 6, 1627 | March 2, 1670 | April 27, 1697 |
| June 25, 1628 | Aug. 24, 1671 | April 29, 1699 |
| March 7, 1632 | Sept. 4, 1671 | Jan. 10, 1700 |
| March 26, 1634 | Sept. 4, 1672 | June 20, 1700 |
| June 1, 1636 | Feb. 17, 1675 | Feb. 24, 1707 |
| March 25, 1638 | April 4, 1677 | March 18, 1708 |
| July 22, 1642 | Oct. 23, 1678 | May 21, 1708 |
| May 24, 1648 | Nov. 12, 1679 | May 26, 1711 |
| Nov. 28, 1649 | Dec. 21, 1681 | July 9, 1713 |
| Dec. 21, 1650 | Oct. 28, 1682 | July 29, 1714 |
| April 25, 1653 | July 29, 1683 | June 11, 1715 |
| July 22, 1653 | Aug. 29, 1683 | Nov. 30, 1715 |
| April 28, 1654 | Feb. 11, 1685 | June 20, 1717 |
| May 8, 1655 | Sept. 9, 1685 | Feb. 5, 1782 |
The Inquisition at Mexico was no less zealous, and Medina is now engaged in a work specially dealing therewith. Dr. George Kohut and others have frequently devoted their attention to Mexico, and, indeed, Dr. Kohut has an article of eighteen pages in Vol. XI of the Transactions of the American Jewish Historical Society, dealing with a single Mexican trial, that of Francisco Maldonado de Silva, who was burnt at the auto of Jan. 23, 1639.

Mr. E. Nott Anable, during a recent visit to Mexico of several months' duration, found there in the hands of an antiquary a collection of MSS. relating to the "Holy Inquisition" of Mexico, covering the period from 1601 to 1692, and has brought them to New York.

The papers for the most part refer to trials before the Inquisition. All the papers relating to each case are collected together, and make thirty-one volumes, about nine and a half inches by thirteen, of which twenty-one volumes are bound in vellum and eleven are bound without covers.

The collections consist generally of the information laid with the officers of the Inquisition by some person, an order directing the arrest of the accused party, the return of the officer who executed the writ, a report of the bearing of the accused, with the statement made by him, the testimony of the witnesses examined for and against him (in some cases statements made by the accused under torture), the judgment of the Inquisitors, and the report of the infliction of the punishment to which the accused was condemned.

Many papers bear the original seals of the church officers of the Inquisition, and are of unquestionable authenticity.

The crimes with which the accused were charged are varied. Many are for "observing the Laws of Moses," several are against priests "for soliciting criminal favours after confession of their spiritual daughters," one is for
maintaining a compact with the Devil, another for practising witchcraft, others for heresy and blasphemy.

The following is Mr. Nott Anable's description of his volumes containing the original records of trials before the "Holy Inquisition" of Mexico between the years 1601 and 1692.

**Volume 22. More than 100 pages. Year 1601.**

Process against Leonor de Caceras, only child of Antonio Diaz de Caceres, and Miss Catalina Cueva de Carbajal, his wife, also her mother and sisters, for Judaism, &c., &c.

**Volume 1. More than 400 pages. Year 1602.**

Criminal case against Bartolome Barba, against Jose de Aguilar, and against Sanchez de Ciordia, a document of two and a half pages, in the old Mexican language, and criminal case against Francisco de Carbajal. Several letters from the commissioner of the Holy Inquisition in Vera Cruz. Information from the same commissioner at Vera Cruz. Process against Geronimo Revera, soldier from New Mexico, born in Sevilla, for having married twice, year 1603. Process against Pedro Marquez, from the village of Puebla de los Angeles. Information of the genealogy and character of Fernando Mendez Valdez, living at the city of Cobu, Islands of Philippines, and his wife, Isabel Jimenez, year 1603.

**Volume 23. 244 pages. Year 1603.**

Process against Fraile Joseph Pirez de Ugarte, priest belonging to the Order of Merced in the convent in the city of Mexico, for having acted as commissioner in cases of the Holy Inquisition without having a right to do so.

**Volume 2. 25 pages. Year 1609.**

Process against Francisco Munoz, clergyman presbyter from the Archdiocespric of Guadalajara, for soliciting criminal favours after confession. Information against Pedro de la Reyuera and Francesca Villa Varde, his wife, their genealogy and morals, of the city of Mexico. A document of inquiry regarding the Holy Inquisition from the Kingdom of Navarra, Spain. Information how Fraile P. Frechel, of the San Augustin Order, was elected member of the Holy Office of the Inquisition of the town of Burgos, year 1617.
Volume 3. 300 pages. Year 1620.
Process against Fraile Esteban Rodriguez, of the San Franciscan Order, priest and confessor, Superior of the Convent of Mexcatitla, Province of Zacatecas, for soliciting criminal favours of boys in confession. Criminal process against Domingo Diaz, alias Domingo Rodriguez, a Portuguese of the city of Los Angeles in New Spain, for Judaism (or being a Jew), year 1622. Information against twenty-four persons (God dispose of them). Commissioner of the Holy Inquisition of Puebla against De Diaz. Publications, &c., &c., against Fraile Rodriguez.

Volume 4. 300 pages. Year 1622.
Criminal case against Presbyter Fraile Pedro Martin Balao, year 1622. A Dominican, for soliciting criminal favours.

Volume 5. 300 pages. Year 1624.
Process against Baltazar del Valle, Portuguese, of the city of Zamora, for being a Jew (or Judaism), and a document regarding his character.

Volume 6. 400 pages. Year 1624.
Criminal process against Fraile (Priest) Pedro Martin. Criminal process against Sebastian Dominguez from Medina, for being married twice.

Volume 24. 150 pages. Year 1626.
Process and criminal case against Miss Antonia Belle, of New Vera Cruz, born in Alcalsazar, for witchcraft.

Volume 7. 150 pages. Year 1629.
Process against Francesca, of St. Joseph's, inmate of the Convent of the Conception, of the city of Oaxaca.

Volume 8. 150 pages. Year 1631.
Process against Fraile Pedro Rodriguez, Order of San Francisco, from the province of San Francisco and from the same island, for saying mass without being ordained a priest. Evidence from the Holy Inquisition of Valladolid.

Criminal process against Baltazar de Valle alias Diaz, from Zamora in Spain. His parents were Portuguese, forty-six years old, peddler, married and living at Pachuca, for Judaism. There were nine witnesses against him, and he testified against twelve. Francisco de Vidal, member of religious order. Copy of information.

Process and denouncement of Miss Isabel Texoso, living in New Vera Cruz, sixty years old, for being a Jewess; had ten trials, twenty-eight persons testifying against her. Criminal case and process asked for by the fiscal or attorney of the Holy Office against the memory and fame of Isabel Texoso, 1659. Pretensions of the Presbyter Serafine Garcia Gardenas for commissioner of the Holy Office in his Curate in Real of Guarysonray, year 1791.

Volume 10.  500 pages.  Year 1642.

Criminal process against Simon Lopez, from the city of Guarda in Portugal, peddler and living in Portugal, for following the Laws of Moses. Advice that Juan Duarte, Francisco Lopez, and Simon Lopez, of Aguarda, Portugal, have been imprisoned. Letters from Lopez while in the Inquisition prison. Criminal process and case against George Jacinto, of Mexico, born in Malaga, husband of Blanca Juarez, for following the Laws of Moses; thirty-eight witnesses against him, for being besides a heretic and Jew, he giving evidence against thirty-three persons. (This case was tried before the celebrated Manozca.)

Publication No. 7 of the American Jewish Historical Society contains a translation of the trial of Gabriel de Granada (1642-1645), and Simon Lopez was one of the persons against whom he deposed.

Volume 11.  300 pages.  Year 1642.

Criminal process against Francisco Ruiz, a foreigner and a weaver living in Guatemala, for being a heretic. Criminal process against Diego Juarez, 1642, from Pazuaro, State of Michoacan, born in Lisbon, for being a Jew, forty-three years old; fifty-five witnesses.


Criminal process against Miss Francisco Texoso, of Vera Cruz, born in Sevilla, thirty years old, for being a Jewess; twenty-seven witnesses, she giving evidence against forty-two persons; the celebrated Irishman Azuzena had criminal connexion with her, as she had with many other persons. Criminal process, 1642, against George Montoya, from Castle Blanco in Portugal, a fugitive, heretic and Jew; he was delivered to the Holy Inquisition as an offender at the Auto da Fé or General Order to the criminal judges in April, 1649; he was also a prisoner of the Inquisition in Goa. A judicial letter or notice to George Moya. Documents sent to priests regarding the foregoing letter.
Volume 13. 300 pages. Year 1642.

Criminal process against Antonio Tinoco, dead, the son of James Tinoco, dead, and Mrs. Henriqueta, of Mexico, for following the Laws of Moses. Letters and advices to his sons and descendants, grandchildren, heirs, or any other persons. Criminal process against James de San Martin, from the Mines of Los Ramos, for having married twice. This case has signatures of many important persons.

Volume 14. 320 pages. Year 1643.

Criminal case against Mrs. Catarina Enriquez, of Vera Cruz, Jewess, for following the Laws of Moses; thirty years old, from Sevilla. Widow of Pedro Arias Maldonado, of Portugal; she had twenty-two brothers, and ninety persons gave evidence against her. Circular and advices of her descendants. Criminal process against the (dead) Gasper de Fonseca, from Portugal, belonging to the village of Ayula, where he died, for having been a Jew. An edict or proclamation. Criminal process against Lorenzo de Torquemada for having tried to become a member of the Holy Inquisition. Criminal case against Francisco Rasen, Frenchman, from Normandy, two leagues from the port of Understadt, pernicious heretic, procurer of heretics, Jew and Calvinist, 1643; ninety persons witnesses against him. A proclamation or edict. Criminal case against Juan Augustin, a mulatto, labourer in the smelter at Guadalajara, for having married twice, 1649.

Volume 15. 222 pages. Year 1643.

Criminal process against Lorenzo de Torquemada, for having forced himself in as a member of the Holy Inquisition. Case against Francisco Rasen, Frenchman, from Normandy, heretic, follower of Luther, Jew, &c.

Volume 25. 20 pages. Year 1643.

Process and criminal case against Fraile Domingo Ramos, of the Order of Santo Domingo, of the province of Chiapas, for having asked criminal favours of his spiritual daughters during confessions.


Process and criminal case against Margarita Morena, of the city of Mexico, follower of the Laws of Moses, wife of Amaro Diaz Martarana, peddler of the city of Mexico, aged thirty-two years; seven witnesses against her and twenty-four witnesses for her.
Criminal case against Yuan Manuel, mulatto, free, from Cirranandaro, Michoacon, a cow-boy at the farm of Coralejo. It was proven by the Holy Inquisition that he had a covenant, contract, or (pacto) with the Devil, a forsaker of the Holy Catholic Religion, and the master of this offence. A judicial sentence against Juan Rodriguez for having been married twice at the mines of Paral.

Criminal case and process against Juana Gutierrez Jalapa, negress, not a slave, belonging to New Vera Cruz. Juana Jalapa was a notable witch; there are many traditions amongst the people regarding her witchcraft. The attorney representing the Holy Inquisition against Luis Rame for being a heretic and belonging to different sects, year 1685.

Denunciation of Nicholas Bazan, mulatto, a slave, belonging to Melchor Díaz de Posadas, against a brother of Melchor de Posadas, Fernando Díaz, his son, and others, and continuation of the case. Criminal case against Pedro Correo, owner of a Hacienda, married in Paral, for blasphemy and being a renegade from or of God, year 1666.

Evidence and sentence as an object of terror. In virtue of an order of the Holy Secretary of the illustrious tribunal of the Holy Inquisition of Mexico of the Kingdom and Provinces of New Spain, against the person and property of Pedro Correa Juárez. The Presbyter Juan Bilboa, by order of the Vicar ecclesiastical and commission of the Holy Office in the Real of San Joseph of Paral and its districts. Case against Miss María Garces, mulatto, not a slave, for having said things against God, 1678.

The attorney of the Holy Office against Fraile Cristóbal Bosueto, alias de la Cruz, forty years old, married. The attorney of the Inquisition of the Holy Office against Father and Fraile Ygnacio Carbajal, of the Order of San Augustin, for criminal solicitation, year 1787.

Criminal case against Juan González de Molina, a Notary Public, living at Carvarroya; De Palavera, living at Tepeaca; Francisco Yanez, living at Tocumachalco; Ana de Figueroa, from Leon in Spain, living
in Mexico; Juan Lopez, a horse-shoer of Mexico, for having put in a village a statue of two Sambenitos. A letter with the great seal of the Holy Inquisition. Another large letter with seal.

*Volume 30.* 350 pages. Year 1688.

The Fiscal Inquisitor or Attorney for the Inquisition and Holy Office against Fraile Eusebio Vellarejo, lecturer in secret of Holy Theology and of the Holy Catholic Missions in the City of Pachuca.

*Volume 29.* 165 pages. Year 1690.


*Volume 28.* 57 pages. Year 1692.

The Fiscal or Attorney of the Holy Inquisition against the Clergyman Sebastian Bolanos, from Guatemala, for criminal solicitation or asking criminal favours.

*Volume 31.*

Book of sixty pages, official and other letters.

*Volume 32.* 54 pages. Year 1647.

Memorials of the father and grandparents of Captain Gasper de Armas, of Guatemala, born at the Canary Islands.

**ITALY.**

The Roman Inquisition, as has already been pointed out, is still in force, though its subjects are now paper and ink instead of flesh and blood. But in the three centuries preceding the French Revolution it was hardly less active, if not quite so bloodthirsty, as its savage daughters in the Peninsula. Where are its records? For a reply to this question we must proceed to a famous Protestant University in Ireland. In 1809 Napoleon took away with him from Rome to Paris over 400 tons' weight of these Inquisition Records. After his downfall they were restored to Rome,
but the pontifical authorities, who have always shown themselves more politic than literary, thought it best to destroy them. And accordingly the precious documents were cut up into minute particles and then sold to the paper-makers. Even so, they realized as waste paper no less than 4,300 francs. Sixty-six volumes, however, of these "Dataria" seem to have escaped that fate, and were purchased by the then Duke of Manchester in 1841. Vice-Provost Wall bought them of him in 1854, and then presented them to the library of Trinity College, Dublin. They constitute a perfect mine of historical information, and are highly treasured by the authorities, who have had them nicely bound and preserved in a strong room. Mr. Karl Benrath has published a rather full description of their contents in the 1879 and 1880 volumes of La Rivista Cristiana. He analyses them into three series:

(a) Twelve volumes of Pontifical Briefs and Bulls, Boniface IX to Pius VI, and one volume of Clement XIII, for the years 1389, 1434, 1439, 1463, 1489, 1493, 1530, 1556, 1561, 1745, 1777, and 1784;
(b) Nineteen volumes of original Sentences for the years 1564 to 1659; and
(c) Thirty-five volumes, giving details of proceedings against heretics and other clerical offenders during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. One of these volumes devotes over a hundred pages to the investigation of a charge of ritual murder against the Jews of Ancona in the year 1711, and their ultimate vindication.

A similar collection of documents relating to the Inquisition in the Canary Islands is in Lord Bute's possession, and a sumptuous catalogue thereof has just been published and favourably reviewed in more than a column of the Times Literary Supplement for September 16, 1904.

E. N. ADLER.

PHILO OF ALEXANDRIA.

With an instinct truer than the reasons alleged, Jerome has included in his catalogue of illustrious men and writers of the Christian Church Philo the Jew and Seneca the Stoic. The traditions on which he relies—that Philo met Peter at Rome on his second embassy to Claudius, and described Christian communities in a treatise "On the Life of Contemplation," and that Seneca corresponded with Paul—are probably the outcome of a natural tendency which seeks to bring into relation the famous figures of a past epoch. Their real justification and Jerome's lies rather in the indisputable fact of the real and important influence which these disciples of Plato and the Porch exercised upon the teaching of the successors of Paul and Peter. But in Judaism there was no dignity titular or real for Philo. As philosophy, Greek or Roman, became gradually more and more thoroughly enlisted on the side of the followers of Jesus of Nazareth, it would seem that the cry went out, "To your tents, O Israel." The attempt to justify the Monotheism of the Old Covenant to the great Greek world was gradually abandoned. The propaganda pursued by popular means like the Sibylline Oracles was dropped. The early Greek translation of the Bible was replaced by the versions of Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion—Jews all, well aware at last of the dangers of loose renderings. Finally the canon of books to which appeal lay was definitely restricted and the authority of "Apocrypha" and "Pseudepigrapha" denied—all the more easily because it had never been formally recognized. Judaism would have none of an Hellenism identified
with Christianity. Greek language and Greek culture became as hateful as when they were forced upon the Jews of Palestine by the ruthless, fruitless efforts of Antiochus Epiphanes.

If this may be regarded as a fair outline of the tendencies of the first few centuries of the Christian era, it is obvious that Judaism had at that time no room for Philo—must indeed of necessity regard him as a deserter by anticipation, a traitor to the Law, who had sold the keys of the stronghold of Monotheism.

For in Philo, as in Seneca, philosophy triumphed over nationality and national religion, and Philo in his exposition of the Law on principles of Platonism and Stoicism—fit fellow thus for Seneca—had offered to the Gentiles the key of knowledge which was the peculiar possession of the Scribes. And so Philo stands alone, a pathetic figure in the history of thought, befriended and adopted only by the foes of that religion which he loved, which he sought to commend to the nations, whose sacred books he accepted with loyal obedience and expounded with tireless devotion. It was not until a much later period that Jews have in part reclaimed Philo as their own.

Whatever the Hebrew Jews, in the first Christian centuries, might think of the wisdom of the Greeks, they could afford to ignore it. But it was far otherwise with the Jews of the Dispersion. They, the Hellenists, for their own sake no less than for the sake of possible converts, made terms with Hellenism. They had the truth in the written revelation of the Law, and if the claim of the Gentiles, that in their wisdom was the truth likewise, were to be upheld at all, then that wisdom could only be derived from the Law. If demonstration were needed to back assertion they had recourse to the current method of allegorical interpretation, by which alone—failing any theory of evolutionary development—a religion embodied in a written or traditional deposit could be reconciled with the advance of thought.
The method has been employed by the Stoics in the interests of popular mythology, which became part of the religion of the Roman Empire. To some extent it was adopted by the Palestinian Rabbis, but with less depreciation of the historical truth of the narratives. Their fundamental principle was typology and their method finds Greek expression in the Pauline Epistles, and was adopted later by the Christian school of Antioch who rejected and resisted the extravagances of the Alexandrians. The Epistle to the Hebrews, on the other hand, and the Fourth Gospel show distinct traces of Alexandrian if not definitely Philonic influence. By this same method Aristobulus had proved that the Peripatetic philosophy depended upon the Law of Moses and the other books (Clem. Alex., Strom. v. 14. 97). Whether the extracts extant under his name (Eus., Prep. Ev. viii. 10, xiii. 12) are earlier or later than Philo, the method is the same as his and so is the general position. His work is described as "an interpretation of the holy laws" or "expositions of the writing (Scripture) of Moses" by Eusebius, though he does not, so far as one can judge from the fragments which remain, comment on the Pentateuch verse by verse, but rather gives a general paraphrase of its contents expounding it philosophically. But it is in the works of Philo that we find the chief monument of this reconciliation of the old and the new. He surpasses the philosophers who preceded him by his systematic industry and the superiority of the material on which he worked; those who followed him, Christians or Platonists, are his disciples.

A systematic digest of the teaching of Philo, taken by itself, gives no satisfactory idea of the man or his writings. It is possible to separate the various elements of his eclectic philosophy—Platonist, Stoic, Pythagorean, and Oriental—and so to assign him his place in the history of Greek thought. But his main object is to expound the Law of Moses: the truth revealed therein is his criterion. Accordingly it seems best to begin by taking some of his tracts
and presenting them in a summary form, so that our readers may be able to taste his quality if not his quantity.

Setting aside, then, his historical works we distinguish on internal evidence two series of expositions of the Law—(1) the De Opificio Mundi followed by Lives of the patriarchs, and (2) the more formal commentary which takes the Scripture verse by verse, beginning with Genesis ii, in the book of The Allegories of the Laws. The first group deals with general subjects and is probably intended for an audience less versed in philosophy and philosophical methods: speaking generally, more stress is laid here on the literal truth of the Scripture narratives than in the second group. So we come to Philo himself, premising only that the Bible he uses is the Septuagint and that he warns his readers to come with purified minds, freeing themselves from the allurements of this fleeting world and the outward shows of things, which hide the naked truth.

The tract On the Creation of the World according to Moses deals with the account of Creation given in Genesis i and ii and also the description of man's primitive innocence and fall as described in Genesis iii. Without any preface explaining the scope or motives of his work Philo begins what may well be the first of a series of homilies on the Law given by and through Moses to The Nation; for he regards the account of Creation as just the preface of the Law. Other lawgivers have been content to present their commands and prohibitions without any introduction in the form of a bare code. Others again have prefixed legendary inventions new or old, hiding over the truth thereby. But Moses, the true philosopher, anxious to prepare and mould the minds of those who should use the laws, begins with the Creation, to show that the universe and the Law are in perfect harmony and that the law-abiding man is ipso facto a citizen of the universe, adjusting his actions to the will of Nature according to which the whole universe also is ordered.
This idea that the Law of Moses is identical with the Law of Nature occurs again and again in Philo's extant works. He does not attempt to prove the truth of the identification, but assumes it as a self-evident proposition. The Law was the supreme example of the direct revelation of God to men, and if there was any validity in the thought of the best philosophy of his time, then it must have been derived somehow from the writings of Moses. Accordingly he is at pains to show that the great Greek thinkers of the past who had, each in his turn, contributed something to its gradual development drew their inspiration from the Hebrew Scriptures; and what he, the eclectic follower of Plato, Zeno, and Pythagoras, holds true in the teaching of his masters in philosophy he finds latent but nevertheless unmistakably expressed by the greatest philosopher of them all, one of his own race, who was king and prophet too.

So, then, the life according to Nature which the Stoic philosopher¹ preached was after all no more than the life of the law-abiding Jew. And, if we must needs regard Philo's axiom as a doubtful proposition, the proof lies plain for us as for him in the spirit which underlies the letter of Scripture. The beauty of these thoughts (τὰ νοημάτων) no one, poet or orator, could worthily set forth. Yet our author cannot keep silence, but "for the sake of his love toward God, will venture to speak even above his power, nothing indeed of his own, but few for many thoughts such as a mortal mind possessed with yearning love of wisdom may reach."

¹ According to Stobaeus, Ed. ii. 132, Zeno, the founder of the school of Stoics, taught that the "end" or goal was "to live conformably" (τὸ δὲ τέλος ὑπὸ δὴ τῆς ζωῆς ὑπῆρχος ἀπὸ τὸ ὑμολογομένους ζητεῖται), that is, according to one harmonious scheme (τὸ τοῦτο δὲ ἵστι καθ' ἐνα λόγῳ καὶ σύμφωναν ζητεῖ). And Cleanthes, his first successor, added the words "to nature." Diogenes Laertius (vii. 87) makes Zeno the author of the complete phrase, and in his next chapter ascribes to Chrysippus expressions very near those employed by Philo here, "Man's end is then, to live in accordance with nature—that is according to his own and that of the universe."
Here, again, he is resting upon one of his axioms—the legitimacy and sufficiency of the allegorical method of interpretation, whereat, as at the touch of Moses' rod, a living spring of water is to well forth from the rock of Moses' Law. But before he can expound in miniature such of the grand revelations as he can attain, he must denounce the atheism or polytheism of other (the Greek) philosophers who, wondering at the world rather than its Creator, have declared that it did not come into being but is eternal. Not so Moses. He knew that there is always an active cause and a passive cause. This world is tangible and visible, apprehended by our senses, and therefore it must have come into being; for everything that is apprehended by the senses is in a state of becoming—coming into being—and of change. Only the things which are not seen are eternal. The deification of the universe abolishes Providence, that most profitable aid to godliness. Well does Moses narrate its Genesis, refuting by his mere title (i.e. the title of the Greek version) this false theology. "The active cause is the Mind of the universe, higher than virtue, than knowledge, than good itself: the passive cause is lifeless and incapable of movement of itself, but, moved and fashioned and quickened by the Mind, it changed to that most perfect work, this present world."

This position was first taken by Anaxagoras, the friend of Pericles, and thereby he showed himself, as Aristotle says, "a sober man among random talkers." He affirmed indeed that the elements of the universe were eternal, but after correcting this error Philo is content to follow him completely. "Anaxagoras first (Diog. ii. 6) set mind upon matter, for he thus begins his work (on Nature): 'All things were together, and Mind came and arranged them.'" And Philo adopts this conception of God in his relation to the world: throughout his account of the Creation he uses Anaxagoras' word διακοσμεῖτο, and speaks of Moses as "possessed by a sober drunkenness." The designation Mind
suggests to him a powerful argument against atheism, to which he often has recourse. "Know thyself," he cries to the ignorant or wilful blasphemer. "See how thy body is animated and governed by the mind. As in the microcosm, so in the universe. The Mind which fashioned all things directs all things. There is—there must be a Mind of the universe, as a mind in thee, lacking which thou art dead. There is, there must be Providence—God, in fine."

But Philo the Jew, though he may adopt and employ habitually such philosophical conceptions of God as "Mind," "the Absolute," and so forth, does not rest content there-with. The God which the Greeks had found out by ceaseless speculation might be identified with, but could not supplant, the God whom his nation had come to know from his dealings with them. Philosopher he is through and through, but his philosophy rests on a firm foundation of piety, of faith in, and love toward God, the good Father. "For if any should wish to track out the cause wherefore the universe was created, methinks he would not miss the mark if he said with one of the ancients that the Father and Maker was good (ἀγαθὸν εἶναι τὸν πατέρα καὶ ποιήτην); wherefore he grudged not his own best nature to Matter that had no good thing of itself, yet could become all things." The ancient in question appears to be Plato, but a comparison with the apparent original shows how Philo has made it his own. In the Timaeus (29 E) the Platonic Socrates says: "Let us say for what cause the framer framed genesis and this universe. He was good, and no good man can ever feel any grudging; and being free therefrom he willed that everything should become as far as possible like himself." Plato the Greek personified his first Cause: Philo the Jew knew God as the Father.

This much of his best-known tract may serve for introduction to the account of the Life of Abraham which comes next.

The first of the five books in which the sacred laws are
written is entitled Genesis because the account of the creation of the world is the most important part of it. This has been expounded as accurately as may be in the preceding treatise. Next in order come the laws themselves, particular and general. The former Philo postpones in favour of the latter, which are, so to speak, archetypes of which the others are copies. But these general laws are not precepts, but men—they who lived honourably and without reproach, whose virtues are engraved in the Holy Scriptures in order to impel (προστέψασθαι) and lead the reader to a like zeal. The patriarchs in fact have come to be living and reasonable laws. Self-taught, they recognized and welcomed the ordinances of Nature, and therein found so good a law that all the particular precepts which were later written down are but the memorials of their lives.

Well then, since the beginning of the participation in good things is Hope, the first lover of hope is called Man, to show that the hopeless are but beasts in human form (Gen. iv. 26, v. 1). Enos, the Man par excellence, is fourth from the first earth-born man, since the number four is honoured by Moses as holy (Lev. xix. 24)—to say nothing of other philosophers (Platonists) who have "welcomed the bodiless ideal essences." To inspire men with good hope is of course the object of all laws and lawgivers: Enos was trained in this virtue by the unwritten law of Nature.

Next after Hope comes Repentance for sin and Amendment: so Enoch, "he who is graced" (κεχαρισμένος), follows Enos. For "Enoch pleased God, and was not found, for God translated him." His translation implies turning or change, and that for the better, because under God's providence. Once translated or converted, he is not found. The wise man loves loneliness and retirement from the society of the many who delight in the evil which he has renounced. So he shuts himself up at home, or, if disturbed by frequent callers goes forth without the city, dwells in a solitude (ἐν μοναχίᾳ), preferring the society of the best of
all the race of men, whose bodies time has dissolved, but whose virtues the writings left behind keep alive by poems and chronicles. So he seeks peace.

Noah, whose name means "Rest" or "Righteous," follows Enoch, and he calls the seventh day (or Sabbath, as the Hebrews call it) Rest—not, as some suppose, because after intervals of six days the people left their usual tasks, but because the number seven is in us and in the world the most peaceful of all. In us there are six things which wage unceasing war, the five senses and the spoken word (ἐπιφόρων ἄγος); but the seventh power is that of Mind, which overcomes the others, and retires into solitude to commune with itself in peace. Such is the dignity of Noah that in his genealogy no man or woman is set down as his ancestor, but virtues only; for the wise man has no home, country, or kindred, save virtues and virtuous actions (Gen. vi. 9). He is a man in the true sense of the word, because he has tamed the bestial lusts of the soul, and is "righteous." And so he is perfect, not absolutely, but as compared with his generation, whose sins brought about the Deluge and their destruction.

These three men or dispositions of the soul present an harmonious order. The Perfect is whole from the beginning: the Convertite is half-made (ἡμερογνος), for he dedicated the former part of his life to vice, and only the latter to virtue: the Hoper is lacking, as his name denotes (ἐλπιζων: ἐλπις), ever aiming at virtue, but never attaining it.

So much for the first trinity of men who yearned after virtue. The second is far greater—Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, men of one house and race—whose names God condescended to add to his, that having a refuge for supplications and entreaties they might not lack good hope. And this supports the view that, though nominally men, they are really virtues or powers, which, being incorruptible, can more reasonably be attached to the name of the Eternal. All aim at virtue; the first by learning, the second by nature, the third by practice: not that any one
is devoid of all three, but that each takes his name from his pre-eminent quality.

After a short preface dealing with this "trinity" collectively, Philo at last reaches his main subject. Abraham, zealous for piety, the highest and greatest virtue, strove to follow God and to obey his commands, not only those conveyed through voice and writing, but those made plainer still through Nature. Scripture records many proofs of this obedience, which must be considered in order.

First of all he was charged by an oracle to leave his country, kindred and home. What other would have been so steadfast as to resist their allurements? Banishment is usually reckoned by lawgivers next to death as a punishment, and might well be thought even worse than death, as it entails a thousand deaths and consciousness of them all. Men leave their homes for many reasons—some for gain, some on embassy to serve the state, some for love of new knowledge—yet all long to return home and often leave their tasks unfinished. But Abraham departed to Haran (Gen. xii. 5) and thence to another place of which we shall speak later.

Now according to the letter of Scripture these are the travels of a wise man, but according to the laws in allegory those of a virtuous soul in quest of the true God. The Chaldeans are the great astronomers absorbed in the study of the visible world. With them and like them the soul dwells long, but at last opens its eye as from a deep sleep at the call, "Come out to the smaller city and learn to know the Overseer of the universe. Come to Haran, that is the 'caves' which are the symbol of the seats of our senses. Shall they have an unseen ruler—the mind—and the world of which all things else are parts have none?" Then God appears (Gen. xii. 7): he "was seen," for none can see or apprehend him unless he show himself. Then Abram, "lofty father," the astronomer, becomes Abraham "father of an elect sound"—the wise man free from the unstable guidance of the senses.
His second departure is to a desert where he leads a wandering life (Gen. xii. 9). They who yearn to find out God love the solitude dear to him, striving first herein to assimilate themselves to his blessed and happy nature. Whichever interpretation we adopt here, literal or allegorical, man and soul are equally venerable.

The greatness of the actions which follow can only be appreciated by those who have tasted virtue and are wont to deride what the many admire. In time of famine Abraham finds that there is corn in Egypt, thanks to the river, and goes thither with his wife. The officials, seeing his wife and admiring her beauty,—for nothing escapes those in high office—tell the king. Finding no escape from the royal lust she appeals to God; and he, the champion of the wronged, sends tortures by which king and consenting household are racked. Thus was that marriage preserved unsullied, from which was to spring “a whole nation—dearest of all to God—which seems to me to hold the priestly and prophetic office on behalf of all mankind.”

Here the literal truth of the story is so much bound up with Philo’s national pride that he introduces not his own allegorical interpretation but that of others:—“I have heard, however, certain philosophers (φυσικὸν ἀνθρώπον) who allegorized the passage not amiss.” The man, they say, is the symbol of a good mind; the woman of virtue. Spiritually the man takes the place of the woman and the woman of the man in their marriage; for, apart from the misleading genders of the names, to those who can see things as they really are, virtue is masculine, reason feminine. The king of Egypt is—as always in Philo’s own exegesis—the mind that loves the body. So the deeper meaning of the story is plain, once the actors are thus transformed.

The next incident chosen is the visit of the three “men” to Abraham (Gen. xviii). Hospitality to strangers is an offshoot (πιστή νομίμωσις) of the greater virtue of piety. But the
letter of the narrative is but a symbol of what can only be comprehended by the mind. The apparition is threefold, but the object is one—God in the midst of his Creative and Sovereign Powers. True, this is not the vision of God as he is in himself, and thus it falls short of the highest bliss. But God, receiving no injury by such imperfect comprehension, gladly invites all that are purposed to honour him, in whatever form. In no-wise does he cast out any man (μηδένα σκόρακίζειν ἄξιων τὸ παράπαν). Nay, to those that can hear he speaks this oracle all but aloud in the soul: "The first prize shall be given to them that worship me for myself, the second to them who do so for themselves in hope of good or freedom from punishment. Though they hope for benefit from my beneficent Power, or fear my sovereign Power, their object is still to worship me."

Now all this is clear not merely from the allegorical treatment of the passage, but from the letter also; for Abraham says, "Lord, if I have found grace with thee" (Gen. xviii. 3), speaking to the three as one. Again, only two go to destroy the inhabitants of Sodom: the third—the Absolute God—judges it fitting that, while benefits are conferred by him immediately, punishment should be inflicted through the instrumentality of others, that so he may be accounted a cause of good only and not of evil directly.

This, then, is the superficial explanation of the story of Sodom for the many: the secret for the few, who seek for moods of the soul rather than forms of bodies, shall now be set forth. The cities of the plain are the five senses: Segon, the place of refuge, standing for sight, the queen of the senses, from which spring wisdom and love of wisdom or philosophy.

The culminating act of Abraham's life is the sacrifice of his beloved son. After giving a sketch of the incident, which includes none of the proper names of persons or places,—an omission characteristic of this group of writings—Philo proceeds to deal with certain objections. Many have
been ready to slay their children, it is alleged, to save their country from plague or defeat, or to serve their religion (cf. Deut. xii. 31). In India the gymnosophists burn themselves when that incurable disease, old age, comes upon them, and widows join their dead husbands on the pyre. But all these practices are due to custom, which has been observed so long as to become a second nature, and are therefore involuntary and therefore not praiseworthy like this deed of Abraham. Nor can any other motive be admitted, such as fear or hope of fame.

But the narrative does not come to an end with the plain and literal interpretation, but seems to suggest something which only the few can grasp. “Isaac” is the name of the son and it signifies “laughter,” that is “joy,” which is rightly offered to God as being his peculiar possession. So Sarah denies that she laughed (Gen. xviii. 15), fearing lest she should appropriate what belongs only to God. But she is reassured: God has mixed joy with the sorrow of men and he has willed that the soul of the wise should rejoice during the greater part of life and be glad in the contemplation of the world.

The complement of this piety or love towards God is love or righteousness towards man; and this virtue also is conspicuously exhibited by Abraham in his relations with Lot and Lot’s servants for example. In fact, throughout his life, Abraham performed the law and all the commandments of God, instructed not by writings but by the unwritten law of nature, and eager to follow its healthy impulses. Such was the life of the first and captain of the Nation—law-abiding, some will say, but really, as my homily has shown, itself a law and unwritten ordinance.

The second group of Philo’s works appears to be a series of homilies, or Midrashim, on the Law, containing his more advanced teaching. The tract “concerning the descendants of Cain the wise-in-his-own-conceit and how he becomes
"a wanderer" begins with Gen. iv. 16. The commentator or homilist points out that this verse alone is enough to prove the legitimacy of allegorical interpretation:—"For if the Absolute (τὸ ὅν) has a face and he that wishes to leave it behind can easily remove elsewhere, why do we renounce Epicurean impiety or the godlessness of the Egyptians or the mythical suppositions of which life is full?" So, to avoid attributing to God human form, and as a necessary consequence human passions, we must not take the words as literally true but turn to the way of allegory. Cain, then, the selfish, wilfully blinded the eyes of his mind and left his soul without vision of the Absolute. Worse than Adam whom God cast out, he forgoes deliberately the quest of that goal which ever recedes into the distance and evades the pursuer though he be a Moses or an Abraham. For no creature can behold God as God is: even mind, the swiftest of all things, falls infinitely short of apprehending the great First Cause, though he be touched in respect of the Creative and Punitive Powers, which are near each one of us. Yet we congratulate those God-lovers who seek after τὸ ὅν, though they never find; for the quest of virtue is of itself sufficient to gladden, though the good be never attained.

The land to which Cain betakes himself is Naid, that is, "tossing" or "restlessness," which properly belongs to the fool (cf. Deut. xxviii. 65 f.). Standing and steadfastness belong to God and the wise and good, to whom he imparts his own calm. So Abraham "stood before the Lord" (Gen. xviii. 22 f.). To Moses God said "Do thou stand here with me" (Deut. v. 31), and on the other hand (Gen. xlvi. 4) to Israel "I will go down with thee to Egypt"—"Thou with me" when standing is in question: "I with thee" when change of place is concerned—"and I will bring thee up to the end." Clearly the descent is figurative, for God fills the universe with himself. "This I do—is Philo's paraphrase—for pity of the rational nature, that from the passions of Hades it may be brought up to the
Olympian place of virtue under my guidance, who have cut the highway leading to heaven for suppliant souls, that they might not grow weary with walking, and have shown it to all."

In considering the famous difficulty "who was the wife of Cain" (Gen. iv. 17) Philo dismisses the theory that she was his sister as not merely sacrilegious but false, for Adam's daughters were born later according to the Scripture narrative. "What then must be said? The wife of the impious Reason, as I suppose, is Opinion which he holds concerning things, just like thousands of the philosophers who have introduced some the same, others different, dogmas into our life." And the particular opinion is the maxim of Protagoras, child of Cain's folly, that man is the measure of all things; for the child of the union is Enoch, i.e. "thy grace," and all things on this supposition are the grace or gift of the mind. But this is to honour the immediate before the final cause. The strength of the dogma is shown by the victory over Abel, but "in my judgment and in that of my friends death with the pious would be preferable to life with the impious, for them that die thus will the everlasting life await, but them that live after that fashion the eternal death."

So much for Cain's son Enoch: but what of the descendant of Seth (Gen. v. 18)? Are they identical or different? The meaning of the name Enoch may be interpreted in two ways. Only some deify their mind as source of all good things: others attribute their blessings to God's graces. These, the true nobility, born not of families long rich but of lovers of virtue, are classed under Seth as chief of their clan. So with Methuselah and Lamech. Their double affinity corresponds to the ambiguity of their names "sending forth death" and "humiliation."

To return to Gen. iv. 17, it is incredible that one man should by himself build a town. Perhaps, then, since this is not in accord with the truth, it is better that we should allegorize and say that Cain resolved to prepare his own
dogma as if it were a city. Each of the impious is found to be the framer of such a city—made up of vices—in his own wretched soul.

The children of Lamech and Ada ("testimony"), Jobel and Jubal, represent change or declination, the one in mind or disposition and the other in the spoken word. So the first is the father of tenders of flocks—those occupied with the irrational sense-perceptions—and the second of music. Such declination is forbidden in the law (Num. xx. 17): the middle way is the royal road which leads to God, the first and only King of all things, and this way is philosophy. "It is not the way followed by the present herd of sophists; for they, practising the arts of words against the truth, have called cleverness (τῆς τανούργίας) wisdom, giving a godly name to an evil thing. It is the way the ancient band (θείας) of ascetics went—men who renounced the cajolings of pleasure and engaged themselves nobly and austerely to the practice of virtue. At any rate this royal road, which we say is true and genuine philosophy, the Law calls the word of God (Deut. xxviii. 14)."

Sella is "Shadow," symbol of bodily and external good; and her son Thobel "All," for in fact they who have gotten that double blessing, hymned among the vulgar, "health and wealth," think that all things, small and great, are added to them. He is an iron worker, for all quarrels past, present, and to come are for the sake of woman's beauty, wealth, glory, honour, dominion, in a word, of bodily pleasures, or for possession of external things which are proved every one to be unsure and unsubstantial by time that tries all things. Sella's daughter is Noeman, "Fatness," the fatness not of strength but of weakness, which consists in departure from the honour of God (Deut. xxii. 15), fatness of body not of soul.

So much for Cain and his progeny. Philo now turns to consider "the regeneration (παλαγγελσιά) as it were of the murdered Abel" in the birth of Seth whose name signifies "Watering." The interpretation suggests a digression.
which occupies most of the remaining part of the tract (§§ 125 ff.) dealing chiefly with the stories of Hagar (Gen. xxii. 19) and Rebecca (Gen. xxiv). In each case water stands for wisdom, "For whence should the thirsty mind of knowledge (φωνήσεως) be filled save from God's wisdom, the unfailing spring?" Hagar's child, whose soul has just begun to aspire after instruction is given to drink from the wine-skin. Rebecca offers the water-pot itself, saying, "drink." And thus she shows forth the divine wealth which is poured forth for all that are worthy and can use it. She brings down the pot from her shoulder, accommodating herself to her disciple, like a good teacher or a good physician, looking not to the greatness of his art but to the capacity of the patient. "For bestow not what thou canst, saith right reason, but what the suppliant is capable of receiving. Or seest thou not that God proclameth oracles corresponding not to the greatness of his own perfection but to the power of them that shall be benefited thereby" (cf. Ex. xx. 19). For the creature is never without a share of the gracious gifts of God—else it had been utterly destroyed—but it cannot bear the much and unstinted force of them. Wherefore, wishing that we should have profit of that which he offers, he apportioneth "the gift to the power of the receivers"—unlike mercenary sophists. And the camels in the story of Rebecca stand for memory, without which wisdom bestowed is useless. The fruit of wisdom is virtue; and though the way to it be hard yet God has changed toil from bitter to sweet. Bodily blessings are contemptible: wild beasts have them in greater perfection than rational men—though this point needs no amplification since the most reputed of the ancient sages are agreed that Nature is the mother of beasts, step-mother of men. Hard is the way of wisdom and virtue but its end is the sight of God (Deut. xxxiii. 39; cf. Ex. xxxiii. 23)—not, indeed, as he is but as he manifests himself in his acts—vouchsafed to the eyes of the mind. "And so the race of men will have use and
enjoyment of deep peace, taught by the law of nature, which is virtue, to honour God and hold fast to his service for this is the spring of happiness and long life" for states and for individuals alike.

The division between the tracts Concerning Giants and That the Divine is unchangeable seems hardly warranted, as the former ends with the words "Having said thus much—sufficient for the present at any rate—concerning the giants, let us turn to the sequel of the narrative. And it is this." It is not uncommon to find two different subjects treated in the same tract (cf. e.g. Concerning the Progeny of Cain, etc.).

The "many men" of Gen. vi. 1 are obviously impious men, because their children are daughters. The story of the union of these daughters with the angels of God is not a myth. Just as the universe is animated (ἐνέχωσθαι) throughout all its parts, earth, water, fire (especially, it is reported, in Macedonia) and heaven (with stars), so the air must be filled with living things, invisible to us like the element in which they live. What Moses calls angels other philosophers call demons, souls flying about in the air. Surely air which gives life to all creatures has a natural right to a population of its own. Well, then, some souls have descended into bodies and some of them are able to resist the current of human life and fly up again: these are the souls of true philosophers, who from beginning to end practise dying to bodily life (ζητούν) that they may share the bodiless and incorruptible life (ζωή). Other souls, again, disdained union with any part of earth, and these hallowed souls, who are concerned with the service of the Father, the Creator is wont to use as servants and ministers for the protection (ἐπιστρατεύον) of mortals. These are of course the good angels, angels worthy of the name. There are bad angels also, of whom the many speak as bad demons or souls, and it is they who descended to converse with the daughters of men.
Here Philo is once more in agreement with the Stoics, who held that the souls of the dead (or of the righteous dead) existed in the air until the great conflagration in which the universe was to be consumed, and that there were also demons sympathetic with men, watchers (επόπται) of human affairs (Diog. vii. 151, 156, 157). The statement that the universe is alive (ζωοπνεύον) and full of demons is attributed to Thales and Heraclitus. Philo expounds again his doctrine of demons or angels in de Somn. i. §§ 134 ff. in connexion with Jacob's dream of a ladder reaching from earth to heaven. The body he regards, with Plato, as a prison or tomb, and the purest and best souls or spirits are those which never yearned for earthly life, the proconsuls of the All-ruler, who correspond to the lesser deities with whom Plato surrounds the Creator (Tim. 41 A).

But in evil men God's spirit cannot remain permanently (οὐ καταμενεῖ, Gen. vi. 3). It remains indeed on occasion "For who is so devoid of reason or soul as never, willing or unwilling, of his own will or without, to receive a conception of the Best? Nay, indeed, even upon the accursed there alights often of a sudden the appearance of the Good (του καλοῦ), but they cannot appropriate it or keep it with themselves. For it departs, removing straightway, renouncing the stranger in the land who has forsaken (ἐκδειπτημένους) law and right, to whom it would never have come at all save to convict them as having chosen base things instead of honourable."

Such men are flesh; and the fleshy nature is the foundation of ignorance. But the Law, in the ordinance against unlawful unions, commands us to despise the flesh (Lev. xviii. 6). A man that is truly a man—such an one as one of the ancients (Diogenes the Cynic) sought with lighted lantern at noon—will not approach that which belongs to his flesh. The emphatic repetition of the word man in the (Greek) text of the passage shows that it is not the ordinary human being but the virtuous man who is meant (ἄνθρωπος ἄνθρωπος πρὸς πάντα οἰκεῖον σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ οὐ προσελεύσεται).
They who fail to keep this law degrade themselves, "reveal their unseemliness"; and such are the self-styled wise who sell wisdom and cheapen their wares like cheapjacks in the market.

The giants who issue from this union are not those of Greek mythology: "Moses wishes to impress upon you that some are men of earth, others men of heaven, and others men of God. The men of earth are the hunters of bodily pleasures, who practise the use and enjoyment thereof and provide whatever contributes to each one of them. The men of heaven are all artists, craftsmen and scholars; for the heavenly part of ourselves—the mind—practises general education, and the other arts, one and all, sharpening and whetting, exercising and training itself in the ideal things (τοῖς νοητοῖς). The men of God are priests and prophets who disdained any state connected with this world ... and have emigrated to the ideal world where they dwell, enrolled in the state of incorruptible and bodiless ideas." For example, Abram, "lofty father," is a man of heaven and rises to become Abraham "elect father of sound," that is a man of God (Gen. xvii. 1). Whereas the children of earth, like Nebrod (Gen. x. 8), are deserters degraded from their proper rank to the lifeless and motionless nature of flesh, as it is written "they twain shall be one flesh" (Gen. ii. 24).

So the beginning of the tract headed That the Divine is unchangeable, is reached with Gen. vi. 4: "After this, when the angels of God went in unto the daughters of men, and they begat (or bare) to themselves." That is to say, after the departure of God's spirit the comrades of darkness unite with the passions and bare unto themselves—not to God like Abraham and Hannah, the mother of Samuel, who dedicated to God the children which he himself gave them. Such selfishness is sometimes fatal, as in the case of Aunan (Gen. xxxviii. 9).

The "wrath of God" (Gen. vi. 5-7) does not, as perhaps
some will suppose, imply that the Creator repented that he had made man when he beheld their impiety. Such a theory dwarfs the crimes here recorded. For what impiety could be greater than to suppose that the Unchangeable should change? And that though some claim that not even all men waver in their opinions! For that they who practise a guileless and pure philosophy win as the greatest good out of their knowledge that they do not change with changing circumstances, but with unbending fixity and steadfast firmness set hand to all their tasks. This quiet, at which philosophy rightly so called aims, is the property of God and by him bestowed on the wise (Deut. v. 31, as before). And rightly, for God is free from all the uncertainties and changes which are responsible for change of mind or repentance, as he is lord of time and omniscient.

Happiness was first defined by Democritus as the calm and stable condition of the soul, which is untroubled by fear, superstition or any other passion, in his book, περὶ εὐθυμίας (Diog. ix. 45: Seneca de Tranquillitate). Timon, disciple of Pyrrho the Sceptic, held the same view (Aristocles apud Eusebium, Prep. Ev. xiv. 18); and it is generally identified with that school—ἀδιάφορα being the fruit of ἐποχή or suspense of judgment—who inherited it from the physical philosophy of Democritus and handed it on to Epicurus. But Philo is probably thinking rather of the Stoic doctrine that what the vulgar reckon as good things are really ἀδιάφορα, things indifferent. For, as he judged schools of thought chiefly by the conduct of their scholars, his praise of the philosophers in question as guileless and pure, points not to Epicureans but to Stoics.

How then are we to understand God's wrath? First notice that there are four distinct grades in the realm of Nature—stones and inanimate things, which have habit (ἐξως); plants and vegetables, which have nature; animals, which have soul; and men, which have rational soul. Man only has freedom—freewill—and therefore only man is blameable for his meditated misdeeds, praiseworthy for
his deliberate right actions. The soul of man alone received from God free will, and therein was made most like him; and therefore, being freed as far as possible from that harsh and grievous mistress Necessity, must be accused because it respects not him that freed it. For indeed it will most rightly pay the penalty incurred by ungrateful freedmen.

But it must not be thought that God (rò ὀμ) is really affected by anger or any passion. For wrath is characteristic of human weakness, but to God belong neither the irrational passions of the soul nor the parts and limbs of the body. None the less, such expressions are used by the great Lawgiver, in order to lessen those who cannot otherwise be chastened. For of the laws contained in the Precepts and Prohibitions which, be it known, are laws in the proper sense of the word, there are set forth two most important summary statements concerning the First Cause—one that God is not like a man (Num. xxiii. 19), and the other that God is like a man (Deut. i. 31). But the first is guaranteed by certain truth, the second is introduced with a view to the teaching of the many, for the sake of instruction or admonition, not because he is such by nature. In fact the two statements correspond to the two divisions of mankind, men of soul and men of body. To suppose that God really is like a man involves the unspeakable mythology of the impious, who profess to ascribe to God the form of man but in reality credit him with man's passions. But Moses' one object is to benefit all his readers, and if the men of body cannot be schooled by means of truth, let them learn the falsehoods by means of which they will be benefited. They need a terrible master to threaten them. And so to these two doctrines correspond two attitudes of God's worshippers, fear and love. To them who conceive of the Absolute without any mortal part or passion, but honour him as he is, belongs the love of God, and the fear of God to every other.

But even so the meaning of the words "I was angry because I made them" is not settled. Perhaps it means
that the wicked are made by the anger of God and the good by his grace (cf. Gen. vi. 8). And so the passion anger, rightly predicated of man, is ascribed to God metaphorically in order to the explanation of a most necessary truth, that all that we do for anger, or fear, or grief, or pleasure, or any other passion, is culpable, and any actions accompanied by right reason and knowledge praiseworthy.

Noah, then, is preserved when the rest perish. The one righteous outweighs the many impious. Thus God mingles “mercy and judgment” (Ps. c. i), showing mercy before judgment: the cup in his hand is full of a mixture of unmixed wine (Ps. lxxiv. 9: οἶνον ἄκρατον πλήρες κεράσματος).

The second quotation leads, as often, to a somewhat lengthy digression. Philo’s point is established by corroborative evidence from Scripture, but the evidence itself must be analysed. God’s powers represented by the cup of wine are at once mixed and unmixed; unmixed so far as he himself is concerned, mixed so far as they come into contact with his creatures. Who could bear the unmixed light of the sun? What mortal could sustain God’s knowledge and wisdom and righteousness, and each of the other virtues untempered? Nay, not even the whole heaven and world could receive them.

But what is the meaning of the text, “Noah found grace before the Lord God” (Gen. vi. 8). The word “found” may or may not imply previous possession. The ordinances relating to the great prayer¹ (Num. vi. 2 ff.) give a clear example of the finding of something previously possessed but lost. Gen. xxvii. 20 and the promises of Deut. vi. 10 f. represent the second kind of finding, treasure-trove. In Deut. i. 43 f. the Law gives the contrast to these happy finders in the persons of those who are compelled to labour against their will, doubly unhappy because they fail of

¹ Prayer is the asking for good things from God; but a great prayer consists in considering God in himself as the source of good things, without the co-operation of any secondary or immediate cause which appears to bestow the benefit.
their end and incur shame to boot. Each passage cited is of course fully expounded in accordance with its symbolical significance, and then Philo returns to his text. The obvious explanations are either that he obtained (ευγνώμονη) grace, or was reckoned worthy of grace. But both impute too high a dignity even for one who never debased the divine coinage within him, the most sacred mind, by evil practices. And so it might be better perhaps to adopt the view that the good man (ὁ ἀσθενός), having by seeking gained much knowledge, found this great truth that all things, earth, water, air, fire, sun, stars, heaven, all animals and plants are the grace of God. For he pleased not the Absolute, like Moses (Ex. xxxiii. 17), but his ruling and beneficent Powers, “Lord” and “God.”

To complete the exposition, Philo recalls the story of Joseph. It is said that he “found grace” (Gen. xxxix. 20 f.), but with the gaoler, not with God; and at the touch of the wand of allegory this patriarch is transformed into the mind that loved the body and its passions, sold to the chief cook, banned from the holy assembly by the Law (Deut. xxiii. 1), and finally cast into the prison of the passions. The story of his life as a whole is given elsewhere, but this episode, taken by itself, is now used as an awful warning to the reader. Reject such pleasing, O soul: aim with all zeal at pleasing the First Cause. Or if thou canst not that, become suppliant to his Powers that thou may be ranked with the generations of “Noah, a righteous man, perfect in his generation, who blessed God” (Gen. vi. 9).

One might fittingly inquire why it is said immediately after this that the earth was corrupted before God, and was filled with iniquity (Gen. vi. 11). But perhaps it is not hard to attain a solution if one is not too devoid of culture. Whenever the incorruptible rises up in the soul the mortal immediately is corrupted, for the generation of the good is the death of the evil practices, since when light shines the darkness vanishes. All which is set forth in the law of
leprosy (Lev. xiii). For there it is said, contrary to the general opinion of mankind, that that which is healthy and living is the source of corruption of that which is diseased and dead: partial leprosy standing for voluntary, complete leprosy for involuntary sin. The priest convicts us of our sin, bids us purge ourselves that he may see the house of the soul clean, and if there be any diseases therein may heal them. It was so with the widow who encountered the prophet (3 Kings xvii. 10 ff.), for she is not widow in the ordinary literal sense, but one whose mind is widowed of the passions that hurt the mind, like Thamar (Gen. xxxviii. 11).

In Gen. vi. 12 "all flesh" is of course feminine in the Greek, but the pronoun "his way" is masculine. Some may think that there is a mistake here, and correct the inflexion (προσωπος). But perhaps the way is not that of the flesh alone but also that of the Eternal and Incorruptible, the perfect way that leads to God, the goal whereof is knowledge and understanding of God. This path every companion of flesh hates, rejects and attempts to corrupt; and the earthly, for such is the interpretation of Edom, bar this royal road to the seers, that is Israel. The way, as was said before, is wisdom, through which alone suppliants souls may fly for refuge to the Uncreated. They that go thereby realize his blessedness and their own worthlessness, like Abraham (Gen. xviii. 27); for they take the mean between all extremes, good disciples of Aristotle, and so draw near to God. And as we pass through the enemies' country we will not touch their water, else must we give them honour (for τευχιτ here is "honour" not "price"). For when the wicked see any of the more austere yielding to the allurements of pleasure, they rejoice and count themselves honoured, and begin to philosophize about their own evils as necessary and profitable. Say then to all such that human affairs have no real subsistence, they are but lying dreams. Consider the history of any one man and the history of the world. Hellas flourished once, but Macedonians robbed it of strength;
Macedonia flourished and fell—so was it with Persian and Parthian, with Egypt, Carthage, and Pontus; so throughout the world the divine Logos, which men call Chance, orders the shifting fates of nations, exalting one and abasing another, that the whole world like one city may keep that best of all forms of government, Democracy. Let us have done then with mortal things and strive to have our inward judge—our conscience—favourable, as we may if we never seek to reverse any of his decisions.

The tract On Husbandry deals with the section (Gen. ix. 20 f.) which introduces the righteous Noah as a husbandman. The very title shows how Moses always uses the right word, for γεωργία differs from γῆς ἐργασία as implying skill and care for the ground worked. And from the consideration of the culture of the ground we are naturally led on to consider the culture of the soul. Just as all cultivated plants and trees bear yearly fruit for the service of man, so in the soul will the mind, which is the man in each one of us, reap fruit of the nurture supplied—general education, corresponding to the child’s milk or advanced instruction corresponding to the bread of the man. All trees of folly and wickedness must be torn up, roots and all. Such as bear fruit, neither profitable nor harmful, must be used as bulwarks (Deut. xx. 20). For philosophy has been compared to a field by the ancients; physical philosophy stands for the plants and trees, ethical for their fruits for whose sake they exist, and logical for the fence which guards them. So the plants sown by the agriculturist of the soul are first the practice of reading and writing readily, the exact investigation of the teaching of wise poets, geometry, rhetoric—in fact, all general education; and then the better and more perfect studies, the tree of understanding, of courage, of soberness, of righteousness, and of every virtue. Accordingly Moses ascribes to the righteous Noah the art of agriculture, and to Cain the working of the ground, unskilled and burdensome.
These two terms then appear synonymous, but once we allegorize according to the mind of Scripture we find they are very different. So also is it with the terms "shepherd" (ποιμήν) and "tender of flocks" (κτημοντρόφος). Both are applied to the reason, but the first to the good, the second to the bad. The soul of each one of us puts forth two shoots, which are the flocks of our nature: the one undivided, whole throughout, is called mind; the other splits into seven natures, the five senses and the powers of speaking and generation. If then a man declare himself his own master, he brings a multitude of evils upon these nurslings of his. Those then who provide them with all the nourishment they ask must be called tenders of flocks; and those who give them enough and no more, circumcising and cutting off excessive and useless profusion, are shepherds. Hence the honour paid to the art of shepherds, practised by Moses for example, in the poets and in Scripture. The Lord's congregation shall not be like sheep which have no shepherd (Num. xxvii. 17). For lack of a shepherd leads to mob-rule (Ochlocracy), that counterfeit of goodly Democracy, just as does the sway of a tyrannical or of an over-lenient governor. And the shepherd is God, who puts forth his right Reason and first-born Son to take over the care of this holy flock, the universe, like a satrap of the great king (Exod. xxiii. 20). Let the whole world then, no less than the individual, say, "The Lord is my shepherd" (Ps. xxi. 1). Such disciples of God laugh at the tending of flocks, and have worked out the skill of shepherds, as may be seen in the story of Joseph and his brethren. Joseph—he that is ever occupied with the body and vain opinions—the ever-youthful, bids the lovers of virtue avow themselves tenders of flocks to Pharaoh, the king of the land of passions (Gen. xlvi. 33 f.);

1 A companion work to that On Vine-dressing (περὶ Φυλοφρύας) which follows, beginning ἐν μὲν τῷ προτέρῳ βιβλίῳ τὰ περὶ γεωργίας τίχρις γενετῆς διὰ παραδοτικὴν ἑιμικὴν ἐγγονομέν ἐν δὲ τούτῳ περὶ τῆς κατ' εἴδος ἀμπελουργίας ὡς ἐν οἷν τε ἐν ἀνθοδῶσομεν.
but they, true to themselves and their fathers, say: “We are shepherds, come to sojourn, not to settle” (Gen. xlvi. 3 f.). For in truth every wise man’s soul holds heaven for fatherland, earth for a strange country.

Here again the allegorical method has led Philo to reverse the ordinary estimate of Joseph and his brethren. But the new view only holds good when applied to detached incidents, and in the tract de Josepho, which deals with the whole story, Joseph comes by his own again.

Another pair of so-called synonyms is “horseman” and “rider.” The horseman is skilled in guiding and controlling his steed, while the rider is unable even to hold the reins and is thrown after a wild and random career. “Horses,” of course, stand for lust and anger (e.g. in the προταπτικά of Moses, Deut. xx. 1), against which God, by his army of the virtues, defends the souls that love him. And after the victory the song of thanksgiving is sung (Exod. xv, especially verses 1, 20). No horseman, Moses says in the admonitions (ταῖς παραπέλεσεσι), is to rule over Israel (Deut. xvii. 15 f.). It is not unnatural therefore that he should pray for the complete destruction of the horsemen (Exod. xv), and the prayer is given in Gen. xlix. 17 f., which needs explanation. Dan, “judgment,” is the faculty of the soul which examines, investigates, discerns, and, in a way, judges each action, and is therefore likened to the serpent, not the friend and counsellor of Life (which is called Eve in the language of the Fathers), but the Brazen Serpent. The two stories referred to may appear mythical, but in the allegorical explanations (ἐν ταῖς δ᾽ ὑπονομαὶ ἀποδοςεσι) the mythical element is entirely removed, and the truth found plain. Eve’s serpent is pleasure, unable to rise, which bites man’s heel. Moses’ is endurance, the opposite of pleasure, which bites the horse’s heel. The prophecy that “the horseman shall fall” leads to the reflexion that he who is mounted on and carried away by any passion is happiest in falling, that he may rise to virtue. Such defeat is better than victory. And so Philo comes to
consider the sacred games of Greece. Surely they are not really sacred if the prize be awarded for pitiless brutality, which the laws condemn. So then that Olympic contest alone may lawfully be styled sacred—not that which the men of Elis hold—but the contest for possession of the divine and truly Olympian virtues, for which they who are weakest in body but strongest in soul are all entered.

So much then for these pairs of words. It is time to turn to the rest of the text. "Noah began to be an husbandman." The beginning, according to the ancient proverb, is half of the whole, but, if the rest be wanting, it is harmful. So it was in the case of Cain (Gen. iv. 7). His honour of God is right, but not his lack of discernment. And there are some like him who make piety consist in the assertion that all things are made by God, whether they be good or not. It is absurd that priests and offerings should be examined for blemishes before coming to the altar, and yet the opinions about God in each man's soul be left in confusion. Seest thou not that the camel is an unclean beast, because it chews the cud, but does not divide the hoof (Lev. xi. 4)? The reason alleged has nothing to do with the literal interpretation, everything to do with the allegorical interpretation. Rumination stands for memory, and memory must discriminate. Both memory and discrimination are necessary to any real progress.

Daily the herd of sophists tickles the ears of their hearers with endless discriminations and divisions, and grammarians, musicians and philosophers follow suit. Yet neither they nor their hearers are bettered. Rightly are such compared to swine, unclean because they divide the hoof, but do not chew the cud (Lev. xi. 7). But from their wordy warfare all who have made a beginning or progress, or attained perfection, are exempt, for the Law thinks it right that a man should be trained not merely in the acquisition of good things, but also in the enjoyment of what he has acquired (Deut. xx. 5-7). Descend not then into the
arena lest another receive the virtues typified by house, vineyard, wife. Enter then the new house—culture that never grows old—crown not thyself rather than God; slay not thus thy soul, but remember God that giveth thee strength to do power (Deut. xxii. 8; viii. 18).

So much of Noah, who gained the first elements of the art of husbandry and then fell weak. What is said of his vine-dressing let us speak on another occasion.

The book On Noah's Vine-dressing fulfils the promise made at the end of "the former book," On Noah's Husbandry. Philo turns from the general to the particular, from the genus to the species, and takes up the greater part of this sequel with preliminary discussions. Noah's vine-planting, a species of husbandry, is not reached till § 139, where the previous sections are described as dealing with (1) the oldest and most holy husbandry which God (τὸ ἀγαλματίου) employs in relation to the world; (2) that of the good man; (3) the ramifications of the number four.

The greatest of planters (φυτωργυρόν) and the most perfect in his art is the Lord of the universe; and the plant which contains in itself the individual plants is this world, whose sure prop is the eternal Word of the everlasting God. Of these plants some possess motion (and these we call animals), some do not. Each and all have their own order and their own sphere. Greatest of all is man, whose eyes alone are so placed that he can behold the heaven; so that he is, as the old saw says, not an earthly but a heavenly plant. By some our mind is said to be a part of the aetherial nature, but Moses cannot compare the rational soul to any other created thing, only to the Creator himself. As our bodily eyes can run up to the far-off heaven, so the eyes of the soul pass the boundaries of the whole universe and press on to the Uncreated. For this reason they that pass their lives never satiated with wisdom and understanding, are said in the oracles to be "called up"; for it is right that they should be called upwards to the
Divine who have been inspired by him (cf. Gen. ii. 7). And as with the great so is it with the little world—man. In him God plants trees, his members and the faculties of body and mind.

The planting of Paradise is consonant with what has been said. The story obviously cannot be taken literally. To take one point only—for whose benefit is the garden planted? Not for God's benefit, for the Cause cannot be contained in that which is caused. Nor for man's, since no man is introduced into it at first. So, then, we must have recourse to allegory, which is dear to men capable of seeing. Indeed, the oracles clearly offer suggestions pointing thereto. The trees of life, knowledge, and so forth, are of no earthly growth, but must be virtues and virtuous actions, plants of the rational soul which revels in God alone. No beasts are introduced into Paradise, as into the Ark: the Ark is the symbol of the body, Paradise of the virtues which welcome nothing untamed or irrational. The man who enters is not he who was fashioned after the image, but he who was created; for the other, the ideal man, does not differ from the tree which bears immortal life. And the man, or mind, proves earthly and is banished. Wherefore Moses, in pity, prays that the clear-sighted may be restored (Ex. xv. 17 f.) to the hill of God's inheritance, whether that be the universe in which they may live in accordance with nature, the \textit{sumnum bonum} which they may use and enjoy, or the company of wise souls (Deut. xxxii. 7–9), who are united by virtue, while the children of earth—the sons of Adam—are scattered. Indeed, not only are such souls the portion of God, but God is also—so Moses dares to say—their portion (Deut. x. 9; Num. xviii. 20), the inheritance of the mind which is perfectly purged and, renouncing (\textit{ἀπογυμνάζομαι}) all created things, knows only the One Uncreated, to whom it has come, by whom it has also been received (\textit{ἴφ' ὁ καὶ προσεληνηται}). Such, Levites

\footnote{Edom means "revelling," or "luxury" (cf. Ps. xxxvi. 4).}
indeed, are like the ancient philosopher who looked on a gorgeous procession and said, "See how many things there are which I do not need"—so was he enamoured of the beauty of wisdom. It is true that some who counterfeit (τὸν ἐπιμορφαζόντων) piety say that such a claim is neither holy nor safe, but this is due to their ignorance. Levites possess God just as a painter the art of painting; the possessor is not the master but the beneficiary of his possession.

Abraham is the next planter (Gen. xxi. 33), and with his "field" must be connected the well in which no water was found (Gen. xxvi. 32 f.). The well symbolizes the search after wisdom which is never satisfied: so one of the ancients (Socrates) said that his wisdom consisted in the fact that he alone knew that he knew nothing. The "name of the Lord God everlasting" (Gen. xxi. 33) refers to the two Powers of God, sovereign and beneficent respectively, as in Jacob's prayer (Gen. xxviii. 21).

But not only the wise, but we also who are not yet perfected, are commanded by the Law to learn agriculture (Lev. xix. 23-25), and to prune or purge our trees. For example, sacrificial worship is a goodly plant, but its offshoot is superstition. Piety does not, as some suppose, consist in the sacrifice itself apart from the mind of the worshipper. God's court of justice is not to be bribed. The guilty, though they offer a hundred oxen every day, are rejected; the innocent, though they make no offering, are accepted. The reference to the purging of the fruit is obviously allegorical, and the mention of the fourth year depends, as in the account of the Creation (Gen. i. 14), upon the mystical significance of the number four. The duty of thanksgiving here inculcated is to be discharged, not by offerings but by hymns, and those not vocal but mental. To illustrate this, Philo quotes the myth of Mnemosyne as an "old story discovered by wise men, handed down by memory from one generation to another, which has not escaped our ears ever greedy of instruction." The
story is that when the Creator had completed the universe he asked one of his underlings (ὕποφητῶν) if any thing were lacking. He answered, only speech to praise it all. The All-Father praised the answer, and soon there sprang up the race of musicians and singers from one of his Powers, a maiden Mneme (memory) or Mnemosyne. Accordingly, we say that as the peculiar work of God is beneficence so that of his creation is thanksgiving. This let us practise in poems and encomia, that the Creator and the world may both be honoured—"the one (as some one said) the best of Causes, the other the most perfect of created things."

Returning to the text (Gen. ix. 20 f), it is obviously necessary to discuss intoxication (μέθη) and the favourite problem of the philosophers, "Should the wise man be intoxicated." Now there are two intoxications, one the being drunk with wine (οἶνον ὑπερθείμαι), the other the raving in wine (ληπείν ἐν οἴνῳ). Of those who have handled the question some say that the wise man should not be intoxicated in either sense; others that the first kind befitted and the second did not befit the good man. The arguments which support the latter position start from a consideration of homonyms and synonyms, the first being words each denoting a number of objects, the second groups of words each denoting the same object. Well, then, μέθη is merely an ancient poetical synonym of ὁἶνος; therefore to be intoxicated is nothing more than to be drunk with wine; therefore the wise man will, like Noah, be intoxicated. Again, the enjoyment and use of wine in ancient times was far different from what we see to-day. The men of old first prayed, offered sacrifice, cleansed body and soul, and then joyfully held their revels in the temples where they had worshipped. Hence, some suppose the word μεθύειν to be derived from μετὰ θείν, "after sacrifice."

1 So the Stoics taught that the wise man should be drunk with wine (οἶνον ὑπερθείμαι) but not intoxicated (μεθυσθείμαι), according to Diogenes Laertius (vii. § 118).
A third argument is likewise based upon (a different) etymology, which explains the word as the equivalent of μέθος, i.e. "relaxation" of soul. And truly, wisdom is not austere and downcast, but joyful. According to the divine Moses its end is sport and laughter; so Laughter (Isaac) sports with Patience (Rebecca), and is seen by no vulgar eye but only the king's (Gen. xxvi. 8). So wine, like wealth and fame, makes the good better, the evil worse, and the good man will be intoxicated without losing aught of his virtue.

If, as in a law court, we must employ not merely technical pleas but points of substance—the evidence of witnesses, for example—we will put forward many well-reputed sons of physicians and philosophers who in speech and in their writings plainly regard intoxication as being simply drunk with wine—which is no bad thing for a wise man in season, if he carry it not so far that he cannot keep a secret.

So far, then, Philo agrees with the Stoics in the matter, but reserves for the next treatise the teaching of Moses. The end of the tract is surely unique in a sermon (if such it be), for he calls upon those who hold the opposite view to state their case that judgment may not go by default. "No one," he says, "contending by himself is proclaimed victor, but if he so contend he will appear to be fighting shadows."

In the de Plantatione Philo gives, so far as possible, the sayings of the other philosophers concerning intoxication, and now turns to consider the opinion of Moses. In the Law some are commanded to drink, others forbidden (e.g. the priests, Lev. x. 9); others again sometimes forbidden and sometimes commanded (Num. vi. 2 ff.). Moses, in fact, takes a more serious view of wine than the philosophers: to him it is the symbol of insensibility (ἀναισθησία) and lack of education (ἀπαίδευσια), which produce the same disastrous results. This symbolism is clear in Deut. xxi.
18—21, where four charges are brought against the sinner:—disobedience, provocation, contribution to feasts, and intoxication. The first is, so to speak, the passive form of the second: the third, though praiseworthy if directed to a good object, is vitiated by folly: the fourth is the inflammation of boorishness or lack of education which ever burns the soul. The punishment pronounced upon the offender is that he should be expelled from yourselves (Deut. xxi. 21), for these guilty thoughts are within us.

"Father" and "mother" may be explained either as the Creator and his Understanding (Prov. viii. 22), whose only and beloved son is the universe, or—better here—of right reason and general education.

Having thus reached an interpretation of the parents in question, Philo proceeds to discuss the four classes of their children: those who obey both or neither, and those who obey father or mother. Of the last class the plainest type is Jethro, "creation of confusion" (πλάσμα τύφων), who will go only to his own land of false doctrine and unbelief (Ex. xviii. 16; Num. x. 29 f.), and convicts himself of impiety even in his pious professions (Ex. xviii. 11), by comparing God with false gods. Laban is such another, who substitutes human laws for the laws of nature when he refuses to give his younger daughter first in marriage (Gen. xxix. 26). But the athlete of wisdom (ὁ σοφιάς ἀσκητής) knows that natures are independent of time; and, to take the passage in its ethical sense, all such must first consort with the younger education, that they may hereafter attain to an undisturbed enjoyment of the more perfect and mature. Yet how amazing it is that we cannot rise out of the clutch of phenomenal good things! Once there come any hope, however faint, of wealth or fame, we yield and cannot resist. Womanish custom (for Rachel speaks "of the custom of women," Gen. xxxi. 35) prevails, and we cannot wash it out and run to the home of men, like Sarah (Gen. xviii. 14) when she was about to bear Isaac, the self-taught; for to men belongs the following of nature
instead of custom. But though we are still the prey of our senses and passions, we shall have an ally, none the less, in our mother, middle education, who records what is considered just in every city, and lays down the law thus for this people and thus for that.

Some there are who can obey the behests of their father, and their reward is the priesthood. "And if we narrate the course of action in which they won this privilege we shall be mocked, perhaps, by many who are deceived by superficial appearances and do not descry the unseen and overshadowed powers." These priests were murderers, fratricides (Exod. xxxii. 27 ff.). Yes, but Scripture does not say murderers of men. Their victims are the affections of the flesh, the band of the senses and speech (δ καρα προφορὰν λόγος), which is nearest of all to the mind. Such are they who honour their father and all that is his, but think little of their mother and all that is hers.

Those who are at war with both parents are like him who said, "I know not the Lord, and Israel I send not away" (Exod. v. 2). They are not yet extinct but exist to plague mankind, impious as regards God, untrustworthy as regards their fellows.

Those who obey both are good keepers of the laws which their father, right reason, laid down, and faithful stewards of the customs which education, their mother, introduced. They were taught by the one to honour the Father of the universe, and by the other not to despise that which is universally considered justice (θέσει not φύσει). And so Jacob becomes Israel. The learner attains perfection, complete insight and wisdom. And as the art of Pheidias is stamped unmistakably on all his works, whatever the material—brass, ivory, gold, what not—so the true form (εἴδος) of wisdom, the art of arts, remains unchangeable on whatever material it be impressed.

So much, then, for the children of this pair. Rightly is the disobedient, provocative, prodigal drunkard expelled as a worshipper of the golden calf (Exod. xxxii. 17–19).
Scripture allegorizes bodily life and calls it the camp wherein is war. Far off will the wise man pitch his tent, removing to the divine peaceful life of rational and happy souls (Exod. xxxiii. 7).

"When I go forth from the city, then will I stretch out my hands unto the Lord, and the voices shall cease" (Exod. ix. 29). No man said that, but the mind which, contained in the city of the body and mortal life, is cribbed, cabined and confined as in a prison. With Abraham (Gen. xiv. 22 f.), he that has seen the Absolute recognizes no secondary cause. All good things come from God, not from the immediate sources through which we derive them. The voice of war is the voice of men who make a beginning of wine ($\phi\omega\nu\eta\nu\varepsilon\xi\alpha\rho\chi\omicron\omicron\nu\tau\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\nu\omicron\nu\omicron\nu$); those who willfully take the way that leads to lack of education and folly. Pray then that this may never happen to thee, and so, when thy prayers are fulfilled, thou shalt be no longer a layman ($\delta\iota\omega\lambda\gamma\nu\eta\varsigma$) but a priest.

For only to priests and worshippers of God belong sober sacrifices (Lev. x. 8-10). Aaron, "the mountainous," is the reason that minds high and lofty things and renounces wine and every drug of folly, including wine. The literal sense of the passage is wonderful enough: it is only reverent that one should come to prayers and sacrifices sober and self-possessed. If, however, we suppose that neither the tabernacle nor the altar is the visible thing fashioned out of lifeless and corruptible matter, but the unseen, intellectual object of speculation ($\theta\epsilon\omega\rho\eta\mu\alpha$), of which this is the perceptible image, then he will marvel the more at the command. The tabernacle is the symbol of bodiless virtue, the altar that of an image perceptible though it never be perceived, just as a log sunk in mid-Atlantic is never burned, though meant for burning. The form of words and expression shows that the writer is not conveying a command merely, but setting forth a meaning ($\gamma\nu\omega\mu\nu\nu\alpha\pi\omicron\phi\alpha\nu\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\nu\omicron\nu\omicron\nu\omicron\nu\omicron\nu$). For he says, "ye shall not drink," and such an one "will not die." It is an eternal ordinance
that education is a healthful and a saving thing, and the lack of it the cause of disease and death.

Similarly, Samuel will never drink wine or strong drink (I Kings i. 11), for he has been ranked—as his name denotes—in the ranks of the divine camp. Perhaps he lived as a man, but he has been conceived of not as a composite living thing of flesh and blood, but as a mind rejoicing only in the service and worship of God. His mother Hannah was accused of drunkenness (I Kings i. 14), for in those inspired by God (rois theophorótois) not only is the soul raised but the body is flushed and inflamed by inward joy. Great is the boldness of the soul that is filled with the graces of God. This then is the band (χαρχός) of the sober, who make education their leader; the other that of drunkards, whose leader (ξαρχός) is boorishness (ἀπαιδευστα).
carried away by the performance as to rise involuntarily and applaud, others as unmoved as the benches on which they sit, and others so alienated as to get up and go, hands over ears.

The refraction of water and the deceptiveness of a distant view all point in the same direction. Indeed we can never perceive any sensible object as it is, but always in relation to something else. Nothing at all in the world is known save by comparison with its opposite. All sense-perception is a complex process and therefore uncertain, and even judgments of right and wrong depend upon early education in the case of most men. The multitude believes what was once delivered to it, and, having left its mind untrained, affirms and denies without independent examination. The philosophers, on the other hand, who test and examine all questions, logical, ethical and physical, cannot agree in their answers. So reserve of judgment is the safest course.

The de Sobrietate naturally follows the de Ebrietate (though the latter is perhaps imperfect, lacking as it does any full exposition of the nakedness of Noah), and the discourse deals with Gen. ix. 24-27. Philo has little to say about sobriety, but that nothing can be better than a sober intellect, nothing so valuable as the clear insight of the soul which it brings. This done, he turns to the text and fastens on “the younger son,” which is proved from Scripture parallels to refer not to age but to maturity of mind. Ishmael, the sophist, though a youth, is called a child in comparison with Isaac the philosopher (Gen. xxii. 14-16). The whole people Scripture calls children (Deut. xxxii. 4-6) when they behave as such. Rachel, who stands for bodily beauty, is younger than Leah the beauty of the soul. Joseph is always young or younger (Gen. xxxvii. 2; xlix. 22). Similarly, elder is first applied to the wise Abraham, the shortest-lived of all the patriarchs (Gen. xxiv. 1). The seventy colleagues of Moses are elders
whom the wise man knows (Num. xi. 16). The significance of these terms is clearly set forth, for those who are skilled to hear, in one commandment of the Law, viz. that relating to the children of the beloved and hated wives (Deut. xxi. 15-17). The beloved wife is the symbol of pleasure, her child the pleasure-loving temper; the hated wife is the symbol of understanding, and her child the love of virtue. The first is always a child, the second an elder from his cradle. Accordingly Esau, the elder in point of age, resigns his birthright to Jacob; and Ephraim, who is “Fruitfulness,” i.e. Memory, is preferred before Manasseh, who is Forgetfulness.

But why does Noah curse the child of the offender and not the offender himself (Gen. ix. 25)? Wherein did Canaan sin? Well, those who are accustomed to elaborate the literal and superficial meanings contained in the laws have considered them by themselves perhaps, but let us obey the suggestions of right reason and interpret the underlying meaning. Ham means “hot,” Canaan “comotion.” Both are evil, the one quiescent, the other in motion. Rightly then is Canaan the son of Ham, and rightly is Canaan cursed. For being moved to sin Ham himself becomes Canaan. So is the law that the sins of the fathers are visited on the children (Ex. xx. 5) justified; the results, or children, of reasonings are punished, while they, if no culpable action be laid at their door, escape accusation.

Shem is, as has been said before, the eponymous good kind of man, and God is his God. He who, like Shem and Abraham (Gen. xviii. 7), has God as his portion (κληρον) has passed beyond the bounds of human happiness.

With regard to the blessing of Japheth, we are not clearly told who is to dwell in the tents of Shem. It is possible to understand that it is the Lord of the universe. What more fitting home could be found for God than a soul perfectly cleansed, counting virtue (τὸ καλὸν) the only good? Of course he will dwell there not as in a place—contained therein—but as bestowing special forethought and attention upon
it, like every master of a house. But perhaps the whole prayer refers to Japheth, that he may reckon all worldly goods at their true rate and seek only those of the soul.

The de Confusione Linguarum opens thus: “As far as these things are concerned what has been said will suffice” —probably referring to the group of homilies relating to Noah—“next we must consider, and not casually (ων παρέφυως), the philosophy of the narrative of the confusion of languages” (Gen. xi. 1–9). And now Philo explains the position of the antagonists, hinted at in the beginning of the de Gigantibus. Certain Jews, presumably Hellenists, disgusted with the ancestral polity, always grumbling and carping at the laws, use this and other such passages as stepping-stones for their atheism, impious that they are. They say “Do you still make solemn professions about your code as containing the canons of truth itself? See, your holy books contain myths such as you deride, when you hear others reciting them.” Well, we have not their leisure to search out these scattered myths, and will be content to deal with the passage in hand.

The first parable is the myth of the Aloeidae, who piled Ossa upon Olympus and Pelion upon Ossa. But notice Moses speak of a tower. The second is a myth, akin to that before us, relating to the common speech of living things recorded by fabricators of myths. It is said that in ancient times all living things, animals, fishes, and birds, had a common speech, so that they could sympathize with each other’s sorrows and joys, as now Greek with Greek and barbarian with barbarian. Then, sated with their unstinted supply of blessings, as often happens, they all turned to longing for the unattainable and treated for immortality, asking for destruction of old age and for perpetual youth, alleging that one of their number, the serpent, had already obtained this gift. But they paid the fitting penalty for their presumption; for their one common language was immediately cut up into different
languages, so that they could not understand one another. Here again a discrepancy is to be noted, for Moses speaks only of men as having the same speech. It is said that the scriptural account is as mythical as the parables cited, and that the division or confusion of tongues was a cure for sins, intended to prevent men from conspiring together to do evil. But the latter theory is untenable. If wicked men wish to conspire they will not be stopped by the difference of their languages. They can always communicate, like men whose tongues have been cut out, by means of signs. Again, if a man learn many languages, he is always held in good repute among those who understand them, and regarded at once as a friend. In fact, the literal interpreters of the Law alone will refute these students of comparative mythology, without opposing sophistry to sophistry.

Well then, we understand this scripture to refer to the universality of evil both in the world and in the individual. Heaviest of all evils, and wellnigh incurable, is the cooperation of all parts of the soul in sin, when no one part is able to heal the rest, but physicians and patients are sick together, as at the time of the Deluge (Gen. iv. 5–7). We must flee all associations for purposes of sin, and confirm our agreement with companions of understanding and knowledge.

In this connexion the saying, “we are all sons of one man, we are peaceable” (Gen. xlii. 11), is introduced as an example of perfect harmony, and leads to a consideration of its origin and its complement. Inevitably will they love peace and hate war whose one and the same father is not mortal but immortal, God’s man, who being the Logos of the Eternal is of necessity himself also incorruptible. Their life is peaceful, while the polytheist’s is full of strife, and yet not, as some think, lazy and ignoble. Men of peace are men of war when opposed to the enemies of the soul’s peace. Such is the disposition of each lover of virtue, and the words of the inspired prophet bear the
same testimony: "O mother, what manner of child am I? a man of war" (Jer. xv. 10).

"The East," or "Dawn" (Gen. xi. 2), bears two meanings in Scripture, according as it refers to the dawning of light or of shadow in the soul. It is used in the good sense in the account of Paradise (Gen. ii. 8). So in the oracle of one of Moses' companions (Zech. vi. 12), "Behold a man whose name is Dawn or 'Rising'." A most novel title this, if you suppose that a man composed of body and soul is spoken of; but if it be that bodiless man who is identical with the divine image you will confess that the title is most happy (εὐθυβολωτατοῦ). For him hath the Father of the universe raised up to be his oldest or first-begotten Son. "East" occurs in a bad sense in the story of Balak the fool and Balaam (Num. xxxiii. 76 f.).

It is notable that these fools "find" the place most fitted for their folly, and "settle" there. Both points are significant. No wicked man is content with the crimes towards which his evil nature proceeds of itself, but invents fresh ones and therein abides. Therefore are all they whom Moses reckons wise introduced as sojourners, who reckon heaven their fatherland. Thence were they sent as colonists and thither they yearn to return (Gen. xxvi. 2, xxxiii. 4, xlvii. 9; Exod. ii. 22).

The mention of "bricks" (Gen. xi. 3) naturally suggests the bondage of Israel, in which the Egyptians compelled them to make bricks and to build fenced cities. The eye of the soul which alone can see God, bound in the bodily nets of Egypt, groans over its task (Exod. i. 11, ii. 23). But the way to freedom is sure. For all men labouring for gain, or fame, or pleasure there is ransom and salvation in the worship of him who alone is wise (Exod. viii. 1). Right is it for them that keep company with knowledge to aspire to see the Absolute and, if that they cannot, then at least his likeness, the most holy Word, and after him the world, the most perfect of sensible things; for philosophy is nothing else than to study to see these distinctly.
The Lawgiver uses “city” not only in the ordinary sense but also of that which a man carries about, built in his own soul, whereof those built on earth of material substances are but copies. How evil their city is, how shameless the exposure of their guilt, is shown by the warning of their conscience which foresees their impending dispersion (Gen. xi. 4). Their tower is like that recorded in the Book of Judgments, Phanuel, that is, “Aversion of God” (Judg. viii. 9).

The statement that “the Lord came down to see the city and the tower” (Gen. xi. 5) must certainly be understood metaphorically. To suppose that the Divine should really share the positions and motions of men is monstrous impiety (ὑπερωκέανος καὶ μετακόσμοι ὡς ἔπος εἰπεῖν ἀσέβεια). The human phrases are applied to God, who is not human in form, for the benefit of our education. And this particular expression is by way of being an exhortation, that no one should refrain from examining things closely, or judge by hearsay (Exod. xxiii. 1). Let no one think that the addition “which the sons of men had built” is otiose and insignificant. We must track out the hidden treasure of Scripture. The “sons of men” are polytheists; the worshippers of the One are styled “sons of God” (Deut. xiv. 1, &c.).

The words put in God’s mouth need careful attention, “Come and let us go down and confound there their tongue” (Gen. xi. 7). For he appears to be speaking to some who are as it were his fellow workers, as at the creation of man (Gen. i. 26, cf. iii. 22). First, it must be said that there is no existing being equal in dignity with God: there is one Ruler and Governor and King, to whom alone it belongs of right to govern and order the universe. The poet’s saying, “the rule of many lords is no good thing; let there be one lord, one king,” applies better to the world and God than to cities and men. The next point is that God, being One, has innumerable Powers around him, all defenders and saviours of the universe, and with them the
Powers of punishment, that is the prevention and correction of sins. By these the ideal world was framed and man also. God entrusts to them tasks which befit him not, for man is prone to err in his free choice between good and evil, and the way toward evil in the rational soul must not be created by God through himself. So God is the cause of all good and of no evil at all; the evil is allotted to his angels or Powers, which work under his supervision.

God says, "let us confound their tongue." It is not, then, as the literalists suppose, simply the division of the speech of mankind which is the penalty of their sin. Yet I would not blame those who follow the superficial sense, for perhaps even they have reached the truth; but I would urge them not to be content therewith, but to come over to the metaphorical interpretations, regarding the letter as the shadow and the inherent spirit as the fact or substance. By choice of the word confusion the Lawgiver directly suggests a deeper meaning. If he referred only to the origin of different languages, distinction would have been the better word. Confusion is the abolition of the powers of each element of a compound or mixture in order to the production of the compound. Here the end in view is the dissolution of the fellowship of wickedness. And if we apply the Scripture again to the individual, it is obvious that God has separated the parts of the soul. It is fitting for God to tune the harmony of the virtues and to dissolve and destroy that of the vices. Now confusion is the most appropriate name of wickedness, as any fool proves plainly, as his words, counsels, and actions are all reprobate and confusion 1.

J. H. A. Hart.

1 A further article on Philo will follow in a subsequent number of the J. Q. R.
THE ITINERARY OF BENJAMIN OF TUDELA (continued).

Hebrew Text.

The text is in Hebrew and includes several annotations and footnotes, indicating editorial work. The content appears to be a continuation of Benjamin of Tudela's itinerary, focusing on his travels and experiences.
BM. Benjamin of Tudela's Itinerary, British
THE ITINERARY OF BENJAMIN OF TUDELA 125

who is shown upon the wooden tablet, is said to have gone through the
labeled Sicily. The text is written in Hebrew script.
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128 THE JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW

...
Fragment of Benjamin of Tudela's Itinerary, Oxford, MS. Opp. Add. 8° 58 [Neubauer 2580]
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וכי אם הוראה המקדש ו
בשלך ו_kernel 당신ה ויהוה
ות忖ו נזק ו with אוקי
ה kısıפוקיר מלמד א
וירז נציבים ומד הוא
켰 למד הוקッסית ומד
שפי עם התמים. למד ע
ש רבה והדרים וודא על
ולאזכרה וותי דצלות
לכתרו ונבה תומך את
ולא מד חיות מדנ הפלת
למדת נפשו העוסק ובר
אחת הלך כוח עשתהשכומ
לעם מזרה ווים זהות מד
וה קולים הלגרדות על
ויקי עונשון. לא תוסר
מודים ונבר סול 관한
נאם שם המחנה וי
ויש יכה תחלה והיו ישרים
אכשון עמה עמה עמה
לאכשון עמה עמה עמה
ינשו ובר חומ השלום
אשה לא תפש למשתתפ
החיות שליש עשה עשה
החיות שליש עשה עשה
THE ITINERARY OF BENJAMIN OF TUDELA

Thence it is a day's journey to the other Gebal, which is on the border of the children of Ammon, and here there are about 150 Jews. The place is under the rule of the Genoese, the name of the governor being Guillelmus Embriacus. Here was found a temple belonging to the children of Ammon in olden times, and an idol of theirs seated upon a throne or chair, and made of stone overlaid with gold. Two women are represented sitting one on the right and one on the left of it, and there is an altar in front before which the Ammonites used to sacrifice and burn incense. There are about 200 Jews there, at their head being R. Meir, R. Jacob, and R. Simchah. The place is situated on the sea border of the land of Israel. From there it is two days' journey to Beirut, or Beeroth, where there are about fifty Jews, at their head being R. Solomon, R. Obadiah, and R. Joseph. Thence it is one day's journey to Saida, which is Sidon, a large city, with about twenty Jews. Ten miles therefrom a people dwell who are at war with the men of Sidon; they are called Druses, and are pagans of a lawless character. They inhabit the mountains and the clefts of the rocks, have no king or ruler over them, but dwell independent in their high places, and their border extends to Mount Hermon, which is a three days' journey. They are steeped in vice, brothers marrying their sisters and fathers their daughters. They have one feast day in the year, when they all collect, both men and women, to eat and drink together, and they then interchange their wives. They say that at the time when the soul leaves the body it passes in the case of a good man into the body of a newborn child, and in the

1 See the narrative of William of Tyre.

2 Jebeil, the ancient Gebal, was noted for its artificers and stonecutters. Cf. Kings v. 32; Ezek. xxvii. 9. The Greeks named the place Byblos, the birthplace of Philo. The coins of Byblos have a representation of the Temple of Astarte. All along the coast we find remains of the worship of Baal Kronos and Baaltis, of Osiris and Isis, and it is probable that the worship of Adonis and Jupiter-Ammon led Benjamin to associate therewith the Ammonites. The reference to the children of Ammon is based on a misunderstanding, arising perhaps out of Ps. lxviii. 8.

3 The Quarterly Statements of the Palestine Exploration Fund for 1886 and 1889 give a good deal of information concerning the religion of the Druses. Their morality is there described as having been much maligned.
case of a bad man into the body of a dog or an ass. Such are their
foolish beliefs. There are no resident Jews among them, but a certain
number of Jewish handicraftsmen and dyers come among them for
the sake of trade, and then return, the people being favourable to the
Jews. They roam over the mountains and hills, and no man can do battle with them.

From Sidon it is half a day's journey to Sarepta, which belongs to
Sidon. Thence it is another half-day to New Tyre, which is a very
fine city, with a harbour in the midst of the city. At night those
that levy dues throw iron chains from tower to tower, so that no man
can go forth by boat or in any other way to rob the ships by night.
There is no harbour like this in the whole world. Tyre is a beautiful
city. It contains about 500 Jews, some of them scholars of the Talmud,
at their head being R. Ephraim of Tyre, the Dayan, R. Meir from Car-
cassonne, and R. Abraham, head of the congregation. The Jews own
some vessels, and there are also glass-makers amongst them who make
that fine glass or Tyrian glass-ware which is prized in all countries.
In the vicinity is found sugar of a high class, for men plant it here, and
people come from all lands to purchase it.1 A man can ascend the
walls of New Tyre and see ancient Tyre, which the sea has now
covered, lying at a stone's throw from the new city. And should
one care to go forth by boat one can see the castles, market places,
streets, and palaces in the bed of the sea. New Tyre is a busy
place of commerce, to which merchants flock from all quarters.

One day's journey brings one to Acre, the Acco of old, which is on
the borders of Asher; it is the commencement of the land of Israel.
Situated by the Great Sea, it possesses a large harbour for all the pil-
grims who come to Jerusalem by ship. A stream runs in front of it,
called the brook of Kedumim. About 200 Jews live there, at their
head being R. Zadok, R. Jephet, and R. Jonah. From there it is three
parasangsto Chaifas, which is Hachepher on the seaboard, and on

1 Tyre was noted for its glass ware and sugar factories up to 1391,
when it was abandoned by the Crusaders, and destroyed by the Moslems.

2 This name is applied to the Kishon, mentioned further on, celebrated
in Deborah's song (Judg. v. 21), but it is about five miles south of Acre,
the river nearest to the town being the Belus, noted for its fine sand
suitable for glass-making. It is not unlikely that R. Benjamin alludes
to the celebrated ox spring of which Arab writers have much to say.
Mukkadasi writes in 985: "Outside the eastern city gate is a spring.
This they call Ain al Bakar, relating how it was Adam—peace be upon
him!—who discovered this spring, and gave his oxen water therewith,
whence its name."

3 Gath-Hepher, the birthplace of Jonah, near Kefr Kenna, in the
the other side is Mount Carmel ¹, at the foot of which there are many Jewish graves. On the mountain is the cave of Elijah, where the Christians have erected a structure called St. Elias. On the top of the mountain can be recognized the overthrown altar which Elijah repaired in the days of Ahab. The site of the altar is circular, about four cubits remain thereof, and at the foot of the mountain the brook Kishon flows. From here it is four parasangs to Capernaum, which is the village of Nahum, identical with Maon, the home of Nabal the Carmelite ².

Six parasangs from here is Caesarea, the Gath ³ of the Philistines, and here there are about 200 Jews and 200 Cuthim. These are the Jews of Shomron, who are called Samaritans. The city is fair and beautiful, and lies by the sea. It was built by Caesar, and called after him Caesarea. Thence it is half a day's journey to Kako ⁴, the Keilah of Scripture. There are no Jews here. Thence it is half a day's journey to St. George, which is Lud ⁵, where there lives one Jew, who is a dyer. Thence it is a day's journey to Sebaste, which is the city of Shomron (Samaria), and here the ruins of the palace of Ahab the son of Omri may be seen. It was formerly a well-fortified city by the mountain side, with streams of water. It is still a land of brooks of water, gardens, orchards, vineyards, and olive groves, but no Jews dwell here. Thence it is two parasangs to territory of Zebulon (Joshua xix. 13), is not here referred to, but the land of Hopher, 1 Kings iv. 10.

¹ In Benjamin's time hermits, who eventually founded the Carmelite order of monks, occupied grottoes on Mount Carmel.

² Benjamin travelled along the coast to Caesarea. Mr. Guy le Strange (Palestine under the Moslems, 1890, p. 477) writes: "Tall Kanisaah, or Al Kunaisah, the Little Church, is the mound a few miles north of Athlith, which the Crusaders took to be the site of Capernaum." Benjamin must have known very well that Maon, which was contiguous to another Carmel (referred to in Joshua xv. 55), belonged to Judah, and was not in the north of Palestine. Here, as in the case of Gath and elsewhere, he quotes what was the hearsay identification current at the time he visited these places. See an article by C. R. Conder on "Early Christian Topography" in the Quarterly Statements of the Palestine Exploration Fund for 1876, p. 16.

³ In the time of the Crusaders Gath was supposed to be near Jamnia, but nothing definite is known as to its site. (Baedeker, Handbook to Palestine and Syria, p. 317.)

⁴ It lies between Caesarea and Lydda. See Conder's Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem. Keilah has been identified as situated near the cave of Adullam.

⁵ The tomb of St. George is still shown in the Greek church at Lydda.
Nablous, which is Shechem on Mount Ephraim, where there are no Jews; the place is situated in the valley between Mount Gerizim and Mount Ebal, and contains about 1,000 Cuthim, who observe the written law of Moses alone, and are called Samaritans. They have priests of the seed of Aaron, and they call them Aaronim, who do not intermarry with Cuthim, but wed only amongst themselves. These priests offer sacrifices, and bring burnt-offerings in their place of assembly on Mount Gerizim, as it is written in their law—"And thou shalt set the blessing on Mount Gerizim." They say that this is the proper site of the Temple. On Passover and the other festivals they offer up burnt-offerings on the altar which they have built on Mount Gerizim, as it is written in their law—"Ye shall set up the stones upon Mount Gerizim, of the stones which Joshua and the children of Israel set up at the Jordan." They say that they are descended from the tribe of Ephraim. And in the midst of them is the grave of Joseph, the son of Jacob our father, as it is written—"and the bones of Joseph buried they in Shechem." Their alphabet lacks three letters, namely נ He, ה Heth, and א Ain. The letter נ He is taken from Abraham our father, because they have no dignity, the letter ה Heth from Isaac, because they have no kindliness, and the letter א Ain from Jacob, because they have no humility. In place of these letters they make use of the Aleph, by which we can tell that they are not of the seed of Israel, although they know the law of Moses with the exception of these three letters. They guard themselves from the defilement of the dead, of the bones of the slain, and of graves; and they remove the garments which they have worn, before they go to the place of worship, and they bathe and put on fresh clothes. This is their constant practice. On Mount Gerizim are fountains and gardens and plantations, but Mount Ebal is rocky and barren; and between them in the valley lies the city of Shechem.

From the latter place it is a distance of four parasangs to Mount Gilboa, which the Christians call Mont Gilboa; it lies in a very parched district. And from there it is five... a village where

1 Mr. A. Cowley in an article on the Samaritan Liturgy in J. Q. R., VII, 125, states that the "House of Aaron" died out in 1624. The office then went to another branch, the priest being called נ ו ר כ, the Levite Cohen. Cf. Adler and Seligsohn's Une nouvelle chronique samaritaine. (Paris: Durlacher, 1903.)

2 The small square building known as Joseph's tomb lies a short distance north of Jacob's well, at the eastern entrance to the vale of Nablous.

3 Cf. Guy Le Strange, Palestine, 381, and Rapoport's Note 166, Asher's Benjamin, vol. II.

4 The MSS. are defective here; starting from Shechem, Mount Gilboa,
there are no Jews. Thence it is two parasangs to the valley of Ajalon, which the Christians call Val-de-Luna. At a distance of one parasang is Mahomerie-le-Grand, which is Gibeon the Great; it contains no Jews.

From there it is three parasangs to Jerusalem, which is a small city, fortified by three walls. It is full of people, whom the Mohammedans call Jacobites, Armenians, Greeks, Georgians, Franks, and people of all tongues. It contains a dyeing-house, | for which the Jews pay a small rent annually to the king*, on condition that besides the Jews no other dyers be allowed in Jerusalem. There are about 200 Jews who dwell under the Tower of David in one corner of the city. The lower portion of the wall of the Tower of David, to the extent of about ten cubits, is part of the ancient foundation set up by our ancestors, the remaining portion having been built by the Mohammedans. There is no structure in the whole city stronger than the Tower of David. The city also contains two buildings, from one of which—the hospital—there issue forth four hundred knights; and therein all the sick who come thither are lodged and cared for in life and in death. The other building is called the Temple of Solomon; which to this day presents a bare appearance, is in a different direction to Ajalon. It is doubtful whether Benjamin personally visited all the places mentioned in his Itinerary. His visit took place not long after the second great Crusade, when Palestine under the kings of Jerusalem was disturbed by internal dissension and the onslaughts of the Saracens under Nur-ed-din of Damascus and his generals. Benjamin could at best visit the places of note only when the opportunity offered.

* King Baldwin III died in 1162, and was succeeded by his brother Almaric.

* The Knights of the Hospital of St. John and the Templars are here referred to. (See Gibbon, Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire; Charles Mills,
it is the palace built by Solomon the king of Israel. Three hundred knights are quartered there, and issue therefrom every day for military exercise, besides those who come from the land of the Franks and the other parts of Christendom, having taken upon themselves to serve there a year or two until their vow is fulfilled. In Jerusalem is the great church called the Sepulchre, and here is the burial-place of Jesus, unto which the Christians make pilgrimages.

Jerusalem\(^1\) has four gates—the gate of Abraham, the gate of David, the gate of Zion, and the gate of Gushpat, which is the gate of Jehoshaphat, in front of the ancient sanctuary called Templum Domini. Upon the site of the sanctuary Omar-Ben-Al-Khataab erected an edifice with a very large and magnificent cupola, unto which the Gentiles do not bring any image or effigy, but merely come there to pray. In front of this place is the western wall, which is one of the walls of the Holy of Holies. This is called the Gate of Mercy, and thither come all the Jews to pray before the wall of the court of the Temple. In Jerusalem, attached to the palace which belonged to Solomon, are the stables built by him, forming a very substantial structure, composed of large stones, and the like of it is not to be seen anywhere in the world. There is also visible up to this day the pool where the priests used to slaughter their sacrifices, and the Jews coming thither write their names upon the wall. The gate of Jehoshaphat leads to the valley of Jehoshaphat, which is the gathering-place of nations\(^2\). Here is the pillar called Absalom's Hand, and the sepulchre of King Uzziah\(^3\).


1 Cf. the writings of Mukaddasi the Hierosolomite, one of the publications of the Palestine Pilgrims' Text Society. See also Edrisi's and Ali of Herat's works. Chap. ii of Guy le Strange's Palestine under the Moslems gives full extracts of Edrisi's account in 1154 and Ali's in 1173. See also five plans of Jerusalem designed between 1160 and 1180, vol. XV, Zeitschrift des deutschen Palästina-Vereins.

2 Ezek. xx. 35. That the Gorge of Jehoshaphat will be the scene of the last judgment is based upon Joel iv. 2. Cf. M. N. Adler, Temple at Jerusalem and Sir Charles Warren's Comments.

3 In memory of Absalom's disobedience to his father, it is customary with the Jews to pelt this monument with stones to the present day. The adjoining tomb is traditionally known as that of Zechariah, 2 Chron. xxiv. 20. King Uzziah, otherwise Azariah, was buried on Mount Zion, close to the other kings of Judah, 2 Kings xv. 7. Cf. P. E. F., Jerusalem, as to identification of sites. Sir Charles Wilson, Picturesque Palestine, gives excellent illustrations of the holy places, and his work might be consulted with advantage.
In the neighbourhood is also a great spring, called the Waters of Siloam, connected with the brook of Kidron. Over the spring is a large structure dating from the time of our ancestors, but little water is found, and the people of Jerusalem for the most part drink the rain-water, which they collect in cisterns in their houses. From the valley of Jehoshaphat one ascends the Mount of Olives; it is the valley alone which separates Jerusalem from the Mount of Olives. From the Mount of Olives one sees the Sea of Sodom, and at a distance of two parasangs from the Sea of Sodom is the Pillar of Salt into which Lot's wife was turned; the sheep lick it continually, but afterwards it regains its original shape. The whole land of the plain and the valley of Shittim as far as Mount Nebo are visible from here.

In front of Jerusalem is Mount Zion, on which there is no building, except a place of worship belonging to the Christians. Facing Jerusalem (at a distance of three miles) are three sepulchres belonging to the Israelites, who in the days of old buried their dead in caves, and upon each sepulchre there is a façade, but the Christians destroy the sepulchres, employing the stones thereof in building their houses. These sepulchres reach as far as Zelzah in the territory of Benjamin. Around Jerusalem are high mountains.

On Mount Zion | are the sepulchres of the House of David, and the sepulchres of the kings that ruled after him. The exact place cannot be identified, inasmuch as fifteen years ago a wall of the church of Mount Zion fell in. The Patriarch commanded the overseer to take the stones of the old walls and restore therewith the church. He did so, and hired workmen at fixed wages; and there were twenty men who brought the stones from the base of the wall of Zion. Among these men there were two who were sworn friends. On a certain day the one entertained the other; after their meal they returned to their work, when the overseer said to them, "Why have you tarried to-day?" They answered, "Why need you complain? When our fellow workmen go to their meal we will do our work." When the dinner-time arrived, and the other workmen had gone to their meal, they examined the stones, and raised a certain stone which

1 Pillars of salt are to be met with elsewhere, for instance at Hammam Meskutim in Algeria. They are caused by spouts of water, in which so great a quantity of salt is contained as at times to stop up the aperture of the spring. The latter, however, is again unsealed through cattle licking off the salt near the aperture, and the same process of filling up and unstopping goes on continually.

formed the entrance to a cave. Thereupon one said to the other, "Let us go in and see if any money is to be found there." They entered the cave, and reached a large chamber resting upon pillars of marble overlaid with silver and gold. In front was a table of gold and a sceptre and crown. This was the sepulchre of King David. On the left thereof in like fashion was the sepulchre of King Solomon; then followed the sepulchres of all the kings of Judah that were buried there. Closed coffers were also there, the contents of which no man knows. The two men essayed to enter the chamber, when a fierce wind came forth from the entrance of the cave and smote them, and they fell to the ground like dead men, and there they lay until evening. And there came forth a wind like a man's voice, crying out: "Arise and go forth from this place!" So the men rushed forth in terror, and they came unto the Patriarch, and related these things to him. Thereupon the Patriarch sent for Rabbi Abraham el Constantini, the pious recluse, who was one of the mourners of Jerusalem, and to him he related all these things according to the report of the two men who had come forth. Then Rabbi Abraham replied, "These are the sepulchres of the House of David; they belong to the kings of Judah, and on the morrow let us enter, I and you and these men, and find out what is there." And on the morrow they sent for the two men, and found each of them lying on his bed in terror, and the men said: "We will not enter there, for the Lord doth not desire to show it to any man." Then the Patriarch gave orders that the place should be closed up and hidden from the sight of man unto this day. These things were told me by the said Rabbi Abraham.

From Jerusalem it is two parasangs to Bethlehem, which is called by the Christians Beth-Leon, and close thereto, at a distance of about half a mile, at the parting of the way, is the pillar of Rachel's grave, which is made up of eleven stones, corresponding with the number of the sons of Jacob. Upon it is a cupola resting on four columns, and all the Jews that pass by carve their names upon the stones of the pillar. At Bethlehem there are two Jewish dyers. It is a land of brooks of water, and contains wells and fountains.

At a distance of six parasangs is St. Abraham de Bron, which is Hebron; the old city stood on the mountain, but is now in ruins; and in the valley by the field of Machpelah lies the present city. Here there is the great church called St. Abram, and this was a Jewish place of worship at the time of the Mohammedan rule, but the Gentiles have erected there six sepulchres, respectively called those of Abraham and Sarah, Isaac and Rebekah, Jacob and Leah.

1 Edrisi in 1154 writes: "The tomb is covered by twelve stones, and above it is a dome vaulted over with stones."
The custodians tell the pilgrims that these are the graves of the Patriarchs, for which information the pilgrims give them money. If a Jew comes, however, and gives a special reward, the custodian of the cave opens unto him a gate of iron, which was constructed by our forefathers, and then he is able to descend below by means of steps, holding a lighted candle in his hand. He then reaches a cave, in which nothing is to be found, and a cave beyond, which is likewise empty, but when he reaches the third cave behold there are six graves, the graves of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, Sarah, Rebekah and Leah, facing one another. And upon the graves are inscriptions cut in stone; upon the grave of Abraham is engraved “This is the grave of Abraham”; upon that of Isaac, “This is the grave of Isaac, the son of Abraham our Father”; upon that of Jacob, “This is the grave of Jacob, the son of Isaac, the son of Abraham our Father”; and upon the others, “This is the grave of Sarah,” “This is the grave of Rebekah,” and “This is the grave of Leah.” A lamp burns day and night upon the graves in the cave. One finds there many casks filled with the bones of Israelites, as the members of the house of Israel were wont to bring the bones of their fathers thither and to deposit them there to this day.

Beyond the field of Machpelah is the house of Abraham; there is a well in front of the house, but out of reverence for the Patriarch Abraham no one is allowed to build in the neighbourhood.

From Hebron it is five parasangs to Beit Jibrin, which is Mareshah.

---

1 Compare R. Petachia’s account of his visit (Travels of Rabbi Petachia: translated by Dr. A. Benisch; London, Trübner & Co., 1856, p. 63). See also an interesting paper by Professor Guthe (Zeitschrift des deutschen Palästina-Vereins, vol. XVII, p. 248) for an account of the opening of the tombs at Hebron in 1119, as given in a presumably contemporaneous MS. found by Count Riant. Fifteen earthenware vessels filled with bones, perhaps those referred to by Benjamin, were found. It is doubtful whether the actual tombs of the Patriarchs were disturbed, but it is stated that the Abbot of St. Gallen paid in 1180 ten marks of gold (equal to about £5,240 sterling) for relics taken from the altar of the church at Hebron. The MS. of Count Riant further mentions that before the occupation of Hebron by the Arabs, the Greeks had blocked up and concealed the entrance to the caves. The Jews subsequently disclosed the place of the entrance to the Moslems, receiving as recompense permission to build a synagogue close by. This was no doubt the Jewish place of worship referred to by Benjamin. Shortly after Benjamin’s visit in 1167 the Crusaders established a bishopric and erected a church in the southern part of the Haram. See also Conder’s account of the visit of His Majesty the King, when Prince of Wales, to the Haram at Hebron. (Palestine Exploration Fund’s Quarterly Statement, 1882.)
where there are but three Jews\(^1\). Three parasangs further one reaches St. Samuel of Shiloh. This is the Shiloh which is two parasangs from Jerusalem. When the Christians captured Ramleh, the Ramah of old, from the Mohammedans, they found there the grave of Samuel the Ramathite close to a Jewish synagogue. The Christians took the remains, conveyed them unto Shiloh, and erected over them a large church, and called it St. Samuel of Shiloh unto this day\(^2\).

\(^1\) Beit Jibrin was fortified by King Fulk in 1134. See Baedeker, *Handbook to Palestine and Syria*, p. 309, for full description of the district; also a preliminary notice on the Necropolis of Maresha in *P. E. F. Q. S.*, Oct., 1902, p. 393. The text has \(p\), but it should be \(rt\). Inscriptions on tombs near Beit Jibrin show that the town, to which those buried belonged, was called Marisheh. The passage in A and all printed editions as to Shunem is corrupt, and certainly out of place. Shunem was a small place in Galilee, and is not likely to have had 300 Jews at the time of the Crusaders.

\(^2\) Shiloh, at the time of the Crusaders, was considered to occupy the site of Mizpeh, the highest mountain near Jerusalem, where the national assemblies were held at the time of the Judges. The present mosque is dilapidated, but the substructure, which dates from the Frank period, is beautifully jointed. The apse is raised. The reputed tomb of Samuel is on the western side of the church. It is still called Nebi Samwil, venerated alike by Jew and Moslem.

(To be continued.)
THE FALASHAS.

During a recent expedition to Abyssinia, to which I was attached, I was in hopes of being fortunate enough to come across some of the interesting tribe of the Falashas. My duties, however, which took me through the Sudan and the southern part of the Abyssinian Empire, prevented my visiting this people, who live further north in the neighbourhood of Lake Tsana, and separated by the Blue Nile and many of its tributaries from the route taken by our party.

The rate, moreover, at which we were moving prevented my searching out members of the tribe, of whom a few are occasionally to be found in other parts of the country.

At Addis Alam, a town about a day's journey west of Addis Ababa, through which our caravan passed at full speed, there is, I believe, a colony of about fifty of this people, who have been brought there by the Emperor Menelik to build a stone palace for him; for the Falasha are said to be almost the only skilled masons in Ethiopia, as nearly all the houses of the Abyssinians are built of wood, wattle, or mud.

During the short time I was staying in Addis Ababa, Menelik's capital, I heard of the presence in the town of a couple of Falashas, but was unable to stay to meet them.

The lateness of the season, involving the rise of the Blue Nile into flood, prevented my tracking north to the Falasha country, so that I was forced to abandon any attempt to reach this tribe during the current year. I hope, however, to be able to pay such a visit later on.
I did, however, meet a gentleman, Ato Woldah Haimanot, who happened to be something of a scholar, and one of the very few educated Abyssinians who speak a European language. This gentleman, who has a very fair mastery of English (obtained, I believe, during a stay in Jerusalem), besides Amharic, Arabic, Galla, Tigrean, and a little Hebrew, took considerable interest in my idea of visiting the Falashas, and it is a letter from him which reached me here in England a few weeks ago which I append.

The letter is verbatim as I received it from Woldah Haimanot. I have added some foot-notes of my own, which may perhaps be superfluous to many readers.

I must take this opportunity to thank Mr. and Mrs. W. N. Macmillan, to whom I owe my presence as a member of the expedition, and Lt.-Col. Sir John Harrington, British Minister at the court of King Menelik, whose guest I was at Addis Ababa, for many kindesses. Without them these few lines would not have been written.

Charles Singer.

Addis-Ababa,
July 15, 1904.

Dear Dr. Singer,

Very soon after you left for Djibouti I found the two Falasha gentlemen about whom I told you; their names are—the first Ato Yetemengo, the other Ato Afawark, and their houses are in the quarters of the masons and carpenters situated between the British Legation and the Palace.

I inquired from these gentlemen the following questions of the Falasha customs and religions which you wanted to know.

1. Funeral customs just the same as Christian Abyssinians, except the body of a male Falasha is laid on the right side and that of a female on the left: any one who has touched a dead body is unclean.

1 Ato is the Amharic title of courtesy, equivalent to our Mr. or Sir.
2. Whenever they kill an animal for food they pronounce: "May the Lord God of Israel be blessed."

3. Phylacteries and amulets are abominations by them.

4. Priests' attire and sacrifice utensils are according to the law of the Levites, except that the vessels have short handles.

5. Priests are married and unmarried, and as the Falashas assume to be descendants of the Levites who came to Abyssinia with Menelik I, any one of them who is fit is appointed for a priest.

6. Their sacrifices, customs of food and drink are according to the law of Moses.

7. Their calendars are taken from the appearance of the moon, and their feasts are during Passion Week.

8. Marriage is performed with prayers and ceremonies; whenever the bride is not found to be a virgin she should be dismissed.

9. Circumcision is on the eighth day.

10. They do not know any history or antiquity except the Old Testament, and that they have come with Menelik.

11. Priests are consecrated with ceremonies.

---

1 The Abyssinians have also their own method of killing, and eat no meat except that of animals killed by one of themselves.

2 The Abyssinians almost all wear amulets, consisting for the most part of passages from the Gospels, written on parchment, and wrapped in little leather cases, not unlike in appearance the phylacteries in use among modern Jews. Crosses and other charms are also very commonly worn among them.

3 The Abyssinian Christians also retain the custom of circumcision.

4 I understand from Waldoh Halmant that the Falashas use the same version of the Old Testament as the Abyssinian Christians (the version being in the Amharic tongue), omitting, however, certain books which are peculiar to the Amharic and Coptic Churches.

5 Menelik I is in Abyssinian tradition the son of King Solomon and the Queen of Sheba. The Negus Negusti (i.e. the King of Kings) of Ethiopia, who is the over-lord of the Rases or sub-kings of the Abyssinian Empire, always makes a claim to be a descendant of this first Menelik. The name Menelik was taken by the present sovereign on his assumption of imperial honours.
12. The women are treated well, and no divorce except for the cause of unchastity 1.

13. Their laws and avenging of blood are in accord with the customs of the Christian Abyssinians.

14. The manner of observing their animal foods, and all clean and unclean things, and the separation of women during child-births, &c., is exactly according to the law of Moses.

15. The day of their Atonement is in the month of November.

16. They have a hope to return to Jerusalem.

17. Except leather-tanning, which is abomination to them, they engage themselves in every other work 2.

18. They have no more arts or learnings than the Abyssinians.

19. They have no other saints but those of the Old Testament.

20. Mohammedans are considered infidels by them, but Christians are respected.

Their manner of observing clean and unclean things is very severe.

As the women of the Christians, or of the other peoples among whom they live, do not observe the Levitical laws regarding women, no Falasha touches the pots or any household utensils of the other people; the Falashas do not eat any food cooked or dressed by other people; they do not buy also any article of food, including butter and milk, in the market which is in the possession of other people, except live animals and raw corn and honey, in order that they might not be defiled. Whenever they trespass against any of these laws they

---

1 The religious marriage, which is somewhat rare among the Christian Abyssinians, is indissoluble.

2 I heard of the Falashas as pursuing the following occupations:—masons, smiths, farmers, carpenters, workers in precious metals. The work of the smith is regarded with superstition, terror, and some contempt by the other Abyssinians.
wash and shave themselves, and live in separation for seven days, eating uncooked beans.

Thus these Falashas have lived for a long time in this condition among such a great nation of different religions. When I asked them about their origin, they told me that their ancestors came with Menelik I from Palestine; and they said: In the former times, the kings of Abyssinia themselves and their subjects being Jews, all was well in that time; but when the first Bishop Aboona Salama (called Frumentius in Church History) came and preached the Gospel, both the king and his subjects being converted to Christianity, all the world was spoiled; and the Falashas began gradually to be despised by the Christians.

Very late in the reign of King Theodore, and King John in our days, when the Christians began to force the Mohammedans to be baptized there were some attempts by the lower classes of people against the Falashas also; but both the kings and the priests prevented them, and said: No man has right to blame the laws of Moses, because he is the inventor of the real worship of the true God. Thus the Falashas are proud and honoured among the great and learned Abyssinians.

What educated man could be found without being touched with sympathy when he hears the story of these people who stick to their marvellous religion for so long a time in the midst of wild African people?

What I urge you is to apply to some Christian and Jewish charitable societies who can afford to assist in teaching them agriculture, arts, trades, elementary education, &c., according to modern views.

1 The Falashas live in separate villages, and in no large tract of country do they form a majority of the population. Their numbers I have heard variously estimated at from 10,000 to 50,000.

2 Aboona is the title of the head of the Abyssinian Church. Since the fifteenth century he has been drawn from the Coptic Church in Cairo.

3 From all I could hear the Falashas live on completely satisfactory terms with their neighbours, from whom they are not distinguishable in appearance.
If you have a chance of coming back again to visit the Falashas, you had better come to Addis-ababa first, and from here you can go to Dambia and Kowara where the Falashas are, and these two men who gave me the above information would like to accompany you, and accordingly you could accomplish your purpose properly. If you go via Massawah, the people will be suspicious against you, and you will have many inconveniences.

I remain,
Your obedient and humble servant,

Woldah Haimanot.
ALLGEMEINE EINLEITUNG IN DIE JÜDISCHE LITERATUR DES MITTELALTERS.

(Continued from Vol. XVI, p. 764.)

VII. *Encyklopädische Entwicklung einzelner Fächer.*

I. Bei der Einteilung einer Literatur kann man entweder von einer *a priori* gebildeten Schablone ausgehen, oder von praktischen Gesichtspunkten, wie z. B. Zunz’ *Geographische Literatur der Juden* das zusammenstellt, was nicht eigentlich Geographie genannt zu werden pflegt, sondern dem entspricht, was anderswo unter “Geographie” berücksichtigt werden kann. In derselben Weise habe ich im ersten Teile der Bibliographie der geschichtlichen Literatur bei den Juden dasjenige aufgenommen, was in der jüdischen Literatur zur Geschichte gerechnet werden dürfte. In der nachfolgenden Entwicklung ist mit der begrifflichen Unterscheidung auch die praktische Seite verbunden, wie das schon in meinem Artikel “Jüdische Literatur” in Ersch u. Gruber (englisch, *Jewish Literature*, 1857; hebräisch von Malter seit 1897) der Fall ist.

So streng auch Quantität und Qualität von einander geschieden werden können, so giebt es doch auch einen notwendigen Zusammenhang beider, wie z. B. im Grade. Ebenso ist auch bei der Einteilung einer Literatur der Umfang von Einfluss auf ihren Inhalt. In den bisherigen Vorlesungen galt es, die Berührungspunkte an der äußersten Peripherie aufzusuchen, um die Grenzen des Ganzen zu gewinnen, also zu entscheiden, was zur jüdischen Literatur gehört oder nicht. Es darf wohl als nachgewiesen gelten, dass in der jüdischen Literatur des Mittelalters in ihrer Gesamtheit politische, geographische und sprachliche Kriterien nur für Unterabteilungen, nicht als unterscheidende Merkmale gelten können. In allen solchen Kreisen ist das Jüdische im Juden die Einheit, welche häufig noch in dem Abgefallenen wirkt, sowohl nach aussen, wie z. B. in Petrus Alfonsi, dem ersten Makamenerzähler in lateinischer Sprache, oder in den jüdischen Gelehrten des 16. Jahrhunderts als Lehrern christlicher Gelehrten¹, als auch zurück, wie z. B. in Michael Adam,

JÜDISCHE LITERATUR DES MITTELALTERS


Die grössere oder geringere allgemeine Bildung und literarische Productivität, die Bedeutung und Verbreitung eines Werkes, die mehr oder minder systematische Form, in welcher die Gegenstände behandelt werden, die Unterscheidung von esoterischen und exteri schen Lehren, auch die Pseudepigraphie, hervorgegangen aus dem

1 Renan hat ein semitisches "Talent" für den Monotheismus erfunden; Geiger legt den Israeliten oder Juden ein religiöses "Genie" bei, das aber, nach Geigers eigener Geschichtsanschauung, einer geraumen Zeit zur Verwirklichung bedurfte, also eigentlich kein Genie ist.
Bestreben, für neue Ideen das Ansehen des Altertums zu gewinnen — alle diese, für die jüdische Literatur so wichtigen Erscheinungen haben ihren Mittelpunkt und ihre Erklärung in der Arbeit des Geistes, das Allgemeine im Menschen mit dem Besondern im Juden in ein festes Verhältnis zu bringen und einen angemessenen Exponenten dieses Verhältnisses zu finden.

Wollte man nun nach dieser rein begrifflichen Seite die Gesamtliteratur des jüdischen Mittelalters einteilen, so erhielte man positive Theologie und rationale Philosophie und als Vermittlung die Mystik oder Kabbala. — Es wäre die Unterscheidung der Fächer etwa folgende:

I. *Schriftkunde* in Form von Ausläufern des Midrasch, oder in der bereits geschiedenen Form der Exegese und Homiletik, oder theoretische und praktische Auslegung; als Hilfsmittel die Sprachkunde, verbunden mit Sprachanwendung, Rhetorik und Poesie.

II. Selbständige Religionslehre in Form von Dogmatik oder Halacha, letztere entweder exegetisch oder discussiv oder methodologisch, woran die Anfänge der Traditionslehre und Geschichte sich knüpfen.


Betrachtet man hiernach die jüdische Literatur vom Standpunkt des Allgemeinen und nimmt noch hinzu, wieviel Stoff die Beschränkung des jüdischen Lebens beseitigt, so bleibt in der That durchaus nur Theologie mit einer Eintönigkeit, welche Viele abgeschreckt hat. Das Entgegengesetzte, meint man, sei als gar nicht jüdisch im Allgemeinen aufgegangen und als gleichgültig zu übergehen. Beides muss bekämpft werden. Die Geschichte der Wissenschaften kann nur aus besonderen Literaturkreisen construiert werden; letztere müssen als Selbstzweck studiert werden, um die Resultate ihrer Forschungen abzugeben. Die Juden als fortwährende, und zwar nicht stumme Zeugen der Geschichte, haben Manches erhalten, was sonst unbekannt geblieben wäre.

Andererseits musste die Theologie als *τῦ καὶ πᾶς*, und namentlich als Schriftforschung, ihren Inhalt erweitern, so dass sie uns mit ihrem Stoffe oft überrascht. So z. B. giebt die Religionsphilosophie des Maimonides Veranlassung zu Abhandlungen über zwei Linien nach Euklid; in der Einleitung des Simon Duran zum Commentar über den talmudischen Traktat Abot findet man Excurse über Tiere und Edelsteine; der Pentateuchcommentar des Abraham Saba bietet Fragmente aus der alten ägyptischen (richtiger nabatäischen)
Agrikultur, mit der Notiz, dass die Brille bedeutet (Chwolsohn, Über die Reste altbabylonischer Literatur, S. 12).


Die Geschichte aller Anfänge ist um so interessanter, als diese in dunkle Zeiten fallen, die ersten Bildungen, als unvollkommene, durch spätere verdrängt und vergessen werden. Einen solchen Zeitraum finden wir nach dem Schlusse des Talmud bis zu Acha (gest. 761), ebenso dunkel als wichtig. Für unsere Abgrenzung sind zwei in dieser Zeit entstandene Hauptkreise zu beachten, die sich einer festen Bestimmung entziehen, weil kein wissenschaftliches Werk aus jener Zeit enthalten ist.

JÜDISCHE LITERATUR DES MITTELALTERS


2. **Talmud** und Midrasch ermangeln einer strengeren Disposition, eines durchgeführten Planes. Exposition wechselt mit Discussion, Erzählung mit Erörterung; ja, der Wechsel der redenden Personen

1 Die Consequenz dieser Eigentümlichkeit für die Beurteilung des Inhalts ist fatal; Cl. Montefiore weiss sie zu würdigen, in seinem Vortrag über Paulus, J. Q. R., XII.

2 Die Bezeichnungen Rabba und Sata scheinen auch auf "Älteres" und "Jüngeres" übertragen.


5. Verbreitung des Inhaltes und daher Förderung der Bildung des Volkes überhaupt.

1 Eine bedeutende Leistung auf diesem Gebiete sind Bacher's Schriften über die Haggada der Tannaim und Amoraim (1878 ff.).

1. Zu den wichtigsten Ereignissen gehört auch hier die Erfindung der Buchdrucker Kunst, deren Geschichte eigentlich in die äussere Einleitung in die jüdische Literatur gehört, deren Einwirkung im Allgemeinen jedoch nach verschiedenen Gesichtspunkten kurz erörtert werden soll:


II. Die jüngste Entwicklung der Kabbala durch die Schule Isak Loria's absorbierte die geistigen Kräfte und ruinirte fast den Orient und Italien, allmählich auch das übrige Europa, beförderte auch von Neuem die Pseudepigraphie und befestigte zugleich die Autorität der älteren.


V. Mit der Reformation treten Juden als Lehrer des Hebräischen für Christen auf, wie z. B. Elia Levita für Münster, werden aber meistens durch Bekehrungsversuche belohnt, die nicht ohne Erfolg


Nachdem wir die äusseren Grenzen des Mittelalters gezogen haben, wenden wir uns zu den Abschnitten innerhalb desselben, welche allerdings verschieden sind, je nachdem man einzelne Wissenschaften und ihre Zweige oder die Gesamtentwicklung ins Auge fasst. Ich nenne die Personen, an welche sich die Epochen knüpfen.

A. Halacha. — Der Sturz des Gaonats (1038), in Frankreich Gerson b. Jehuda und Salomo Isaki als Commentatoren; Maimonides (gest. 1204) als Erster, der die gesammte Halacha systematisch zusammenstellt; Jakob b. Ascher in Toledo (1340), dessen praktisches Werk die Grundlage des späteren Schulchan Aruch ist. — Als Commentator tritt schon Chananel b. Chuschiel in Kairuwan (um 1050?) hervor,


D. Der Ritus findet in den Gebetsordnungen der Gaonim Amram (870–888) und Saadia (gest. 941–2) eine Fixierung für bestimmte Kreise; später mündet er in die Halacha. Die Asketik des Jehuda ha-Chasid in Regensburg (um 1200), welche kürzlich wieder nach einem Ms. herausgegeben worden, umfasst die gesamte „Frömmigkeit“ mit ihrem Anhang von Aberglauben.

Trinitätslehre des phantastischen Abraham Abulafia (1290). Mit dem Buche Sohar, als dessen Urheber Mose de Leon (um 1290) von einem Zeitgenossen bezeichnet wird, ist die Grundlage für die späteren Verirrungen der Geister gegeben.

F. Die karäische Literatur, welche in ihren Anfängen, meist in arabischer Sprache, zu kritischen Forschungen anregte, findet in der gereimten Compilation des Jehuda Hadassi (1149) einen Abschluss, auf welchen fast nur Reproduktionen folgen. Die Bekehrung eines Teils dieser Sekte in der Krim (957; Geiger, Urschrift, 168) ist problematisch. Ahron b. Josef (1294) lenkt die Studien wieder auf die rabbinische Literatur.


I. Exegese. — Im christlichen Europa, namentlich in Frankreich, treten Josef Kara und Salomo Isaki (gest. 1105) hervor; Abraham ibn Esra vermittelt die Resultate der Forscher unter arabischer Herrschaft den europäischen Bewohnern christlicher Länder, und David Kimchi bietet das Mittel zur Verbreitung. Ein Musterkodex der Bibel (Tadj), welchen Maimonides benutzt hat, verbleibt im Orient.


L. In der Astronomie ist die offizielle Einführung des Sonnenjahres nach dem Araber Albattani in den jüdischen Kalender, nach Slonimski, dem Spanier Hasan (952) beizulegen; die Einteilung der Stunde in 1080 Teile findet sich schon in der Polemik zwischen Saadia Gaon und "ben Mei'r," welcher das Privilegium Palästinas, den Kalender zu bestimmen, wiederherstellen wollte (920). Isak b. Baruch (1035-94), dessen Schriften über den jüdischen Kalender verloren sind, diente arabischen Herrschern in Spanien. Abraham bar Chijja,

Über Arithmetik verfasst Ibn Ezra eine hebräische Schrift mit Anwendung arabischer Ziffern, die in neuester Zeit edirt worden ist.


ins Hebräische übersetzten Buche, welches einem Asaf, höchst wahr-
scheinlich dem Psalmendichter, zugeschrieben wird. Die Überset-
zungen fast aller bedeutenden arabischen Ärzte ins Hebräische
nehmen ein grosses Feld ein, welches selbständig bearbeitet ist,
neben der Übersetzung von mehr als zwanzig Schriften aus dem
Lateinischen durch einen Anonymus (1197-99), den ich für einen
reuigen Apostaten halte.

M. STEINSCHNEIDER.

(To be continued.)
THE HIGH PRIEST'S PROCESSION ON THE DAY OF ATONEMENT.

The safe exit of the High Priest from the innermost recess of the Temple on the Day of Atonement has always been considered the most capital event in ancient Israel's religious life. The awe-inspiring mystery of the place whereto only once in a twelvemonth one man was allowed access, and the belief that the ceremony being performed without accident was a token of the granted requests and wishes of the nation were facts of too great importance not to strike the fancy of the faithful after the dispersion.

Still, any contemporary record of the way in which the happy occurrence was solemnized is absolutely wanting. The Bible contains not the slightest hint at a festivity in that connexion, and Philo and Josephus keep also silent on the subject. In the Mishna, Yoma VII. 2, we find the statement that the High Priest was seen home by the congregation, and used to give a feast when he came out from the Holy Shrine in safety. The feast, apparently consisted of a banquet to which only his friends, ולל יאוהבר, or all his friends, were invited. The Jerusalem Gemara adds nothing in the way of illustration, and we find in the Babylonian the account of a large crowd once parting with the High Priest as soon as it comes across the great masters Shemaiah and Abtalion, which affront could hardly be done to the high dignitary if the procession bore any official character and was formally organized.

As with all traditions lending themselves to legendary developments, the farther we go from the time and scene of the historical fact, the more it is enriched with particulars derived from the inventiveness of writers. It is, however, surprising that on a theme like this imagination has played so sober a part. So Rabbenu Asher supplements the above particulars of the Mishna only by adding that the procession included the leaders and magnates of the nation, וظلم איה תול女排. In the prayer-books of nearly all rites we find one or more poems following the description of the service within the Temple, and they all are with the refrain—

Blissful the eye that watched all this,
The mere hearing of it fills our souls with sorrow,
but with the exception of Ibn Ghebirol’s, Aben Ezra’s, and Jehuda Halevy’s verses, no breath of true poetry is noticeable in these compositions. The authors mentioned, too, do no more than magnify the appearance of the High Priest whose face used to shine like gems, the sun and stars, and the messengers of God.

Full particulars of a pageant are supplied by a fragment of a Corfu MS. now in my hands which cannot be earlier than the latter half of the sixteenth century. The MS. to which the fragment belonged was in the main the prayer-book after the Romania rite, of which three editions (Venice and Constantinople, xvi and xvii centuries) are known, and a manuscript copy is cursorily mentioned by Zunz in p. 102 of Literaturgeschichte der synagogalen Poesie,—but it contained also many pieces borrowed from the Spanish liturgy, which had already begun to get grafted on the Greek rite until it supplanted it altogether. After the description of which we will speak presently, the most important feature of this fragment is the commentary on the Aboda, which in places is in a more expanded form than that published in the . We cannot say with a certainty whether this is the only copy referred to by Zunz in the above-mentioned passage of his work; but, as a matter of fact, no other MS. with this commentary is entered in any catalogue of public libraries.

An unknown poet is also revealed to us by this fragment as the author of a poem, beginning with the words . According to the inscription his name would be , but the initials of the four stanzas composing the poem form . Each stanza consists of ten lines rhyming alternately, the number of syllables is six, seven, or eight, with no set rule, and, with a few exceptions, all its phrases are borrowed from the Bible and linked together with taste and much correctness. An erroneous expression, , having as subject the enemy of Israel, was evidently suggested by of Ps. xxv. 17, where modern criticism would rightly

My article was set in type long before I had the good fortune of seeing Mr. E. N. Adler’s MS. 461, which is a complete prayer-book for the Day of Atonement, written in Corfu at a later date than the one from which my fragment was taken off, and very probably a copy of the same. Mr. Adler’s MS. is also supplied with the account of the High Priest’s pageant, and a commentary on the Aboda, differing both from that known through the editions and from the one described by me, which is the fullest extant.—To Mr. Adler’s MS. is appended a list of circumcisions operated by a Moel of Corfu which could be profitably used in a possible investigation into the history of the Jewish Community of that town. The earliest recorded circumcision is of the year 1660.
propose the emendation בְּרֵאָב with thou (God) as subject. To meet the requirements of meaning and rhyme must be restored in the place of בְּרֵאָב.

It was a general belief in the East that the Aboda was the work of Shelomo Ibn Ghebirol. We find this error recorded both in our MS. and the printed edition of the מָצוּאָר רומאָא, but, strangely enough, the latter supplies the additional information that the same poetical account was composed by R. Jehuda Hababli, and the conflicting statements are slurried over without any notice. The words ההנה פירושה which in our fragment precede the text and commentary would lead to the belief that the copyist of this MS. was the author of the commentary, and chronological considerations would not stand against his identification with יִשְׁרָאֵל בָּאֵרוֹת הָבָה, a Corfiote scholar who, in the year 1598, published in Constantinople a commentary on the罗马尼亚 rite of the Roman rite.

The account of the pageant which forms the principal subject of this article seems also to be from the pen of the learned copyist. At first sight we should think that the phrase יָאָב occurring at the beginning was used by the author for the purpose of surrounding his account with the halo of antiquity, and thus securing to it credit and authority. In fact, the ceremony he purports to describe is on the whole a retrospective adaptation to ancient Judaism of the pageants he must have witnessed either in Corfu or in Venice; perhaps he found the prototype of it in the solemn reception which every new Roman Catholic Archbishop was accorded when he first landed in Corfu, and in which the representatives of the Jewish community were bound to take an official part. There is, however, one item which forces the belief that Byzantine customs had their share of influence upon the mind of our author. We refer to the mention made in the parade of a class of dignitaries known under the name of דֵּלָת חַוֹּת, for the identification of which we would in vain look in the specification of Venetian hierarchy. In Constantinople, however, besides the one χαρτογνώματα who fulfilled duties of secretary to the Patriarch there were a number of officials with this title whose task in the government of the country was similar to that of the Cabinet Ministers in our day (see Du Cange, Glossarium...mediae et infimae Graecitatis). Moreover, the distinction between the וּמַלְוָה described as akinПетербург to the High Priest on one hand, and the descendants of the וּמַלְוָה on the other, would take us as far back as the epoch of the Maccabees, whom one feels tempted to recognize under the expression "the Kings of Israel's offspring," which without a construction of this kind would yield no satisfactory meaning.
All these considerations afford reasonable ground for the hypothesis that the words אַלֲחָאָדָה נוֹכַל נוֹכַל מָנוֹרָה כָּל הָעָם וּכְלָה מִּלְחָאָה יָדָה לְנָחָל אַלֲחָאָדָה נוֹכַל נוֹכַל מִלְחָאָה יָדָה לְנָחָל אַלֲחָאָדָה נוֹכַל נוֹכַל מִלְחָאָה יָדָה לְנָחָל אַלֲחָאָדָה נוֹכַל נוֹכַל מִלְחָאָה יָדָה לְנָחָל אַלֲחָאָדָה נוֹכַל נוֹכַל מִלְחָאָה יָדָה לְנָחָל אַלֲחָאָדָה נוֹכַל נוֹכַל מִלְחָאָה יָדָה לְנָחָל אַלֲחָאָדָה נוֹכַל נוֹכַל מִלְחָאָה יָדָה לְנָחָל אַלֲחָאָדָה נוֹכַל נוֹכַל מִלְחָאָה יָדָה לְנָחָל אַלֲחָאָדָה נוֹכַל נוֹכַל מִלְחָאָה יָדָה לְנָחָל אַלֲחָאָדָה נוֹכַל נוֹכַל מִלְחָאָה יָדָה לְנָחָל אַלֲחָאָדָה הָנֵחַל מִלְחָאָה יָדָה לְנָחָל אַלֲחָאָדָה הָנֵחַל מִלְחָאָה יָדָה לְנָחָל אַלֲחָאָדָה הָנֵחַל מִלְחָאָה יָדָה לְנָחָל אַלֲחָאָדָה הָנֵחַל מִלְחָאָה יָדָה לְנָחָל אַלֲחָאָדָה הָנֵחַל מִלְחָאָה יָדָה לְנָחָל אַלֲחָאָדָה הָנֵחַל מִלְחָאָה יָדָה לְנָחָל אַלֲחָאָדָה הָנֵחַל מִלְחָאָה יָדָה לְנָחָל אַלֲחָאָדָה הָנֵחַל מִלְחָאָה יָדָה לְנָחָל אַלֲחָאָדָה הָנֵחַל מִלְחָאָה יָדָה לְנָחָל אַלֲחָאָדָה הָנֵחַל מִלְחָאָה יָדָה לְנָחָל אַלֲחָאָדָה הָנֵחַל מִלְחָאָה יָדָה לְנָחָל אַלֲחָאָדָה הָנֵחַל מִלְחָאָה יָדָה לְנָחָל אַלֲחָאָדָה הָנֵחַל מִלְחָאָה יָדָה לְנָחָל אַלֲחָאָדָה הָנֵחַל מִלְחָאָה יָדָה לְנָחָל אַלֲחָאָדָה הָנֵחַל מִלְחָאָה יָדָה לְנָחָל אַלֲחָאָדָה הָנֵחַל מִלְחָאָה יָדָה לְנָחָל אַלֲחָאָדָה הָנֵחַל מִלְחָאָה יָדָה לְנָחָל אַלֲחָאָדָה הָנֵחַל מִלְחָאָ�ה הָנֵחַל מִלְחָאָה הָנֵחַל מִלְחָאָה הָנֵחַל מִלְחָאָה הָנֵחַל מִלְחָאָה הָנֵחַל מִלְחָאָה הָנֵחַל מִלְחָאָה הָנֵחַל מִלְחָאָה הָנֵחַל מִלְחָאָה הָנֵחַל מִלְחָאָה הָנֵחַל מִלְחָאָה הָנֵחַל מִלְחָאָה הָנֵחַל מִלְחָאָה הָנֵחַל מִלְחָאָה הָנֵחַל מִלְחָאָה הָנֵחַל מִלְחָאָה הָנֵחַל מִלְחָאָה הָנֵחַל מִלְחָאָה הָנֵחַל מִלְחָאָה הָנֵחַל
HIGH PRIEST’S PROCESSION ON DAY OF ATONEMENT

L. Belleli.
ZU DEM GENIZA-FRAGMENT, J. Q. R., XVI, 690 FF.


3 S. Harkavy, Stud. u. Mitt., IV, 96. In einer anderen Gruppe von Hai's Responsen aus d. J. 997 (ib., p. 235, l. 1) wird er ר״ז קוק י״י ר״ז פ״י genannt, und in
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... alsdann dass unter ibn 'Aknin auch ein Kairuwaner verstanden sein kann, was aber noch bewiesen werden muss. Uber einen anderen Responsum, aus d. J. 1011, s. 71: Zufall also, dass der genaue Titel des Fragments nicht in einer früheren Quelle erwähnt ist, der jetzt aber in einer späteren Quelle gemalt ist. Es ist mir nicht bekannt, ob es sich um eine frühere oder eine spätere Quelle handelt, die ich hier nicht näher erörtern möchte. Ich weise Sie deshalb auf die oben erwähnten Quellen hin.

1 S. Steinschneider, 1. c.

2 Irrtümlcherweise übersetzt Hirschfeld (p. 694, 1. 9) den Ausdruck "mexiel" mit Exilarch.
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Also ist auch dieser Grund nicht stichhaltig.


SAMUEL POZNAŃSKI.

WARSCHAU, den 7. August 1904.

CRITICAL NOTICES.

R. TRAVERS HERFORD'S "CHRISTIANITY IN TALMUD AND MIDRASH."


This work aims at presenting, with approximate completeness, what the Jewish traditional literature (Talmud and Midrash) has to say concerning the Founder and adherents of Christianity. The author's theme is thus a double one: Jesus in the old Jewish tradition, and the Minim in so far as adherents of Christianity are to be understood under that term. Both sides of the theme offer many difficulties to the investigator; and the texts, which must be cited, again and again require fresh critical examination, however often they have already been interpreted before. To adduce only the most fundamental of these problems, even the questions whether in the Jesus-texts Jesus is really meant, and whether in the Minim-texts Christians are intended, are still far from settled. Mr. Herford, who with rare devotion, with a wide outlook and sound scholarship, has devoted several years to a study of the question, proceeds by the inductive method. He first marshals (pp. 35-341) the "Passages from the Rabbinic Literature illustrating the Rise and Development of Christianity in the early Centuries," and in his second part (pp. 342-397) formulates the "General Results" which he has arrived at from the consideration of the passages previously collected and discussed. The first part—much the larger of the two—falls into two sections: (A) passages relating to Jesus (Nos. 1-25), and (B) passages referring to Minim and Minuth (Nos. 26-139). The author deserves special thanks for providing in an Appendix (pp. 401-36) the originals of all the 139 shorter or longer texts cited, so that the reader can conveniently survey the materials on which the whole treatise is based, and can also easily test for himself the renderings and explanations which Mr. Herford has given of this long array of passages derived from many scattered sources.

The author has, however, spared himself no pains, though he has
lessed the reader's trouble. He appends to the translation of every text a searching commentary, which includes secondary as well as primary issues. Thus each of the 139 numbers forms, in a sense, an independent study. On the one hand, this method leads to many repetitions, and also entails the separation from one another of matters which belong together. On the other hand, the thoroughness and circumspection of the author's procedure in detail in his first part materially contribute to the consequence that the "General Results" in his second part inspire confidence and bear the stamp of well-founded theses. The mistakes into which the author occasionally falls in translating his texts are sometimes serious enough; but in view of the great conscientiousness which distinguishes Mr. Herford's work they detract little from its general worth, especially as they concern points of slight or no importance in relation to the essential subject matter of the discussion. I will at this point draw attention to some of these errors of translation. In the first number (p. 35) the discussion concerning Ben Stada (Sabbath, 104 b) is incorrectly reproduced, for the questions and answers of the original are not noted as such in the rendering. The first words of this discussion should not be rendered "Ben Stada is Ben Pandira," but "Ben Stada? Was he not son of Pandira?" &c. P. 41: In the passage (Chagiga, 4 b) Mr. Herford renders "None but this," after Biblical usage. But the meaning is "Yes! Like this."—P. 46: "founding his house," "founding his sepulchre," are Mr. Herford's renderings of and and (Yoma, 66 b). He was thinking of , but it belongs to the verb which also occurs in Deuteronomy xxvii. 4 , and means "to plaster."—On the same page, "because they differed on them" is the translation of , but the meaning is, "because he diverted them from the subject"; instead of answering their questions he spoke to them on other matters.—P. 83: "Ulla says, 'Would it be supposed that a revolutionary had aught in his favour?'" This is the rendering of the words (Sanhedrin, 43 a) The meaning is: "Dost thou think that he (Jesus) is one for whom something is to be sought that speaks in his favour?" (Compare , Sabbath, 119 a.) The author seems, however, to have taken in the sense of "son of overthrowing," whence "destroyer," "revolutionary"; and the word if separated, as Mr. Herford separates it, from is left syntactically in the air. Later on (p. 355) Mr. Herford again refers to the "statement of Ulla that Jesus was a revolutionary," and even categorically asserts (p. 349), as an ingredient of the Rabbinic
account of Jesus, that "he was a revolutionary." All this arises from the mistranslation indicated. On p. 88 seq. the same passage (from Sanhedrin, 43a) is translated again somewhat differently, but Jesus still bears the epithet "a revolutionary," for which there is no foundation.—P. 104: "It is different in regard to Minuth, which bites a man, so that he comes to be bitten afterwards" (Aboda Zara, 27 b). Mistranslated by the previous citation from Koheleth, X, 8 (רומא), Mr. Herford has not understood the words לָמֶשׁלע and לָמֶשׁגא in their right sense (from מָשֵׁר "to draw"), and derives them quite ungrammatically from לָמֶשׁ "to bite."—P. 115: In the passage from Jer. Sanhedrin, 25 d, the translator, as a consequence of reading לָלֹא instead of לָלֹא ("clod"), renders the word by "bird," and thus the story becomes a magic transformation of a bird into a calf.—P. 136: In the passage from the Tosefta, Berachoth, III, 25, the words and לָלֹא are wrongly rendered "seceders" and "strangers." The right meaning is the "pious" and the "proselytes."—P. 139: In the passage from the Baraitha (Aboda Zara, 17 a), the translator separates the first two words from the rest ("what may be done with it?"), and the rest of the passage then has to constitute an independent sentence. Clearly לָלֹא is the object to the verb לִפְשֵׂא.—P. 157: In the translation of Gittin, 45 b, and p. 177, in the translation of Tos. Chullin, II, 21, in place of "receive" must be substituted "buy" (לקיח).—P. 161: Mr. Herford informs us that for some time he was under the impression that in Tos. Yadaim, II, 16, the expression ללמוד מיינ referred to "ordinances concerning heretics." The exact words used are: לא מחזיאו לא הלומדים זא והрешוות בטלי. But a comparison with Jer. Bikurim, 65 d, brought him to the conclusion that the reference was here also to the seven "kinds" of fruits indigenous to Palestine. Further consideration would, however, have convinced him that we must read in the Tosefta, not לָלֹא, but לָלֹא, in the sense of לָלֹא, which occurs three lines later ("your votes," i.e. "your decisions").—P. 173 (Aboda Zara, 26 a, b): The words סֵפְר מָשֵׁר belong to the remark of Johanan (סֵפְר is imperative); Johanan thereby indicates that Abahu may omit (strike out) the reference to apostates in the Baraitha cited. What follows in the text is also wrongly reproduced in the translation, for Mr. Herford has missed the meaning of the word לָלֹא.—P. 183: When in Aboda Zara, 17 a, the words יב וּב (Prov. xxx. 15) are interpreted as הנה לא, the translation is not "Give, give."—P. 184: In the same passage from the Talmud, the words מָשֵׁר, occurring
before the incident of Eleazar b. Dordaya, are not recognized by the translator as a question, but are connected by him with the preceding ("and not from her sin"), and thus the whole context is destroyed.—

P. 231: In the account of the conversation between Rabban Gamliel and the Minim (Sanhedrin, 90 b), the translator thrice misses the significance of the word רָאֵל ("or perhaps?") with which the Minim refute the biblical texts adduced to prove the resurrection of the dead. It hence results that the whole conversation is incorrectly, or, one might rather say, unintelligibly reproduced.—P. 267: "As a Talmudist," "as a Scripture-teacher," are altogether inadequate translations of the words לֶאָרֶץפַּר מַנְבַּט and קְרָא. The latter means at all events "in Bible texts," i.e. in the knowledge of the Holy Scriptures; the first word is not quite clear; but the word anyhow means the knowledge of the tradition. Abahu says he had praised Safra as a "great man" in the knowledge of tradition, but not also as such in the knowledge of the Bible. Moreover, the author has given a twist to the sense of the whole passage by assuming that Abahu had recommended Safra to the Minim of Caesarea as a teacher. There is nothing of the kind implied in the passage. What he adduces on p. 269 against my interpretation of the passage I cannot accept. (Mr. Herford cites me as holding that Safra was engaged by the Minim "as an assistant in collecting the Imperial revenue." I have never asserted this. What I really said (Agada der Pal. Amorier, II, 96) is: "Einmal empfahl er ihnen Safra zur Berücksichtigung in Zollsachen. Safra bekam dadurch Zollerlass für mehrere Jahre."—

P. 281: "Thy scalp" is an unfounded rendering of קְרַענְץ (Sanhedrin, 91 a). The reference is to the "crookedness" of the humpbacked Gebiha ben Pesia, whose deformity the Min threatens to straighten out. For this rudeness Gebiha expresses his gratitude with Socratic irony by rejoining: "If thou dost so, I shall call thee a skilful physician, and thou wilt receive a great reward." The author has made it impossible for him to understand the retort of Gebiha, and is driven to his forced explanation, which he gives at the end of the paragraph (p. 282).

Such errors in translation as have been adduced above show how difficult it is to avoid mistakes in understanding Talmudical texts, unless the student has become habituated to these texts by long years of practice. But these errors, as I have already said, do not affect one's appreciation of the value of Mr. Herford's performance as a whole. Every one must recognize that the author has erected, for both parts of his theme, a storehouse in which are contained all the relevant original texts, judged with scientific width of view and with noteworthy impartiality.
As regards the first part of his theme, the author practically offers nothing beyond what is contained in H. Laible's monograph, *Jesus Christus im Talmud* (Berlin, 1891). But our author's comments on the texts are far more instructive and thoroughgoing than are his predecessor's, and Mr. Herford is besides less prone to hypothesis than is Laible. From Mr. Herford's work we perceive anew how scanty the whole of this material is, and how little Tannaim and Amoraim had to say about Jesus. Yet, scanty as the material produced is, it would be scantier still were it not that several passages are included which on nearer examination have nothing to do with Jesus. Take, for instance, the statement (p. 43) which Simon b. Azzai adduces, from a Book of Genealogies found by him in Jerusalem (*Mishnah Yebamoth*, IV, 13; *T. B. Yebamoth*, 49 b). With the exception of the expression נון (N.N.), there is nothing to show that Jesus is referred to in this report cited in confirmation of a halachic opinion of Joshua b. Chananya. Besides, we must not assume that נון is quite identical with the elsewhere-used נון; and the theory is moreover by no means incontestable which interprets נון as Jesus in the question addressed to Eliezer b. Hyrkanos (p. 45; *Yoma*, 66 b). In the report of Ben Azzai it is highly probable that reference is made to a member of some distinguished Jerusalem family, whose illegitimate birth is recorded, so as to exhort, by this warning, the rest to preserve their family record from stain. Inasmuch as the object, so far as the halacha is concerned, is to establish the fact that the term נון designates one who is the offspring of a union forbidden under pain of death, the name of the individual in question remains unmentioned. We have here, then, an example in which the name is indifferent, and with this may be compared the formula of the Mishnah (*Sanhedrin*, III, 7 [11]; *T. B. Sanh.* 29 a) regarding the pronouncement of their verdict by the judges: נון נון נון נון. —Mr. Herford himself devotes a paragraph to demonstrate that a passage generally included among the references to Jesus must be removed from that category. We refer to the passage regarding the execution of Ben Stada at Lydda, an incident related in Tannaite sources (*Tos. Sanhedrin*, X, 11; *Jer. Sanh.* 25 c, d; *Bab. Sanh.* 67 a). This is the same Ben Stada who, in another Tannaite report bearing the name of Eliezer b. Hyrcanus (*Tos. Sabbath*, XI, 15; *Jer. Sabb.* 13 d; *Bab. Sabbath* 104 b), is said to have brought from Egypt magic formulae which he had cut into his body. Mr. Herford suggests (p. 345) that Ben Stada, who was executed as a leader of sedition, is identical with the false prophet who came from Egypt (Josephus, *Antiq.* XX, 8. 6; *Wars*, II, 13. 5; *Acts* xxii. 38). Whatever be the truth as to this identification, Mr. Herford is certainly right in
refusing to interpret the Tannaite passages quoted above as referring to Jesus under the name Ben Stada, for the former was not put to death in Lydda, but in Jerusalem. The identification of Jesus—or Ben Pantera (Pandira), as he is also called in the Palestinian sources (Tos. Chullin, II, 22, 23; Jer. Sabb. 14 d; Aboda Zara, 49 d)—with Ben Stada first took place in the Babylonian schools. With reference to the two above-cited Tannaite traditions, the question is purported in the Babylonian Talmud (Sabbath, 104 b; Sanhedrin, 67 a):

"He is here called Ben Stada, while above he was named Ben Pandira." The discussion which follows, and which opens with a reconciling remark of Rab Chisda's, shows that the identity of the two names was taken for granted in Babylonia, but it does not prove that in the Tannaite sources was identified with Jesus. The post-Tannaite Palestinian sources are also ignorant of this identification of Ben Stada with Ben Pandira. In Babylonia the prevalence of this identification caused the addition of the words רולאהו בבראשית to the Baraitha narrating the execution of Ben Stada (Sanhedrin, 43 a). This item is wanting in the Tosefta and in the Jerusalem Talmud; it is taken over from the Tannaitic tradition concerning the execution of Jesus (Sanh., 93 a): בבראשית מסתרתしたもの ל jä [זא יא]. Mr. Herford is therefore quite correct in his hypothesis concerning Ben Stada; it is only a pity that he has not recognized that the identity of Ben Stada with Jesus is of late origin in the Babylonian Amoraite period.

The proverb quoted (on Joshua xiii. 22) by a Babylonian Amora of the second half of the fourth century (Sanh. 106 a) is incorrectly applied by Mr. Herford to the mother of Jesus (p. 45). It is a popular saying, which did not arise in Palestine, and in which no allusion to the Carpenter of Nazareth can possibly be contained. Mr. Herford is rightly sceptical regarding the narrative in Tractate Kallah (p. 49), in which the names of the Tannaites, Eliezer, Joshua, and Akiba, are employed in an apocryphal manner. Laible (p. 37) does this passage the honour of seeking a historical kernel in it.—On the other hand, Mr. Herford is decidedly wrong when (p. 87) he detects a reference to the crucifixion of Jesus in the parable of Rabbi Meir on Deut. xxi. 23 (Tos. Sanh. IX, 7). With this parable it was designed to show how "accursed of God is he that is hanged," and this on the ground of the idea that man is made in the image of God. In the parable God is not meant by the one brother who is described as ממלך על כל גויים (i.e. as ruler of the world, κυριοκράτωρ, such as the Roman emperors were; cf. Ziegler, Die Königsgelehrnisse des Midrasch, p. 10, n. 5); nor is the other brother, who was crucified as a robber, meant for Jesus (cp. Agada der Tanaiten, II, 59, 64).
That in the Talmud Balaam must sometimes be understood as typical of Jesus is a hypothesis which is almost universally accepted. But Mr. Harford goes too far when he assumes that there is also some reference to Jesus even in the sayings concerning the biblical sections dealing with Balaam (Baba Bathra, 14 b; Jer. Pesachim, 3 c). Although here and there people thought of Jesus when they spoke of Balaam, nevertheless the remarkable figure of the heathen prophet himself did not disappear from the ken of Tannaim and Amoraim. On the contrary, it was precisely the circumstance that the history of Balaam and his prophecies plays so conspicuous a part in the Pentateuch, although the incidents occurred outside the Israelite camp, that impelled the authorities of the Tannaitic period to assert categorically that this section of the Pentateuch (Num. xxii-xxiv) was also written by Moses. And it is probable that the Amora of the third century, in whose name Samuel ben Nachman recorded the tradition that the Balaam-section should be recited every day, was moved to this by the desire to give prominent expression to the belief in the Mosaic authorship of the section, as indeed is done in Baba Bathra, 14 b. To the extraordinary position which the heathen prophet assumes in the Pentateuch must also be ascribed his mention in the Mishnah Sanh. X, 2, at the head of the four non-royal biblical persons who are excluded from participation in the future world. Mr. Herford indeed limits the identification of Balaam with Jesus with excellent arguments (p. 69); but he cannot refrain from suggesting that in the three other biblical characters named in chronological order in the same Mishnah, viz. Doeg, Ahitophel, and Gehazi, there is an allusion to the Apostle Peter, Judas Iscariot, and Paul (p. 71). Mr. Herford returns (p. 99 seq.) to the identification of the Gehazi of the Agada (Sota, 47 a; Sanh. 107 b) with the Apostle Paul; and the suggestion gains speciousness when the circumstance that Elisha betook himself to Damascus in order—as Rabbi Jochanan says—to lead Gehazi back to the right way, is brought into relation with the fact that Paul received Christianity in Damascus. But it is impossible to adduce a real proof for the identification of Gehazi and Paul in the Agadic texts. (In this same passage the words אֶלְוַי לַעֲשָׂנָה יִרְבְּעֵה לֶאֱלֹהִים רַבִּיעֵם are translated by Mr. Herford (p. 101): “He set up a lodestone according to the sin of Jeroboam.” He fails to understand that רַבִּיעֵם אֶלְוַי לַעֲשָׂנָה is Jeroboam’s golden calf, which Gehazi suspended in the air by means of a lodestone, thus convincing the deluded people that the calf possessed divine powers. Further on, again, Mr. Herford does not perceive that the words שֶׁאֶלְוַי לַעֲשָׂנָה אֶלְוַי לַעֲשָׂנָה also refer to the calf (“the sin of Jeroboam”). These misconceptions lead Mr. Herford to a distorted explanation of the whole passage, including the assumption of an image of Jesus known to the Rabbis.)
The passage just discussed finds us in the second part of Mr. Herford's book, for in the Agada about Gehazi we reach the first of the author's texts concerning Minim and Minuth. He divides these texts into four groups: (1) "Descriptions and Definitions of Minim and Minuth"; (2) "Polemical Encounters between Jews and Minim"; (3) "Polemical Allusions to Minim, Minuth"; and (4) "Miscellaneous Passages referring to Minim." The whole of the relevant material is marshalled in systematic order, and grateful recognition is due to Mr. Herford for this collection of passages and for his comments on them. The author's general conclusions as to the Minim-passages in Talmud and Midrash are given in three paragraphs of the second chapter of Part II. In § 1 (pp. 362-5) Mr. Herford discusses the name "Min." He propounds a very artificial explanation of the word. He supposes that as the Hebrew word י"מ has an Aramaic equivalent פ' ("kind, species"), the similarity of sound between the Aramaic פ' and the Hebrew י"מ (which besides other senses means "infidelity," "unbelief") led to the use of the Hebrew י"מ in the sense "infidelity," "unbelief." Mr. Herford was led to this suggestion by a hypothesis of Friedmann, who in his commentary on Pesikta Rabbathi (101 a) explains the expression ינני י"מ as equivalent to ינני פ', since the Hebrew י"מ is rendered by the Aramaic פ'. But it is altogether incredible that the word "Min" acquired its Rabbinic significance in any such way. I am sorry that the author has not acquainted himself with what I have written on the origin of the word "Min" in the Revue des Études Juives, XXXVIII, 45. Though, however, he has not read my article ("Le mot 'Minim 'dans le Talmud"), he arrives at the same conclusions as myself in his polemic against Friedlander in § 2, "Who were the Minim" (pp. 365-81). He rightly emphasises that those Tannaim to whom occupation with Gnostic thought was ascribed, are never called "Minim," and that when Friedlander says that "Acher der Min γαρ έξω ἐκ των Ἰουδαίων," this denotation of Acher does not emanate from the Talmud. Mr. Herford further shows that Friedländer suppresses passages in which by "Minim" are unquestionably meant Christians, and that in other respects Friedländer deals with the Minim-passages in a very arbitrary fashion. Mr. Herford finally arrives at the conclusions that in general when the Talmud or Midrash mentions the "Minim" the reference is to Jewish Christians, but that occasionally other heretics or enemies of Judaism were called "Minim," and that opinions were sometimes attributed to the "Minim" which have nothing to do with Christianity.—§ 3 ("The Place of the Minim in History," pp. 381-97) connects the evidence concerning the "Minim" with the trend of
the history of the first post-Christian century. Especially noteworthy is the happy use by Mr. Herford of a suggestion of Graetz, which has enabled our author to extract from the Epistle to the Hebrews several quotations which admirably illustrate the opinions ascribed to the "Minim" (see pp. 264, 272, 322, 339). Mr. Herford had already (in § 2, p. 378) quoted the following passage from Jerome (Ep. 89 ad Augustinum) concerning a "heresy of the Jews": "quae dicitur Minaorum, et a Pharisæis nunc usque damnatur, quos vulgo Nazareos nuncupant . . .; sed, dum volunt et Judæi esse et Christiani, nec Judæi sunt nec Christiani." The light which this passage throws on the Minim of the Jewish traditional literature is not always appreciated at its true value.

Of the special points raised by Mr. Herford in his comments on the Minim-passages, we may first note his theory regarding the puzzling term כְּסֶפֶּרוֹתּ, which he explains from the Greek φιλοσοφικαὶ ἀκρόασις as "places for philosophical disputations" (p. 167). This hypothesis is not altogether satisfactory. We must not leave out of account that in the chief passage concerning כְּסֶפֶּרוֹתּ (Sabbath, 116a) the reference is to such places of meeting as were still extant in Babylonia in the fourth century. Joseph b. Chama (for this is the correct reading for the Joseph b. Chanin of the editions), who addressed to Abahu the question regarding the books of Be-Abidan, was also a Babylonian scholar, the father of Raba. A son of Joseph, head of the School of Pumbeditha, had intercourse with the people of Be-Abidan, while Joseph's pupil Raba (רבע א' must be read for רבע א'' must be read for רבע א'' must be read for רבע א'' must be read for רבע א'') held himself aloof from them. Again, in Erubin, 79 b, 80 a (p. 165), we find Be-Abidan used in a Babylonian context. (In that passage the reference is not to wine for the "Lord's Supper," as Herford (p. 170) thinks, but to the date-palms from which was prepared an intoxicating drink, מִשְׁמַרֶה, which the associates of the דִי נָרָשׁ drank on their feast-days.) The heroes of the stories in T. Bab. Sabbath, 152 a, and T. Bab. Aboda Zara, 17 b, are, it must be admitted, Palestinian Tannaim; but the name כְּסֶפֶּרוֹתּ may merely have been a term transferred to Palestinian conditions, as is often the case in the Babylonian Talmud. Characteristic of this—as may be incidentally remarked—is the story concerning Joshua b. Perachya and Jesus (Sanh. 107 b, p. 51). This story is indeed connected with a Baraitha, but is reported quite in the style of the Babylonian narrative, and even presents details which can only be interpreted from Babylonian conditions (אֲנֵמי אָרָבピンּ מַאֲהוּ שְׁמַרֶה; מֵ帨ָה לָלוֹנִים יַנְעָלָיִים). Hence the expressions כְּסֶפֶּרוֹתּ and מִשְׁמַרֶה must remain a riddle which Mr. Herford's hypothesis fails to solve.

In noticing a work so rich in material as Mr. Herford's there is
naturally much opportunity for remarks or corrections. A few such points follow.

P. 51. The allegation at the close of the narrative concerning Joshua b. Perachya and Jesus (Sanh. 107 b: ויתר המרכים العراق והגנבי stellt der Tanna die Sache wieder in einander) deserved special treatment. It is a Baraitha which contains in nuce the attitude of the Tannaite epoch towards Jesus: "He performed magic and misled Israel." This Baraitha should also have been specially noticed on p. 351.

P. 86. The description הנרייתא ידניא is a later change in the printed text of the Talmud. The original expression always runs בהנה בנו והיה. This is also the reading in Mishnah Sanh. VI, 4.

P. 89. With the statement (Sanh. 43 a) that Jesus "was near the government" (רבי למלכתו והיה), we might compare Luke xxiii. 7, where it is related that Herod (Antipas) interested himself in behalf of Jesus.

P. 90. The name of the second of the five disciples of Jesus (Sanh. 43 a) must be read Nakkai (Naqqai), not Neqai (Laible, p. 71, reads Neqaj). The word-play with מפקן is then clearer. The same name was borne by the oldest-named Massorite, in the time of the war with Hadrian (see Berliner's Magazin, XVII, 169 seq.). Mr. Herford rightly derives the name from Nicodemus (John iii. 1), Hebrew נוקמי. The name is formed similarly to נלויי, אֵלִי. The narrative of the execution of the five disciples of Jesus, being introduced by the formula ויהי, is thus marked out as a separate Baraitha, and is not, as Mr. Herford thinks (p. 91), a continuation of the previous Baraitha (והיה) on the execution of Jesus, accompanied, as that Baraitha is, with Amoraitic remarks.

P. 94. I would remark that the group of five disciples of Jesus is most probably intended as a set-off to the five pupils of Jochanan ben Zaccaei (Mishnah Aboth, II: והני אתי לוח נבא ת นอกจาก בכי כדי; Sanh. 43 a: והני אתי לוח נבא ת עשה). There would also seem a reference to the five pupils of Akiba who were ordained by Jehuda b. Baba (Aboda Zara, 8 b). The choice of the names themselves is founded upon a vague knowledge of the names of the first followers of Jesus, and was determined by the word-plays of which the chosen names were susceptible.

P. 109. The author has not correctly understood the citation of Koheleth, X, 5, in the story of Joshua b. Levi's grandson (Jer. Sabbath, 14 d). It has the same significance as in the stories of the Babylonian Talmud, in which unconsidered expressions of disaster used by an important man produce the disaster spoken of (Moed Katon, 18 a; Kethuboth, 23 a, 62 b; Baba Mezia, 68 a).

P. 112. For R. Lazar read R. Eliezer. The allusion is not to
R. Eleazar b. Azarya (p. 113), but R. Eliezer b. Hyrkanos, as is always the case when the word precedes ה"ד ר'.

P. 118. In the translation of Tos. Sanh. XIII, 4, its interpretation is wrongly joined to the subsequent word "yeir", "descend into Gehinnom in their body"); the word must really be joined with the previous word. מאתה

Ibid. Mr. Herford translates "and those who have lied concerning the Torah." He elsewhere mistranslates ר"כ ב' in this way (pp. 123, 156, 289, 372). He gives the right meaning, however, on p. 299, where he renders שבחרו בעלויי שלום "they had denied the only one."

P. 127. (With reference to the word תברחת התהילה.) "The word translated benediction serves equally for malediction, and it is rather in that sense that it is used in regard to the Minim." But as the word תברחת here means not blessing, but "formula of benediction," there is no thought of a euphemistic use of the word for ר"כ. The תברחת stands in the same category as the eighteen תברחת of the Prayer.

P. 136, note. R. Jose, in the passage cited from Jer. Berachoth, 8a, is not Jose b. Chalafta, the Tannaite of the second century, but the Palestinian Amora who lived 200 years later. On his son Eleazar (here cited), see Die Agada der pal. Amorder, III, 236.

P. 155. On see Revue des Etudes Juives, XXXVIII, 38 seq.

P. 171. יי נוצר (Aboda Zara, 6a, 7 b), "the Nazarene day"; more correctly, "the day of the Nazarene." Sunday is the day of the Nazarene, i.e. Jesus (א"ב נוצר), as the day on which he rose. Compare dies dominica.

P. 185 n. The quotation from Aboth di R. Nathan is to be found on p. 7 a (not 7 b), ed. Schechter.

P. 188. The sign of interrogation after the words "she no longer lived in the world" may be removed when it is remembered that the expression כי ה"י לובלה הבאה is identical withania תבש ה"י לובלה. יא.

P. 193, line 1. For "Exodus" read "Numbers."

P. 204, n. תברחת תאן is a very common formula in the Jerusalem Talmud, by which a Baraitha is introduced to complete, correct, or confirm an otherwise known Halacha. The formula must be translated, "He found (or: it was found) that the tradition was reported." The word תברחת which here follows means that the Baraitha so found contradicts the Halachic passage previously quoted. The question of Mr. Herford, "It is not clear to me," &c. (p. 205), is thus answered. The passage beginning ר"כ no longer belongs to the answer of R. Simon.

P. 210. For יא תבש ר' ר in Jer. Naderim, 38 a, must be read יא תבש ר' ר. See Die Agada der pal. Amorder, III, 123.
Very remarkable is the parallel which Mr. Herford
draws between the two passages of Koheleth Rabba (on i. 8 and vii. 26).
The emendation of אֶלֶּה אֵין קַשֵּׁי קָשָׁי is plausible. But if so, the
emendation of Friedländer (עיַבְּבַּע נָבָע עֵלֶּה נָכָה מַכָּנָה)
must also be accepted. Only thus is the parallel made complete. I myself had suggested (op. cit., III, 711) that in Koheleth
Rabba to vii. 26 אֵין קַשֵּׁי must be expanded to צִיץ קַשְׁי מַכְּנָה.

P. 247. “This refers to us” is an incorrect translation of |3אשניא
(Pesachim, 87 b). It should be rendered, “On the other hand, what con-
cerns us,” and construed with what follows.

P. 254. The missing reference (Agada der Tannaiten, II, 50, n. 5), in
which R. Meir's saying may be found, is Sifre to Deut. xxxiii. 12.

P. 293. For R. Eliezer read Eleazar, i. e. ben Arach, whose saying
(Aboth, II, 19) is cited, as the author rightly notes, on p. 295, below.

P. 298. הַלָּוֶת signifies, not “distinguish,” but “contradict” (“dis-
pute”). With this correction, Mr. Herford’s explanation on p. 299
fails.

P. 303. Reuben, the authority for the Agada to Daniel iii. 25 (Jer.
Sabbath, 8d) is not the Tannaite Reuben (b. Aristobulus), as Mr. Herford
assumes, but is the Palestinian Amora of that name (see, concerning
this Amora, Agada der pal. Amoräer, III, 79-86).

P. 324. For “Nissa” read “Naso.”

P. 391. The statements concerning the proposed decanonization of
the Book Koheleth can by no means be connected with those con-
cerning the Books of the Minim. The Amoraim who use the term
מִנְיָא in connexion with Koheleth employ it in the general sense of
unbelief, heresy, without reference to Christianity 1.

Special praise is due to the exhaustive introduction (pp. 1-33)
prefixed by the author to his work. He devotes it to the literature
from which are derived the texts considered in the body of the work,
and treats of the Jewish tradition as well as of its literature. The
reader obtains an insight into the method of Jewish traditional
exegesis, and into the contents of both branches of this literature:
Halacha and Haggada (Agada). He also receives guidance as to the
degree of trustworthiness attaching to the historical statements of
the Talmud and Midrash. Historians are, as Mr. Herford indicates
(p. 25 seq.), still far from agreeing upon a canon of criticism by
which to judge the historical value of Rabbinical data. Mr. Herford
himself offers (p. 29) this contribution to the question: “Perhaps
we may make some approach to a general canon of criticism on
the subject, if we say that in the literature referred to, the obiter

1 The texts reproduced in the Appendix contain all sorts of misprints,
which, however, can be corrected without difficulty.
*dicta* are of most value as evidence of historical fact; or, in other words, there is more reason to suspect exaggeration or invention in statements which appear to form part of the main line of argument, than in those which appear to be mere illustrative notes, added to the text and embedded in it."—In his preface (p. x) Mr. Herford thus expresses himself: "As a Christian who has for several years found his chief and absorbing intellectual interest in the study of the Rabbinical literature . . . I offer this book as a contribution to Christian scholarship." It says much, therefore, for Mr. Herford's impartiality that he later on (p. 31) remarks with reference to the Jewish and Christian investigators of the historical material presented by the Talmudical literature: "So far as I am competent to judge, it appears to me that Jewish historians—as is only natural—make a far more legitimate and intelligent use of the Rabbinical literature for historical purposes than is generally to be observed in the writings of Christian historians who have dealt with that literature." The same absence of bias is displayed by Mr. Herford in his judgment on Rabbinic Judaism (pp. 7 seq.): "What is usually called 'empty formalism,' 'solemn trifling,' and the like, deserves a nobler name; for it is—whether mistaken or not—an honest effort to apply the principle of the service of God to the smallest details and acts of life. . . . The great Rabbis whose work is preserved in the Talmud were not hypocrites or mere formalists, but men who fully realized the religious meaning of what was expressed in the form of legal precept and apparently trivial regulation. . . . Paul doubtless spoke out of the depths of his own experience; but he does not represent the mind of the great leaders of Rabbinism. And the system of thought and practice which bears that name is unfairly judged if it be condemned on the witness of its most determined enemies." Such words are rarely spoken by Christians concerning Rabbinism. These remarks are all the more gratifying, seeing that they occur in the introduction to a work devoted to an inquiry into the far from sympathetic utterances of the Talmudic writers on the subject of the Founder and the adherents of Christianity. Mr. Herford has regarded these utterances with the eye of an historian, and they thus could not injuriously affect his verdict on the spirit of the whole literature in which these utterances are to be found. The affectionate zeal with which he has betaken himself to the study of that literature has not failed of its reward. Despite faults in detail, his treatise will remain a standard work on the subject of Christianity in the Talmud and Midrash.

W. BACHER.
Westminster Commentaries. The Book of Genesis, with Introduction and Notes, by Prof. S. R. Driver. (Methuen, 1904.)

The object of the "Westminster Commentaries" is to provide a series of handbooks to the Bible which should be less elementary than the "Cambridge Bible for Schools," and less exhaustive and critical than the "International Critical Commentaries"; which should appeal to the ordinary theological student, as well as to the more educated layman, and although not so didactic as the "Expositor's Bible," would aim at steadily keeping in view the needs of the preacher. The standpoint of the series, to quote Prof. Lock, the editor, is the combination of "a hearty acceptance of critical principles with loyalty to the Catholic Faith," the critical testing of the books of the Bible "by the ordinary canons of scientific and historical investigation, and a tracing of the clear marks of a higher spirit in its religious tendency."

Every one will agree that there is a very real need at the present day for commentaries written with the above objects; to many people the criticism of the Bible has developed too quickly, and those who have not followed the various stages of its progress find themselves confronted with views apparently irreconcilable with the religious beliefs in which they have been brought up. There are many who ignore the advance of Biblical criticism—from inability to form an independent opinion of their own, from a lurking dread of the extent to which the study might compel them to modify their earlier views, and too often, perhaps, from absolute indifference. There are many, also, who have acquired a passing acquaintance with the results of recent studies, and, confining themselves to "destructive criticism" only, have been unable to adapt their beliefs to the new results, and have rejected the entire teaching of the Old Testament. But it is to those who would keep abreast of the times and who find their reverence for the Bible and their religious faith shaken by modern criticism that this series especially appeals, and unless one is to believe that the critical study of the Old Testament is to be ignored by them, or is to be continued on mildly traditional lines, it should meet a distinct want.

As a matter of fact, the present volume has already reached a second edition, and we may conclude that this is due not only to the confidence which every one has in the author's scholarship, but
also in no small degree to the fact that the aims and objects of the series exactly correspond to the requirements of the bulk of the thinking public. Genesis is pre-eminently the most important book for "higher criticism"; it has exceptional difficulties for those who have been brought up on traditional lines, and it is a matter for congratulation that the commentary should be from the tactful pen of Prof. Driver. It is just because so many problems confront the average reader that a sympathetic, critical, and honest statement of the facts is to be looked for. From its position and literary history the book of Genesis requires a somewhat full treatment, and readers will find that every question of importance is dealt with thoroughly and concisely. Nothing is assumed or taken for granted. The literary problems are introduced, and handled briefly and clearly. Certain problems, such as the cosmogony of Genesis in the light of modern science, are handled with an elaborateness which to some will appear needless. But undoubtedly the ordinary reader has not at his finger-ends the evidence touching the problems of the Creation or Deluge, and we may see in Prof. Driver's commentary the summing up once and for all and the final verdict upon the problems which have for so long perplexed reverent minds.

The lakes, the "bitter lakes," of ink poured out in vain attempts to reconcile science and the Old Testament arose from the failure to understand what the science of the Bible really was. The science of the early chapters of Genesis is the science of a bygone age, its cosmogony, states Prof. Driver, "must be read in the light of the age in which it was written; and while the spiritual teaching so vividly expressed by it can never lose its freshness or value, it must on its material side be interpreted in accordance with the place which it holds in the history of Semitic cosmological speculation" (p. 33).

It is not only science—excavation in Bible lands has thrown a new light upon Genesis. In proportion as the Promised Land shrinks in size when we view it by the side of the mighty empires of Babylonia, Assyria, and Egypt, it gains in dignity of thought and grandeur of religion. Israel's history appears comparatively trifling compared with that of these old-world monarchies, but the sublimity of its teaching and the influence of its literature have played a grander part in the world's history than all the heritage of Egypt and Mesopotamia. A deluge-myth or a creation-legend finds its prototype in Israel's eastern neighbour, but if Israel loses in the point of originality it gains in its ability to adapt and, in adapting, to improve.

Many archaeological questions of the most interesting character
are associated with Genesis, and when one recalls the hasty judgments so often passed it is highly important that the entire evidence should be carefully reconsidered. Thus the bearing of archaeology upon Genesis, chap. xiv especially, receives careful treatment at Prof. Driver's hands, and it may be that many readers will learn with surprise that "monumental evidence that the narrative is historical is at present [July, 1903] entirely lacking" (p. 172), and that "obviously, the monuments cannot 'corroborate' the account of an expedition which they do not mention, or even by implication presuppose" (p. 173). To those who have kept abreast with critical studies this statement will cause no surprise, but undoubtedly the warning is necessary in the interests of a large number of students.

All the questions raised by the text are treated with candour and in a critical spirit, yet with characteristic caution. The notes represent all that can be said with certainty, or at least with safety. Mere speculations and many recent theories do not find a place in them. The commentary more properly confines itself to that upon which the great majority of critics are agreed. Such a disputed question, therefore, as the North Arabian Musri is (if I am not mistaken) wholly ignored, and no reference appears to be made to it even in its most moderate form.

The text of the Revised Version forms the basis, and is printed in full. Where necessary, however, preferable renderings are suggested in the notes. Thus, in Gen. xxxii. 28, it is pointed out that "thou hast persevered" is the most probable interpretation of רִפְיוּ, and Joseph's coat of many colours" is shown to be strictly a tunic of palms and soles, i.e. reaching to the hands and feet. The difficulties of Gen. xlix. 10 ("until Shiloh come") are reserved for special treatment in an appendix, where, too, the various names of God in Genesis are discussed.

To the Hebrew student who finds Dillmann's admirable work too technical, Prof. Driver's commentary will be always useful; to the theological student it will indeed be indispensable: it is precisely that "adjustment of theology to the new knowledge of the past" (p. xi) which we believe is so earnestly called for at the present day. It does not represent the limit of "higher criticism." Upon many a question the last word has not been said, and many a problem still remains to be solved. No doubt the tide will continue to flow ever onward, sweeping away (it may be) still more long-cherished views, but bringing with it the gift of a better understanding of the Old Testament, and a clearer perception of its origin and growth. One can but dimly guess what the future may have to give us. The assiduous and often thankless labour of the excavator at the tell and
of the worker in his study must bring its fruit. Gezer and Taanach have thrown a flood of light upon pre-Israelite cult and civilization, and have opened our eyes to unlooked for possibilities. Of Hebrew life it is true we are at present less informed, and each discovery in this field seems to bring fresh problems. But the conviction is irresistible that although much remains to be done in the less fascinating departments of philological study and of literary and textual criticism, it is from the archaeology of the lands of the Bible that Biblical study will profit most in the future. Unfortunately, in this country at least, this is pre-eminently a subject in which little practical interest is taken.

S. A. Cook.

**IBRĀḤĪM IBN JA’KŪB ON LEVITICUS XXIII.**

*Das Festgesetz der Samaritaner nach Ibrāḥīm ibn Ja’kūb. Edition und Uebersetzung seines Kommentars zu Lev. 23 nebst Einleitung und Anmerkungen von Dr. Siegmund Hanover.* (Berlin, 1904, in 8vo, 74 + xviii pp.)

When Klumel, some little time back, edited for the first time, as an “Inaugurat-Dissertation,” a large portion of Ibrāḥīm’s Samaritan-Arabic Commentary on the Pentateuch (cf. my review in J. Q. R., XVI, pp. 402 seq.), it was easy to foresee that other publications of a similar nature would speedily follow. The publication under review represents a step forward, seeing that the editor has placed before us something which forms a complete work. New conclusions on the festival law were certainly not to be expected. The Samaritan conception of this law is already well known (so far as the general principles are concerned), especially from the researches of Geiger, who had before him also Ibrāḥīm’s Commentary. Moreover, it is just in the Commentary to Leviticus xxiii that we miss the discussion of the most interesting points, those points on which the Samaritans, like other sects, set themselves in opposition to Rabbinism. I refer to such matters as the explanation of מִסְמַר הַיָּד (cf. on this *Revue des Études Juives*, XLV, 176 seq.) and מָרָיח הָעַבָּר (cf. *Monatschrift*, XLI, 206, and J. Q. R., XVI, 407). We equally miss points on which the Samaritans followed their own independent lines, as e.g. the prohibition of all manner of work on festivals (cf. *Revue des Études*...
Juices, l. c., p. 184). Dr. Hanover has, however, partly filled the gap by citing in his Notes (pp. 54-74) extracts from other passages from Ibrahim's Commentary; in so far as these concern the festivals and have not already been communicated by Geiger (Z.D.M.G., XX, 532 seq.). See Dr. Hanover's notes 53, 67, 74, 125, and 133; compare also note 58. He has also given in his Introduction a presentation (by no means exhaustive) of Ibrahim's exposition of the festival law, as compared with the views of the Rabbanites and Karaites (pp. 23-32).

The date assigned by Dr. Klumel to Ibrahim was the fifteenth century (see J. Q. R., l. c., p. 403). Dr. Hanover (p. 6) would place him a century or even two centuries later, on the ground that in the Commentary to Exod. xii. 16 the use of coffee and tobacco is referred to (طهور وشرب الدخان), and these products, it is assumed, first came into use in the Orient at the beginning of the sixteenth and in the seventeenth centuries respectively. But it is, on the other hand, difficult to assume that so late a Samaritan could have composed a commentary so comprehensive in scheme and so rich in contents. And, as regards coffee, it was brought from the African coast to Aden before 875 of the Hegira (=1470-1), according to an Arabic report (in de Sacy, Chrestomathie arabe, 1, 412; cf. Encyclopaedia Britannica, s. v. Coffee). Tobacco certainly first reached Europe in 1558, and the Orient at the end of the sixteenth century; but does not only mean tobacco but is used in other senses by old Arabian authors (see Doby, s. v.). Nevertheless Ibrahim cannot be placed earlier than the end of the fifteenth century, for the Ja'kûb b. Ḥasan-al-Muhsin, cited by Ibrahim (see Hanover, p. 19), is most probably identical with Jacob b. Maḥasin of Damascus, the copyist of a Samaritan MS. of the years 1482-88. (See Steinachneider, l. c., p. 327, n. 19, and Oriental. Litt.-Zeitung, VII, 357.)

Like all Samaritan authors, and particularly those of later date, Ibrahim could not escape the influence of Rabbinical literature and tradition, but the instances adduced by Dr. Hanover (pp. 20 seq.) are not conclusive. Yet such influences can be proved from the Commentary to Leviticus xxiii, edited by Dr. Hanover. Thus, e.g. the assumption (p. xi, line 10) that the date of the Day of Atonement corresponds to the day on which Moses completed his 120 days' fast (thrice forty days) reminds us of a similar Talmudical opinion (Seder Olam, c. vi and parallels; cf. Hanover, note 139). So, too, the view that God pardons on the Day of Atonement only those whose repent-

1 A Spanish work on Tobacco by Monadres, which appeared in 1571, was not long afterwards translated into Arabic in the Orient by a Karait, Schabān b. Ishāk. See Steinschneider, Die arab. Literatur d. Juden, § 208.
ance includes a determination not to commit the sin again (p. xi, line 2 from bottom: בֵּֽשֵׁ֑רְתָּו אֵלֶּה רֶדֶדֶנֶּהוּ) entirely agrees with the Talmudic view (cf. Maimonides, lviBTI TiWH, ii. 2; the passage from the Sifra quoted by Dr. Hanover in note 141 does not, strictly speaking, belong here). Interesting are the various explanations of the 'Asereth-festival (p. xiv), among them the theory that God forgives sins on this day—an idea which, as Dr. Hanover rightly remarks (p. 22), has relations with Kabbalistic conceptions.

The text is carefully edited, and there are only a few unimportant misprints'. The translation (pp. 34-53), which I have only in part examined, seems to be very accurately done.

SAMUEL POZNANSKI.

DAS GEBETBUCH NACH JEMENISCHEM RITUS.


Zunächst sei bemerkt, dass W. nur die in J., Bd. I, enthaltenen Gebete in sich fasst, somit die Festgebete ausschliesst. Sie ist also für den praktischen Alltaggebrauch bestimmt, und damit erklärt

1. P. ii, last line לֵֽלֶדֶנֶּה read לֵֽלֶדֶנֶּה; p. vi, line 17(read טַֽצִּלְּאֵל); p. vii, line 1(read וְתַֽבָּרְנָה); p. xvii, line 5(read וְתַֽבָּרְנָה); p. 68, line 14(read תַּֽעֲמָלָל); ib. line 25(read חָלָלָל). Besides this, on p. xiii, lines 14 and 21, and p. xv, line 4 from the bottom, must be corrected to יִֽפְּוֹלֶת, and the note of interrogation, p. xiii, line 5 from the bottom, must be removed. Note 100 seems to have fallen out by an oversight.
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sich auch ihr Format (klein 8°), der Mangel eines jeden Commentars
und der wiederholte Abdruck solcher Gebete, die bei verschiedenen
Gelegenheiten recitirt werden, was bei J. nicht immer der Fall ist l.
Sie besteht aus 430 Seiten, die mit hebr. Buchstaben und gewöhn
lichen Ziffern paginirt sind, und das Titelblatt lautet : 'Bv itPED TID

nno i>ai n"jt N3»x P"p :>"ud3 rwn mo^ bsb ein trxni mevn hrci
oy .V't D"3D-in vtby omS y~h6 Ttton bi-un -wjn »b |>jj p'nrt
Derart b"i Derart *d by rhsnn roua lBDinj it?« niBDin nvp
-ipvbi öhyo DWin roto by «ain t6 jn /nn nnoa na cncs^
.i"vi jnsn Dma tid p tpr ''B dovujh T3jn rm naiJ mix'VD
.13 /ibn ,dot nisn D'3-in n« nistb H3 dibth traao !>k W3nb
p"a^ l"nn W» Jjm. Die Druckerei von M. Knöpfelmacher ist auf
der Kehrseite des Titelblattes angegeben.
Josef ha-Kohen also, auf dessen Kosten diese Ausgabe erschienen
ist, hat von der kaum zwei Jahre früher vollendeten, mit dem Cotnm.
des Sälih ausgestatteten Edition nichts erfahren. Trotzdem sind die
Anordnung und der Text der Gebete in beiden Ausgaben dieselben,
weil beide der recipirten Vorlage folgen. Auch W. hat am Anfange
die Ueberschrift : bs) Ny3V p"pn MjrUDS nii>Bnm ni3W TID ntl
N"jr JD*n HJ?, und auch hier beginnt der Siddur mit dem Nacht
gebet, worauf Alles wie in J. folgt s. Es sind nur zwei Abweichungen
zu verzeichnen : Die Vorschriften und Benediktionen über fWV und
pPBTl sind hier bei dem Morgengebete enthalten (p. 30-21), und nicht
bei den allgemeinen Benediktionen, wie in J., fol. 186, und zweitens
folgen die Bussgebete für die 4 Fasttage in kalendarischer Ordnung :
10 Tebeth, 13 Adar, 17 Tanimuz und 3 Tischri (anders in J., s. B„
p. 590). Weggelassen in W. sind nur unbedeutende Gebete, die für
besondere Fälle bestimmt sind, wie z. B. für den Fall einer Epidemie
(J., fol. 79b), vor und nachdem Lernen (fol. 83b) u.s.w., und verschie
dene Benediktionen (J., fol. 172 b ff., 180 a, 187 b -189 a). Dafür
enthält W. einzelne in J. fehlende Gebetstücke, die Manche zu
recitiren pflegen und die daher mit der Ueberschrift S|'DVv J"'l
versehen sind (s. p. 12, 19, 31, 86). Ausserdem noch ein Pijut, das der
Vorbeter vor dem Maphtir recitirt, wenn dieser ein Bräutigam ist

(p. 261 : : nr now jrnn toini tbdo!> mir6 rbty jnn v* Dto • • •

1 Hier werden solche Gebete, wie z. B. das rmcs root:, nicht nur nicht
wiederholt, sondern es werden auch auf andere, besonders auf solche,
die .-ins Bibelstellen sich zusammensetzen, nur kurzhin gewiesen, 8.
z. B. inbetreff des Nachtgebets B., p. 584.
a In den ersten 36 Seiten lauten die Ueberschriften irrtümlich nrpoi.


Alle diese Divergenzen sind aber von geringem Wert.

Die zwischendie Gebettexte eingeschobenen Vorschriften, in hebr. und arab. Sprache, die zumeistens Bestandteile des Rituals bilden (s. B., p. 585), sind zum grössten Teile auch hier enthalten. Von grösseren Stücken fehlen nur die sich auf den Morgen beziehenden Vorschriften (J., fol. 2 b ff.). Andererseits findet sich in W. 40 (wiederholt p. 245) unten am Rande eine grammatische Bemerkung zu 

Aehnlich bei Sālih z. St. (fol. 33 b): 

Ausdrücklich wird Sālih in W. nur einmal erwähnt, und zwar p. 1. Hier sind die Worte des Nachtgebetes in Klammern gesetzt und es folgt die Bemerkung: 

Ausserdem aber werden in W. noch an zwei Stellen die jemenischen Siddurim, die (s. B., p. 604), angeführt. An der einen Stelle, im Hallelnach den Worten vb tō (p. 307), heisst es: 

In J. wird darüber nichts gesprochen, auch weiss ich nicht, wer unter 

Die andere Stelle, die sich auf die Benediktion nach der Beschneidung bezieht, lautet (p. 347): 

In der That fehlen in dem Responsum des Maimonides, nr. 132, diese fünf Worte. J. dagegen (fol. 179 b) hat sie, und das ist, soweit ich festgestellt habe, auch die einzige wichtige Variante im Texte der beiden Ausgaben. In Sālih's Comm. findet sich darüber nichts.

Aussser den hier beschriebenen Gebeten enthält W. aber noch zunächst (p. 403-423) eine arab. Übersetzung zum Buche Esher, die in J. nicht vorhanden ist. Diese Übersetzung, über die ich an einem

SAMUEL POZNAŃSKI.


¹ Miscellen über Saadja IV (Monatschrift, XLVI).
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AN ANCIENT ILLUMINATED HEBREW MS.
AT THE BRITISH MUSEUM.

In the present paper I wish to bring to the notice of readers of this Review one of the most interesting and most elaborately illuminated Hebrew MSS. in existence. Parts of it have been consulted or studied by various scholars, but its contents form such a veritable treasury of Jewish literature that a comprehensive study of the volume would be sure to throw light on many topics.

The MS. is numbered Add. 11,639, measures about 6½ in. by 4½ in., and contains 746 vellum leaves. It was written in France towards the end of the thirteenth century. At the back it bears the modest impress, Chumash et Machzor, but it in reality contains ever so many other texts, such as Seder shel Ḥachamim, Megillath Tuanith, Hattarshish, Seder Haddoroth, a commentary on Selichoth, and a number of other pieces which still await comparison with works of a similar nature. For the present, however, I will only give a list of the thirty-nine coloured miniature pictures which the MS. contains. With the exception of the three miniatures belonging to the second series, all are full-page. The MS. is besides richly illuminated with initials and borders of various designs. The subject ought really to be approached from the artistic point of view, and about...
treated similarly to the Haggadah of Sarajevo and cognate works. In point of antiquity the present MS. must undoubtedly take rank before the Haggadah just mentioned as well as before Lord Crawford's Haggadah (now at the Ryland's Library, Manchester), and the British Museum illustrated MSS. of the Haggadah. The present writer can, however, only deal with the matter from a bibliographical point of view, and give it a treatment which may possibly lead to further work on the subject by others.

The pictures, four series in all, occur in the MS. in the following order. Each picture has a Hebrew description, which is not, however, cited here.

A. First Series, foll. 114*-122*.

a. Fol. 114*: seven-branched candlestick in gold on a ground of green, blue, and red. The high-priest on the left, pouring in oil.

b. Fol. 115*: the opened hand, with notes relating to palmistry prognostics, the outlines of the hand being drawn in gold mixed with black.

c. Fol. 116*: King Solomon, intent upon a scroll of the Law in his hands. The figure is seated on an arm-chair, with the foot resting on a footstool. A red cap on the head. The whole is enclosed by a rounded archway. Gold and various colours.

d. Fol. 117*: King David, playing on the harp. The figure is seated on a gilded throne, with a crown on the head; enclosed within a canopied archway. Gold and various colours.

e. Fol. 118*: (1) Upper part of page, Abraham going to welcome the three angels; (2) lower half, the three angels sitting at meat, with Abraham in attendance upon them.

f. Fol. 118b: (1) Upper part, Sarah in the tent, with Abraham pointing towards the same by way of informing the angel; (2) on the right of lower half, the angel announcing that Sarah would bear a son; (3) on the left of lower half, two of the angels on the way to Sodom for the purpose of destroying it.

g. Fol. 119*: the two angels throwing down fire and brimstone upon Sodom. The page is divided into two equal parts separated by
two perpendicular and closely parallel lines of gold reaching from the upper to the lower border.

h. Fol. 119b: (1) on the upper half, the two angels leading Lot and his two daughters away from Sodom, Lot's wife being left behind as a pillar of salt; (2) on the lower half, Lot and his daughters in the cave.

i. Fol. 120a: (1) on the upper part of the page, a picture described as the two angels interposing between the camp of Egypt and the camp of Israel. In each corner is a winged angel in a flame of fire. (2) In the lower part, the passage of the children of Israel through the Red Sea. The figure of Moses is drawn with his staff in his right hand and (by an anachronism) the tables of the Law in his left.

k. Fol. 120b: (1) on the upper part, Moses striking the rock, with another figure (that of Aaron or Joshua?) near him; (2) on the lower part, the brazen serpent on the top of a pole, with three persons on each side looking up to it.

l. Fol. 121a: (1) Holofernes in a sitting posture, with Judith standing opposite him; (2) on the lower part, Judith beheading Holofernes.

m. Fol. 121b: (1) on the upper part, Aaron burning incense on the altar of gold; (2) on the lower part, the sea of Solomon's temple.

n. Fol. 122: the tree of life, with four angels guarding it, each having a kind of long shining arrow in his hand.

B. Second Series, foll. 259b-260b.

a. Fol. 259b: a picture in four compartments. In the upper two, Nebuchadnezzar speaking to Hananiah, Misael, and Azarias; in the two lower compartments, the three children and the Archangel Gabriel over a flame of fire, with Nebuchadnezzar and the nobles opposite.

b. Fol. 260a: (1) on the upper part, apparently, Daniel before King Darius (Dan. vi). There is another figure behind each of these. (2) On the lower part, Daniel in the lions' den.

c. Fol. 260b: Ahasuerus holding out the golden sceptre to Esther.

Note.—The blank left for a picture on fol. 261a has not been filled in.
C. Third Series, foll. 516b-527b.

a. Fol. 516b: a figure in circles, illustrating the signs of the Zodiac.

b. Fol. 517a: a circular figure, with sun, moon and stars within it.

c. Fol. 517b: the fabulous bird known as Bar-Yochani, with an egg underneath it.

d. Fol. 518a: King Solomon judging between the two women concerning the ownership of the child.

e. Fol. 518b: the leviathan.

f. Fol. 519a: the shôr habbar.

g. Fol. 519b: Aaron's rod that budded, with five non-budding rods on one side and six on the other.

h. Fol. 520a: Samson killing the lion.

i. Fol. 520b: Adam on the right, Eve on the left, and the tree of knowledge in the middle with the serpent twining round it.

k. Fol. 521a: the ark in which Noah and his family were saved from the flood.

l. Fol. 521b: the intended offering of Isaac, with the angel on the right taking hold of the raised knife.

m. Fol. 522a: the Cherubim over the mercy-seat; the golden table and a censer.

n. Fol. 522b: Aaron pouring oil into the lamps of the golden candlestick.

o. Fol. 523a: Aaron wearing the mitre inscribed with the words, מְזוֹן מַלְאָךְ; he also wears the breastplate, and the bells at the bottom of his mantle. There is no inscription below this picture.

p. Fol. 523b: David and Goliath. Below, the figure of Goliath.

q. Fol. 524a: Esther before Ahasuerus.

Note.—Foll. 524b, 525a are blank.

r. Fol. 525b: Moses with his hands supported by Aaron and Hur.

s. Fol. 526a: Samuel beheading Agag.

Note.—Foll. 526b, 527a are blank.

t. Fol. 527b: Mordecai on horseback, with Haman holding the bridle.
D. Fourth Series, foll. 740*–743*.

a. Fol. 740*: picture of a burning city within a gilded circle, the open mouth of a reptile, or the like, gaping widely at the bottom of the picture. The inscription refers to Isaiah lxvi. 23.

b. Fol. 741*: within a gilded circle, Lot and his two daughters, and Lot’s wife in the act of being turned into a pillar of salt. This picture is quite different from the one given under A, h.

c. Fol. 741b: within a gilded circle, Moses holding the tables of the Law, with six princes of Israel by his side. The illustration, therefore, refers to the incident of the budding of Aaron’s rod, and the unchanged condition of the other rods. It is, however, difficult to see why only six princes should be present. See the next number.

d. Fol. 742*: within a gilded circle, Aaron’s rod that budded, and the other rods, five on one side and six on the other. Compare the preceding number and C, g.

e. Fol. 742b: a picture in two divisions. In the upper smaller division, a fanciful picture of the brazen serpent; in the lower division, five men looking up to the brazen serpent. The margins have been too closely cut. There is in this instance no inscription.

f. Fol. 743*: within a gilded circle, Moses about to strike the rock, with two other persons standing behind him. There is no inscription. Compare A, k.

The miniatures A, d, e (foll. 117b, 118*) are here reproduced (though without the colouring) as a specimen of the art.

G. Margoliouth.
THE ARABIC PORTION OF THE CAIRO GENIZAH AT CAMBRIDGE.

(Eighth Article.)

XXIII.

AN UNKNOWN WORK BY MAIMONIDES.

PAPER, two leaves, 19 x 14 cm. Orient. Rabb. Char.

The fragment to be discussed in this article belongs to a hitherto unknown work of legal character, or, more definitely expressed, a digest of the six hundred and thirteen canonical laws. An examination of the meagre relic discloses the interesting fact that the author of the work in question could have been no other than Moses Maimonides. Conclusive evidence of this will be found in the following.

The arrangement of the paragraphs follows the sequence of ordinances in the Pentateuch, but only three of them are complete. Nearly the whole of par. 38 (Exod. xxiii. 2 b), 39 (ibid., a), the last part of pars. 49 (ibid., 13 b), 50 (ibid., c), 51 (ibid., 14), 52 (ibid., 15 a), and the beginning of par. 53 (ibid., b) are preserved. The main argument for the authenticity of the work is derived from par. 38 which contains references made, in the first person, to all of Maimonides' legal works, with the exception of his commentary on the Mishnah. The next paragraph contains the words: "We have explained," but the references are
unfortunately missing, although there can be no doubt that they were the same as in the previous paragraphs. They are regularly repeated in the other paragraphs, being introduced by the words: "Thou wilt find," &c. The numbers quoted tally exactly with those of the BC¹, and the shorter enumeration of laws embodied in the introduction to the Mishnēh Torāh.

Now this evidence is somewhat strengthened by the concordance of a few passages in the fragment with those in the quoted paragraphs of the BC.

The Fragment. BC.

38. על בחלקלך לך neg. 283. ע' 283. כחלקלך לך

39. ובינה בויכ אלבקה אלבלקה pos. 175. ובינה בויכ אלבקה אלבלקה

49. לעבורה ויהי ולעבורה neg. 14. לעבורה ויהי ולעבורה

The foregoing arguments justify the conclusion that Maimonides, having completed the BC, compiled a short abstract of the same work, rearranging the paragraphs in the order alluded to above. Apart from this work he seems to have compiled a third, which was divided into two parts, separating the regulations now in force from those in abeyance. We gather this from paragraphs 51 and 52. Had it been the work of another author, his name would have been mentioned, although, of course, this might have been done in one of the earlier paragraphs. The omission of the commentary on the Mishnah among the books referred to may lend support to the theory, upheld by M. Bloch ², that this work did not, at that time, exist.

A similar arrangement of the laws to that in our fragment is given in the ספר היהות of Aaron Hallēvi of

¹ Book of Commandments. For quotations, see the edition of the Arabic original by M. Moïse Bloch. Paris, 1888.
² Préface, p. vii.
Barcelona (13th cent.). The great discrepancies in the numbers are, however, shown in the following comparison:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Fragment.</th>
<th>מער תודעה</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>76 + 77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>490</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finally, there is a word to be said on the title, "Book of Commandments." In our fragment this title obviously only refers to what is commonly known as מֵעיֵי הַפּוֹרָת, whilst the larger work has no title at all, but is only referred to in its two divisions of commandments and prohibitions. It is likewise interesting to observe that in the quotations of the *Mishnēh Tōrāh*, the author does not mention this title, and only deals with the superscriptions of the single books. All this tends to strengthen the conviction that it was Maimonides himself who here quoted his own writings and no other author.

---

The text contains a table comparing numbers and a discussion of the title of the work.
ARABIC PORTION OF CAIRO GENIZAH AT CAMBRIDGE 201

We interpret the text (Exod. xxiii. 2 b) thus: Thou shalt not speak in the same cause to turn aside in it after a multitude of evil-minded persons, to turn it from the decisions of the law. True tradition makes it clear for us that the words, Thou shalt not speak in a cause, entail an injunction for the judge not to follow his colleague in court in the way of adopting his view when he convicts [the accused]. The words of the Bible text mean to convey: Thou shalt not speak in a cause, adopting the view of the greatest man among the judges, but thou shouldst turn after the majority who are of different opinion. The Sages explain that this prohibition also includes the other, not to convict in a penal case, if the accused had been found not guilty before. The injunction, After a multitude, &c., is not accessory to the previous one, but another, and independent.

1 Above the line ז"ע.
ordinance, as we will explain. I have already explained this matter in No. 283 of the "Prohibitions," and in the "Book of Commandments" under the same number; and in the "Book of Judges," 1 among the regulations concerning the punitive powers of the Sanhedrin.

39. The command: To turn after a multitude is explained by the Sages thus: This again is no supplement to the preceding command, but an independent injunction to the judges only to decide according to the opinion of the majority, if there exists a difference between this and the rest [of judges] in this matter. We have explained this subject 2.

[49.] ......... he shall not swear by idols even for idolaters, nor shall he cause them to swear by it if they owe him an oath. Thou findest this in No. 14 of the Prohibitions, and in the BC under the same number, and the Book Maddâ 3 in the regulations concerning idolatry.

50. Let it not be heard out of thy mouth. Tradition explains that this refers to one who leads astray [the inhabitants of a city to idolatry]. Thou findest this in No. 15 of the Prohibitions, and under the same number in the BC, and in the Book Maddâ in the regulations concerning idolatry.

51. Three times thou shalt keep a feast unto me in the year. See No. 31 of the ordinances which are now obsolete, No. 53 of the BC, and the "Book of Sacrifices" 4 among the regulations concerning the festival offering.

52. Seven days thou shalt eat unleavened bread. We have already explained in the chapter hashkēm 5 that the duty of eating unleavened bread only applies to the night of the fifteenth [of Nisan]. I treated the matter there in detail.

This command forms No. 63 of those still in force, No. 158 of the BC, and in the Book of the Feasts 6 among the regulations concerning leavened and unleavened bread.

53. None shall appear before me empty. The traditionists explained this .......

1 Mishneh Tôrâh, Book XIV. 2 BC, I, par. 175.
3 M. T., Book I. 4 M. T., Book IX.
4 Exod. ix. 13 sqq., cf. יָעַנְתָּךְ, No. 10. 5 M. T., Book III.

HARTWIG HIRSCHFELD.
At the time of the Restoration there were some thirty families of Jews in England, and these naturally awaited with expectation the promise of the king, given through General Middleton, "to abate that rigour of the law which was against them," and welcomed the declaration of a Liberty to tender Consciences which had been made at Breda. But they had many enemies to reckon with—religious fanatics at a time when no one was thought religious unless fanatical, and trade rivals who, thinking that every transaction of the newly-settled foreign merchants was a loss to themselves, looked with a jealous eye on the large and increasing foreign and colonial trade of the Jews, especially that with the recently-acquired colonies in the West Indies. Accordingly it creates no surprise to find that a number of petitions were presented to the king and the Privy Council praying that the laws against the Jews should be enforced, and that, if necessary, new ones should be enacted. At the meeting of the Privy Council on November 30 such a petition from Sir William Courtney and others was read, and it is plain from the Council's minutes that several other petitions had also been received. The petition of Sir William Courtney is probably the document preserved in the State Papers under the title "Remonstrance concerning the Jews," and dated November, 1660. It recites, apparently taking Prynne's *Demurrer* as a guide, the mischief said to have

---

1 See the Da Costa lists published in Wolf's *Jewry of the Restoration*, p. 4.
been done by the Jews in former times and their banishment under Edward I, and how they have "by little and little and by degrees crept and stolen into England again, and together, some as Jewes aliens and others as English, are become of late exceeding numerous, and how they became so is conceived to be by the means of the late Usurper, who most apparently did protect and countenance them in their affairs and actions," and suggests the issue of a commission to inquire into their state, the imposition of heavy taxes, seizure of their property, and their banishment for residing here without a licence from the crown. 1. The Council having heard this petition read resolved that it, together with others on the same subject, should be taken into consideration again on December 7. On that day there were read at the Council a petition of the merchants and tradesmen of the City of London for the expulsion of the Jews, and also a petition of Maria Fernandez Carvajal (widow of Antonio Fernandez Carvajal already mentioned, who had died in November, 1659) and other merchants, Jews by birth, for his majesty's protection to continue and reside in his dominions. The latter petition has unfortunately been lost; the former is probably the petition of the Lord Mayor and Aldermen preserved in the Guildhall archives; it requested the king "to cause the former laws made against the Jews to be put in execution, and to recommend to the Two Houses of Parliament to enact such new ones for the expulsion of all professed Jews out of your Majesty's dominions, and to bar the door after them with such provisions and penalties as in your Majesty's wisdom shall be found most agreeable to the safety of Religion, the Honour of your Majesty, and the good and welfare of your subjects." The Council, judging the business of very great importance, referred all the petitions to the consideration of Parliament, desiring advice therein, and ordered them to be delivered to a member of

2 Remembrancia, vol. IX, p. 44.
the House of Commons to be accordingly presented to the Parliament. Though the Privy Council did not itself come to any decisive conclusion on the subject, it seems that the intention was to uphold the king’s promise and not to molest the Jews, for on December 17 Mr. Hollis, no doubt under orders from the Council, presented the above-quoted order to the House of Commons as specially recommended to them for their advice therein, touching *Protection* for the Jews. The House thereupon decided to take the business into consideration the next morning. The next morning, however, the matter seems to have been shelved, for there is no entry in the journal of anything having been done, and a few days afterwards (Dec. 24) Parliament was dissolved without ever having given their advice on the Jewish problem as they had been requested by the Council. From the general temper of the House of Commons on religious questions during this reign it is clear that no relaxation of the law was to be effected by legislation in favour of the Jews, and the subject was not again brought forward in Parliament for a period of more than ten years. The position of the Jews, though unsatisfactory, was by no means intolerable; the laws against Recusants were not very strictly enforced against them, and their place of worship, if they had already one, was not known, and they therefore escaped all proceedings for taking part in illegal forms of public worship. On the other hand, the new Navigation Act had securely closed all the colonies and plantations against foreign merchants and factors, but this obstacle was surmounted by applying for and in many cases obtaining letters of denization from the king. As early as the year 1662 they were emboldened

---

3 The Navigation Act is 12 Car. II, cap. 18. See sec. 2, which, being passed by the Convention Parliament, was expressly confirmed by the following Parliament. See 13 Car. II, cap. 14. Mr. Webb, in an appendix to the *Question, &c.*, gives a list of 105 Jews who received letters of denization in this and the following reign, and this list is not exhaustive.
to erect a synagogue. There is the doubtful reference to a synagogue in *The Great Trapanner of England Discovered*, published in 1660, which has already been referred to; but in a letter dated April 22, 1662, and written by Jo. Greenhalgh to his worthy friend Thomas Crompton, minister of Astley chapel, we have the description of a visit to the Jews' synagogue and the form of worship held there. It is plain that the synagogue was a separate building formed no doubt out of a private house and arranged in very much the same manner as synagogues are at the present day, the service also being very similar, lasting some three hours and conducted wholly in Hebrew. It was necessary to observe the strictest secrecy, nor was any one admitted to the building, which was in "a private corner of the city," and had three doors, one beyond another, except very privately. Mr. Greenhalgh himself had some difficulty in going to it. He had an idea that the Jewish merchants in the city must have some place of meeting together for divine worship, and was curious to see it. "Whereupon as occasion offered me to converse with any that were likely to inform me, I enquired hereof, but could not of a long time hear or learn whether or where any such thing was;" but, having taken to the study of Hebrew, he obtained as a teacher a learned rabbi named Samuel Levi, who gave him a ticket of admittance to the synagogue. We may judge the size of the congregation by the writer's statement that in the synagogue he counted "about or above a hundred right Jews and one proselite amongst them." It soon became no longer necessary to maintain this strict secrecy. In

There is a curious petition for naturalization of about this date (1661) of Jacob Joshua Bueno Henriques among the *State Papers Colonial*, vol. XV, No. 74. He says he had heard of a gold mine in Jamaica, and desired permission to go there and develop it, giving the king ten per cent. He also asks for naturalization for himself and his brothers Joseph and Moses, and that they may follow their own laws and have synagogues. (See Calendar, *S. P. Colonial*, 1661-8, p. 43, and *Jews in the British West Indies*, by Dr. Friedenwald; pub. American Jewish Hist. Soc., No. 5, p. 45 seq.)

1 Ellis's *Original Letters, and series*, vol. IV, Letter cccix, pp. 3-22.
the absence of any documentary evidence it is not safe to assume that a special dispensation was given by the king to the Jews by reason of that dispensing power which he conceived to be inherent in him, but it may well have been given, and if not it is most reasonable to suppose that reliance was placed on the king's declaration to all his loving subjects, which, as before stated, was published on December 26, 1662. At any rate it is quite certain that the worship of the synagogue, which had hitherto been conducted with the greatest privacy, was shortly after this time no longer concealed, but open to the public; and for a time at any rate without any evil consequences to the worshippers. On October 14, 1663, Samuel Pepys and his wife and his friend Mr. Rawlinson paid a visit to the synagogue after dinner, where they were present at what was evidently the afternoon service for the rejoicing of the law. There was no difficulty as to admission, and no attempt at concealment. The clerk of the acts of the navy remarks upon the disorder, want of attention and confusion in the service, and observes that he could not "have imagined there had been any religion in the whole world so absurdly performed as this." It was in the course of this year that the hitherto isolated Jewish families formed themselves into a community. Henceforth regular records were kept; the synagogue, in addition to being made public, was renovated and improved, and in 1664 a lease was taken; in September, 1663 the Finta, or contributions of the individual members of the synagogue, was fixed, and in the following November the Ascamoth.

1 Diary of Samuel Pepys, Oct. 14, 1663, Wheatley's edition, vol. III, p. 303. This description of a visit to the Synagogue gives an impression which was shared by other Christian observers; see the autobiography of Henry Newcome, M.A., A.D. 1686, "June 26. We went to the Jews' Synagogue. I could not have believed, but that I saw it, such a strange worship, so modish and foppish; and the people not much serious in it as it is. And I was affected to think, that many likely men of understanding should be without Christ, and live in the denial of him." Chetham Society's Publications, vol. XXVII, p. 262.
or code of laws to govern the newly-founded community, was drawn up; it was published in April, 1664, and in the same month a Haham, or Chief Rabbi, was appointed; the whole organization being completed by April 19, 1664. It was not likely that the public exercise of a strange religion should long remain unnoticed, and the passing of the Conventicle Act, which expressly declared that the Elizabethan legislation against Recusants was still in force and ought to be put into execution, invited an attack upon the Jews. It was not long delayed. The Conventicle Act came into force on July 1, 1664. And immediately afterwards we hear of a Mr. Rycaut molesting the heads of the congregation, suggesting that they were liable to all sorts of penalties and forfeitures, and what was worse, the Earl of Berkshire, the second son of that Earl of Suffolk in fear of whom the Jews had fled the country in the reign of James I, who held a high position at court, being a gentleman of the bedchamber and privy councillor, intervened, saying he was verbally authorized by the king to protect them, but threatening that unless they came to a speedy agreement with him, he would himself prosecute them and procure the seizure of their estates. In these circumstances the wardens of the synagogue, the first that had been yet appointed, took the only course open to them, and petitioned the throne direct. With great wisdom they omit all mention of the religious question and the infringement of the newly-enacted law, but say they know of no law to hinder their residence in the kingdom, and ask to be allowed to remain under the protection of the law until his majesty should think fit to order them to depart, and promise to be loyal and obedient subjects of the king. The petition was referred to the Privy Council on August 22, 1664. A most generous answer was returned. The king declared that he had

given no orders for molesting or disquieting the petitioners, and that they might "promise themselves the effects of the same favour as formerly they had had, so long as they demeaned themselves peaceably and quietly with due obedience to his Majesty's Laws, and without scandal to his government." The concession was of great importance; it was a formal recognition of a system of public worship which had been established for more than a year in open defiance of the Elizabethan statutes enforcing uniformity, and was given at the very time when Parliament had declared that those statutes should be carried out, and had even added to their severity by the enactment of the Conventicle Act. The king's claim to grant dispensations from penal laws had not yet been questioned in Parliament, and this particular dispensation granting the Jews the same favours they formerly had had, and by implication including the right of public worship which they had of late openly exercised, was never disputed in the legislature. Even assuming an express dispensation had been given to the Jews after Christmas, 1662, the new declaration was necessary to enable them to escape the severe penalties of the new Act which had just come into force.

For some years the synagogue was kept open and the services regularly held without molestation. On February 6, 1673, the House of Commons thought fit to take this matter into their consideration. There was a scheme on foot to prevent the growth of Roman Catholicism, and in case legislation should be introduced, it was thought a good opportunity to aim a blow at Judaism also. It was accordingly ordered "that a Committee be appointed to inquire into the causes of the growth of Popery; to prepare and bring in a bill to prevent it, and also to inquire touching the number of the Jews and their Synagogues, and upon what terms they are permitted to have their residence here, and report it with their opinions to the

---

1 S. P. Dom. Car. II, ent. Book 18, pp. 78-9; Calendar, 1663-4, p. 672.
Either from want of time or knowledge, or because the subject was not thought of sufficient importance, the part of the reference relating to the Jews does not seem to have been proceeded with; the Committee's report, which was presented to the House on February 17, dealt only with the causes of the increase of Popery, and it was resolved that an address requesting a proclamation for the banishment of priests and Jesuits, and the enforcement of the laws against Recusants, should be drawn up and presented to the king; whose answer to this address excepting those who served his father and himself faithfully in the late wars has been already mentioned.

For the time being, then, the Jews were left undisturbed; nor were they concerned with the publication of the Declaration of Indulgence in the spring of 1672, for, for nearly nine years before that time they had openly exercised the right of public worship which was conferred by that instrument on all Nonconformists except Papists. But the cancelling of the declaration in the following year gave occasion for a new attack upon the synagogue; the organizers of it no doubt argued that the withdrawal of the general indulgence of itself annulled the particular dispensation granted to the Jews, which, though previously acted upon, was evidenced and confirmed by the king's answer to their petition given on August 22, 1664. Accordingly, at the winter quarter sessions of 1673 at the Guildhall, the leaders of the Jewish community were indicted of a riot for meeting together for the exercise of their religion in Duke's Place, and a true bill was found against them by the grand jury. The Jews again petitioned the king, referring to the favourable reply they had received in 1664; and, as was seen in the first of these articles, on February 11, 1673, an order was made by the King in Council "that Mr. Attorney General do stop all proceedings at law against the Petitioners who have been

indicted as aforesaid and do provide they may receive no further trouble in this behalf."

The method by which the Attorney General is able to stop proceedings in a criminal trial is by entering a *nolle prosequi*—a course which before these times was not unusual in the case of informations or prosecutions commenced by a representative of the crown. About this very time the system was extended to indictments or prosecutions commenced by any member of the public without the necessity of any intervention or permission from the representative of the crown as a convenient way of exercising that dispensing power which the king thought inherent in his office. It is somewhat remarkable that though Parliament was sitting at the time, and the king’s power of suspending penal statutes in matters ecclesiastical had recently been questioned, no protest against this particular dispensation in favour of the Jews was made in either House; this may, however, be accounted for by the fact that Parliament was prorogued within a fortnight of the issue of the Order in Council, which may not have been generally known till some time afterwards. The measure of favour now shown the Jews was a distinct advance upon the proceedings of 1664. In the earlier year a vague promise of protection had been given upon condition that the laws of the land were duly obeyed. The formal Order in Council made ten years later effectually saved the young community from the consequences of undoubted infringements of the laws then in existence. The king could not make the celebration of an unauthorized religious service legal, but he could and did, by the exercise of his dispensing

---


2 In Goddard v. Smith (1764), 8 Mod. Rep., p. 264, Chief Justice Holt says that it began first to be practised in the latter half of King Charles the Second’s reign, but that on informations it had been frequently done, and he ordered precedents to be searched if any were in Mr. Attorney Palmer’s or Nottingham’s time. And on another day he declared that in all King Charles the First’s time there is no precedent of a *nolle prosequi* on an indictment.
power in this formal way, render those who took part in it immune from the penalties of the law which they were habitually violating. Indeed, shortly after this event, the leaders of the community thought themselves so far secure that during this year they took the lease of a house in Creechurch Lane for a term of twenty-five years, and established there a larger and more commodious synagogue. Nor was their confidence without justification, for no further attack was made upon them during the remainder of the reign.

It is well to pause here and glance at the progress made since the king's return. The resettlement, towards which, in spite of several sustained but unsuccessful attempts, no real advance had actually been made during the Commonwealth, was now actually effected, and, if the policy of Charles were confirmed by his successors, legally complete. At the time of the Restoration, Jews, though they might enter the country as freely as other aliens, were yet in no better legal position than they had been in the days of James I; they were subject to heavy fines if they did not regularly attend the Christian services of their neighbours, and were under still severer penalties debarred from setting up a synagogue of their own. It was impossible to establish a settled community or even to meet together for Jewish religious purposes except under the cover of the strictest secrecy. Those who were here are rightly called by Mr. Wolf Crypto-Jews, for they were unable to openly profess their allegiance to Judaism. The king, who in his exile had promised to abate the rigour

1 Gaster's History of the Ancient Synagogue, p. 7. Creechurch Lane is in close proximity to Duke's Place, but the extreme accuracy required in an indictment shows that in 1673 the house of prayer was at Duke's Place itself. Neither Pepys nor Greenhalgh indicates the locality of the synagogue, but it was probably the same house in Duke's Place which was still used in 1673. In the old synagogue in Duke's Place, according to Greenhalgh, the women worshipped in an inner room; in the newer synagogue in Creechurch Lane there was a separate gallery and entrance for ladies.
of the law that was against them, proved as good as his word. At the very beginning of his actual reign we have the earliest reliable evidence of a meeting-place for public worship according to Jewish rites. At first these services, though open to all Jews, were carefully concealed from the general public; yet after a lapse of three years it was possible to hold them openly; and the criminal proceedings which were threatened, or actually took place in consequence, were prevented or rendered abortive by the intervention of the king, and by the year 1674 the community, already firmly established, was able to obtain a long lease of a house, and especially reconstruct it for the purposes of a synagogue. No less than seventy members of the new congregation were granted during the reign letters of denization, and thus acquired the rights of English citizenship. Questions concerning the customs and rights of Jews, as would necessarily happen as soon as an actual settlement took place, now for the first time were discussed and decided in the courts of law—for instance, it was held that a Jew should be sworn on the Old Testament in legal proceedings whether at common law or in chancery; that it was right to alter the venue in a case where a Jew would be a necessary witness so that it should not be heard on Saturday, the Jewish Sabbath, and that a Jew might maintain an action in this country unless expressly prohibited by the king from carrying on trade here. Under the aegis of the king, and protected by the exercise of his dispensing power, a Jewish community had been practically established, requiring only the like recognition and protection from succeeding monarchs to make itself permanently and legally secure.

On February 6, 1684, Charles II died, and his brother James was proclaimed king. The new sovereign was from the first determined that the crushing disabilities under

---

1 See the cases of Robeley v. Langston (1667), 2 Keble, p. 314; and Anon. (1683), 1 Vern., p. 263; Barker v. Warren (1675), 2 Mod., p. 271; and case in Lilly's Practical Register, vol. I, p. 4 (1684).
which his fellow Papists laboured should no longer press
upon them, and was quite willing to give similar relief to
other Dissenters. In his speech made to the Privy Council
at the time of his proclamation as king he promised “to
preserve the government both in Church and State as it is
now by law established,” and to defend and support the
Church of England. On March 5, to the great grief of
all Protestants, mass was publicly said at Whitehall¹, but
in his speech at the opening of Parliament on May 22, the
king repeated the promise he had made to preserve the
government both in Church and State. This assurance, it
is plain, did not give universal satisfaction, for, fashionable
as it was in those early days of his reign to profess un-
bounded confidence in the king, there was still some mis-
giving and jealousy of the royal power in religious matters
which was bound to find expression. On May 27, the
grand committee for religion reported that they had agreed
upon two resolutions, of which the second was “That the
house be moved to make an humble Address to his Majesty
to publish his royal Proclamation for putting the laws in
execution against all Dissenters whatsoever from the
Church of England.” This resolution gave great offence
at court, and the court party in the House managed to
defeat it by moving the previous question, which was
carried, and the following motion was then unanimously
adopted: “That this house doth acquiesce, entirely rely,
and rest wholly satisfied in his majesty’s gracious word and
repeated Declaration, to support and defend the Religion
of the Church of England, as it is now by law established;
which is dearer to us than our lives².” Though no pro-
clamation was issued, an attempt was a short time after-
wards made to enforce the penal laws against the Jews;
for one Thomas Beaumont issued process under the statute
made in the 23rd year of Queen Elizabeth, which inflicted

a penalty of £20 a month for non-attendance at church, against no fewer than forty-eight Jews, of whom thirty-seven were arrested "as they were following their occasions on the Royal Exchange"; whereupon Joseph Henriches, Abraham Delivera, and Aaron Pacheco, the overseers of the Jewish synagogue, presented a petition to the King in Council praying "his Majesty to permit and suffer them as heretofore to have the free exercise of their religion, during their good behaviour towards his Majesty's Government." King James, following his brother's example by a formal Order in Council, exercised his dispensing power in favour of the Jews by ordering the Attorney-General to stop all the proceedings against them; "His Majesty's intention being" (so the order runs), "that they should not be troubled upon this account, but quietly enjoy the free exercise of their religion, whilst they behave themselves dutifully and obediently to his government 1."

This Order in Council was made on November 13, 1685, at the very time when Parliament, newly reassembled after the suppression of Monmouth's rebellion, was questioning the power of the king to retain in his service Roman Catholic officers who had served against the rebels by granting them dispensations from the Test Act. In his speech to both Houses, at the resumption of the session on November 9, James openly expressed his intention of continuing them in their employment, saying: "And I will deal plainly with you, that after having had the benefit of their service in such time of need and danger, I will neither expose them to disgrace, nor myself to want of them, if there should be another rebellion to make them necessary for me 2." On November 14 the House of Commons resolved to present an address dealing with this matter which, when finally drawn up and adopted, ran as follows: "We further crave leave to acquaint your Majesty that we have with all duty and readiness taken into consideration your Majesty's

1 Hag., Cons. Cas., Appendix, p. 3.
gracious speech to us, and as to that part of it relating to the officers in the Army not qualified for their employments according to an Act of Parliament made in the twenty-fifth year of the reign of your Majesty's Royal Brother of blessed memory, intituled an Act for preventing dangers which may happen from Popish Recusants, we do out of our bounden duty humbly represent unto your Majesty, that these officers cannot by law be capable of their employments; and that the incapacities they bring upon themselves thereby can no ways be taken off but by an Act of Parliament: Therefore out of that great deference and duty we owe unto your Majesty who has been graciously pleased to take of their services to you, we are preparing a Bill to pass both Houses for your royal assent to indemnify them for the penalties they have now incurred. And because the continuance of them in their employments may be taken to be a dispensing with that Law, without Act of Parliament (the consequence of which is of greatest concern to the rights of all your Majesty's dutiful and loyal subjects and to all the laws made for the security of their religion) we therefore, the knights, citizens, and burgesses of your Majesty's House of Commons, do most humbly beseech your Majesty, that you would be graciously pleased to give such directions therein, that no apprehensions or jealousies may remain in the hearts of your Majesty's good and faithful subjects.” A motion was made that the concurrence of the Lords be desired to the said Address, but was rejected by 212 votes to 138. And so, as had happened in the year 1673, the denial of the dispensing power of the Crown was embodied in a resolution of the Lower House only. The Lords, however, did not desire to be left behind in this matter, for on Thursday, November 19, they resolved “that Monday next be appointed for reading and considering His Majesty's speech.” But in the meantime the king, who had been highly incensed with the Commons Address when presented to him, and had expressed dissatisfaction and surprise at their want of confidence in him, prorogued Parliament,
which never met again for the transaction of business during his short reign.

The struggle was now transferred from the Parliament House to the Law Courts. A decision that the king had power to dispense with the penalties inflicted by the Test Act was obtained, and James proceeded to make the utmost use of this judgment in his favour, but not content with granting dispensations wholesale, at length in April, 1687, he published a Declaration for liberty of conscience, suspending all the penal laws, and remitting all penalties incurred under them; allowing the free exercise of every form of religion, and announcing that the oaths of supremacy and allegiance, and the recently enacted tests, should no longer be required to be taken or subscribed by any person, “and further declaring that this royal pardon and indemnity should be as good and effectual to all intents and purposes as if every individual person had been therein particularly named or had particular pardons under the great seal.” A year afterwards this Declaration of Indulgence was reissued, and ordered to be read in all churches, but now the storm, which had long been brewing, at length burst, and James was driven from his throne.


2 The case is Godden v. Hales, which was decided in Easter term, 1686. The action was brought against Sir Edward Hales to recover a penalty of £500 incurred by holding the office of colonel in the army without having taken the oath required by the Test Act. The defendant, in answer, pleaded a dispensation from the Crown. Sir Edward Herbert, Lord Chief Justice of the Common Pleas, after taking time to consult the other judges, declared that he and all the other judges (except Street and Powell, who doubted) were of opinion (1) that the kings of England are sovereign princes; (2) that the laws are the king’s laws; (3) therefore it is an inseparable power in the kings of England to dispense with penal laws in particular cases, and upon particular necessary reasons; (4) that of those reasons and those necessities the king himself is sole judge; (5) that this is not a trust invested in or granted to the king, but the ancient remains of the sovereign power and prerogative of the kings of England, which never yet was taken from them nor can be. And therefore, such a dispensation appearing upon record, judgment ought to be given for the defendant. See a Shower, p. 475; XI St. Tr., p. 1166 seq.
Until after the decision of Godden v. Hales in Easter term, 1686, the king had probably not gone beyond the law, though he had undoubtedly stretched his prerogative to its furthest limits, but his proceedings after that time are rightly regarded as wholly illegal. A special dispensation to a particular person or persons is very different from a general indemnity to all who might violate and incur penalties under the penal laws. However much we may at the present time approve of the wording and the substance of the declarations of indulgence, we cannot forget that if toleration was to be established, it could be secured only by an Act of the legislature, and not by the king alone usurping the authority of Parliament. James's hopes of success had lain in uniting all the dissenting sects against the Established Church, but the great mass of Dissenters were as vehement in their opposition as churchmen, partly because they regarded the indulgence offered them as illegal and unconstitutional, and a direct infringement of the liberties of the people and their right of legislation, and partly because they feared that the real object of placing the members of the different sects on the same footing as members of the Church of England, was, after destroying the supremacy of the Established Church, to afterwards gradually transfer it to the adherents of the Church of Rome. The Jews did not avail themselves of the Declaration of Indulgence, but for different reasons from their nonconformist brethren. They were satisfied with the dispensation granted them by Charles II, and confirmed by James II in November, 1685, for it enabled them to escape the penalties of recusancy, and also to hold public worship in accordance with the rites of their religion; nor had they any desire to take any part in the political life of the country, which under the Declaration of Indulgence they might have done. For not only were they for the most part aliens and wholly absorbed in commercial enterprises, but one of the ascamoth or laws of the synagogue strictly forbade its members from
taking any part in politics—\textsuperscript{1}—a very wise provision in the then condition of the newly-organized community. The position of the Jews therefore remained throughout the reign the same as it had been under Charles II, but lapse of time and the confirmation of the dispensation given by Charles and his successor rendered their settlement more secure, and their community was rapidly increasing, and still enjoying the royal favour, as is proved by the fact that thirty-four of its members were granted letters of denization by James II during his short reign.

The Revolution of 1688 did not affect the status of the Jews. It was indeed recognized that it was necessary to reward in some way the loyalty to the constitution of the Dissenters, who, in spite of the indulgence offered them by the deposed king, had joined entirely in the resistance to the illegal attacks on the rights and privileges of the Established Church, but it was determined that the toleration to be granted should be strictly limited. The penal laws might be divided into two classes; first those which compelled attendance at church, and punished the holding of religious services not in conformity with the ritual laid down in the book of common prayer, secondly those which disabled all who did not profess the doctrines of the Church, and join in communion with it, from sitting in Parliament, or holding any political or municipal office or any place of profit under the Crown. The gratitude felt by churchmen to their nonconformist brethren for the support rendered to the Church in her hour of need, was not strong enough to create any desire to admit them to any share of political power, and it was thought that sufficient generosity was shown in granting freedom of worship to Protestant Dissenters, and relief from the penalties incurred by absence from church. No attempt was therefore made to mitigate any of the laws falling under the second category, nor were any of those belonging to the first class amended or repealed, but, in accordance with a mode of legislation

\textsuperscript{1} Gaster, \textit{The Ancient Synagogue}, p. 88.
which seems peculiarly dear to the English people, the
effect of disobedience was annulled by exempting Dissenters
from the penalties they would have otherwise incurred.
This was done by means of the statute (1 Will. & M., cap. 18)
entitled “An Act for exempting their Majesties' protestant
subjects dissenting from the Church of England from the
penalties of certain laws,” and generally known as the
Toleration Act. In spite of its high sounding title the
toleration granted was strictly limited to Protestant
Nonconformists, who might take the new oaths of allegiance
and supremacy, and subscribe a declaration against tran-
substantiation; though Dissenters, such as Quakers, “who
scruple the taking of any oath,” were allowed instead to
subscribe a declaration of fidelity to the throne, and also
a profession of their Christian belief, and it was also pro-
vided “that neither this Act nor any clause, article, or thing
herein contained, shall extend or be construed to extend to
give any ease, benefit, or advantage to any papist or popish
recusant whatsoever, or any person that shall deny in his
preaching or writing the doctrine of the Blessed Trinity, as
it is declared in the aforesaid articles of religion.” Dissenters
entitled to the benefit of the Act were enabled to have
their places of worship certified, and persons who should
disturb the services held there were made liable to penalties.
At the same time it was made clear that there was no
intention to allow any relaxation of the strict observance
of the Sunday, for by section 16 “all the laws made and
provided for the frequenting of divine service on the Lord’s
Day, commonly called Sunday, shall be still in force, and
executed against all persons that offend against the said
laws, except such persons come to some congregation or
assembly of religious worship, allowed or permitted by
this Act.” Yet, such as it is, the Toleration Act is not
unjustly regarded as the charter of freedom of conscience
in this country, for it in practice gave all the liberty which
at the time it was intended to allow. Nonconformity was
still regarded in theory as a crime, but exceptions were
introduced, which in the course of time became so numerous as to eat up the rule. The true effect of the Toleration Act is well expressed by Lord Mansfield in his speech in giving judgment in the House of Lords in the case of the Chamberlain of London v. Evans in the year 1767; he says, that in former days nonconformity was "in the eye of the law a crime, every man being required by the canon law, received and confirmed by statute law, to take the sacrament in the church at least once a-year, . . . but the case is quite altered since the Act of Toleration; it is now no crime for a man, who is within the description of that Act, to say he is a Dissenter; nor is it any crime for him not to take the sacrament according to the rites of the Church of England; nay, the crime is, if he does it contrary to the dictates of his conscience. . . . The Toleration Act renders that which was illegal before now legal; the Dissenters' way of worship is permitted and allowed by this Act; it is not only exempted from punishment, but rendered innocent and lawful; it is established; it is put under the protection and is not merely under the connivance of the law. . . . Dissenters, within the description of the Toleration Act, are restored to a legal consideration and capacity; and an hundred consequences will from thence follow, which are not mentioned in the Act. For instance, previous to the Toleration Act, it was unlawful to devise any legacy for the support of dissenting congregations, or for the benefit of dissenting ministers; for the law knew no such assemblies and no such persons; and such a devise was absolutely void, being left to what the law called superstitious purposes. But will it be said in any court in England, that such a devise is not a good and valid one now?" but then he adds later, "the case of 'Atheists and Infidels'" (among whom Jews are included) "is out of the present question; they come not within the description of the Toleration Act".

The benefit of the Toleration Act was extended to Unitarians in the year 1813, and to the Roman Catholics, who had received considerable measures of relief by statutes passed in 1778, 1791, 1829, in the year 1832, and finally to the Jews in the year 1846, but until the reign of Queen Victoria there had been no legislative enactment exempting the Jews from the penalties of the penal laws, which were finally repealed in the years 1844 and 1846.

1 In 1812 three of the most intolerant Acts passed in the reign of Charles II, namely, the Act against Quakers, the Five Mile Act, and the Conventicle Act, were repealed by the Places of Religious Worship Act, 1812 (52 Geo. III, cap. 153), which also made it necessary, under a penalty of £20, to certify and register all places for religious worship of Protestants, at which more than twenty persons should be present.

In 1813, 53 Geo. III, cap. 160, admitted Unitarians to the benefit of the Toleration Act, by repealing the last two lines of sect. 17, which exclude any person who shall deny the doctrine of the Blessed Trinity.

The Acts relieving Roman Catholics are (1) Sir George Savile's Act (18 Geo. III, cap. 60), which exempted Roman Catholics who took the prescribed oath, expressing allegiance to King George and disclaiming the Stuarts and the deposing power of the Pope, from many of the disabilities and penalties imposed since the Revolution by 11 & 12 Will. III, cap. 4. Catholics were henceforth allowed to purchase and inherit land, and the provisions allowing a Protestant kinsman to enter and enjoy the estate of a Catholic heir, and imposing perpetual imprisonment for keeping a Roman Catholic school, were repealed. (2) The Roman Catholic Relief Act, 1791 (31 Geo. III, cap. 32), which among other things exempted all persons who should make a declaration professing the Roman Catholic religion, and take the prescribed oath of allegiance to the king and the Hanoverian succession, from all penalties for not resorting to the parish church, and from being prosecuted for being a Papist, or for hearing or saying mass, or taking part in any other ceremony of the popish religion, provided that all places of worship should be certified, and provided also that all the laws made and provided for the frequenting of divine service on the Lord's Day, commonly called Sunday, shall be still in force, and executed against all persons who shall offend against the said laws, unless such persons shall come to some congregation or assembly of religious worship permitted by this Act or by the Toleration Act, i.e. a Roman Catholic or Protestant Nonconformist chapel. (3) 43 Geo. III, cap. 30, substitutes the declaration and oath prescribed in the Catholic Relief Act of 1791 for the oath prescribed in Sir George Savile's Act of 1778. (4) The Roman Catholic Relief Act, 1829 (10 Geo. IV, cap. 7), admitted Roman Catholics to full political rights, with certain exceptions, by exempting them from the provisions of the Test Acts and the Corporation Act. (5) The Roman Catholic Charities Act of 1832 (2 & 3 Will. IV, cap. 115) extended to Roman
No relief was formally given to enable Nonconformists to fill municipal, political, or military offices, from which all who did not take the Communion according to the rites of the Church of England were excluded; but after the beginning of the reign of George II such offices were practically thrown open to Protestant Dissenters by passing annual Indemnity Acts, the first of which is 1 Geo. II, st. 2, cap. 23, in favour of those who had omitted to qualify themselves under the Corporation and Test Acts. At length in the year 1828 the statute 9 Geo. IV, cap. 17, substituted a Declaration, “upon the true faith of a Christian,” not to disturb or injure the Established Church for the Sacramental test, thus sweeping away all the political disabilities of Protestant Nonconformists, and in the following year the obligation to make a Declaration against transubstantiation was repealed, and Papists also, under certain conditions, were admitted to full political rights by the Roman Catholic Relief Act of 1829.

It is somewhat remarkable that, until the year 1846, no legislative relief from the penal laws, except in so far as some of them had been repealed in the year 1812 and the year 1844, was granted to the Jews.—The repealing Acts were not intended to benefit the Jews; but were made in favour of Protestant Dissenters and Roman Catholics respectively.—Indeed the statute passed in the last-mentioned year, which is entitled “An Act to repeal certain Penal enactments made against Her Majesty's Roman Catholic Subjects,” expressly restricted the repeal of many of the statutes it dealt with, to the extent to which they related to or in any manner affected Roman Catholics. The Commission for revising and consolidating the criminal law, which was appointed in February, 1845, recommended in its first report, published three months afterwards, that the Catholics the benefit of the Toleration Act, by making them subject to the same laws as Protestant Dissenters “in respect of their schools, places for religious worship, education, and charitable purposes.” (6) 7 & 8 Vict., cap. 102, expressly repealed many of the penal enactments, so far as they “relate to or in any manner affect Roman Catholics.”
clauses in the Uniformity Acts by which a penalty is inflicted for repairing to other places of worship than churches, and also those inflicting penalties on Roman Catholics, Dissenters, and Jews for professing, exercising, or promoting any religion other than that of the Established Church, and also the Laws of Recusancy, be repealed, and further that the religious worship of the Jews be protected in like manner as that of Roman Catholics and Dissenters. These recommendations were carried out in the following year by the Act to relieve Her Majesty’s Subjects from certain penalties and Disabilities in regard to Religious opinions (9 & 10 Vict., cap. 59). At length, therefore, after the lapse of more than a century and a half, the Jews were formally, by a solemn Act of the legislature, admitted to the benefits of the Toleration Act, and their religion was no longer merely connived at, but was placed under the protection of the law. During this long period the Jewish question was frequently brought to the notice of Parliament, and the Jews had always both friends and enemies in that assembly; but the Jewish question never became a burning question of the day.¹ The enemies of the Jewish religion, having the letter of the law in their favour, did not feel the necessity of taking any legislative action, though they may have deplored their inability to enforce the penal laws against the Jews. The friends of the Jews, on the other hand, did not care to introduce remedial measures, which would have certainly been opposed and possibly if not probably defeated, because in fact the Jewish religion, though not sanctioned by Parliament, had under the king’s dispensing power, as exercised by the Orders in Council in 1674 and 1685, all the protection that was necessary. The synagogue was always open; its worshippers were not prosecuted, and a considerable and

¹ An exception should perhaps be made of the events following the ill-fated Naturalization Act of 1753, but even then the right of public worship and the practical freedom from the penalties of recusancy were never seriously brought in question.
increasing Jewish community gradually grew up both in London and the principal commercial centres. Every year the position became more secure, and premature attempts at legislation would have only endangered it.

It cannot, however, be disputed that the Jews were deliberately excluded from the Toleration Act, for almost immediately after its passage their status was the subject of discussion in the House of Commons. In order to provide funds for the reduction of Ireland, which still held out for the Stuart king, and the vigorous prosecution of the war against France, it was resolved in the autumn of 1689 to raise an additional supply of two million pounds. On November 7, the Committee of the whole House, which was sitting to consider the means of raising this sum, recommended that a tax of one hundred thousand pounds be laid upon the Jews, and a bill for that purpose was ordered to be brought in. On November 11 the Jews presented a petition to the House of Commons against the proposed tax. The rule of the House then was that no petition against a bill imposing a tax would be entertained, or if presented entered upon the Journals of the House. This rule, founded on the assumption that as a tax extended over all parts of the kingdom, no individual should be allowed to treat it as a special grievance to himself, was not rescinded until 1842, when standing order 82, discontinuing the former usage and enabling the House to entertain such petitions, was passed. Consequently the petition and the debate upon it are not mentioned in the Commons Journals. The petition gave a very interesting account of the condition of the Jews in England at this time: stating that about the year 1654 there came six Jew families into this kingdom, which since the Restoration of Charles II had been increased to the number of between three and four score families, who had settled in the cities of London and Westminster, under the public faith and protection of King Charles II; that many of them had been made denizens by the last two kings, and that though
one half of them had moderate or indifferent estates, the other half consisted partly of persons assisting the better sort in the management of their commerce, and partly of poor people maintained by their richer brethren, and in no ways chargeable to the parish; that they paid all the taxes and fulfilled all the duties imposed upon them, and by their large commercial transactions they greatly enriched the nation, and increased the revenue from Customs: that they were wholly unable to pay the large sum proposed to be levied upon them, and could not expect any assistance from their brethren abroad; so that if the tax were proceeded with they would be utterly ruined. Though not mentioned in the petition, the rumour was spread abroad that the Jews would be forced to leave the country, and that they would remove themselves and their effects into Holland, rather than submit to the imposition. On Nov. 19 the petition was delivered by Mr. Paul Foley, member for Hereford, and afterwards Speaker; and a debate as to whether it should be received ensued. It was questioned whether the Jews were subjects of the king having the right to petition Parliament, and stated that, if they were, they had no more right than their fellow subjects, and could not petition against an Aid. Sir Thomas Lee said: “Pray let not such petitions be received. You will not receive it from others, pray begin not with the Jews.” And though Mr. Foley answered these arguments by declaring “I think that for the honour of the House you are to hear what they will say. When you lay a general tax on a whole kingdom, you can receive no petition against it, because all are represented here, but when there is a particular tax on men they may petition.” Mr. Speaker Powle stated that he never knew a petition against a Bill before the House was seised of it, and it was decided not to receive the petition. On Dec. 30 the Bill was read a first

1 See the Greenwich Hospital News-letter, 3, No. 77, Nov. 12; Cal. S. P. Dom., 1689, p. 318; and Luttrell’s Diary, vol. I, p. 393.  
time, and it was resolved that it should be read a second time, but it went no further, for men saw how dangerous a precedent it would be to single out for special taxation a small, defenceless, and wholly unrepresented class, which was unable to bear the burden sought to be imposed upon it. The projected tax was accordingly withdrawn. Therefore the Jews did not become subject to a separate system of taxation, as in our West Indian colonies. They were, however, expected to bear the burdens of the country in the same way as their neighbours, and about this very time great disappointment was expressed that they were not ready to advance or lend, on the security of the new taxes, large sums of money for the purposes of the Government, and the Lord Mayor was actually requested by the Earl of Shrewsbury, then Secretary of State for the North, to send for their elders and principal merchants, and to impress upon them the great obligations they were under to the king for the liberty and privileges they enjoyed, and endeavour to induce them to raise the sum of £12,000, which they had offered to provide, to £30,000, or at the very least £20,000. It is probable that the response to this appeal did not come up to the expectations of the Government, and that it was partly in consequence of this that the exemption from certain of the alien duties, which had been granted in the reign of James II, and continued since the Revolution, was finally withdrawn by an Order in Council made in the October of this year.

On other occasions also the permanent settlement of the Jews here was recognized by Parliament, and they are more than once expressly mentioned in Acts of Parliament. The first of these Acts is 6 & 7 Will. and Mar. cap. 6, entitled "An act for granting to His Majesty certaine rates and duties upon Marriages, Births, and Burials, and upon

---

2 S. P. Calendar, Feb. 10, 1690. * See Tovey's Anglia Judaica, pp. 287-95.
Batchelors and Widowers, for the terme of 5 years, for carrying on the War against France with Vigour.” It imposed a duty of two shillings and sixpence upon the marriage of every person not in receipt of alms, and additional taxes in case of the marriage of persons of rank or property, and contained a proviso that Quakers, Papists, and Jews, and any other persons living together as man and wife, should be liable to the duties they would have been obliged to pay, if they had been married according to the law of England, but at the same time the Act was not to be construed as in any way making good or effectual any such marriage.

Again a few years later, in the spring of 1698, when “the Act for the more effectual suppressing of Blasphemy and Profaneness” was before Parliament, and an amendment was inserted after its return to the Lords, by which all persons openly professing the Jewish religion would have been made liable to the severe penalties it imposed; the House of Commons recognized the right of the Jews to remain here and continue the exercise of their religion by rejecting the amendment by a substantial majority. This incident is thus described by Narcissus Luttrell in his Diary, under the date March 22, 1698: “The Commons yesterday divided about a clause in the bill against prophaneness, relating to the Jews, who deny Jesus Christ; 144 were for it, and 78 against it: so the clause was added that the Jews shall not be molested.”

The next occasion on which this subject was raised in the legislature was in the year 1702, when the Act to oblige the Jews to maintain and provide for their Protestant children was passed. The way in which this statute was put in operation has already been described in the second of these articles, and calls for no further comment, but it

1 The Commons Journals give the numbers as 140 and 78. In reality no clause was added, but the words which had been struck out by the Lords were restored to the Act. See the second of this series of articles, J. Q. R., vol. XIII, pp. 375–80.
may be advisable to recall the circumstances which led to its enactment. A few years earlier the Commons had rejected the Lords' amendment to the Act against Blasphemy and Profaneness, on the express ground that it would drive the Jews out of the country, and so deprive them of the means of being rightly instructed in the principles of the true Christian religion. It soon became clear that this desire of gaining proselytes would not be gratified to any great extent if the converts were exposed to financial ruin, nor, as there was not in those days a rich and highly endowed society for the promotion of Christianity among the Jews, were the conversionists prepared to support a burden which they had reasonable hopes of removing to other shoulders. In the year 1701 a case arose which gave an opportunity for introducing legislation. In May of that year Mary Mendez de Breita, a girl nearly eighteen years of age, who had been brought up as a Jewess, embraced the Christian faith, and was baptized by Mr. Thorold, a minister of the Church of England. Thereupon her father, Jacob Mendez de Breita, disowned her for his child, turned her out of doors, and refused to allow her any maintenance, and she, being afraid of her father's anger, applied to the Lord Mayor for protection, and at his order the churchwardens of St. Andrew's Underhaft, in whose parish the father lived, provided for her and maintained her at the charge of the parish. The churchwardens lodged a complaint against the father at the Quarter Sessions at the Guildhall, and an order was made under the Relief of the Poor Act of Elizabeth that the father should allow her twenty shillings a-month for her maintenance, but this order was subsequently quashed by the Court of King's Bench, on the ground that there was no jurisdiction to make it. A petition was then presented

1 See the Inhabitants of St. Andrew's Underhaft v. de Breita, Lord Raymond's Reports, vol. I, p. 699. Before the Committee of the House of Commons it was stated that the allowance for maintenance was twenty shillings a-week. Commons Journals, vol. XIII, p. 799.
to the House of Commons by the ministers, churchwardens, and overseers of the poor of the above-mentioned parish and the five neighbouring parishes, stating that most of the Jews in London lived in their parishes, and that, "though they enjoy the protection of the government and the free exercise of their religion and grow rich, yet they bear such a hatred to our national religion, that in case any of their children embrace the same, they utterly disown them and treat them with great cruelty; an instance whereof appears by the daughter of Jacob Mendez de Breta, a rich Jew in St. Andrew's Underhaft, who being converted to the Christian Faith, he utterly disowns her for his child and refuses to maintain her; so that she is now kept by the said parish for her encouragement, suitable to her education," and praying that a bill might be brought in to oblige Jacob Mendez de Breta in particular and the Jews in general to maintain and provide for their Protestant children. The petition was at once referred to a Committee. The Committee heard a large number of witnesses on both sides, including the father himself, who said that Mary was not his daughter, but with two or three more children had been laid at his door in Portugal, and that he had maintained them purely out of charity, and further that he had never owned her as his daughter, but had always treated her as a servant, and that if she was entered in the parish books for the poll-tax as his daughter it was without his knowledge or consent. The Committee, however, found that the allegations in the petition were fully proved, and recommended that a bill be brought in according to the prayer of the petition. When the bill was read a second time a petition from several Jews, merchants in London, was presented against it, and after certain amendments had been made in the Commons, it was passed in the Lords without any amendment and almost without debate.

On other occasions occurring at frequent intervals before

1846 Parliament took cognizance of the presence of the Jews, generally with the view of mitigating in their favour new enactments which would have otherwise pressed heavily upon them, but it will for our present purpose be sufficient to enumerate briefly the principal of these occasions. For instance, in the year 1723, in order to place a check upon the Jacobites, many of whom were Roman Catholics, it was enacted by 9 Geo. I, cap. 24, that all persons owning land, who refused or neglected to take the oaths appointed for the security of the king's person and government, which included the oath of abjuration as framed in the reign of James I, and ending with the words "on the true faith of a Christian," should register their names and real estates before a fixed day, or in default should forfeit their lands. But, in the following year, an amending Act, 10 Geo. I, cap. 4, was passed, which allowed persons professing the Jewish religion to take the oath without the final words, in like manner as Jews are admitted to be sworn to give evidence in Courts of Justice.

Again in the year 1740 an Act was passed enabling all persons who had settled for a period of seven years in any of the British colonies in America to be naturalized, under certain conditions, without the necessity of obtaining a private Act of Parliament, by which naturalization was granted in those days, but it contained a proviso that all such persons should first receive the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper in some Protestant and reformed congregation in Great Britain or one of the colonies, except the people called Quakers, "or such who profess the Jewish religion." It was also further provided that Jews taking the necessary oaths for the purposes of this Act might omit the words "on the true faith of a Christian," in the same way as they were enabled to do under 9 Geo. I, cap. 24. Thirteen years later Lord Hardwicke's Act for the better preventing of clandestine marriages (26 Geo. II,

---

13 Geo. II, cap. 7, repealed by the Naturalization Act, 1870; see especially secs. 2 and 3.
cap. 33), which made null and void all marriages solemnized without the publication of banns or licence, expressly excepted marriages amongst the people called Quakers or amongst the persons professing the Jewish religion, and most of the subsequent marriage Acts have contained similar exceptions. In the same year was passed the famous Jew bill (26 Geo. II, cap. 26), which permitted persons professing the Jewish religion to be naturalized by Act of Parliament without having previously taken the Sacrament. The Act passed through the House of Lords with great ease, but when it came down to the House of Commons met with strong opposition; indeed it would have possibly been wrecked in the Lower House, had not some of the enemies of the Government slackened their efforts against it, in the belief that it would cause widespread unpopularity throughout the country against the party in power. Nor was this belief ill-founded, for the storm of prejudice and fanaticism that arose during the recess compelled the Government to pass as their first effective measure of the next session an Act repealing the obnoxious Jew bill. For more than seventy years the Jews were not specially mentioned in any Act of Parliament, but they were again expressly excepted from the provisions of the marriage Acts of 1824, 1836, and 1840, and the Registration Act, 1836, provided for the due registration of Jewish marriages by the Secretary of a synagogue certified by the President of the London Committee of Deputies of the British Jews.

This brings us down to the years 1845 and 1846, when the measures of relief were granted, and the Jewish religion finally admitted to the benefit of the Toleration Act. Till then the immunity of the Jews from the consequences of the penal laws had rested on the royal dispensations granted by the king in Council in answer to the petitions of Abraham Delivera and others in 1674, and of Joseph Henriques and others in 1685, and the preceding summary of Parliamentary enactments concerning the Jews shows
that the legislature tacitly acquiesced in this particular exercise of the dispensing power formerly claimed by the Crown, nor was there any individual bold enough to challenge it by persisting in a prosecution in a court of law. This fact is not without significance, when it is remembered that the laws against recusants, though by no means uniformly enforced, had not become quite obsolete, even at the time when they were finally repealed. The Criminal Law Commissioners, in their first report published in 1845, mention a considerable number of convictions, followed by actual imprisonment of the offenders, which had recently to their knowledge taken place in different parts of the country. Though never questioned in a court of law, the immunity of the Jews did in truth rest upon sufficiently sure foundations. It could not indeed be proved that any charter or formal document of exemption had been executed in their favour, but the fact of the dispensation was sufficiently evidenced by the story of the proceedings taken against them on two important occasions in two different reigns.

There can be little doubt that in the reign of Charles II, when the Jews re-established their community here, the king still retained the power of dispensing with laws, though subject to certain limits, which even in those times could not be precisely defined, but which it was generally acknowledged that James II had in the latter part of his reign undoubtedly transgressed. Accordingly it was not absolutely condemned by the Declaration of Rights, but it was thought sufficient to declare that "the pretended power of dispensing with laws or the execution of laws, by regall authoritie, as it hath beene assumed and exercised of late, is illegall." To prevent such abuse in the future, the Bill of Rights absolutely abolished the power, except in such cases

1 See first report of Her Majesty's Commissioners for revising and consolidating the criminal law, note on pp. 32-3, and also Lord Brougham's remarks, Hans. Parl. Debat., vol. 59, p. 815 (1841), and id., vol. 85, p. 1264 (1846).
as should be specially provided for by statute, and contained a special saving clause, providing no charter, grant, or pardon granted before October 23, 1689, should be in any way impeached or invalidated. Though the Jews had no formal charter in their possession, they could claim the final words of the Order in Council of 1685—"His Majesty's intention being that they should not be troubled upon this account, but quietly enjoy the free exercise of their religion, whilst they behave themselves dutifully and obediently to his government"—as a grant within the meaning of the proviso.

When the facts are properly analysed, it is difficult to suggest any other foundation for the freedom of the Jews to establish synagogues, and to absent themselves from church, than the exercise of the dispensing power of the Crown. From this an anomalous consequence of no small practical importance resulted, namely, that there never was any necessity to certify or register a synagogue in the same way as places of religious worship belonging to other Dissenting bodies. The benefit of the Toleration Act of 1688 was confined to persons who attended divine service at some place permitted by the Act, and no place for religious worship was permitted by the Act until certified to the Bishop, Archdeacon, or Quarter Sessions, and duly registered or recorded, and the Roman Catholic Relief Act of 1791 contained similar provisions for the certification and registration of Roman Catholic places of worship. Furthermore, the second section of the Places of Religious Worship Act, 1812, which is still in force, imposed a penalty of twenty pounds upon every person permitting a congregation or assembly for religious worship of Protestants, at which more than twenty persons should be present, to meet in any place occupied by him before it had been duly certified.

1 For the dispensing power see the cases of non-obstante, 12 Rep., fo. 18: Thomas v. Sorrel (1674), Vaughan, p. 330, and Godden v. Hales (1686), a Shower, p. 475, and XI St. Tr., p. 1,166, with the notes, especially those at pp. 1,187 and 1,251, and generally Broom's Constitutional Law, pp. 493-506; Anson's Parliament, pp. 311-17; and Burnet's Reign of James II, pp. 458-60.
In the year 1855 the Act for securing the liberty of religious worship (18 & 19 Vict., cap. 86) considerably modified this stringent provision, by excepting from its operation assemblies for religious worship conducted by the incumbent of the parish, or a person authorized by him, and congregations meeting in a private dwelling-house, or meeting occasionally in a building not usually appropriated to religious worship. The second section of the same Act, by providing that the expression in the Act of 1846, Her Majesty's subjects professing the Jewish religion, in respect of their places for religious worship, shall be subject to the same laws as Protestant Dissenters are subject to, shall mean are subject to for the time being after the passing of this Act, seems to imply that at that time it was necessary to certify a Jewish synagogue. But it is certain that there was no provision for certifying a synagogue before 1846, and it is hardly consonant with the true principles of the interpretation of statutes to extend the scope of a highly penal section of an Act of Parliament in this indirect way, especially by an enactment entitled "An Act to relieve Her Majesty's subjects from certain penalties and disabilities in regard to religious opinions," the manifest intention of which was to grant relief from former burdens, but not to impose any new obligations. However, by the Places of Religious Worship Registration Act, 1855 (18 & 19 Vict., cap. 81), a Jewish synagogue may be certified in writing to the Registrar-General of births, deaths, and marriages, and will then be registered in due time. Although, as has been said, this course is optional and not compulsory, it is to be recommended, because it ensures the following advantages. A building so certified is exempt from uninvited interference by the Charity Commissioners, and is also, if exclusively appropriated to public religious worship, not liable to be rated for parochial or municipal purposes. In

---

1 See 16 & 17 Vict., cap. 137, sec. 62; 18 & 19 Vict., cap. 81, sec. 9; and 32 & 33 Vict., cap. 110, sec. 15, as to the provisions of the Charitable Trusts Act; and as to the exemption from rates, 3 & 4 Will. IV, cap. 30; 5 & 6 Will. IV, cap. 50, sec. 27; and 38 & 39 Vict., cap. 55, sec. 151.
addition, a synagogue not certified is not entitled to any of the advantages conferred by the legislature in 1846: a gift or legacy to it is void, nor can contracts to hire seats in it be enforced, or disturbers of the service be punished.

With the mention of this somewhat curious anomaly, the consequence of this method in which full legal recognition has been given to the Jewish religion, it is time to bring the foregoing inquiry to a close; nor is it necessary to recapitulate at any length the conclusions already arrived at. In the year 1290 the Jews were banished from the kingdom by royal edict, but this edict, now lost, would not avail to absolutely exclude from the country centuries afterwards Jews in no way connected with the former bondsmen of the king. From time to time isolated Jews came and lived in England, but the severity of the laws enforcing uniformity of religion was sufficient to prevent the formation of a Jewish community, and as late as the reign of James I the Jews that were here fled the country through fear of the commissioners appointed to execute the laws against Jesuits. The treaty with Spain in 1630 made it somewhat easier for Jews to settle here, by allowing them to evade some of the penalties imposed on recusants, but this advantage, such as it was, was lost by the outbreak of the war with Spain in 1656, though restored after the return of Charles II. Availing themselves of this advantage a small number of Jews settled in the country in the reign of Charles I, and at the time of the execution of that king a formal request was made for the recognition of the Jewish religion, but it was not successful, and being renewed seven years later, in spite of the fair words used and the courtesy shown to Menasseh, it again proved a failure. During Cromwell's régime nothing was done; but there is evidence that the Protector allowed some half-dozen families of persons he knew to be Jews to remain in the realm, but this was a special favour which did not enable them to form a distinct body or set up a synagogue. During his exile Charles II made a formal promise to
relax the law in their favour; but no legislation was introduced, nor, if introduced, would it have had a chance of success. But the promise was fulfilled. A considerable number of Jews received the rights of citizenship; a distinct Jewish community arose, and a synagogue was established. At first the services were kept strictly secret, for fear of the enforcement of the penal laws, but, under the protection of the king's dispensing power, before the end of 1663 it was possible to hold them with open doors, and the attacks made upon the Jews were successfully repelled. On the accession of King James II a further and last attempt was made to visit with the rigour of the law the still young and struggling community, which was again saved by the exercise of the dispensing power of the Crown. After the Revolution the power of dispensation was swept away, but it was expressly provided that charters or grants already made should not be held invalid, and the formal Order in Council of November 13, 1685, granting the Jews the free exercise of their religion, was thus confirmed. At length, in 1846, after an interval of more than a century and a half, the Jewish religion, the profession of which had been frequently recognized by the legislature, was formally made legal by Act of Parliament.

H. S. Q. Henriques.
THE ALPHABET OF BEN SIRA.

ΣΟΦΙΑ ΣΕΙΡΑΣ ΛΙ. 13-29 from The Old Testament in Greek according to the Septuagint, H. B. Swete, D.D. (II, 753 f., Camb., 1896), with the letters of Ben Sira's Alphabet assigned conjecturally to their places in relation to the Greek.

13 ἔτι δὲν νεώτερος πρῶ ἐπλανηθήναλ ὑμεῖς,
     ἐξήςα ποιμαν προφανῶς ἐν προσευχῇ ὑμοί,
14 ἐραυτὶ ναοῦ ξίον περὶ αὐτῆς,
     καὶ ἔσχατων ἐκζητῆσω αὐτὴν.
15 ἐξ ἀνθίσος ὅσ περκαζώσης σταφυλῆς
     εὐφράση ἡ καρδία μου ἐν αὐτῇ,
16 ἐπέβη ὁ ποὺς ὑμοῦ ἐν εὐθύνη,
     ἐκ νεότητός μου Ἰσραήλ αὐτήν.
17 ἐκλίνα ἄλγου τὸ ὑπὸ μου καὶ ἐθεάμην,
     καὶ πολλὴν εὐρον ἐμαυτῷ παιδελαν
18 προκόπη ἐγένετο μοι ἐν αὐτῇ,
     τῷ διδότη μοι σοφιαν δόξον δόζαν.
19 διενοθήθη γὰρ τοῦ ποιήσαι αὐτήν,
     καὶ ἐξήλωσα τὸ ἀγαθόν, καὶ ὅν μὴ αἰσχυνθῶ.
20 διαμεμάχοιται ἡ ψυχή μου ἐν αὐτῇ,
     καὶ ἐν ποιήσαι λιμῷ δυσκρισάμην
21 τὰς χεῖράς μου ἐξεπέτασα πρὸς ὑψος,
     καὶ τὰ ἀγνοήματα αὐτῆς ἐπένθησα.
22 τῆς ψυχῆς μου κατεύθυνα εἰς αὐτὴν,
     καὶ καρδίαν ἐκπηχάμην μετ' αὐτῶν ἐπ' ἄρχης,
     καὶ ἐν καθαρισμῷ εὐρον αὐτήν.
     διὰ τοῦτο οὐ μὴ ἐγκαταλείψω.
THE ALPHABET OF BEN SIRA

\[21\] καὶ δὴ κοιλία μου ἑπαράχθη ἐκξητῆσαι αὐτὴν·
диδ τοῦτο ἐκπισάμην ἀγαθῶν κτήμα.

\[22\] ἡμῶν Κύριος γλῶσσάν μοι μισθῶν μου,
καὶ ἐν αὐτῇ αἰνέως αὐτῶν.

\[23\] Ἐγγίσατε πρὸς μὲ, ἀπαίδευσοι,
καὶ αὐλίσθητε ἐν οἶκῳ παιδείας.

\[24\] καὶ ὑπερείσθη λέγετε ἐν τούτοις,
καὶ αἱ φύκαὶ ὑμῶν διψάσαι σφόδρα,

\[25\] ἑρεία τὸ στόμα μου καὶ ἐλάλησα
Κτῆσασθή αὐτοῖς ἀνευ ἀργυρίου.

\[26\] τὸν τράχηλον ὑμῶν ὑπόθετε ὑπὸ ἰσιόν,
καὶ ἐπιδεξάσθω ἡ ψυχὴ ὑμῶν παιδείαν.

\[27\] ἐγγὺς ἐστὶν εὑρεῖν αὐτὴν.

\[28\] δετε ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς ὑμῶν ὅτι ἀλγον ἑκοπιάσα,
καὶ εὕρον ἐραυνῷ πολλῆν ἀνάπαυσιν.

\[29\] μετάσχητε παιδείαν ἐν πολλῷ ἀριθμῷ ἀργυρίου,
καὶ πολὺν χρόνον κτῆσασθε ἐν αὐτῇ.

\[30\] εὐφρανθεῖ ἡ ψυχή ὑμῶν ἐν τῷ ἑλέει αὐτοῦ,
καὶ μὴ αἰσχυνθεῖτε ἐν αἰνεῖ αὐτοῦ.

C. TAYLOR.

[Note.—The Master of St. John's College, Cambridge, delivered a public lecture on November 2, 1904, in which the above arrangement of the Alphabet was presented. The full text of the lecture will eventually appear in the Journal of Philology. Dr. Taylor has also reconstructed the Hebrew (on the basis of the Cambridge MS., with important conjectural emendations) and has come to the general conclusion that the Hebrew is not a retranslation from the Syriac. The Hebrew text, however, he regards as corrupt. Dr. Taylor made the suggestion that in the Hebrew the 6 line begins מְסָחוּת כָּצִים (מְסָחוּת כָּצִים) ; the 7 line with עִמּוֹת (equivocal emendation for עִמּוֹת) ; and the 8 line with עִי הָאֵל (equivocal emendation of עִי הָאֵל, cf. Bickell).

Ed. J. Q. B.]
THE COSMOPOLITAN ASPECT OF THE HEBREW WISDOM.

The Hebrew Wisdom, though it has been a distinct subject of investigation for more than fifty years, has still its unsettled problems; and of these there are perhaps two of paramount importance at the present time. The first is the question of the age in which this remarkable movement flourished. The prevalent opinion has been that the Wisdom belongs to no one age in particular. It has been viewed as a permanent bent or aptitude of the Hebrew mind, operative throughout almost the entire history of the nation, and throwing off its literary productions at widely separated stages of its development. Originating in the time of Solomon, it is supposed to have been carried forward by a succession of Sages or Wise Men, who were ultimately incorporated as a regular teaching profession or guild. From this circle of thinkers there emanated the various writings which we group together under the title of the Hokmah literature:—first, perhaps, the Proverbs of Solomon, next the Book of Job, and lastly—as works born out of due time—the late post-Exilic books of Ecclesiastes and Ecclesiasticus.

Of late years, however, another view has been gaining ground. The tendency of recent criticism has been to draw together the separate remains of Hokmah writing within a comparatively narrow compass of time; and to assign the composition of Job, of the Proverbs, of Ecclesi-
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1 The first of two lectures delivered at the Summer School of Theology, Edinburgh, 1904. The second lecture will be published in a later number of the J. Q. R.
astes and Ecclesiasticus to one stage in the history of Jewish religion. Just as we can speak of a golden age of prophecy, or an age of legalism, or an age of Apocalyptic, so it is thought there may have been a period which was pre-eminently the age of the Wisdom,—an age when its peculiar mode of thinking was in the ascendant, and when it formed a vital contribution to the development of Judaism. If that theory is to be entertained, there can obviously be no question about the particular time to which the movement is to be assigned. It must have been the age immediately preceding the Maccabean rebellion,—that great upheaval which by universal acknowledgment divides post-Exilic Judaism into two entirely dissimilar phases. On the very eve of that conflict Jesus ben-Sira lived and wrote: Ecclesiastes certainly cannot be much earlier; and the two remaining books must then be assigned to a date considerably earlier indeed, but still within the middle period of post-Exilic history. Thus, from about the year 180 B.C., backwards for perhaps two centuries, is the period which would have to be considered the golden age of the Hebrew Wisdom. And there is no doubt that within that tract of time there were influences at work which might be very closely related to the spirit of the Wisdom movement. There was, for example, the transference of religious interest from the Temple-cultus to the study of the written law, and the rise of the scribe to a position of rivalry with the priesthood. There was the substitution of the Church for the State as the basis of religious fellowship; and accompanying that the translation of the theocratic conceptions of the prophets into terms of personal religion, and the elaboration of an ethical code suitable for the individual life. These are internal changes which must have been in progress during the interval between Ezra and the Maccabees; and it can readily be seen that the process was one in which the conceptions of the Hokmah were fitted to play an influential part. Besides all this there was the presence of
Hellenic culture, which is not unnaturally supposed to have had some share in the formation of the peculiar type of thought represented by the Wisdom. I think it is not at all surprising that keen students of the Jewish Wisdom should be attracted to this period of history as affording an explanation of some of the characteristic features of that many-sided and interesting literature.

Now, touching on this question at many points, but fundamentally independent of it, is the other unsettled problem to which I referred. It may be stated generally thus: Was the Wisdom purely a native product of Israel-Itish life and thought, unalloyed with foreign elements; or was it influenced to any degree by movements of a similar character in other countries? The latter alternative, of course, may cover a wide range of possibilities. It might amount to nothing more than the admission of a casual and sporadic influence exerted on the development of the Wisdom from without, and revealing itself in certain subordinate features of the system. Or it might mean that the Wisdom of the Old Testament was simply the Hebrew phase of a great international movement of thought, deriving its energy from intellectual impulses not peculiar to the religion of revelation, but common to the civilized races of the East. Between these extremes any number of intermediate positions might be assumed, each of which would justify us in speaking of a cosmopolitan aspect of the Hebrew Wisdom. This, then, is the class of questions to which I am now to direct your attention. And before entering on the discussion of them, I will try to express in few words where I conceive the true importance of the inquiry to lie, and how I have been led to think of it at all.

Any one who has followed recent developments of theological research must have been struck by the rise of a somewhat novel application of the comparative method to the problems of historical theology. We have long been familiar with the science of Comparative Religion
as a handmaid of theology. We have come to know much of the great faiths of the world; and have learned to study them reverently and dispassionately, as sincere and not wholly unrewarded efforts to solve the enigmas of existence and meet the deepest need of the human soul. We have learned also to compare them one with another and estimate their relative worth; and in the comparison we have found a proof of the intrinsic and immeasurable superiority of the religion of the Bible. But for the most part we have proceeded on the tacit assumption that the ethnic religions can be handled as separate and independent entities, dwelling apart, each within its own sphere of influence, and developing its own genius without much help or interference from without. At least we have been accustomed to look on the religion of Israel as an entirely isolated fact of history. Now the new point of view to which I have alluded involves the negation of this assumption. It is denied that the religions of antiquity were thus secluded from each other's influence; it is maintained on the contrary that, through the common medium of a vast and immemorial civilization, they had acted on and interpenetrated each other to an extent that has hardly as yet been dreamed of. In the later pre-Christian ages especially it is held that the interchange of religious ideas went on with astonishing rapidity; and that the effects are to be seen in the dissolution of the old bond between religion and the state, in the rise of new religious fellowships, the amalgamation of divine names, and the diffusion of similar customs and beliefs over the whole surface of the Oriental world. From this process of syncretism Judaism was least of all exempt. While the most conservative of all faiths, it was at the same time the most receptive; and from all quarters,—from Babylonia, from Persia, from Egypt, and from Greece,—it drew much of the material imbedded in its later theological constructions. In the language of one writer, Judaism was the alembic into which was thrown the heterogeneous deposit of many
phases of religious speculation; and from which was to emerge, under the name of Christianity, a sort of sublimated essence of the religious consciousness of the race. Such, in crude outline, appears to be the view of things common to theologians like Gunkel and Bousset, of Assyriologists like Zimmern and Winckler, and a historian like Eduard Meyer; not to mention more extreme developments of the theory in the recent utterances of Friedrich Delitzsch and the writings of the Abbé Loisy. The claim of the Bible to be the revelation of the perfect religion would thus have to be based, not so much on its self-contained superiority to all other sacred literatures, but rather on its capacity for assimilating what was best in the religions around and utilizing the results of the highest human thought as the vehicle of its peculiar message to mankind.

Now the inquiry into the external affinities of the Hebrew Wisdom is a special and restricted case of this far-reaching investigation. The cosmopolitan character of the movement has been emphasized by Gunkel and Bousset; and both have found in this fact a confirmation of the soundness of their main thesis. The former in particular has indicated certain specific channels of communication between the Wisdom movement in Israel and parallel phenomena in other countries. And it seemed to me that it might be worth while to follow out these hints carefully and arrive, if possible, at some definite judgment on the evidence within this limited sphere. The results, I admit, have not been very decisive; but such as they are I will now endeavour to put them before you.

The subject may be approached from two sides: first, from the side of the Old Testament itself; and secondly, from the side of foreign systems which are thought to present points of contact with it.
I.

I begin, then, by observing that the Old Testament betrays the consciousness of a certain international significance attaching to the Wisdom tradition. There are several passages which prove that the quality so highly esteemed in Israel under that name was not regarded as an exclusive possession of the Hebrew people. In the account of Solomon's wisdom in 1 Kings iv. 29–31, we read that "God gave Solomon wisdom and understanding very much, and breadth of mind, even as the sand that is on the sea shore. And Solomon's wisdom excelled the wisdom of all the sons of the East and all the wisdom of Egypt. For he was wiser than all men; than Ethan the Ezrahite, and Heman, and Calcol, and Darda, the sons of Mahol; and his fame was in all the nations round about." Ethan and Heman and Calcol and Darda are as yet unknown personages, though it is at least possible they were non-Israelites; but Egypt and the sons of the East are perfectly understood designations; and the fact that this foreign wisdom could be compared with the wisdom for which Solomon was famous shows clearly that it was considered of the same quality as his, however far he may have surpassed them. But Solomon was not only a wise king; he was also regarded as the patron of the later literary Wisdom and the schools from which it proceeded; hence we may perhaps infer that the comparison of his wisdom to that of the East and Egypt implies the recognition of an essential affinity between the whole body of Hebrew Wisdom and the parallel developments which certainly existed among the neighbouring peoples. Of these countries, Edom appears to have enjoyed a special reputation for wise men and wisdom down to the latest ages of the monarchy. In Jer. xlix. 7, the scornful question, "Is there no longer wisdom in Teman?" obviously implies that the fame of the Temanite wisdom was traditional; and the same inference may be drawn from the threat in the eighth verse
of Obadiah: "In that day I will destroy the wise men from Edom, and understanding from the mount of Esau." These allusions are amply sufficient to prove a knowledge of the existence of foreign wisdom on the part of Old Testament writers; though of course they say nothing of actual influence or intercourse on either side.

A more positive argument might perhaps be based on some facts of the Hokmah writings. There are two well-known sections of the book of Proverbs which appear at least to be assigned to foreign sources,—the words of Agur the son of Jakeh (xxx. 1), and those of Lemuel, king of Massa (xxxi. 1). The text of the superscriptions is no doubt uncertain, and the meaning almost hopelessly obscure. But in the second case I hardly think that any of the emendations proposed has as much claim to respect as the simple construction of the Massoretic text, that Lemuel was a king of an Ishmaelite tribe of Massa. The other title is less decisive, but even there there is a presumption that a non-Israelite origin is suggested. It is possible of course that this is merely a literary invention, and that the contents are purely Hebrew or Jewish; but even the fact that a Jewish writer could put them in the mouths of foreign sages counts for something in favour of the international character of the movement. Still more striking is the
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1 Here, for want of another opportunity, I may just call attention to a remarkable series of Indian parallels which Mr. Jacobs has pointed out in Prov. xxx (Studies in Biblical Archaeology, p. 125 f.):—

4. Who has gone up to heaven and come down? Who has gathered the wind in his fists? Who has bound up the waters in a garment? Who has established all the ends of the earth? What is his name, and what is his son's, if thou knowest? Who knows or who here can declare Whence has sprung—whence this creation— From what this creation arose, Whether any made it or not? He who in the highest heaven is its ruler, He verily knows, or even he knows not!

(Rig-veda, X, 129.)
case of the book of Job, where the facts are fortunately not in dispute. That the hero of that great poem is a non-Israelite, that the scene is laid outside the Holy Land, that all the human personages of the drama are Edomites or Arabs of the eastern deserts, are circumstances which taken together, and taken along with some rather remarkable Arabisms in the language, are perhaps barely appreciated in the ordinary theories of the composition of the book. To speak of the book (with Renan) as an echo of the ancient wisdom of Teman, or to say that it is not more specially Hebrew than Idumean or Ishmaelite, may be a romantic extravagance; and to suppose that it is a translation into Hebrew of a work originally written in another tongue is a view which does not require serious refutation. But avoiding these extremes, and allowing that the background and atmosphere of the poem belong to the art of the writer, we have still to ask why his sense of artistic fitness took this particular turn. It must surely mean, at the very least, that the author wished to present the pro-

15. The horseleech has three daughters, they say alway, Give, give.
There are three things never sated,
Yea, four that never say, Enough:
Sheol is never sated with dead,
Nor the womb's gate with mor,
Earth is never sated with water,
And fire says never, Enough.

Fire is never sated with fuel,
Nor Ocean with the streams,
Nor the god of death with all creatures,
Nor the bright-eyed one with men.
(Pants., I, str. 153.)

18. There be three things too wonderful for me,
Yea, four which I know not:
The way of an eagle in the air . . .
The way of a ship through the sea.

And fire says never, Enough.

The path of ships across the sea,
The soaring eagle's flight Varuna knows.
(Rig-veda.)
&c.

None of these might be very impressive by itself; but taken altogether from a single chapter, and that chapter ostensibly of foreign origin, they do create a presumption in favour of Mr. Jacobs's suggestion, that Prov. xxx consists of fragments of Indian Wisdom which had made their way into Palestine by way of Arabia.
blem which exercised his mind as a problem of universal religion, and not a difficulty arising from the special revelation given to Israel. Whether we can go further and infer that he knew such matters to be the theme of discussion amongst wise men of the East, is just the point at issue; and it is one very difficult to determine. On first thoughts one is inclined to say that the problem of the moral government of the universe could only arise on the soil of a strictly monotheistic faith; but that is a matter on which it is easy to be too confident. Through all the more developed religions of antiquity, polytheistic though they are on the surface, there runs a strain of monotheistic reflection; and we have no right to say beforehand that this could not be sufficiently earnest to create difficulties regarding the distribution of providential rewards and punishments in this world. As a matter of fact, there exists an Egyptian papyrus, of late date, in which this very question of the righteousness of the world-government is discussed with much heat and acrimony between a great cat and a small jackal, representing doubtless two deities of the Egyptian pantheon. It illustrates the possibility of discussing the theodicy on a basis of superficial polytheism; and that may be accepted as a proof that this grave difficulty could be felt outside the pale of revealed religion. While, therefore, we must hold that the book of Job is "the genuine outcome of the religious life and thought of Israel," and its author a true son of Israel, we may believe that the setting of the poem was due to his knowledge of the higher thought of the neighbouring peoples; and that this knowledge made the scene chosen attractive to the writer himself and suggestive to his readers.

There is one general feature of the Wisdom literature which, though perfectly familiar to all students of the subject, acquires a fresh interest in connexion with the question we are considering. The Wise Men of Israel, it has often been pointed out, are in a sense Humanists.
Their point of view is universal and individual; they do not concern themselves with the religious relations and obligations of the Israelite as such, but only with those which pertain to him as a man, living under the rule of a perfectly righteous Governor of the world. Their indifference to the positive institutions and theocratic ideals of the national religion surprises us by its consistency and apparent deliberateness. In the book of Proverbs, for example, while the divine proper name Yahweh is regularly used, the name Israel never occurs; and the distinction between Israel and the other nations finds no place whatever. In Job, Yahweh is employed in the prose framework, but (with the exception of one doubtful verse) sedulously avoided in the speeches, where it is frequently replaced by 'Elōhîm, which is just the Arabic name of God, 'Ilāh. Both books ignore the whole cycle of peculiarly prophetic ideas: those, namely, which cluster round the conception of the Kingdom of God and the Messianic hope. Equally marked is their silence regarding the legal aspect of the national religion. The study of the written law is nowhere recommended; allusions to sacrifice and priesthood are not found; and the few references to points of ritual are of the most vague and cursory nature. All this shows that the Wisdom represents a tendency of mind secluded in some way from the main currents of Hebrew piety, and containing the germs of a philosophy of life applicable to mankind everywhere.

Now there are two ways in which this peculiarity of the Wisdom has been explained. Some writers, holding that the Wisdom sprang up on the soil of Judaism, maintain that the legal and national standpoint, though never expressed, is always presupposed; that the Wise Men never really look beyond the little circle of the Jewish community; and that the questions they ignore regarding the special relation between Yahweh and Israel form the silent assumption of all their thought and teaching. There is undoubtedly an element of truth in that view. The un-
swerving faith which these men had in the principle of retribution can only be accounted for by the teaching of the prophets and a rigorous training under legal conditions. Nevertheless I think the explanation is inadequate. If the written law was the source whence the Wise Men drew their ethical teaching, it is not easy to understand why they avoid referring to it and prefer to deduce every maxim from observation of life or the tradition of the sages. And this attitude is all the more remarkable when we compare the Proverbs of Solomon or the book of Job with the Wisdom of Ben-Sira. The greater part of the latter work is essentially similar to the book of Proverbs; but there is also an unmistakable vein of legalism, which manifests itself in many ways: such as the inculcation of the study of the Scriptures, the identification of the divine Wisdom with the Mosaic legislation (of which more in the next lecture); there is also a vivid sense of the unique privileges of Israel, and an ardent enthusiasm for the institutions and history of the theocracy. The natural conclusion is that originally the Wisdom was independent of legalism; and that in the book of Ben-Sira we see the two streams beginning to coalesce, and the functions of the Sage on the point of being absorbed by the scribe, the professional expounder of the written law. But if we accept that interpretation of the facts, we cannot exclude the possibility that the humanistic tendency in the Wisdom was stimulated by intercourse with men of other nations whose natural piety took a direction somewhat similar to that which we find in the Wisdom literature.

It would serve no good purpose to dwell longer on this side of the question. We may now proceed to the second branch of the inquiry, and examine some of the foreign sources of wisdom from which the Hebrew Sages are thought to have drunk.
The beginnings of Hebrew Wisdom may be traced ultimately to certain primitive instincts and habits of thought congenial to the Semitic mind. A faculty of close observation of nature and life, joined to a love of sententious and eloquent speech, constitute perhaps the mental endowment which effloresced in the primary form of written Ḥokmah, the proverbial literature. These tendencies are strongly marked amongst the Bedouin of the desert, where the tribesmen spend much of their day in the tents of the sheiks, listening to the eloquence which is bred of large experience and acute judgment. “These Orientals,” says the traveller Doughty, “study little else, as they sit all day idle at the coffee in their male societies; they learn in this school of infinite human observation to speak to the heart of one another. His tales” (referring to a certain Moorish rogue named Mohammed Aly) “seasoned with saws, which are the wisdom of the unlearned, we heard for more than two months; they were never-ending. He told them so lively to the eye that they could not be bettered, and part were of his own motley experience.” The great collection of Arabic proverbs by Meidani shows that this species of wisdom has been popular among the Arabs since the dawn of their literary history.

But amongst the civilized Semites of antiquity we have as yet little direct evidence of a wisdom tradition comparable to that of the Old Testament. We may cherish the hope that from the immense accumulation of unexplored cuneiform material some documents of Babylonian or Assyrian wisdom will be recovered, which may bear an instructive comparison with the gnomic poetry of the Israelites. Up to the present nothing of this kind appears to have been published, with the exception of a short collection of proverbs and riddles translated by Jäger in 1894. It is thought to have been part of a scholar's exercise-book; and
its chief importance lies in the proof it yields of a Babylonian gnomic literature of at least greater antiquity than the age of Asshur-bani-pal, in whose reign the extant copy is thought to have been made. With regard to the contents, the resemblance to the Hebrew proverbs seems to me to have been somewhat over-stated. There are only eighteen sayings in all; and of these a considerable proportion contain obscure astrological or mythological allusions of no interest for our present purpose. Others are conundrums, similar in character to Samson’s riddle in the book of Judges. There are, however, a few which bear a family likeness to the moral maxims of the Old Testament. For example: “He who says, O that I might exercise vengeance, and more also (the common Hebrew idiom), draws from a well without water, and rubs his skin without anointing it.” “If in the time of wind I consume my (store of) garlic, my heart shall be straitened in the time of rain.” “Thou wentest and seizedst the property of thine enemy: the enemy came and seized thine.” “The strength of a worm, . . . the drunkard is no better.”—These are the most striking instances; and scanty as the harvest is, the conclusion is undoubtedly suggested that a proverbial philosophy of life was cultivated in Babylonia as well as in Israel. Looking at the age to which these maxims must be traced, it is not reasonable to deny off-hand the antiquity of some of the collections of proverbs current under the name of Solomon.

The closest parallels to the Wisdom writings of the Old Testament as yet discovered are not in the Semitic world at all, but in the didactic literature of the Egyptians. In this particular department the Egyptologists have been more fortunate than the Assyriologists. A small group of treatises has been deciphered which shows not only that a practical philosophy was extremely popular in the Nile Valley, but that its origin goes back to an almost incredibly remote period of history. The two leading documents are the Precepts of Ptah-hotep, professing to
have been written under the Fifth Dynasty, and published by Chabas under the title of "The Oldest Book in the World"; and the Maxims of the sage Aniy, addressed to his son Khonsu-hotep. Besides these we have the Book of Kaqemni (from the same papyrus as Ptah-hotep, and of very similar character); the Poem of Dauuf, a turgid and stilted composition in praise of the learned profession; a Demotic papyrus in the Louvre; and some other MSS. of less importance for our present purpose. Here, then, we have abundant material for a comparison with the Hebrew Hokmah; and if the resemblance should be such as to reveal literary dependence, there can obviously be no question as to which side has borrowed from the other.

The resemblance of this class of writings to the Jewish Hokmah has been noted ever since they were first discovered. One writer has ventured on the assertion that several of the Jewish maxims are translated word for word from those of Ptah-hotep (Reveillout). That, to be sure, is a gross exaggeration. There is no single Jewish proverb which can by any stretch of courtesy be described as a literal transcript of any known Egyptian original. The truth is expressed by the more guarded language of Renouf: that "these books are very similar in character to the book of Proverbs in our Bible. They inculcate the study of wisdom, the duty to parents and superiors, respect for property, the advantages of charitableness, peaceableness and content, of liberality, chastity and sobriety, of truthfulness and justice; and they show the wickedness and folly of disobedience, strife, arrogance and pride, of slothfulness, intemperance, unchastity and other vices." The general and formal similarity of the two bodies of literature is indeed very striking: I will just enumerate some of the outstanding features. (1) Three at least of the Egyptian treatises are thrown into the form of an address from a father to his son. It is very possible that this is one of the literary artifices of which at all times the Egyptian writers were prodigal, the father being really the teacher.
and the son the pupil; but that does not in the least detract from the significance of the usage. It is precisely the form of address constantly recurring in the Wisdom of Ben-Sira, and employed in two sections of the book of Proverbs, where, beyond reasonable doubt, the name "father" designates the master, and "son" the disciple. (2) As in the Proverbs, the instruction consists of detached maxims, thrown loosely together, without much regard to consecutiveness of subject. As to the form of the sentences, it is difficult to judge from translations; but sometimes at least one detects the familiar rhythm of the parallel distich, which is the unit of gnomic poetry in Hebrew. A verse like the following: "The magnanimous man is the object of God's regard: but he who listens to his belly is scorned by his wife," is just a typical Hebrew Mashal. (3) A more important fact is that the precepts are addressed to a select and privileged class, who considered themselves superior to the mass of the population: viz. the youths of the literary caste whose education opened the avenue to honourable office in the service of the state. There is nothing exactly corresponding to this in the Hebrew Wisdom; though even there the instruction of the Sages seems directed mainly to young men of the leisured and well-to-do classes. It is not improbable that some of these men were candidates for employment under the foreign government (see Sir. xxxix.4); and the conditions may well have been such as to account for the borrowing of certain rules of conduct by Jewish teachers from Egyptian models. There are, at any rate, a good many injunctions which presuppose that the pupils might have the entrée to the best society at home and at the court. (4) Another point that requires to be emphasized is the strongly marked utilitarian character of the ethical system in both cases. It has often been urged in disparagement of the morality of the Hebrew Wisdom that it incites men to the pursuit of virtue for the sake of the earthly rewards which follow it. The criticism is unjust. The Wise Men of Israel did not hold that the morality of
a course of action consisted in its tendency to produce happiness; but only that earthly happiness is the outward sign that the life which leads to it is approved by God in his providential government, and is thereby shown to be truly moral. It may be prejudice, but one can hardly resist the impression that the utilitarianism of the Egyptian ethic is much deeper-seated than that of the Hebrew Wisdom. That is to say, the Egyptian sages appear really to recommend virtuous conduct for the sake of its advantages. However that may be, the utilitarian point of view is forcibly presented in both literatures: in the Jewish writings there is a whole department of conventional etiquette and savoir vivre, in which no ethical principle is involved, and which must in any case have been based on foreign customs. (5) Lastly, the range of duties covered by the two sets of writings is largely identical. That appears from the words of Renouf quoted above, and still more clearly from a more exhaustive classification which I take from Amelineau: “Household economy, religion, study of ancient books, industry, drunkenness and gluttony, discretion, luxury, avoidance of faults, modesty, the end of life, slander, loquacity, generosity, education, propriety, respect for old age, occupations, courage, dissipations, vicissitudes of life, friendship and neighbourliness.”

It is extremely difficult to estimate the evidential worth of general resemblances like these. Similar social conditions tend to produce similar ethical codes, and similar institutions for propagating them; and it might be held that the parallelism is not greater than was to be expected from that consideration, without the hypothesis of direct contact and dependence. Accordingly, a good deal depends on the occurrence of particular coincidences, which are not likely to have happened apart from real and direct influence of the Egyptian teaching on the Jewish. Such coincidences undoubtedly exist: whether they are sufficiently numerous to convert the improbability into an
impossibility, I do not venture to say. I can only cite a few of those I have noted: naturally they are the most striking I have been able to find; but their number could easily be multiplied.

(1) There is an interesting passage in chapters xxxviii and xxxix of Ben-Sira—too long to quote—in which the advantages of the scribe’s calling are set forth in contrast with several manual occupations: the husbandman, the builder, the seal-engraver, the smith, the potter. Now the poem of Dauuf is constructed on the very same lines: it is a praise of the learned profession as contrasted with a number of handicrafts, sixteen in number, including all those of Ben-Sira, except the potter. Contempt for manual labour, however, was a characteristically Egyptian sentiment which finds no countenance from Ben-Sira: no Hebrew writer would have agreed with Ptah-hotep that “manual labour is little elevated; the inaction (of the hands) is honourable.”—In the same poem of Dauuf, the son is exhorted to “set his heart after knowledge, and to love her as a mother, for there is nothing that excels knowledge”—words recalling the terms in which the search for wisdom is inculcated in Prov. i-ix.

(2) The descriptions of the “strange woman” in Prov. ii. 16-19; v. 3-23; vii. 5-27; ix. 13-18 (?), find a close parallel in the maxims of Aniy (viii). It is thus translated by Erman: “Guard thee against the woman from without, who is not known in her city. Look not upon her..., know her not carnally. A deep water whose eddies one knows not is a woman who is far from her husband. ‘I am gay,’ she will say to thee day by day. If she has no witnesses, she will stand and lay her snares.” The question has been discussed whether the ’ishshah zārāh in Proverbs means merely the wife of another man, or a foreign courtesan, like the Greek Hetairai. To judge from the Egyptian maxim, she may have combined both characters: she is at once a stranger in the city where she dwells, and a wife far from her husband.
(3) "When thou sittest at table with a magnate, consider well what is before thee. Thou puttest a knife to thy throat if thou be a gluttonous person. Do not hanker after his delicacies; they are a deceitful enjoyment." So we read in Prov. xxiii. 1-3. In Ptah-hotep: "If thou art among the persons seated at meat in the house of a greater man than thyself, take that which he gives thee bowing to the ground. Regard that which is placed before thee but point not at it; regard it not frequently: he is a blameworthy person who departs from this rule." The interest of this striking parallel is that it shows that in both countries a code of table-etiquette formed part of the instruction of the Wise Men. There are many similar passages in the book of Ben-Sira: a curious specimen will be found in chap. xxxiv. 12 ff., where the author enters into details that throw a strange light on the feasting customs of the time. Wisdom of this nature is little likely to have been the native product of Jewish society or of Jewish religion.

(4) Talebearing, so often denounced in the Proverbs and Ben-Sira, is discountenanced in these terms: "Do not repeat any extravagance of language; do not listen to it; it is a thing that has escaped from a hasty mouth. If it is repeated, look, without hearing it, towards the earth; say nothing in regard to it" (P.-H.xxiii). And again: "What thine eye sees in thy house keep silence about; and do not tell it abroad to another, lest it become an offence worthy of death when it is heard" (Aniy, vii).

(5) Severity in family discipline is insisted on in the Proverbs, and still more forcibly in Ben-Sira. In the Egyptian Wisdom we have such rules as the following: "Bring up a son who shall be pleasing to God. If he conforms, &c. . . . But if he conducts himself ill and transgresses thy wish . . . strike him on the mouth in return" (P.-H. xii). "Discipline in the house is life: use reprimand and thou shalt find thyself better for it (?)" (Aniy, xx).
Readers of the Proverbs have possibly been surprised at the prominence given to the "faithful messenger" (e.g. x. 26; xiii. 17, &c.). It is not apparent why the ordinary Jewish burgher came to have so many important messages to transmit, or how he was so dependent on the accuracy of his subordinate. If we could suppose that the origin of these rules was the code of the Egyptian civil service, the matter might be elucidated by such a precept as this: "If thou art one of those who bring the messages of one great man to another, conform thyself exactly to that wherewith he has charged thee; perform for him the commission as he has enjoined thee. Beware of altering;" &c.

The Egyptian Wisdom, like the Hebrew, is profoundly impressed with the dangers of the tongue, the value of wise speech, and on the whole the advantage of silence. "The ruin of a man is in his tongue." "Guard thee against sinning in words; let them not be wounding: a reprehensible thing in the bosom of a man is the malicious loquacity which never rests." — The "soft answer that turneth away wrath" appears in Aniy (lviii): "Speak gently to him who speaks with vehemence; that is the remedy for pacifying his heart."

These examples must suffice. They might, as I have said, be multiplied, if one were to take note of every coincidence of thought and expression; but if those quoted do not make the hypothesis of a common origin plausible, I do not think that any number of less decisive parallels would produce conviction. The only other question is, whether or at what time such communication as is presupposed between Egypt and Palestine was probable. Now, if there was any period more than another when the influence of the one country on the other was natural, and almost inevitable, it was the century or more during which the Jews were ruled directly from Alexandria under the Ptolemies. The son of Sira must have spent the best part of his life under that dominion; and we may be quite sure
that Egypt was one of the foreign countries in which he claims to have travelled. Nothing, therefore, could be less surprising than that his mind should have been impressed by the hoary wisdom of the Egyptian sages, or that he should have been a diligent student of their writings. The book of Proverbs is no doubt older, though how much older it is impossible to say. It is quite possible, indeed probable, that the final redaction of the book preceded the date of Ben-Sira by much less than a century, so that any traces of Egyptian influence which appear there might belong to an earlier phase of the same intercourse which had become more frequent in the days of Ben-Sira. In these circumstances, the nebulous hypothesis of Gunkel,—that the origin of the proverbial literature is to be sought in Egypt, and that the Egyptian wisdom was transmitted to Israel through the medium of Arabia and Edom,—seems to me altogether unnecessary.

I have said nothing as yet about the book of Ecclesiastes, which is the book of the Old Testament with regard to which the question of external influences has been most keenly debated. The discussions, however, have turned almost exclusively on the possible acquaintance of the writer with the systematic teaching of the Greek philosophical schools. On that large and difficult inquiry I do not propose to enter here; but I may be permitted in closing this lecture to advert to some interesting parallels between Ecclesiastes and the class of Egyptian writings from which I have been quoting.

I begin with a pair of casual coincidences. (1) Take first the well-known verses which contain the preacher’s curiously moderate recommendation of religious duties, v. 1 ff. (E. V.). “Keep thy foot when thou goest into the house of God, for it is better to draw near to hear than to offer a fool’s sacrifice... Be not rash with thy mouth, and do not utter a word precipitately before God; for God is in heaven... When thou vowest a vow unto God, defer not to pay it... Better it is that thou shouldest
not vow, than that thou shouldest vow and not pay..."
To this there are two analogies in the maxims of Aniy:
"The sanctuary of God abhors (noisy manifestations?).
Pray humbly with a loving heart, all the words of which
are uttered in secret. He will protect thee in thy affairs,
he will listen to thy words, he will accept thine offerings."
And again: "In making thine oblation to God, beware
of what he abhors... Exaggerate not the liturgical pre-
scriptions; it is forbidden to give more than what is
prescribed" (Renouf). (2) The sequel of the above passage
in Qoheleth is as follows: "Suffer not thy mouth to bring
thee into condemnation, and say not before the angel that
it was an inadvertence..." As usually explained, the
"angel" means the priest; and the case supposed is that
of a man pleading off from the fulfilment of a vow on the
ground that he had made it inconsiderately. Professor
Dillon finds that interpretation unsatisfactory; and thinks
the underlying allusion must be to some notion of an angel
of death who appears suddenly to a man, and whom the
man tries to evade by some pretext. I confess I do not see
very well how that exegesis can be carried through; but
if it could, an illuminating parallel would be found again
in the maxims of Aniy: "When thy messenger comes to
take thee, let him find one who is ready. Surely thou wilt
not have time to speak, for when he comes he will present
himself suddenly. Do not say, I am a young man...&c."
The point is that the messenger, who is evidently the angel
of death, is spoken of quite generally as "thy messenger,"
showing that the idea was firmly rooted in popular
thought.

Of far greater weight than these isolated coincidences
is a profound similarity between the temper of the book
and one of the persistent strains of Egyptian meditation.
The combination of a cheerful abandonment to the pleasures
and occupations of life with a gloomy resignation to the
fate of death is a characteristic note of the teaching of
Qoheleth, which is all the more remarkable because the
very same sentiments seemed to the later author of the Wisdom of Solomon the essence of impiety. “Go thy way, eat thy bread with joy, and drink thy wine with a merry heart, for God hath already accepted thy works. Let thy garments be always white; and let not thine head lack ointment. Live joyfully with the wife whom thou lovest all the days of the life of thy vanity which he hath given thee under the sun; for that is thy portion in life and in thy labour wherein thou labourest under the sun. Whatevery thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might; for there is no work nor device nor knowledge nor wisdom in the grave whither thou goest.” “Truly the light is sweet, and a pleasant thing it is for the eyes to behold the sun. Yea, if a man live many years, let him rejoice in them all; but let him remember the days of darkness, for they shall be many.” “Rejoice, O young man, in thy youth . . ., &c.” Now, this is precisely the mood which so frequently finds expression in the tombs of Egypt, and whose influence on the life of the ancient people has struck all observers from Herodotus downwards. Here are a few illustrations: “Possess what thou hast in the joy of thy heart. What thou hast not, obtain it by work. It is profitable for a man to eat his own bread; God grants this to whosoever honours him” (Leiden papyrus). “Fulfil thy desire while thou livest. Put oils upon thy head, clothe thyself with fine linen . . . yield to thy desire—fulfil thy desire with thy good things whilst thou art upon earth, according to the dictation of thy heart. The day will come to thee when one hears not the voice—when the one who is at rest hears not their voices. Feast in tranquillity; seeing that there is no one who carries his goods with him.” “Make a happy day, O divine one (?). Let odours and ointments stand before thy nostrils, garlands and lotus-flowers for thy shoulders . . . Let song and music be before thy face, and leave behind thee all evil cares. Mind thee only of joys, till cometh the day of pilgrimage when we draw near the land that loveth silence.” “O brother, cease
not to drink, to eat, to be drunken, to practise love, to
make a happy day, to follow thy heart day and night;
let no grief affect thy heart: what are the years, how
numerous soever they be which one passes on the earth.''
The feeling is admirably rendered in the following lines
of a modern poet:—

O swart musician, time and fame are fleet,
Brief all delight, and youth's feet fain to fly!
Pipe on in peace! To-morrow must we die?
What matter if our life to-day be sweet!
Soon, soon, the silver paper-reeds that sigh
Along the Sacred River will repeat
The echo of the dark-stoled bearers' feet,
Who carry you, with wailing, where must lie
Your swathed and mummied body, by and by,
In perfumed darkness with the grains of wheat.

The preacher did not learn that strain from the songs
of Zion; may he not have borrowed it from Egyptian
sources?

John Skinner.
IV.

Fragment T-S., paper, eight leaves, size 9 x 14 cm., is written in the cursive hand of the thirteenth or the twelfth century. The letters often run into each other, which makes the deciphering of the MS. difficult. Moreover, the copyist was negligent, and although there is evidence from many cases that he was well able to mark clearly the differences between 1, 2 and 3, 1 and 7, yet he often so writes these similar pairs of consonants that they cannot be distinguished from each other.

The Fragment represents the remains of a collection of Geonic Responsa, and contains forty-two Responsa, which, with the exception of the first two, bear the name of their writers, Žemaḥ, Sherira, and Hai.

Below, I propose to give a brief résumé of each Responsum, together with parallels to them found elsewhere in Geonic literature.

1. The first Responsum, whose beginning is missing, deals with the use of raisin wine for Kiddush, and for

---

1 The writer begs to acknowledge his indebtedness to Professor S. Schechter, who was good enough to put at his disposal the Genizah text presented in this article.

2 Undoubtedly Žemaḥ ben Paltoi.
the Seder. Isaac ben Gajat, in his שֶׁנִּי כְּמָה, p. 2, quotes the decisions of the Geonim Pałtoi and Zemah on this question, and the same decision of Zemah is cited in the Geonic collection דִּשְׁנָה, 35. But in both these collections the wording shows variations from the form given in our Fragment. Notice particularly the addition occurring in our Fragment, according to which raisin wine made by Gentiles is prohibited.

2. According to this Responsum, one who eats bread baked by a Gentile is not subject to the punishment of flagellation. The same opinion is attributed, in the הָלֹהַת מַשָּׁת, 26, to the Gaon Rab Amram. But while in the latter the הָלֹהַת מַשָּׁת, the final, authoritative decision, is stated simply, without argument or explanation, our Fragment goes into a discussion of the points leading up to the decision.

3. The Responsa from the third to the eighth, inclusive, deal with מְרֹזְתָּה, and are ascribed to Sherira. The first of this group, on מְרֹזְתָּה, is found in מְרֹזְתָּה, 43, and מְרֹזְתָּה, 159, only in these works the Responsum is attributed, not to Sherira, but to Hilai Gaon and Isaac ben Jacob Gaon respectively. It is noteworthy that Hai Gaon, who, in מְרֹזְתָּה, II, 41, also has a Responsum on מְרֹזְתָּה, makes no reference to his father.

4. On מְרֹזְתָּה. This Responsum is found also in מְרֹזְתָּה, 16, and there it is ascribed to Gaon Natronai. The quotation at the end of the Responsum, מְרֹזְתָּה, is found neither in the Talmud nor in the Geonic literature known to us. Most probably, however, it was taken from some Geonic הלֹהַת מַשָּׁת.

5. In this Responsum Sherira renders the very important decision that the מְרֹזְתָּה, if on the right lung, is to be counted as one of the five מְרֹזְתָּה. Rashi on Hullin, 47 a, argues against this decision, which he states to have found in the הלֹהַת מַשָּׁת. It is doubtful whether Rashi had our Responsum before him, for there are several Geonic decisions to the same effect (for which see, for instance,
6. This is the only discussion of נַהֲנָא דְּעוֹתִיוֹת in Rabbinic literature, and it is therefore curious that none of the old codifiers has any reference to this decision.

7 and 8. In סנ, 32, the ספמ of these Responsa is given on the authority of Hilai Gaon, but in a very corrupt form, and it is to be corrected according to the text of our Fragment.

9. The group 9 to 29 is ascribed to Zemah Gaon, but it is extremely doubtful whether all these Responsa issue from the same authority. The first of the group, No. 9, codifies the Talmudic discussion (Hullin, 56a) on נַהֲנָא דְּעוֹתִיוֹת. 10–11 treat of לֹא דְּﬠֵר וּנְהֲנָא דְּﬠֵר and שֵׁם וַחֲמוֹת יִדְיוֹ, and in both cases the Gaon decides against Rab (Hullin, 57) in opposition to the general rule, הַלֵּבָב נָבִיב נְאִמָרָיו.

12. This Responsum is found in סנ, 35, where it is also ascribed to Zemah Gaon.

12a. This Responsum is a reply to the question about the slaughtering of a bird whose windpipe has no cartilages (סַמְבָּע). The Gaon maintains that the case is impossible. It may happen that the cartilages are small and thin, but they cannot be lacking entirely.

13. The thirteenth Responsum deals with סִירְכָּא דְּﬠֵרָא. The Gaon decides that any סִירְכָּא makes the animal לֹא דְּﬠֵר.

14. This is identical with Responsum 14 in the סנ, where it is ascribed to Natronai.

15 is the well-known Responsum on הַלֵּבָב נָבִיב, הַלֵּבָב, וּרְבָּא לְאָלַח, and Isaac ben Moses' יָרְא לוֹ, 311, given in our Fragment in a much correcter form than in the other two sources. The statement at the end of our Responsum, which does not occur in the parallel sources, is of historical importance: מַר רַב מְסֻמָּא נְהֹדֵיהוּ הַיְּהוָא מְסֻמָּא לְהַיְּהוָא כַּהֲנָא כַּהֲנָא לְהַיְּהוָא אַלָּא רֶישׁ כַּהֲנָא רֶישׁ לְהַיְּהוָא וּלְרַב מְסֻמָּא אַלָּא רֶישׁ כַּהֲנָא רֶישׁ לְרַב מְסֻמָּא אַלָּא רֶישׁ כַּהֲנָא רֶישׁ לְרַב מְסֻמָּא אַלָּא רֶישׁ כַּהֲנָא רֶישׁ לְרַב מְסֻמָּא אַלָּא רֶישׁ כַּהֲנָא רֶישׁ לְרַב מְסֻמָּא אַלָּא רֶישׁ כַּהֲנָא רֶישׁ לְרַב מְסֻמָּא אַלָּא רֶישׁ כַּהֲנָא רֶישׁ לְרַב מְסֻמָּא אַלָּא רֶישׁ כַּהֲנָא רֶישׁ לְרַב מְסֻמָּא אַלָּא רֶישׁ כַּהֲנָא רֶישׁ לְרַב מְסֻמָּא אַלָּא רֶישׁ כַּהֲנָא רֶישׁ לְרַב מְסֻמָּא אַלָּא רֶישׁ כַּהֲנָא רֶישׁ לְרַב מְסֻמָּא אַלָּא רֶישׁ כַּהֲנָא רֶישׁ לְרַב מְסֻמָּא אַלָּא רֶישׁ כַּהֲנָא רֶישׁ לְרַב מְסֻמָּא אַלָּא רֶישׁ כַּהֲנָa.

From this we see

\[1 \text{must be read twice, to complete the clause before it and the clause after it.}\]
that Rab Semonai was a Resh Kalla, and also, that even in cases in which he consulted the Resh Kalla the Gaon did not refer to him.

16. This Responsum, on שמעון ורבים, seems to be directed against the divergent opinions of other authorities. See ו, I, 112 a, and 114 a towards the end.

17. The Gaon decides against Rab in the case of ב' יבשא לש עזרות (Hullin, 8 b). The justification of his decision lies in the fact that the opponent of Rab, Rabbah bar Hanna, or, as the Gaon reads, Rabbah bar Huna, is one of the later authorities, and the rule applies only to a difference of opinion between later Amoraim. This statement of the Gaon is of great importance, as, according to the older authorities, the rule cited applies only to a difference of opinion between later Amoraim.

18. This Responsum deals with the same subject as the fifth of our Fragment, the latter by Sherira. There is a difference of opinion between the two Geonim. According to the fifth Responsum the יתנתה counts with the right lung only, according to the eighteenth it may be counted with either the right or the left lung. There can be no doubt that Responsum 183, in Harkavy, Responsen der Geonim, should be corrected in accordance with the text of our Fragment. They must be identical with each other, both having the same author, Zemah Gaon, but the text as printed by Harkavy obviously contains a contradiction.

19. In the nineteenth Responsum the Gaon decides that an animal is not made מרשמה by eating or drinking prohibited food immediately before its slaughter. The assumption is that the tissues have absorbed and assimilated the food-material, even though so short a time passes between the taking of the food and the death of the animal.

20. This Responsum contains a curious explanation of the prohibition תיבשא התל'. Proceeding from the Talmudic

1 See Tosafot to Kiddushin, 45 b, below.
statement (Niddah, 9 a) that milk is only blood modified, the
Gaon maintains that in eating meat and milk together
we are violating the prohibition against the use of blood.
Obviously, the Gaon believes that milk brought into
contact with blood regains its status as blood. Unless
we assume this reasoning on his part, we would expect
milk to be prohibited in all circumstances.

21. Here the Gaon gives a somewhat rationalistic
explanation of the nun is n" כPackageName. He formulates the principle
that any disease which results fatally in man disqualifies
an animal affected by it as food.

22. The Gaon decides, on the authority of the Talmudic
case (Ketub. 94), that the heirs of a man who
has left a single dwelling house are not obliged to let his
widow occupy it. If her sustenance is provided for, she
can be made to return to her father's house. This decision
does not apply to a case in which the estate owns several
houses.

23. This deals with the case of a widow who prefers
to be maintained by her late husband's estate to having
her dowry paid out to her. The practice varied in
different parts of Palestine as well as in different parts
of Babylon. In the latter country, with the exception
of Nehardea and its district, the widow was compelled,
in the time of the Amoraim, to accept her dowry (Ketubot,
54 a). For his own time the Gaon decides that in Babylonia
the old practice with its exception should be continued,
but beyond Babylonia the widow's preference was to be
considered. However, the Gaon's decision was not uni-
versally accepted, as may be seen from Harkavy, Responsen
der Geonim, 389. Comp. also Alfassi on Ketubot, l.c.

24–25. The next two Responsa also deal with dowry
rights, in connexion with Ketubot, 54.

26. Here we have a lengthy discussion of the dimensions
of the two tablets of the Law. The subject-matter and
the temper of the discussion make it highly improbable
that this Responsum is genuinely Geonic. Furthermore,
is quoted, which would bring the Responsum down to the end of the eleventh century. It is possible that is a copyist's error for , who is mentioned by the Geonim Natronai and (see Müller, *Mafteah*, pp. 121, 149). It should be noted, too, that the statement here attributed to Nathan does not occur in the Aruch, which throws further doubt on the reading .

27–30. These Responsa deal with mourning ceremonies, and, with the exception of No. 28, are found in the Geonic collection *III, 4, 8; III, 4, 4; III, 4, 5*, where they are attributed to the Geonim Paltoi, Natronai, and Hilai respectively.

31–32. Both these Responsa bear the superscription , and all the Responsa that follow, up to the last, lack a superscription. It remains doubtful, therefore, whether all the following Responsa are attributed to Hai Gaon, or only the two actually bearing his name. The first of these two Responsa is found also in *III, 4, 6*, and is there attributed to Paltoi Gaon. The other, which is written in Arabic, will appear in the next article of this series.

33–35. This group of three contains explanations of certain difficult words in Gittin, the most noteworthy among the explanations being of the word . According to the Gaon the Amoraim possessed a sort of digest of the most important parts of the Halachah, and this they called .

36–40. This group of four Responsa deals with certain laws of clean and unclean (*). In Responsum 36, the Gaon calls attention to the fact that vessels belonging to Gentiles are not unclean by reason of their owners, but only because they may have been used for prohibited food. He supports his opinion by reference to the Tal-

---

1 This Nathan was from Africa, and he was no relative of Sherira, whose uncle's name was Nathan ben Judah. Müller, *Mafteah*, 157, attributes what really belongs to the African to the Babylonian Nathan.
mudic statement that the corpse of a Gentile cannot defile (המחותה אינן ממסמלות בעל). On the otherhand, the Gaon is very strict regarding מברחת בעל קריו, which, he insists, must precede even the benediction over food as well as any other prayer. It is worth calling attention to the Geonic opinion concerning אוכל חולין במלאה. After the destruction of the Temple it ceased to be a possible practice. At first a few Perushim, who led a completely isolated life, succeeded in maintaining the practice, but later it became absolutely unattainable.

41. The last Responsum is a very lengthy though clear explanation of the Talmudic topic ריעה in Shabbat, 85 a–85 b. Rabbenu Hananel in his commentary on this passage refers to Saadiah's explanation of it, but the few quotations adduced by Hananel do not justify us in ascribing the Responsum to Saadiah. Hai Gaon also has a long Responsum on this topic (see Harkavy, Responsen der Geonim, 425), his explanation differing from that given in the present Responsum, which tends to strengthen doubt as to Hai's authorship of the latter Responsa of our Fragment. At the end of Hai's Responsum as printed by Harkavy, there is a reference to a strenuous but vain attempt to explain the same topic. Possibly Hai had in mind the Responsum in our Fragment.
[Excerpt from a text in Hebrew and English, discussing various topics including Hebrew script and translations.]
The editionsof the Talmud read in >oinn, MS. Munich TO Win withoutai.

* The editions of the Talmud read in >oinn, MS. Munich TO Win withoutai.

1 Read.

2 The editions of the Talmud read in >oinn, MS. Munich TO Win withoutai.

3 Hullin, 47 a.

4 ?; י"ע, 32, reads ואר.

5 Arabic: end.

6 arabic: end.
(Leaf a, recto.)

שושבת האיל1 חק בר צום ראה וישיבת

1 Read מָלְכָּה.
2 Ḥullin, 56 b.
(Leaf a, verso.)

שי אל חפה עליה שלדزع דג אומן וסקפין אלא אא לא והם אתה אל חוף
כאמפיא, אלא אל חוף אפייה והיילוד ענオリיה מЈגנור עהליה ור, חותם
אם לא לו, כי היא כאשר עמודים מתGroמם ויהי בר גותי מצרפין
שלראייב ביד שטח בני תחרננול, ויהי חותמ דјם פכל החותמ נא כיו
5 ראぬ אתו מתו, עוד לא בק תחרננול ור ויהי חלב וד אק יMrsn שמע תיטה
dכמ험 לה סמאל.sections הקירם הרתחי חיבר ולרגו wład הנדיב הנל תם
heten היראLiv תבר 포ית בדיכון מתGroמם תם החר工业大学 הו
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יתן היראLiv תבר 포ית בדיכון מתGroמם תם החר工业大学 הו
dצ בזא לה סָיִּיט החר工业大学 מיתGroמם שחלני הד שمع
שקת אאמ נאמות בקך ובכירי עד מכונס לילנה וא לא
שתוחפ גבירא יב יושר ואא שאה ינודד קל顯示ך
שתוחפ הוריה וחורית ו örgüt הוריר יכאי זיירי
שקת כופרה ואהובב שע זה שזורומ ימי החסד רדא
5 שקית בכרמה לילה אם בו התחפש און ולא בהרי
someone שוחלת רוחות או הצל העשיש בכобще עיון
ומאה עינ כרמשי לילהו 1 שאהים שטניד חום השערה
ה mắtיק אתנו בנות יפה פרמה או פאר, לא יסורה אלא
כני ניקבה הדיאה ואהאמ הברך ולא נ_codecח采矿 קובר
10 הברך הדיאה שיניבב למ' לדוגר קור משלו שמע תמעה
כבר איני כים 2למער הוי תומח ואים אפורט חכל שלב
馁פת שיהם אנוiek מכסמו הווה ניימ יאנתית
ופסמי מברחה ריא novità dolore, הוא כל כיור קם להרי
והא לא אופר, כי יימר, ינ"ה הצל העשיש בכобще עיון
מישון.
15 הזו היא כרמשי לילהו 1 לוספי מירה לילנה בת לח
upplierות: הנהו כוכב שמי ישובת דררה לילנה בת לח
הPersist: אשר מקצת אנדרוס ו youre שבודקן את אחד ותי
שישה מכשרת פרה במרחתה ובידיו גודל א WINAPI
منهج אדם בין שטניד סופרה לימדה לילה ואים את שום
20 ונהון על הברחה על ראשהון וואלי אנדרוס וסודו לבנ יקר
נאגון על עלי כל אחד השון הזה אני עוד מנהמכ מה הוא שאמר
מוהו היה מוחר און ויודע ב כל ויינו שמוסרים שמי
שבירה.
25 ברו טיקב מירה לילה והברחתו שלאות ישובת הלקח
לאחר שהלה לא אנ꽂י מסנה ומעש עשת שמע חצאי, שמרור יעקב
置换 לילדה והנה את המסר אריכו מציר רבר
26 ברו עוזי זאטו והנה את המסר הולמידים עשת כארו
ברוא שסמעו ראשת מתיי לברד מירה לילנה אמור ליה און
לוא 1 Hullin, 49 b. 2 Ibid., 48 a.
(Leaf 3, verso.)

סימן מסים סכורים פסח ביהו גון מתיי והאמרים מעמשי גון
בכד אנdifficulty דעון ששם המשמעו ויתר ירצה חול שחלב
סמחא שודבד לא בנותו הדאא אויגתה ודרותיו הרב אינו ירצה
בזא אחר חובה בשלא לא חותם והשלום אין להם איה בקמה
למסק׳ הפר vb אולם להצג מהמרפה מהזכר ובכין מרי קירכום
שנידר חישה מרד צורק בשם כ 합니다 קא אש זא הלך על דור
בעידי אם ידוע מרחיבים הרה חניקה חוטא מהצלב התיבות
אותו והדיעワイン מה שקדננו שלמה בהשדרה_renderer נמצת
10 שימון הסכלן מר רבד יועק גဏ תשביש מהכח וה든지 אברת
בצרה של מחרי לא חכמ מהשיך אופもり היה מהרי החזון בון מי
שברד סכורים לכלב אולא עבדר לע דער שטי שיבורת אום זה
שלמה עסיך והדיעワイン מה שיבו לדורמה הצלחה דרך אברת
מר יעקוב עדבר כיון להם פסידא בשאלות שלמה באמה שסנה
15 לומר רבד אוכלמי הלמר רבד צורק גဏמז אלא אחיה זה
סקרי הזהcle ממחביה אל מחבריה להמר רבד יעקב וייחזק עלף
Rails בין הזה אתה ישבוט שסנה מהחומר לא בע לאל שקולב
הדורא מילהת האסורהOrNull רבד חזרה כי יתבון פאני מר רבד
הניגון זמר רבד סמוכני זה הכבר פירש לגלמר רבד חיגיא
20 סרטא לולא ולא הכהו את הימה פגואה זמר יבר סמוכה לוהי הזה הוהי
השיבו אלו היו חזרנה כל ענן לא ירש אלא ריש אלה אלה הוהי הוהי
האמונים המהומים מכל הלך זיר רבד יעקב דרש מליוב רבד
יויחודא ארורה ל텀 לאראור מבר רודיהaira אלת מלחא
סמטברת לה אלו שונים בכנה דבר רטור זיוהי, בר רבד
25 אזהר יבר יבר, רכוב, א磁场ננה להזון הצלחה בשקנן תריל
והא אחרי יש בירכה בכלל בך בום הבושלות
ם מונה שתי שיסבה פנים מודים בצאתה לכל:

1 Kethubot, 21 a.
2 See my remark in the introductory notes.
3 Read הרא.
4 Read מלחן.
5 Pesahim, 112 a.
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הנה אֶלֶמְדוּת, יָפְתַּחְתָּנוּ בַּכּוֹכָּה עֶרְקֵבָּנוּ בַּכּוֹכָּה, וַהֲלוֹא בָּנָּא דָּגֵז, וַהֲלוֹא בָּנָּא דָּגֵז, וַהֲלוֹא בָּנָּא דָּגֵז, וַהֲלוֹא בָּנָּא דָּגֵז.

This reading is not found either in the editions or MS. of the Talmud. Compare also Ra., S. H. Y., ad loc. 3 Hul. 47 a.

1 Hullin, 8 b.

9 So reads MS. H. in Rabbinovicz, Dikduk Soferim, the editions have 9b, and was a contemporary of Rab.

This reading is not found either in the editions or MS. of the Talmud. Compare also Ra., S. H. Y., ad loc. 4 Hullin, 47 a.

Sic! 6 Hullin, 71 a; but read and not אִנָּא. 7 Mishnah, Nasir, VI, 1.

8 Parah, IX, 5, comp. also Pesahim, 18 a. 9 Erubin, 96 b.

10 R. H. Sh. 10b. 11 Read אִנָּא twice to complete the clause before it and the clause after it.

11 Erubin, 46 b.

12 Read אִנָּא.
לשם אדיר לך קיבועי עילギ הבשר בהלב שטלחה ומימה והו דוד העממים.
הכל מכסה נמה בהלב שלל אמיסים 1 שאותכם מבוכרת ונהגא ראות
דוא אלואא אתו הד נגשה חלב חרובור 2 על ענו, מי יינת מсмер עמו וגו: 3
מכן וישבלת נמכי ליל۞ يصلבלש 버ב בהלב באלים ליאו יוכיחי,
ולא תבל תמס על הבשר וגו:
спектן עפרה מ المشكل שיש שומת רפר
ומכסים שמיאイト אשר ממם בבלו ומﾜיה מקהלא איהו
спектן עפרה מтехнолог נבודת החמה וגו:éri ממר הנdataProvider שלד
ובכללו כלveyor בדוי פרעה:לאם שפומתו עפרה מ gezocht לollipop
سهل עיר שיא אלה נובה שלארהaloreתא מזומן אחר עלבו בבלמה
גלימי כי שפומתו שלארה נוקב והו דוע וכין שחתיב דמלפה
אום בטיק קרום שלארה ניידת ולשם שפתיא ניצל ברש
שלארה אינון מת כינו שקורות מת ניק קמי והו מת ונבקי מאפר
ולבבלמה קרום שלארה נוקב הליב הליב לכל כינו שלארה נוקב מרי
והו метро כין הנורשה וה naprawה שמקובה ניידת ולשם שפתיא
וסשתו למחל ספריהם בלשוה שלארה יאלו כל כין שקט
אושק על השיא שלארה שלארה מרי מיהו אם ומבל שפומתו עפרה מerged
שלאר感应י בכין ירשאר בבלו ומורה חבלו ומורה לא חבלו וגו:
ושארא או שיא תיבת חבלו לכל שפומתו עפרה 6, כי משיא לציון אום.
יושק בתיות לא בקטעה 7, חיא עראה לה, נח יתי ואלהו לשביא
אלא או רימהו, שכר אצורים éxito עלינו, אם שפס יאלו בת אואריך בים
יתבל הלימוד לרחש לאשת אליי היא אשייה עשו יר, ובית זה בלימה.
מק
אוחר ספרו ד#ac את ר oma שיאו ליאו אשת קל שאנה ביי
ומנסיאר ק ומותו אי שם שפומתו שלארה קבלה
כמר בר בר גוסי; השואו: כי והמא לירסל ח PVOIDית שוחתא אולמות
כיתבל לכל מים היה שמיא חに戻ות חנהתה אימ ישטיש נקווית ללה
כ_locale המוסר קוחו אוזיא הר פי:לא לה כלאשיה והדותה ויאת
היל לא מסוי נליא: בבל אל פימרת ויאלה, היל וח שלאל אנשי בזרעה.

1 Read מחרש. 2? 3 Nidah, 9a. 4 Hullin, Mishnah, II, 1.
5 Ketubot, 54a. 6 Read אדו. 7 Ketubot, ibid.

(xxii)

(xxiii)
(Leaf 5, recto.)

At Avron Armor, in his book Shelonu, he refers to the Jewish community as a whole, not only to the community of Merkaz.

According to Armor, the community's history is intertwined with its religious and cultural heritage, and the community's continuity is essential for its survival.

The community's role as a center of learning and culture is highlighted, with a focus on the community's contributions to Jewish thought and literature.

The community's history is filled with challenges and triumphs, and Armor emphasizes the resilience and strength of the community in the face of adversity.

The text concludes with a note of optimism, highlighting the community's potential for growth and development in the future.

---

Footnotes:

1. Ketubot, Mishnah, XI, 1; 95 b.
2. Ibid., 54 a.
3. Ibid., 54 b-55 a.
4. Ibid., 90 a.
5. Ibid., 55 a.

The second מ"ק is dittoography from the preceding line.

* Read ר"מ ר"מ "on both sides."
(Leaf 6, recto.)

A table showing:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1 Erubin, 28a.
2 Mued Katan, 27a.
3 Ibid.
GENIZAH STUDIES

(Leaf 6, verso.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>xxxvii</td>
<td>Mishnah, Katan, III, 7; 24 b below.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxxviii</td>
<td>Ketubot, 8 b.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxxix</td>
<td>M. Kat., 24 a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxx</td>
<td>Ibid., 24 b.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxxi</td>
<td>Shabbat, 152 a below.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ишראל בנם ישראל הם מסמכו במכסה להם חה הימים מסמכו
לופך ארבעה כתות אלו ואלה כתות אלו ושאר שאר שאר
יתר מסמכי ולא מסמכי אולם מסמכי אולם מסמכי
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1. Gittin, 34a.
2. Ibid., 37a.
3. Sifre, Num. 158; Aboda Zara, 75b, but in both passages see Comm. and not דבורה.
4. Berahot, Mishnah, III, 2; 20b.
5. Read וויהי.
6. Hullin, 123b-123a.
ולענין בקיא התופון כי בלעבים כי לחומת משיחות כי שירוחי בו שוניו והם בכתיי
בזימה והצלאה aluno עד כי לכל הפוריות את כל מתקלחים ألד חכורת
בענייה שלם כי ית מוס נזלא מitorio אתORIA שתים איך אדומית קיים
ולא רומאיםectar כלום אדומית בבחור כי שיש תופון הקיסאום כי בש
על כל מבשלות מבית כי זה שכר עד כי אוכלין מען בחרון
אסור כי לא רבר בחזרות איוו ענ לכל עם אלא בקירות
אבל חוכל לא אלא איך לא המדינה לחלות בתמרות כי ימ תמדות
רבים כי אוכלין חולות בתמרות כי זינו㈎ רווחי יד מתוקים
סמל (1): (2) الجمع תמורותék不會 יין כי לו לאלא חוכל בתמרות
כרוא כי בו, גם יאכל כי יזוכרו את הפקות גלוב
ישעא, על פאודת חיותה, יוכשר הקדומים שלפרשת ממוס
דו מלומסני. له יישור מירוות היחנון כי ראשונים כי הנפש המוחודה
הנמצאת עדרי הורות ועורינו לעורותቅשמטים שמכחו וכומי
15 הנמצאים שבר אמרי המוסכמים צירי הנמצאי ולהרעתם מ ogs קייםично
רבעים חכבי שכח הצאר אלצומ זאבדיו בזיווה יש ימי
ויקו ביבור הורות וחוזר לעורות ניתוחה צאר אלצומ בראון
כי לכל ירקוי כי פי: כי חסırken הוגמו בחריו שחיות שחיות
20 הקיסאו על רחלין שאובר נל שוריה שלשה אמד המקורות זמן מאכתי
על צומרי רביעית.@example: כי שח ושני הוגמו בביא ולאחר
אף שכראכת החשיש ואיש שטרייה תשחי כי לא ליפ fiat
מסויה כי עד זן כי נורמי בצורותיקיבה: כי שח옼יא
ויהו כי השירה כי רצינו מקומינו גםך צhiro לי לים
25 כי שניהם ידו כל כי סתם לידיו כי זה_cipherו והיו זה ראש תורה כי
והיה כי בבל נמאי מכל שהמא עני לי ממכך 9 במס_texts
וחו ממקה על פי מסקן (1): (2) איום ינוי הגון והדברים רבעים שחיות שחיות
ותוחים ליאלה לא מפירם את דודו והרונים מקובבל בין

1 Yerushalmi Berahot, III, 6 e below. 8 Berahot, II, Mishnah, 22 b.
Bab Bithra, 60 b. 9 Read י. 6 Shabbat, 84 b.
7 תإسرائيل מברע. Read י. 8: An abbreviation?
הבתנהי את הערים בחשיבות העצמאית של onwards ש להיות無料 כל מה שמזוהי עםיה. אם כן, cafe מקבת של הת훼וגות, המותה מבלייה הפיהת. במחם
מקבת הפיהת,샹יيون ובר או מתנה תמיכה של הת훼וג והשם של התフリーיה.

פפיאנים שבר הזירה שכנים או תמיכה עם התフリーיה והשם של התフリーיה.

אילו זה טמנה שלותרניה,_cloud ידוהו של תם ביקור וחלמה ממקבת של התフリーיה כשחיה

鲛ן ידועו של מסתור ב "ס"ה של התフリーיה

ס"ה של התフリーיה, שבר הזירה שכנים או תמיכה עם התフリーיה והשם של התフリーיה.

פה הזירה שכנים או תמיכה עם התフリーיה והשם של התフリーיה.

וחייו שבר הזירה שכנים או תמיכה עם התフリーיה והשם של התフリーיה.

וורuzzer שהшибישות הביצן בתבנית הזירה או זים התフリーיה וול ס"ה של התフリーיה
tאילו זה טמנה שלותרניה, cloud ידוהו של תם ביקור וחלמה ממקבת של התフリーיה כשחיה

1 Read ועיין.
(Leaf 8, verso.)

לouis ginzberg.

1 Shabbat, 85 b ; קא' ואא' with 'ז and not נא with 'ז is the reading of the 'aruk, see s. v. 2 Shabbat, 150 a below. 3 Kiddushin, 39 a.
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OF TUDELA (continued).

HEbrew text.

The Hebrew text is presented in a complex manner, with various notes and corrections indicated by letters and symbols. The text is a transcription of a Hebrew manuscript, which includes biblical references and historical accounts. The text is written in a traditional Hebrew script, with some modern additions and corrections.

The text begins with a verse from the Hebrew Bible, followed by a narrative that describes the travels of Benjamin of Tudela. The narrative is interwoven with biblical references and historical accounts, providing a detailed account of the journey.

The text is accompanied by notes and corrections, which are indicated by letters and symbols. These notes provide additional context and elucidate the content of the text. The notes are written in a smaller font, and some are enclosed in parentheses to indicate footnotes or marginalia.

The text is a valuable resource for those interested in the history of Jewish travel and exploration during the medieval period. It offers insight into the cultural and religious practices of the period, as well as the political and social conditions of the time.

The text is written in a clear and concise manner, with a focus on accuracy and precision. The notes and corrections are carefully integrated into the text, providing a comprehensive and detailed account of the journey.

Overall, the text is a valuable resource for those interested in the history of Jewish travel and exploration during the medieval period. It offers insight into the cultural and religious practices of the period, as well as the political and social conditions of the time.
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1 R inverts: 'וכו' instead of 'וכו'; A inserts 'וכו' instead of 'וכו'.
2 R it inverts: 'וכו' instead of 'וכו'; A inserts 'וכו' instead of 'וכו'.
3 R it inverts: 'וכו' instead of 'וכו'; A inserts 'וכו' instead of 'וכו'.
4 R omits this passage till 'וכו'; A inserts 'וכו' instead of 'וכו'.
5 R it inverts: 'וכו' instead of 'וכו'; A inserts 'וכו' instead of 'וכו'.
6 R it inverts: 'וכו' instead of 'וכו'; A inserts 'וכו' instead of 'וכו'.
7 R omits from after "וכו" and continues. A omits from after "וכו" and continues. The brackets are Asher's.
Aני תכסי יד, והםdni ידד ידד, "כבריכים מתחממים רבים."
ר' ברכט ב. ר"ע, והם בנו מהית, פסמה שין. ירך מתחממים רבים. והם כنمو הפסמה здоровьяים בישראל, ר' אלעד. והם בנו מהית, פסמה שין.
ולא ראש בר עיד, ראש בר עיד מהית המשלי והisce ר' ג'. ר' אלעד. והם בנו מהית, פסמה שין.
ויש נוכל, פסמה שיש תחתן. (סוכק) הא קר נוכל על פסמה יש זה בתיה. והם כنمو הב' בר' הביא את." ל' לא. והם כنمو המשה את המשלי והisce ר' עד. והם בנו מהיות המשלי והisce ר' ג'. ר' אלעד. והם בנו מהית, פסמה שין. פסמה שיש גורי ד' מתקבז של פסמה שיש חיה. והם בנו מהית, פסמה שין.
איליא סחי עיד, סחי עיד מהית המשלי והisce ר' ג'. ר' אלעד. והם בנו מהית, פסמה שין. פסמה שיש גורי ד' מתקבז של פסמה שיש חיה. והם בנו מהית, פסמה שין. פסמה שיש גורי ד' מתקבז של פסמה שיש חיה. והם בנו מהית, פסמה שין. פסמה שיש גורי ד' מתקבז של פסמה שיש חיה. והם בנו מהית, פסמה שין. פסמה שיש גורי ד' מתקבז של פסמה שיש חיה. והם בנו מהית, פסמה שין. פסמה שיש גורי ד' מתקבז של פסמה שיש חיה. והם בנו מהית, פסמה שין. פסמה שיש גורי ד' מתקבז של פסמה שיש חיה. והם בנו מהית, פסמה שין. פסמה שיש גורי ד' מתקבז של פסמה שיש חיה. והם בנו מהית, פסמה שין. פסמה שיש גורי ד' מתקבז של פסמה שיש חיה. והם בנו מהית, פסמה שין. פסמה שיש גורי ד' מתקבז של פסמה שיש חיה. והם בנו מהית, פסמה שין. פסמה שיש גורי ד' מתקבז של פסמה שיש חיה. והם בנו מהית, פסמה שין. פסמה שיש גורי ד' מתקבז של פסמה שיש חיה. והם בנו מהית, פסמה שין. פסמה שיש גורי ד' מתקבז של פסמה שיש חיה. והם בנו מהית, פסמה שין. פסמה שיש גורי ד' מתקבז של פסמה שיש חיה. והם בנו מהית, פסמה שין. פסמה שיש גורי ד' מתקבז של פסמה שיש חיה. והם בנו מהית, פסמה שין. פסמה שיש גורי ד' מתקבז של פסמה שיש חיה. והם בנו מהית, פסמה שין. פסמה שיש גורי ד' מתקבז של פסמה שיש חיה. והם בנו מהית, פסמה שין. פסמה שיש גורי ד' מתקבז של פסמה שיש חיה. והם בנו מהית, פסמה שין. פסמה שיש גורי ד' מתקבז של פסמה שיש חיה. והם בנו מהית, פסמה שין. פסמה שיש גורי ד' מתקבז של פסמה שיש חיה. והם בנו מהית, פסמה שין. פסמה שיש גורי ד' מתקבז של פסמה שיש חיה. והם בנו מהית, פסמה שין. פסמה שיש גורי ד' מתקבז של פסמה שיש חיה. והם בנו מהית, פסמה שין. פסמה שיש גורי ד' מתקבז של פסמה יש...
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The next paragraph is omitted in EA. 10. A repeats here what is not in E, and B repeats it in different words. 11. Omits from B. — Here the Rome MS. resumes. 12. R omits the words "bini 84, wide 85, both omit the." 13. R adds "not E." 14. Omit the words "bini 84, wide 85, both omit the." 15. R adds "not E." 16. A omits the words "bini 84, wide 85, both omit the." 17. R adds "not E." 18. R omits the words "bini 84, wide 85, both omit the." 19. A adds "not E." 20. R omits the words "bini 84, wide 85, both omit the." 21. R adds "not E." 22. A omits the words "bini 84, wide 85, both omit the." 23. R adds "not E." 24. A omits the words "bini 84, wide 85, both omit the." 25. R adds "not E." 26. A omits the words "bini 84, wide 85, both omit the." 27. R adds "not E." 28. A omits the words "bini 84, wide 85, both omit the." 29. R adds "not E." 30. A omits the words "bini 84, wide 85, both omit the." 31. R adds "not E." 32. A omits the words "bini 84, wide 85, both omit the." 33. R adds "not E." 34. A omits the words "bini 84, wide 85, both omit the." 35. R adds "not E." 36. A omits the words "bini 84, wide 85, both omit the." 37. R adds "not E." 38. A omits the words "bini 84, wide 85, both omit the." 39. R adds "not E." 40. A omits the words "bini 84, wide 85, both omit the." 41. R adds "not E." 42. A omits the words "bini 84, wide 85, both omit the." 43. R adds "not E." 44. A omits the words "bini 84, wide 85, both omit the." 45. R adds "not E." 46. A omits the words "bini 84, wide 85, both omit the." 47. R adds "not E." 48. A omits the words "bini 84, wide 85, both omit the." 49. R adds "not E." 50. A omits the words "bini 84, wide 85, both omit the." 51. R adds "not E." 52. A omits the words "bini 84, wide 85, both omit the." 53. R adds "not E." 54. A omits the words "bini 84, wide 85, both omit the." 55. R adds "not E." 56. A omits the words "bini 84, wide 85, both omit the." 57. R adds "not E." 58. A omits the words "bini 84, wide 85, both omit the." 59. R adds "not E." 60. A omits the words "bini 84, wide 85, both omit the." 61. R adds "not E." 62. A omits the words "bini 84, wide 85, both omit the." 63. R adds "not E." 64. A omits the words "bini 84, wide 85, both omit the." 65. R adds "not E." 66. A omits the words "bini 84, wide 85, both omit the." 67. R adds "not E." 68. A omits the words "bini 84, wide 85, both omit the." 69. R adds "not E." 70. A omits the words "bini 84, wide 85, both omit the." 71. R adds "not E." 72. A omits the words "bini 84, wide 85, both omit the." 73. R adds "not E." 74. A omits the words "bini 84, wide 85, both omit the." 75. R adds "not E." 76. A omits the words "bini 84, wide 85, both omit the." 77. R adds "not E." 78. A omits the words "bini 84, wide 85, both omit the." 79. R adds "not E." 80. A omits the words "bini 84, wide 85, both omit the." 81. R adds "not E." 82. A omits the words "bini 84, wide 85, both omit the." 83. R adds "not E." 84. A omits the words "bini 84, wide 85, both omit the." 85. R adds "not E."
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 websocket sent time element. 1. An atom of the earth, by itself, can...

 1. A B insert: 'ךֵּךָךַ�
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לאחר צאת עימודים, נאזכרו של יומן 1 וישראל 2 בכר 3.
ובאום הנבואה הנסיך זוהי. זוהי 4 על חבר 5 של שולח ארצות 6. זוהי 7 הנשואים 8, או התאיל 9.
ולעומת 10 נבוי של שולח ושק נבון 11.
אצורי היה שולח עמק כל דבר עמק של שולח 12, ושומרים של שולח קיים על המדינית 13.
וכל האזר היה וישבר באמרות בכבוד של זה הכבוד 14.
ויריות שלם עלי יחדו להתבונן 15.
ויריות שלם עליiance נהד מובנת 16.
יגילו בדILER כאוב 17. כל האזר היה וישבר באמרות בכבוד של זה הכבוד 18.
וכנישת המגמה של המסעדת הזה או 19, היריות השמים של 20.
יכנישת המגמה של המסעדת הזה או 21.
וכנישת המגמה של המסעדת הזה או 22.
יכנישת המגמה של המסעדת הזה או 23.
יכנישת המגמה של המסעדת הזה או 24.
יכנישת המגמה של המסעדת הזה או 25.
יכנישת המגמה של המסעדת הזה או 26.
יכנישת המגמה של המסעדת הזה או 27.
יכנישת המגמה של המסעדת הזה או 28.
יכנישת המגמה של המסעדת הזה או 29.
יכנישת המגמה של המסעדת הזה או 30.
יכנישת המגמה של המסעדת הזה או 31.
יכנישת המגמה של המסעדת הזה או 32.
יכנישת המגמה של המסעדת הזה או 33.
יכנישת המגמה של המסעדת הזה או 34.
יכנישת המגמה של המסעדת הזה או 35.
יכנישת המגמה של המסעדת הזה או 36.
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From there it is three parasangs to Mahomerie-le-petit, which is Gibeah of Saul, where there are no Jews, and this is Gibeah of Benjamin. Thence three parasangs to Beit Nubi, which is Nob, the city of priests. In the middle of the way are the two crags of Jonathan, the name of the one being Bozez, and the name of the other Seneh. Two Jewish dyers dwell there.

Thence it is three parasangs to Rams, or Ramah, where there are remains of the walls from the days of our ancestors, for thus it was found written upon the stones. About 300 Jews dwell there. It was formerly a very great city; at a distance of two miles there is a large Jewish cemetery.

Thence it is five parasangs to Joppa or Jaffa, which is on the seashore, and one Jewish dyer lives here. From here it is five parasangs to Ibelin or Jabneh, the seat of the Academy, but there are no Jews there at this day. Thus far extends the territory of Ephraim.

From there it is five parasangs to Palmid, which is Ashdod of the Philistines, now in ruins; no Jews dwell there. Thence it is two parasangs to Ashkelonah or New Ashkelon, which Ezra the priest

1 This and Mahomerie-le-grand, already mentioned, are Crusaders' churches. See Rey, Les Colonies franques de Syrie aux XIIe et XIIIe siècles, p. 327; also Conder, The Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem.

2 Beit Nubi near Ramleh has been identified without proof with Nob. Richard Coeur-de-Lion encamped here some twenty-five years after Benjamin's visit. He with the army of the Crusaders passed through Ibelin on his way to Ashkelon. Cf. Vinsauf's Itinerarium Regis Ricardi.


4 Asher renders וֹור Ramleh, for which there is some justification. Ramleh did not exist in Bible times—it was founded in 716. It prospered to such an extent that it became as large as Jerusalem. It was a good deal damaged by an earthquake in 1033. Ramleh had a large Muslim population, and the Jews there remained comparatively unmolested by the Crusaders. This latter fact accounts for the somewhat large number of Jews residing there. Asher's reading, and that of all the printed editions, is "about three Jews dwell there." This is obviously wrong. Probably the copyist is to blame in taking 'ו to be an abbreviation for וור. The reports of contemporary Arabic authors will be found in Guy le Strange's Palestine, pp. 903-8.
built by the sea. It was originally called Bene Berak. The place is four parasangs distant from the ancient ruined city of Ashkelon. New Ashkelon is a large and fair place, and merchants come thither from all quarters, for it is situated on the frontier of Egypt. About 200 Rabbanite Jews dwell here, at their head being R. Zemach, R. Aaron, and R. Shalomoh; also about forty Karaites, and about 300 Cuthians. In the midst of the city is a well, which they call Bir Abraham; this the Patriarch dug in the days of the Philistines.

From there it is a journey of a day to St. George of Lud: thence it is a day and a half to Zerin or Jezeel, where there is a large spring. One Jewish dyer lives here. Three parasangs further is Seffurieh or Sepphoris. Here are the graves of Rabbenu Hakkadosh, of Rabban Gamaliel, and of R. Chiya, who came up from Babylon, also of Jonah the son of Amittai; they are all buried in the mountain. Many other Jewish graves are here.

Thence it is five parasangs to Tiberias, which is situated upon the Jordan, which is here called the Sea of Chinnereth. The Jordan at this place flows through a valley between two mountains, and fills the lake, which is called the Lake of Chinnereth; this is a large and broad piece of water like the sea. The Jordan flows between two mountains, and over the plain which is the place that is called Ashdoth Hapisgah, and thence continues its course till it falls into the Sea of Sodom, which is the Salt Sea. In Tiberias there are about fifty Jews, at their head being R. Abraham the Seer, R. Muchtar, and R. Isaac. There are hot waters here, which bubble up from the ground, and are called the Hot Waters of Tiberias. Near by is the Synagogue of Caleb ben Jephunneh, and Jewish graves. R. Johanan ben Zakkai

1 Ali of Herat, Benjamin's contemporary, writes: "Ashkelon is a fine and beautiful city. There is near here the well of Abraham, which they say he dug with his own hand." Bohadin, in his Life of Saladin, gives a detailed account of the demolition of the city in 1192, after the conclusion of peace between King Richard I and Saladin. Ibn Batutah in 1355 found the town in ruins, but gives a detailed account of the well. (Guy le Strange, pp. 402-3; cf. Dr. H. Hildesheimer, Beiträge zur Geographie Palästinas.)

2 The cathedral at Lydda with the tomb of St. George was destroyed when Saladin captured the place in 1191. It was rebuilt by a King of England in the seventeenth century.

3 A. M. Luncz in his Year-book for 1881, pp. 71-165, gives a complete list of the reputed Jewish tombs in Palestine. There are many records of the graves of Jewish worthies in our literature, but it is not easy to reconcile the different versions.

4 See Deut. iii. 17.
and R. Jehudah Halevi¹ are buried here. All these places are situated in Lower Galilee.

From here it is two days to Tymin or Timnathah, where Simon the Just³ and many Israelites are buried, and thence three parasangs to Medon or Meron. In the neighbourhood there is a cave in which are the graves of Hillel and Shamai. Here also are twenty graves of disciples, including the grave of R. Benjamin ben Japhet, and of R. Jehudah ben Bethera. From Meron it is two parasangs to Almah, where there are about fifty Jews. There is a large Jewish cemetery here, with the graves of R. Eleazar ben Arak, of R. Eleazar ben Azariah, of Chuni Hamaagal, of Raban ⁴ Simeon | ben Gamaliel, and of R. Jose Hagelili.

From here it is half a day's journey to Kadesh, or Kadesh Naphtali, upon the Jordan. Here is the grave of Barak the son of Abinoam. No Jews dwell here.

Thence it is a day's journey to Banias, which is Dan, where there is a cavern, from which the Jordan issues and flows for a distance of three miles, when the Arnon, which comes from the borders of Moab, joins it ⁴. In front of the cavern may be discerned the site of the altar associated with the graven image of Micah, which the children of Dan worshipped in ancient days. This is also the site of the altar of Jeroboam, where the golden calf was set up. Thus far reaches the boundary of the land of Israel towards the uttermost sea ⁶.

Two days' journey brings one to Damascus, the great city, which is the commencement of the empire of Nur-ed-din, the king of the Togarmim, called Turks. It is a fair city of large extent, surrounded by walls, with many gardens and plantations, extending over fifteen miles on each side, and no district richer in fruit can be seen in all the world. From Mount Hermon descend the rivers Amana and Pharpar, for the city is situated at the foot of Mount Hermon. The Amana flows through the city, and by means of aqueducts the water is conveyed to the houses ⁴ of the great people, and into the streets and market-places. The Pharpar flows through their gardens

¹ Both BM. and R have ידוהיה תרשיש ית, whilst E and A have the faulty reading ידוהיה תרשיש. The Seder Hadoroth has the same reading as E and A. Jehuda Halevi died within twenty years before Benjamin's visit, and the question of the burial-place of our great national poet is thus finally settled.

² The common belief is that Simon the Just was buried near Jerusalem, on the road to Nablous, about a mile from the Damascus Gate.

³ Cf. Schechter's Saadyana, p. 89.

⁴ The passage referring to the Arnon is evidently out of place.

⁵ See Deut. xi. 24.
and plantations. It is a place carrying on trade with all countries. Here is a mosque of the Arabs called the Gami of Damascus; there is no building like it in the whole world, and they say that it was a palace of Ben Hadad. Here is a wall of crystal glass of magic workmanship, with apertures according to the days of the year, and as the sun's rays enter each of them in daily succession the hours of the day can be told by a graduated dial. In the palace are chambers built of gold and glass, and if people walk round the wall they are able to see one another, although the wall is between them. And there are columns overlaid with gold and silver, and columns of marble of all colours. And in the court there is a gigantic head overlaid with gold and silver, and fashioned like a bowl with rims of gold and silver. It is as big as a cask, and three men can enter therein at the same time to bathe. In the palace is suspended the rib of one of the giants, the length being nine cubits, and the width two cubits; and they say it belonged to the King Anak of the giants of old, whose name was Abramz. For so it was found inscribed on his grave, where it was also written that he ruled over the whole world. Three thousand Jews abide in this city, and amongst them are learned and rich men. The head of the Academy of the land of Israel resides here. His name is R. Azariah, and with him are his brother, Sar Shalom, the head of the Beth Din: R. Joseph, the fifth of the Academy: R. Mazliach, the lecturer, the head of the order: R. Meir, the crown of the scholars: R. Joseph ben Al Pilath, the pillar of the Academy: R. Heman, the warden: and R. Zedekiah, the physician. One hundred Karaïtes dwell here, also 400 Cuthians, and there is peace between them, but they do not intermarry.

It is a day's journey to Galid, which is Gilead, and sixty Israelites are there, at their head being R. Zadok, R. Isaac, and R. Shelomoh. It is a place of wide extent, with brooks of water, gardens, and plantations. Thence it is half a day to Salkat, which is Salchah of old.

1 For a description of the city and its great mosque, see Baedeker, Handbook to Palestine and Syria, under "Damascus." The most eastern dome of the mosque is to this day called Kubbet-es-Saa, the Dome of Hours. Mukaddasi gives an elaborate description of the mosaics and other features of this mosque.


3 Pethachiah estimates the Jewish population at 19,000. This confirms the opinion already given (p. 26) that Benjamin refers to heads of families.

4 Dr. W. Bacher with justice observes that, at the time of the Crusades, the traditions of the Palestinian Gaonate seem to have survived at Damascus. See J. Q. R., XV, pp. 79-96.

5 Galid as a city cannot be identified. Salchah is in the Eastern Hauran,
Thence it is half a day's journey to Baalbec, which is Baalath in the plains of Lebanon, and which Solomon built for the daughter of Pharaoh. The palace is built of large stones, each stone having a length of twenty cubits and a width of twelve cubits, and there are no spaces between the stones. It is said that Asmodeus alone could have put up this building. From the upper part of the city a great spring wells forth and flows into the middle of the city as a wide stream, and alongside thereof are mills and gardens and plantations in the midst of the city. At Tarmod (Tadmor) in the wilderness, which Solomon built, there are similar structures of huge stones. The city of Tarmod is surrounded by walls; it is in the desert far away from inhabited places, and is four days' journey from Baalath, just mentioned. And in Tarmod there are about 2,000 Jews. They are valiant in war and fight with the Christians and with the Arabs, which latter are under the dominion of Nur-ed-din the king, and they help their neighbours the Ishmaelites. At their head are R. Isaac Hajvani, B. Nathan, and B. Uziel.

From Baalbec to Kerithin, which is Kirjathim, is a distance of half a day; no Jews are there except one dyer. Thence it is a day's journey to Hemesan, which is a city of the Zemarites, where about twenty Jews dwell. Thence it is a day's journey to Hamath, which is Hamath. It lies on the river Jabbok at the foot of Mount Lebanon. Some time ago there was a great earthquake in the half a day's journey from Bosra, and is spoken of in Scripture as a frontier city of Bashan. (Deut. iii. 10; Joshua xii. 5.) It lies a long way to the south of Damascus, whilst Baalbec lies to the north.

1 Tarmod is Tadmor or Palmyra. See Baedeker, p. 521.
2 The important city Emesa, now called Homo, is here probably indicated. In scripture, Gen. x. 18, the Zamarite and the Hamathite are grouped together among the Canaanite families. In this district is the intermittent spring of Fuwar ed-Der, the Sabbatio River of antiquity, which Titus visited after the destruction of Jerusalem. Josephus (Wars of the Jews, Book VII, sec. 5) describes it as follows: "Its current is strong and has plenty of water; after which its springs fail for six days together and leave its channels dry, as any one may see; after which days it runs on the seventh day as it did before, and as though it had undergone no change at all: it has also been observed to keep this order perpetually and exactly." The intermittent action is readily accounted for by the stream having hollowed out an underground duct, which acts as a syphon.
3 Hamath is often mentioned in Scripture, situated at no great distance from the Orontes. In the troublous time after the first crusade it was taken by the Ismailians or Assassains. The earthquake of 1157 caused great damage. Twenty years later the place was captured by Saladin.
city, and 25,000 souls perished in one day, and of about 200 Jews but seventy escaped. At their head are R. Eli Hacohen, and the Sheik Abu Galab and Mukhtair. Thence it is half a day to Sheiza, which is Hazor\(^1\), and from there it is three parasangs to Dimin (Latmin).

Thence it is two days to Haleb (Aleppo) or Aram Zoba, which is the royal city of Nur-ed-din. In the midst of the city is his palace surrounded by a very high wall. This is a very large place. There is no well there nor any stream, but the inhabitants drink rain-water, each one possessing a cistern in his house\(^2\). The city has 5,000 Jewish inhabitants, at their head being R. Moses el Constantini and R. Seth. Thence it is two days to Bales\(^8\), which is Pethor on the river Euphrates, and unto this day there stands the turret of Balaam, which he built to tell the hours of the day. About ten Jews live here. Thence it is half a day to Kalat Jabar, which is Selah of the wilderness, that was left unto the Arabs at the time the Togarmim took their land and caused them to fly to the wilderness. About 2,000 Jews dwell there, at their head being R. Zedekiah, R. Chiya, and R. Shelomoh.

Thence it is one day’s journey to Rakka\(^4\), or Salchah, which is on the confines of the land of Shinar, and which divides the land of the Togarmim from that kingdom. In it there are 700 Jews, at their head being R. Zaki and R. Nedib, who is blind, and R. Joseph. There is a synagogue here, erected by Ezra when he went forth from Babylon to Jerusalem. At two days’ distance lies ancient

---

\(^1\) Robinson and Conder identify Hazor with a site near Kedesh Naftali, but Sheiza is doubtless Sheizar, the ancient Larissa. Having regard to the readings of the other MSS., there is no doubt that Latmin, the next stage on the way to Aleppo, is the correct name of the place. See M. Hartmann’s articles, “Beiträge zur Kenntnis der Syrischen Steppe,” Z.D.P.V., vols. XXII and XXIII, 1900–1. Cf. the article on the Boundaries of Palestine and Syria by M. Friedmann, Luncz’s Jerusalem, vol. II.

\(^2\) Edrisi writes that there was abundance of water at Aleppo, but there is no discrepancy between Benjamin’s and Edrisi’s statements, as Asher supposes. The old waterworks were restored by Malek about the year 1200, some thirty years after Benjamin’s visit.

\(^3\) Edrisi and Abulfeda speak of Bales and Kalat Jabar. See Guy le Strange, p. 417.

\(^4\) Rakka is on the left bank of the Euphrates. This river separated the Seljuks from the empire of Sandjar, the powerful Shah of Persia. Salchah is the modern Salkhad in the Hauran. On the right bank of the Euphrates, nearly opposite to Rakka, was Thapsacus. Here Cyrus forded the river, and here Alexander crossed in pursuit of Darius.
Haran, where twenty Jews live. Here is another synagogue erected by Ezra, and in this place stood the house of Terah and Abraham his son. The ground is not covered by any building, and the Arabs honour the site and come thither to pray.

Thence it is a journey of two days to Ras-el-ain, whence proceeds the river Al Chabur—the Habor of old—which flows through the land of Media, and falls into the river Gozan. Here there are 200 Jews. Thence it is two days to Gazriah Iben Omar, which is surrounded by the river | Hiddekel (Tigris), at the foot of the mountains of Ararat.

It is a distance of four miles to the place where Noah's Ark rested, but Omar Ben al Khataab took the ark from the two mountains and made it into a mosque for the Mohammedans. Near the ark is the Synagogue of Ezra to this day, and on the ninth of Ab the Jews come thither from the city to pray. In the city of Jeziret Omar are 4,000 Jews, at their head being R. Mubchar, R. Joseph and R. Chiya.

Thence it is two days to Mosul, which is Assur the Great, and here dwell about 7,000 Jews, at their head being R. Sakai the Nasi of the seed of David, and R. Joseph surnamed Borhan Al Pulkh, the astronomer to the King Sin-el-din, the brother of Nur-ed-din, King of Damascus. Mosul is the frontier town of the land of Persia.

1 Haran, the city of Nahor, is twenty-four miles SSE. of Edessa on the Belik, a tributary of the Euphrates.
2 Ras-el-ain, probably Rhesaina. The river Chabur—the Araxes of Xenophon—is doubtless the Chebar, the scene of Ezekiel's visions. It flows from the Kurdistan mountains southwards, and runs into the Euphrates.
3 The Gozan river, known as the Kizil-Uzun, is on the right of the watershed of the mountains of Kurdistan, and falls into the Caspian Sea. The Chabur above referred to flows through Mesopotamia, not through Media. The misconception arises probably from the author being too mindful of the passage occurring repeatedly in Scripture, e.g. 2 Kings xvii. 6: "... and placed them in Halah and in Habor by the river of Gozan, and in the cities of the Medes."
4 All the MSS. except BM. have here: "Thence it is two days to the city of Nisibis. This is a great city with rivulets of water, and contains about 1,000 Jews."
5 Josephus (Antiquities, I, 3) mentions that Noah's Ark still existed in his day. Rabbi Pethachiah, who travelled through Armenia within twenty years after Benjamin, speaks of four mountain peaks, between which the Ark became fixed and from which it could not get free. He adds: "the Ark is not there for it has decayed." See Marco Polo, Bk. I, ch. 3, also I. J. Benjamin II, Eight years in Asia and Africa, p. 93.
6 Pethachiah calls Mosul New Nineveh.
7 See Lebrecht's Essay "On the State of the Khalifate at Bagdad."
It is a very large and ancient city, situated on the river Hiddekel (Tigris), and is connected with Nineveh by means of a bridge. Nineveh is in ruins, but amid the ruins there are villages and hamlets, and the extent of the city may be determined by the walls, which extend forty parasangs to the city Arbel. The city of Nineveh is on p. 53 the river Hiddekel. In the city of Assur (Mosul) is the synagogue of Obadiah, built by Jonah; also the synagogue of Nahum the Elkoshite.

Thence it is a distance of three days to Rehobah, which is on the river Euphrates. Here there are about 2,000 Jews, at their head being R. Hezekiah, R. Tahor and R. Isaac. It is a very fine city, large and fortified, and surrounded by gardens and plantations.

Thence it is a day’s journey to Karkesia which is Carchemish, on the river Euphrates. Here there are about 500 Jews, at their head being R. Isaac and R. Elhanan. Thence it is two days to Al Janbar which is Pumbedita in Nehardea. Here reside 3,000 Jews, and amongst them are learned men, at their head being the Rabbi R. Chen, R. Moses and R. Jehoiakim. Here are the graves of Rab Jehuda and of Samuel, and in front of the graves of each of them are the synagogues which they built in their lifetime. Here is also Sin-el-din, otherwise known as Seif-ed-din, died 1149, some twenty years before Benjamin’s visit, and Graetz (vol. VI, note 10) suggests that the appointment of Astronomer Royal must have been made by Nur-ed-din’s nephew. None of the MSS. has this reading, nor is such a correction needed. R. Joseph may have been appointed by Nur-ed-din’s brother, and would naturally retain the office during the reign of his successor.

1 Arbel, otherwise called Erbil, is two days’ journey from Mosul. See Saadyana, J. Q. R., vol. XIV, p. 503, and W. Bacher’s note, p. 741; also I. J. Benjamin II, chap. xi.

2 For a full account of Mosul and other places here referred to, see Layard’s Nineveh and its Remains and Nineveh and Babylon. Layard carefully examined Nebbi Junus, which is held in great veneration by the Mussulmen, and came to the conclusion that the tradition which places Jonah’s tomb on this spot is a mere fable (p. 596). It will be seen that Benjamin speaks of the Shrine as a Synagogue. At Alkush near Mosul the tomb of Nahum is pointed out, and the Arabs say that after Jonah had fulfilled his mission to the people of Nineveh they relapsed into idolatry. Then Nahum denounced the city and was slain by the populace, who proclaimed him and Jonah to be false prophets, since the doom the latter foretold had not come to pass. See Schwarz, Das Heilige Land, 1856, p. 259, who quotes the Midrash, Jerome and the Parchi as authorities for identifying Kefar Tanchum near Tiberias with Nahum’s burial-place.

3 Full information as to these and other Jewish seats of learning in Babylon will be found in Dr. Krause’s Article “Babylonia” in the Jewish Encyclopedia.
the grave of Bostanai the Nasi, the head of the Captivity, and of R. Nathan and Rab Nachman the son of Papa.

Thence it takes five days to Chadara, where about 15,000 Jews dwell, at their head being R. Saken, R. Jehosef and R. Nathanel.

Thence it takes two days to Okbara, the city which Jeconiah the King built, where there are about 10,000 Jews, and at their head are R. Chanan, R. Jabin and R. Ishmael.

Thence it is two days to Bagdad, the great city and the royal residence of the Caliph Emir al Mumenin al Abassi of the family of Mohammed. He is at the head of the Mohammedan religion, and all the Kings of Islam obey him; he occupies a similar position to that held by the Pope over the Christians. He has a palace in Bagdad three miles in extent wherein is a great park with all varieties of trees, fruit-bearing and otherwise, and all manner of animals. The whole is surrounded by a wall, and in the park there is a lake whose waters are fed by the river Hiddekel. Whenever the king desires to indulge in recreation and to rejoice and feast, his servants catch all manner of birds, game and fish, and he goes to his palace with his counsellors and princes. There the great king, Al Abassi the Caliph (Haft) holds his court, and he is kind unto Israel, and many belonging to the people of Israel are his attendants; he knows all languages and is well versed in the law of Israel. He reads and writes the holy language (Hebrew). He will not partake of anything unless he has

1 Chadara goes under the name Alhathr or Hatra. There must exist great doubt as to whether Benjamin had personally satisfied himself as to the Jewish population he gives for this and the other places he tells of, till he comes to Egypt. Up to this point the Traveller has always appeared to under-estimate the Jewish population. Henceforth it will be found that he gives apparently exaggerated figures,—and this lends colour to the view that Benjamin did not proceed beyond Bagdad, but found his way thence direct to Egypt. The statements concerning the intervening places must therefore be taken to have been based upon hearsay information. Pethachiah's remarks are significant: "In the land of Cush and Babol are more than sixty myriads of Jews; as many are in the land of Persia. But in Persia the Jews are subject to hard bondage and suffering. Therefore Rabbi Pethachiah visited only one city in Persia." (Dr. Benisch's edition, p. 19.)

2 The Caliphs of the Abasside Dynasty traced their descent from Mohammed. Benjamin here refers to the Caliph El Mostanshed. The Caliph is aptly compared to the Pope. In addition to his temporal authority at Bagdad, he exercised as Leader of the Faithful—Emir al-Mumenin—religious authority over all Mohammedans from Spain to India. At a later time the vizier arrogated all authority to himself, and the Caliph spent his time either in the mosque or in the seraglio.
earned it by the work of his own hands. He makes coverlets to which he attaches his seal; his courtiers sell them in the market, and the great ones of the land purchase them and the proceeds thereof provide his sustenance. He is truthful and trusty, speaking peace to all men. The men of Islam see him but once in the year. The pilgrims that come from distant lands to go unto Mecca which is in the land Al Yemen, are anxious to see his face, and they assemble before the palace exclaiming "Our Lord, light of Islam and glory of our law, show us the effulgence of thy countenance," but he pays no regard to their words. Then the princes who minister unto him say to him "Our Lord, spread forth thy peace unto the men that have come from distant lands, who crave to abide under the shadow of thy graciousness," and thereupon he arises and lets down the hem of his robe from the window, and the pilgrims come and kiss it, and a prince says unto them "Go forth in peace, for our Master the Lord of Islam granteth peace to you." He is regarded by them as Mohammed and they go to their houses rejoicing at the salutation which the prince has vouchsafed unto them, and glad at heart that they have kissed his robe.

Each of his brothers and the members of his family, has an abode in his palace, but they are all fettered in chains of iron, and guards are placed over each of their houses so that they may not rise against the great Caliph. For once it happened to a predecessor that his brothers rose up against him and proclaimed one of themselves as Caliph; then it was decreed that all the members of his family should be bound, that they might not rise up against the ruling Caliph. Each one of them resides in his palace in great splendour, and they own villages and towns, and their stewards bring them the tribute thereof, and they eat and drink and rejoice all the days of their life. Within the domains of the palace of the Caliph there are great buildings of marble and columns of silver and gold, and hangings with precious stones are suspended from the walls. In the Caliph's palace are great riches and towers filled with gold, silken garments and all precious stones. He does not issue forth from his palace save once in the year, at the feast which the Islamites call El-id-bed Ramadan, and they come from distant lands that day to see him. He rides on a mule and is attired in the royal robes of gold and silver and fine linen; on his head is a turban adorned with

1 Lebricht, p. 391, states that this was a scarf of black velvet, generally a portion of the hangings of the mosque of Mecca, which was suspended from a balcony of the Palace and was called the Sleeve of the Caliph.

2 The statements here made are strangely contradictory; see Lebricht, pp. 381 and 390.
precious stones of priceless value, and over the turban is a black shawl as a sign of his modesty, implying that all this glory will be covered by darkness on the day of death. He is accompanied by all the nobles of Islam dressed in fine garments and riding on horses, the princes of Arabia, the princes of Togarma and Dilas (Elam?) and the princes of Persia, Media and Guzistan, and the princes of the land of Tibet, west of the country of Samarcand, a land which is three months' journey distant. He proceeds from his palace to the great mosque of Islam which is by the Bussorah Gate. Along the road the walls are adorned with silk and purple, and the inhabitants receive him with all kinds of song and exultation, and they dance before the great king who is styled the Caliph. They salute him with a loud voice and say "Peace unto thee, our Lord the King and Light of Islam!" He kisses his robe, and stretching forth the hem thereof he salutes them. Then he proceeds to the court of the mosque, mounts a wooden pulpit and expounds to them their Law. Then the learned ones of Islam arise and pray for him and extol his greatness and his graciousness, to which they all respond. Afterwards he gives them his blessing and they bring before him a camel which he slays, and this is their passover-sacrifice. He gives thereof unto the princes and they distribute it to all, so that they may taste of the sacrifice brought by their sacred king; and they all rejoice. Afterwards he leaves the mosque and returns alone to his palace by way of the river Hiddekel, and the grandees of Islam accompany him in ships on the river until he enters his palace. He does not return the way he came, and the road which he takes along the river-side is watched all the year through, so that no man shall tread in his footsteps. He does not leave the palace again for a whole year. He is a benevolent man.

(To be continued.)
THE REFORM MOVEMENT IN JUDAISM.

IV.

THE FRANKFORT SOCIETY OF THE FRIENDS OF REFORM.

The Jewish community of Frankfort-on-the-Main had been for centuries one of the foremost in Germany; it was distinguished for the learned men who had filled the rabbinical position there, for the stirring scenes that had been enacted in its famed "Gasse" and for the prominence and wealth of a number of its families. While the city was an imperial fief its Jewish community had been ruled by special legislation (Judenordnungen) which the Emperors issued from time to time; when the sway of the Emperors came to an end in 1806, Frankfort passed under the rule of the Prince Primate of the Rhenish Confederation, Karl von Dahlberg. This ruler published a new order for the government and protection of the Jews which was not much of an improvement on the old Judenordnungen, for it withheld from them expressly the right of citizenship. When the Duchy of Frankfort with its own constitution was formed, upon the dissolution of the Rhenish Confederation, the representatives of the Jews induced the Archduke

1 In connexion with the reference to the Jewish Religious Union of London towards the close of my article in the April (1904) number of the Quarterly, mention should have been made of the Hampstead Sabbath Afternoon Services, begun on Feb. 22, 1890, and conducted by the Rev. Morris Joseph with the assistance of a number of other gentlemen. These services continued for three years and were of a reform tendency.

2 Frankfurter Verein der Reformfreunde.

3 See the author's Old European Jewries, 46-81 (Philadelphia, 1894).
Dahlberg to promulgate a special law in consideration of a great sum of money; this law declared that the Jews of Frankfort "with their children and descendants should enjoy civil rights and privileges equally with other citizens." The Jews took the oath of citizenship and it seemed indeed as though the long night of mediaevalism had passed away and the morn of freedom had dawned. But it was a deceptive hope. After the fall of Napoleon a reactionary period set in, the evil effects of which were felt for the time being by the Jews throughout Germany.

The Congress of Vienna, which was convened in 1814 for the purpose of regulating the affairs of the European states after the fall of Napoleon, and which was participated in by the great statesmen of the allied countries, gave some consideration also to the Jewish question; the fourteenth Article of the first draft of the Acts of the Congress, as agreed upon by the representatives of Austria, Prussia, and Hanover, had declared that Jews who performed all the duties of citizens should be accorded all the rights of citizenship, and that wherever the existing laws of a State presented obstacles to the consummation of this programme, those obstacles should be removed as soon as possible. A number of the representatives of the smaller German states protested against this paragraph, but the two great Powers, Austria and Prussia, insisted upon its retention. The free cities, among them Frankfort, which had obtained its autonomy in the meantime, objected particularly to the term "rights of citizenship" (Bürgerrechte) and demanded the substitution of the phrase "civil rights" (Bürgerliche Rechte). This alteration was made, and in its final form the Article included the further provision that until such a change became an accomplished fact the Jews of the separate states should continue to be governed by the special legislation in force at the time. This action of the Congress gave ground for the hope that the spirit of mediaevalism that still obtained in the conduct of the affairs of the Jews would soon disappear. A violent anti-
Jewish literary campaign ensued, however, in various cities of Germany, which culminated in the turbulent and disgraceful hep-hep outbreaks of the year 1819 in Frankfort and elsewhere. A bitter struggle waged between the Senate of Frankfort and the Jews for eight years, from 1816 to 1824, in which latter year the Jews succeeded in obtaining certain rights. The movement for Jewish civil emancipation went bravely forward until it was crowned with success in the revolutionary year 1848 in most of the German states, although it was not until 1864 that the last vestige of civil discrimination against the Jews of Frankfort disappeared.

But the agitation for change was not confined to the political and civil disabilities under which the Jews rested; the dissatisfaction with the status quo had invaded the religious province also. In former essays I traced the earliest efforts towards religious reform in Berlin, Hamburg, Breslau, and London, in which cities sharp contests had been waged between the traditionalists and the reformers. A similar encounter took place in the community of Frankfort-on-the-Main, which was differentiated from the incidents previously described in that other aspects of the struggle were brought prominently to the fore.

In Frankfort, possibly more than anywhere else, the intimate connexion between the newer educational movement among the Jews and religious reform is apparent. Frankfort was noted among the Jewish communities of Germany for its excellent school, the Philanthropin, where modern methods of education had superseded the Cheder altogether. The children who attended this school received instruction in all branches of knowledge commonly taught in secular educational institutes; instruction in Jewish subjects only, as was the case in the Cheder, had given way to a more extended curriculum; life necessarily had a larger outlook for the pupil who attended such a school than it

had for the child whose education was restricted to Jewish subjects. The spirit of the new time ruled in the one place while the spirit of the ghetto still brooded over the other. It is in the Philanthropin that the first faint traces of the reform agitation in Frankfort are discernible. Devotional exercises for the pupils were introduced in the year 1813; religious instruction had been imparted regularly since the organization of the school in 1804, but the need for a service that should edify the pupils was felt more and more strongly. In the synagogue of the general community, as a matter of course, there was no sign of change; the rabbi, Solomon Abraham Trier, was one of the most uncompromising opponents to any innovation whatsoever, as shall appear later on; the rising generation was repelled rather than attracted by the public worship; the service instituted on Sabbath and holidays in the Philanthropin was of a character to stimulate devotion and intensify the religious spirit of the young people within its walls; it was conducted partly in the vernacular and an address was delivered in German weekly, either by the head master, Dr. M. Hess, or the teacher, J. Johson. Thus the German sermon was introduced into this community without any struggle, whereas had the attempt been made at this early day to have such sermons delivered in the communal synagogue it would have entailed a bitter struggle with the adherents of the old order, as had been the case in Berlin. As the children who attended this school grew into manhood and womanhood they leaned naturally towards reform; nay more, the services conducted in the school began to attract adults in the course of time.

In 1825 Dr. Michael Creizenach was called from Mayence to teach in the school. Creizenach was a man of great

1 Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift für jüdische Theologie, II, 148. For a full account of these services, see the recent publication Festschrift zur Jahrhunderfeier der Realschule der israelitischen Gemeinde (Philanthropin) zu Frankfur am Main, 1804-1904, 50-54. (Frankfurt am Main, 1904.).
ability and of marked personality; he was an earnest advocate of the reform cause, although he wavered between decisive outspokenness and the desire to conciliate the orthodox party; like so many writers of that time he aimed to prove the justification for reform in Judaism from the Talmud; he hoped thus to bridge over the differences between the traditionalists and the reformers, and to reconcile the former to the changes which were taking place in the interpretation of Judaism and which he felt were absolutely necessary. But in this he could not succeed, eloquently and learnedly as he defended his thesis in a number of his earlier writings. For the thesis rested upon a fallacy. True, passages can be cited from the Talmud in support of the contention that authorities of former times sanctioned departures from established law and custom because of changed conditions; but these were isolated instances; the body of authority remained the same. The new movement in Judaism, however, meant something altogether different; the Jews were facing a state of affairs as subversive of their past as was the case when the temple of Jerusalem was destroyed and they exchanged their national existence for a world mission. Circumstances had compelled the postponement of the active carrying out of this prophetic world mission; for eighteen hundred years they were forced into isolation by the inhuman policy of both church and state, and as a defence against their hostile onslaughts "the fence of the law" was built up, and surrounded the religion in its every activity; this was the religious counterpart to their political state; now another crisis was at hand; the ghetto isolation was apparently drawing to a close,

1 Jost, Geschichte der Israeliten, X, 1, 100.
2 xxxii. Thesen über den Thalmud (Frankfurt, 1831) and the earlier portions of his chief work Shulhan Aruk oder encyklopädische Darstellung des mosaischen Gesetzes, four vols. (Frankfurt, 1833-1840).
3 A. Rebenstein, in Freund's Zur Judenfrage in Deutschland, II, 89 (Berlin, 1844).
4 J. Q. R., XVI, 67.
as eighteen hundred years before the national existence had ceased. The Talmudical legislation no longer fitted conditions and the spirit of the Talmudical legislation could not be invoked to summon forth the light which was to distinguish between chaos and order, between past repression and prospective freedom. The fortunes of Jewry were undergoing a revolution; the Talmudical legislation in its details could not be accommodated to the changes superinduced by this revolution; there must be a new adjustment of the standards even though this involved a new interpretation of the principles of tradition; the purpose of God was as apparent in the present changes as it had been in any past events, and since God had brought this to pass it was as truly a divine revelation as any recorded of former times: hence it might be necessary to disregard the form that the faith assumed under the Talmudical guise and clothe it in garments altogether different. The Talmudical legislation could not be expected to meet so radical a change as the new time involved, hence the failure of such as attempted to sail the craft of Judaism through the agitated waters of the sea that had been unknown to the Talmudical mariners, by the compass and chart fashioned by them. Creizenach himself recognized this before his death, which occurred in 1842, a short time before there took place the sharp and definite clash between the opposing parties in Judaism in the city of his adoption, which crisis he, possibly more than any single individual, helped to precipitate.

1 See Holdheim's remarkable statement in Freund's Zur Judenfrage in Deutschland, II, 165-166, which is quoted below; also ibid., p. 335.

2 In his later writings Creizenach abandoned this position, which involved, besides the attempt to justify the reform movement by Talmudical authority, the effort to fit the Talmudical legislation to the needs of the new age, as the Talmud by means of its peculiar hermeneutics had done with the Biblical injunctions. He now advocated a return to pure Mosaism, thus disregarding the Talmudical period of Jewish development altogether; this was a serious misreading of the import of the idea of tradition, as shall be shown later on.
His appointment as teacher in the Philanthropin proved to be of far-reaching effect not only in the educational but also in the religious life of the scholars of the institution; nay more, his influence extended beyond the walls of the school into the community at large. On the one hand he preached definitely and positively against the indifference of such as, having ceased to be strict observers of traditional law, form and custom, had swung to the opposite extreme of aloofness from the religious life altogether, and on the other hand he denounced the formalism into which rabbinical Judaism had degenerated, and which, being the recognized official expression of the faith, was the primary cause of the alienation of those who looked to religion to be a living reality and not merely the observance of a mass of forms, the most of which had ceased to have any significance whatsoever for that generation. Creizenach gave utterance to these ideas not only in his publications but still more effectively in the sermons preached at the weekly services in the school. Through these sermons, the services attracted many adults and the number of participants grew to such an extent that a special chapel known as the Andachtsaal was erected in 1828. The confirmation service for boys and girls was introduced. Similar services were conducted in another educational establishment, the Weil Institute. The most noteworthy effect of these services and sermons in the vernacular was that they paved the way for reform. However, the traditionalists were not blind to what was going on; they denounced the influence of the teachers of the Philanthropin as disintegrating and demoralizing, and blamed the instruction in secular branches as being responsible for the breaking away from the traditions. Hence they concluded that the situation could be saved only by the re-establishment of an old-time school wherein Hebrew branches alone should be taught. It became apparent before long that such a school was doomed to failure; in order to ensure its success they determined

1 Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift für jüdische Theologie, II, 149.
to introduce secular studies into the curriculum, these to be secondary, however, to the Hebrew instruction. Even with this concession the school did not flourish and had to be closed. This failure did not discourage the advocates and upholders of the traditional system of Jewish education. They sought to establish a higher institute for the exclusive study of the Talmud and the allied disciplines. A long and heated controversy on the Talmud and rabbinism ensued; voices were heard pro and con, but the Talmudical party were championing in this instance, as it appeared, a hopeless cause. They received no encouragement at the hands of the Senate of the city in their plea for the establishment of this special Talmudical academy, and the attempt was abandoned. The cause of reform was winning its way quietly not only through the educational work within the community, but it was furthered also by the attitude of non-interference on the part of the law-making body of the city. As has been already mentioned, ever since the Jews had been permitted to dwell in Frankfort they had been governed by special legislative Acts. After Frankfort had become a free city, and notably after the passing of the sway of Napoleon and the meeting of the Congress of Vienna, the Jews petitioned for the rights of citizenship. The sixteenth Article of the proceedings of the Congress, as adopted finally, gave rise to prolonged discussions in the Senate, which resulted in the passing of the law of Sept. 1, 1824, defining the restrictions and rights of the Jews. This law declared that the Jews could regulate their own religious affairs and were exempt from all interference of the state or the Christian community in their internal religious organization.

The agitations in the community, growing out of the differences between progressivists and reactionaries, in the fourth decade of the nineteenth century were converging gradually to the point of gaining a majority representation on the governing board of the community. This

1 Jost, Geschichte der Israeliten, X, part i, 101.
promised to be of far-reaching importance because of the fact that the old age of the rabbi made the election of an associate imperative. The progressive party naturally wished to secure the appointment of one of the new school of rabbis to the post; the traditionalists were just as desirous of electing a rabbi of the old school, to whom Talmud and Shulchan Arukh were oracle and authority. This contingency, together with other difficulties arising out of questions which touched the administration of all the affairs of the Congregation, induced the Directory of the same to request the Senate to pass a general Act on the organization, the duties and the mode of procedure of the governing board of the Israelitish community. This petition aroused intense excitement, and an address signed by 212 members of the community was presented to the Senate, in which the request was preferred that all the religious and ecclesiastical affairs of the community should be taken out of the hands of the Directory, who should thereafter concern themselves only with the political, civil, social, and other non-religious concerns of the community, and that the religious affairs be made the care of a special committee as suggested in the address. This called forth a counter-address, signed by 272 names, denouncing the unwarranted procedure of the signers of the first address. The result of all this agitation was the passing of an Act by the Senate on Feb. 16, 1839, for the regulation of the affairs of the Israelitish community; the communication of the Act to the Directory was accompanied by an extract from the proceedings of the Senate which contained these striking words: "The Senate will be ready always to oppose every-and anything that may wound the conscientious scruples of believing Israelites or may disturb or place obstacles in the way of their traditional worship, but on the other hand it will encourage and support such institutions as the progressive needs of the age make necessary for the true and essential demands of religion." Cognizance is taken here of the differing wings of religious thought in
Judaism. The fourth paragraph of this Act of 1839 is of particular interest and import in the story of Jewish reform, notably in the light of later events. This paragraph was concerned with the question of the qualification of the future rabbis of the congregation; it required that the candidates for the position "be German by birth, that they must have graduated from a German gymnasium and have taken courses in Oriental languages, in historical and philosophical branches in a German university." This implied, as a matter of course, that the day of the rabbi trained and educated in the yeshibah only was past, and served notice that the aspirants to the rabbinical position in this community must be men of modern education and modern training. In so far, the progressive party had gained a victory, and the old rabbi who, as was mentioned specifically in the Act, was to remain undisturbed in his position could not but be troubled by the evident signs of the impending introduction of a new order of things in the religious guidance of the community.

These signs had been apparent for a number of years past in private circles within the Jewry of Frankfort to a much greater degree than appears from the official history of the community as embodied in Acts and regulations. Since the breaking up of mediaeval conditions there had been in Frankfort, as in Berlin and other German cities, a coterie of Jewish laymen, who, educated in the gymnasia and the universities, were dissatisfied with traditional Judaism, and formed a nucleus for the dissemination of ideas advocating the reform cause. Individually, these men were at variance with the official representatives of Judaism; they were out of sympathy with the existing conditions in the synagogue; when Geiger established his Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift für jüdische Theologie they hailed this as the dawning of a

\[1\] Israelit. Annalen, I, 102. See also a correspondence between Senator Frederick Ihm, the referee for Jewish affairs, and the Directory of the Congregation, ibid. 132-4.
new day; here was a platform for the discussion of the
new wants and a forum for the scientific exposition of
the principles and the literature of Judaism. The gradual
appearance on the scene of German Jewish life of a new
school of rabbis, men graduated from the universities,
a number of whom contributed to this magazine, en-
couraged them in the hope that definite steps would be
taken towards an official adjustment of Judaism to life;
but the rabbis proceeded too slowly for them; with very few
exceptions these rabbis considered it advisable to proceed
very cautiously, and to reconcile the old with the new
rather than discard the old in the interest of the new; in
theory many of the rabbis quite agreed with the most
pronounced opinions concerning the inadequacy and the
unsuitedness of the Talmudical legislation to modern needs
and the modern spirit, but in practice they continued to
conduct their office along the traditional lines; they
declared their sympathy with religious progress by enlisting
under the banner of what they called progressive rabbinism
(der fortschreitende Rabbinismus); the laymen just spoken
of had no patience with this Fabian attitude; they wanted
an outspoken declaration expressive of the change that had
come over Judaism; they began to accuse the rabbis of
cowardice and to take matters into their own hands; they
wrote slightly and bitingy of the lack of courage dis-
played by the rabbis in not rising to the occasion, and
coined the phrase "creeping rabbinism" (der fortkriechende
Rabbinismus) as a substitute for the rabbis' own designa-
tion "progressive rabbinism."

A company of such laymen was much in evidence in
Frankfort in the fourth and fifth decades of the nineteenth
century; they had formed a society significantly entitled
"The Society of the Dawn" (Die Lesegesellschaft zur aufge-
henden Morgenröthe), the members of which were described
by one of their number in 1841, as "not subscribing to
Talmudical ceremonialism which separates the Israelites
from their fellow citizens," after a rhetorical outburst in
the following strain: "How long will the Talmud-devotees confound the pure religion of an Isaiah, a Jeremiah, a Micah with the ceremonial religion of the Pharisees? . . . How long will they continue to oppose the progress of civilization and the civic life?" The first of these questions shows how little men of this stamp understood the true inwardness of the reform movement in its attitude towards the Talmud and how superficial was their understanding of the true development of Judaism.

An anonymous article which appeared in Geiger's Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift in 1837, and which was written supposedly by one of these Jewish laymen of Frankfort, describes their attitude so fully and so clearly that it may be considered almost in the light of a preliminary notice of the formation of the Society of the Friends of Reform, the subject of this essay. The article is entitled "Jews and Judaism," and has the sub-heading "Reflections of a Layman." After setting forth the progress of the Jews in various branches of learning in the new era, their strides in the struggle for civil emancipation and their growing participation in the life and endeavour of society, he declares broadly that although "the Jews have progressed, Judaism has stood still." There may be some, he continues, who have a correct understanding of what Judaism really is, but as long as there is no clear, unmistakable declaration of what is to be considered pure Judaism and what only temporary form, so long will the religion continue in its present distortion; "as yet Judaism is supposed to include every jot of the traditional rabbinical interpretation; the Shulchan Arukh with its insatiable commentaries and super-commentaries is still recognized as the authoritative code, a deviation from which is considered equivalent to a deviation from the religion itself." He declares that the prime need is a sifting of the mass of

1 Israelit des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts, II (1841), 82.
3 Jost, Gesch. der Israeliten, X, part iii, 212, note 3.
accretions that have attached themselves to Judaism, and
the separation of the pure metal from the dross; the rabbis
should do this; he recognizes, however, that the rabbis,
ministering as they do to congregations composed of many
elements, are placed in a difficult position, and in their
longing to have the confidence of all are fearful of taking
decisive steps forward even if they would. Be this there-
fore as it may; be the rabbis chargeable with neglect in
a fearless expression of their religious convictions or no,
"it becomes the duty of us non-theologians, if we have the
welfare of Judaism, truth, and progress at heart, to make
solemn declaration of our views in order to remove from
ourselves the reproach—first, of indifference, and secondly,
of a contradiction between our thoughts and acts on the
one hand and our religious profession on the other, as
well as to encourage by this sign of earnest participation
such rabbis as are perhaps ready and anxious to take
decisive steps forward." He recognizes that non-theologians
have neither the requisite knowledge nor authority, but
this declaration of theirs is to be only a general statement
of their convictions, and is to be rather in the nature of
an address to the rabbis of Germany calling upon them
to state whether the declaration is a truthful representa-
tion or no. But of all things it was necessary to publish
such a declaration; all else was detail that could be worked
out later; this declaration should make known that the
signers "do not feel in conscience bound to invest the
prescriptions of the Talmud, to say nothing of those of
the later rabbis, in as far as these cannot be proven by
scientific exegesis to have been derived directly from the
Bible or to have been handed down by Moses, with any
greater authority than is accorded all other temporary
religious institutions whose reasonableness and whose agree-
ment with the spirit of Judaism must first be established." He
concludes by saying that in whatever community
a sufficient number of intelligent laymen may be found
they must unite in a declaration of this kind. The cleft
between practice and profession must be removed. . . . The differences in Judaism exist; better that the sympathizers range themselves together than that they act single-handedly; better that a clear understanding be arrived at than that compromises be resorted to; better, in short, that the present state of affairs be made the starting-point of true progress than that, through wilful blindness, it lead to complete disintegration.

Without doubt, such were the sentiments that prevailed with a large number of Jews throughout Germany; these sentiments crystallized into definite form in Frankfort, where in November, 1842, a number of Jews formed themselves into a society which they called “The Society of the Friends of Reform” (Verein der Reformfreunde). They were all laymen; it was distinctly a lay movement; the absence of all theologians from the membership of the society was so noticeable a feature that it could not but arouse comment, especially as the purpose of the society was pre-eminently religious. The charge was preferred against its promoters that the exclusion of theologians was intentional; Dr. M. A. Stern of Göttingen, famed as a mathematician and undoubtedly a man of exceptional intellectual powers, wrote a series of open letters in answer to attacks upon the society. I shall have occasion to refer to these letters frequently, as they are the *apologia* for the society. In one place he meets the charge of exclusion of rabbis from the society by claiming that there is no longer any priestly caste in Judaism; there is no distinction between rabbis and laymen on the score of sacerdotalism; the only recognized distinction in Judaism is between those who know and those who do not know the law. Herein lies a great principle of religious freedom, and the fact that the society is composed altogether of so-called laymen is equivalent to a rebuke to the assumptions of the occupants.

---

of the rabbinical office who would bring into Judaism this distinction between rabbi and layman, a distinction thoroughly foreign to the genius of the faith; he refers to the article published some years before in Geiger's theological magazine, which urged the formation of societies of laymen for the very purpose for which the Frankfort society was founded. Still, despite this explanation which contains a great and salient truth, there seems to be little doubt that the real reason for the exclusion of rabbis was a certain contempt which the "intellectuals" among the laity felt for the occupants of the rabbinical positions;—this trace of intellectual snobishness is apparent even to this day. The rabbis had not grappled with the religious problem as vigorously as these laymen thought they should have done; they themselves would therefore take the matter in their own hands and lead the way. Geiger, the foremost figure in the Jewish theological world, was a close friend of Stern's; letters passed between them in one of which Geiger speaks of "your contempt for the theologians—which you deny, it is true, but which is only too apparent". This sharp differentiation was unfortunate inasmuch as it accentuated the very distinction that Stern claimed the society desired to eradicate, and arrayed all the rabbis, with one exception, against the movement.

The brief career of the Frankfort Reform Society was one of the most striking episodes of the drama of Jewish religious development that is being unfolded in these pages. The men who formed the society were actuated by the conviction that there must be many Jews throughout Germany who were ripe for a new expression of the principles of Judaism, since the changed political and social status, the acquisition of secular knowledge, in short

---

1 op. cit., V, 182.  
2 Supra.  
3 "Professional theologians were excluded intentionally from the deliberations of the society."—Jost, Gesch. der Isr., X, part iii, 213.  
4 Geiger, Nachgelassene Schriften, V, 169.  
5 M. Hess of Saxe-Weimar, editor of the Israelit des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts, which newspaper became, in a measure, the organ of the society.
the complete break between their external fortunes and the conditions of the life of their ancestors must make them feel the impossibility of fitting the rabbinical interpretation of the religion to the modern Jewish environment. It was also felt that if they would make a short, sharp, and definite declaration of what they considered the essential principles of the faith, this would encourage all who entertained like sentiments to do the same, and the concerted movement away from rabbinical Judaism, many of whose enactments were disregarded by a multitude of contemporaneous Jews, and towards a modern Judaism would be begun.

The members of the society met privately for deliberation and discussion. They formulated five principles as their declaration of faith, viz.: (1) that they consider the Mosaic religion capable of continuous development; (2) that they do not consider binding the various ritual, dietary, and other laws concerned with bodily practices that emanated from the ancient polity; (3) that they do not consider circumcision binding either as a religious act or a symbol; (4) that they do not recognize the Talmud as authoritative; and (5) that they do not expect or long for a Messiah who will lead the Jews back to Palestine, but regard the country to which they belong either by birth or citizenship as their only fatherland. This original declaration of principles was altered at a subsequent meeting, when it was determined to omit paragraphs 2 and 3 and cast the other three paragraphs into another form; this was done and the revised draft, which will be cited presently, was adopted and promulgated as the creed of the society. The omission of the two paragraphs was due to the argument which was advanced successfully that such a declaration should be general in character and not touch special points about which there were still such decided differences of opinion, even among many who might confidently be expected to sympathize with a forward movement.

They did not make their deliberations nor this declara-
tion public at once, for they felt that the time was not yet ripe; they desired to secure first the co-operation of sympathizers throughout Germany. The declaration of principles, together with a prefatory address setting forth the objects and aims of the society, was sent privately to prominent men in various localities to obtain their signatures; this delayed the work greatly as it took weeks at times to secure one signature; as a result, only some fifty signatures had been obtained by the beginning of August, 1843. The most celebrated of the men whom they addressed were Gabriel Riesser, of Hamburg, the dauntless champion of Jewish political emancipation in the German States, who had expressed frequently his sympathy with the movement for religious reform, and Dr. M. A. Stern, of Göttingen, who had been present at some of the preliminary meetings. Letters were exchanged whose purpose was the free and unhampered expression of opinions; these letters were of a confidential nature, but some of those that passed between Riesser and Stern were given out for publication by an adherent of the orthodox party into whose hands they had fallen, together with excerpts from the proceedings of the society which had been altogether private; these extracts were garbled and edited in a manner to discredit the society, which in self-defence was now forced to give to the public prints the address and declaration mentioned above. This was in August, 1843.

These official documents of the society were three in number, marked A, B, and C. A was a circular letter accompanying the documents; B was the address which explained the reasons and aims of the movement, and was entitled "Programme of a Declaration of German Israelites. Presented for Consideration to friends of religious reform in

1 M. Isler, Gabriel Riesser's Leben, nebst Mittheilungen aus seinen Schriften, I, 359 (Frankfort, 1867).
2 J. Q. R., XVI, 47.
3 Allgemeine Zeitung des Judenthums, VII (1843), no. 35.
Judaism, 1843" (Programm zu einer Erklärung deutscher Israeliten, Freunden religiöser Reform im Judenthume zur Beherzigung vorgelegt, 1843); and C was the declaration proper\(^1\). The letter, which was signed by Simon Maas, Dr. jur., in the name of the Jewish Friends of Reform, requested the co-operation of the addressee in the undertaking with which a number of reputable Israelites had declared themselves in sympathy, and for the furtherance of which many highly respected men in Germany were ready. The founders of the society requested the signatures of all “who do not expect a Messiah to lead them back to Palestine; all who do not accord any authority or obligatory power to the confused and frequently meaningless rabbinical interpretations and injunctions; all who strive for a form of faith whose enlivening principle is pure Mosaism.” The letter asserted further that reform in Judaism existed in reality, and that all that was necessary was an open declaration; as a result of this the reform movement would be sure to receive fitting recognition and become a working force in Jewish life.

The so-called programme opens with a eulogy of Moses and the religion he established; this religion is capable of unceasing development; however, many of the institutions of Mosaism were of a national character and dependent upon the possession of a particular land. When in the course of time the land was lost and the nationality came to an end, many of the Mosaic ordinances ceased to exercise any binding force, e.g. the laws regulating the ownership of land, the prerogatives of the priests and Levites, the sacrificial ritual and the criminal code. Their place was taken, however, by a mass of ritual and ceremonial laws to which in time the greatest importance came to be attached, and Judaism became a system of observances whereby the spiritual content and import of

\(^1\) These documents were published in full in Freund's Zur Judenfrage in Deutschland, 1843, pp. 257-65 and as the supplement to no. 44 of Vol. IV (1843) of the Israelit des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts.
the religion were dimmed. This externalism assumed ever
greater prominence during the ages of exclusion and
oppression; the Jew clung to every observance, custom,
and ceremony that had developed in the course of the
ages. When, however, the era of freedom dawned, men
arose who realized with dismay how far Judaism had
travelled along this path and how pronounced was the
difference between the inner purity and dignity of the
divine truth of the religion and the external form that
it had assumed. The new opportunities had been grasped
by such as these, and they had acquired the culture of
the people among whom they lived. They sought to
extricate the jewel of Judaism from the dross with which
it had become encrusted; they found their inspiration
in the prophets of the Old Testament who had pro-
claimed that the spirit of the religion was independent of
the blood of bullocks. . . . Yet attempts at reform up to
this time consisted merely in liturgical imitations of other
religions or in compromises with the followers of rabbinism.
Rarely did any one think of emphasizing the capacity of
Mosaism for unending development. In so far the charge is
ture that no decisive step has been taken by the Jews to con-
form their religious practice to the higher culture to which
they owe their intellectual progress. Civilization has freed
them from rabbinical jurisdiction; it must be our task to
purify the religion of all antiquated disfigurements and
present it in a worthy form. “In our day the difference
between the inner truth of Judaism and its external form
has become especially acute. Nurtured by the intellectual
culture of the age many of those who are accounted
members of the Mosaic religious community have arrived
at the conviction that most of the practical commands, the
observance of which constitutes the bulk of present-day
Judaism, rest on human and temporary premises. They
claim rightfully that this external form is for the most
part without significance, yes even unworthy of pure
religion, and they draw the inner content of divine truth,
which an earlier generation found in the Law, from those treasures of wisdom alone which have won over to the truth so many great spirits of all nations. Thus thousands have renounced allegiance to Talmudic rabbinical Judaism, and are connected outwardly with the Mosaic religious community only by habit or by the control of the state or by family ties. This condition of affairs is destructive and immoral; for as long as a man lives in a community he should not pass as something altogether different externally from what he is in thought and inner conviction. The Jew who has grown indifferent to his religion on this account must decide whether he will continue to be known merely as a Jew by birth, thus sacrificing free-will to habit, and being deprived of all outward religious association that is expressive of his inner conviction or—whether, longing for some tangible form, he will join some other religious association. . . . But those who cannot content themselves with either of these alternatives will pin their faith to the belief in the capacity of Judaism for development, and instead of continuing in a state of indolent lethargy will aim to harmonize their spiritual convictions with their professions. . . . Moved by these considerations, a number of German Israelites have determined to give expression to their opinions of the present conditions in Judaism through a public declaration, and to renounce formally their allegiance to all objectionable commands, and to all antiquated customs, which to all intents and purposes they have rejected long ago.” They disclaimed any purpose of desiring to obtain through this declaration more political rights than were accorded to the strict observers of the rabbinical code; neither did they intend to formulate any dogmas or create a sect or a schism; all that they purposed was an open, honest statement of facts and beliefs as had obtained in Jewish life for a number of years past; and particularly did they desire to convince competent religious teachers that truth has a home in Israel, and to encourage such to support with all the weight of their learning the
religious standpoint of truth-loving laymen. The address concludes with the words, "least of all is it our desire to hurt the susceptibilities of the strict adherents of rabbinical Judaism. Let us hope that success will crown this our honest endeavour, not only to give our religion a worthier form, but also to expound the pure content of Judaism, and to remove from it everything which has degraded and dishonoured it in the eyes of thinking men. Every participant in this movement feels already great inner satisfaction in that he has chosen his standpoint in reference to the highest spiritual interests, and has paid allegiance to the truth. Let us begin bravely then a task not only necessary from the civic standpoint and intellectually justified but also highly moral and, in all truth, pleasing to God."

Hereupon followed the famous Declaration; it consisted of three paragraphs as follows:

1. We recognize the possibility of unlimited development in the Mosaic religion.

2. The collection of controversies, dissertations, and prescriptions commonly designated by the name Talmud possesses for us no authority either from the dogmatic or the practical standpoint.

3. A Messiah who is to lead back the Israelites to the land of Palestine is neither expected nor desired by us; we know no fatherland except that to which we belong by birth or citizenship.

As already mentioned, the publication of these documents was premature, and had been forced by the excitement aroused by the reports circulated by the enemies of the society in the public prints; it had been the intention of the founders of the society to refrain from all public activity and agitation until so many signatures had been obtained from all sections of Germany as to prove that this was a great popular movement; they had not had time to accomplish this purpose, if in truth it could ever have been accomplished with the programme they had formulated.
This, of course, must remain conjecture for all time; the facts in the case are that the publication of the documents of the society called forth a storm of opposition and denunciation that was in truth overwhelming; orthodox, conservatives, moderates, reformers, all joined in reprehending the presumption of this handful of men whose address and declaration showed how ill prepared they were for the task they had undertaken, and how inadequately they understood the true import of Jewish development. The thunders of the opposition sounded from all quarters; the rabbis,—from Holdheim¹, Geiger, and Einhorn, the reformers, to Trier and Ettlinger, the uncompromisingly orthodox,—wrote in criticism and disparagement; the society found but one sympathizer and defender among the rabbis, M. Hess of Saxe-Weimar. But not only among the rabbis was this resistance met with; the most prominent layman in all Germany was Gabriel Riesser; as soon as he became acquainted with the three points of the declaration he announced his unalterable opposition in a letter to Stern; although an active and enthusiastic advocate of religious reform he declared the Frankfort movement a step backward rather than a step forward. He feared also the impression that the paragraphs of the declaration would make upon the general public; the first he considered a mere phrase; the second and third were simple retorts upon the watchwords of Judaeophobia. He despised this tendency for it does not serve the truth; its only purpose is the effect it may produce upon the civic authorities². Stern answered him at length, but I pass this answer by for the present since I shall give at length his elaborate defence of the society which appeared some time later³; Riesser found no time to reply to Stern, but

¹ Except in the circumcision controversy in which Holdheim supported the position assumed by members of the society, infra.
³ The society itself answered its critics in an official document dated December, 1843, and signed by Dr. Neukirch in the name of the members of the society. The statements in the document are quite the same as
that he had not been convinced appears from the fact that when the affairs of the society became a matter of newspaper comment in the summer of 1843, and Stern and Riesser were named as its chief sponsors, Riesser denied this statement publicly and declared his opposition to the society. The most striking attacks upon the organization were made by Leopold Stein, rabbi in Burgkunstadt, Bavaria, and elected rabbi of Frankfort in March, 1844, M. Gutmann, rabbi in Redwitz, S. D. Luzzato, David Einhorn, Michael Sachs, Zacharias Frankel, and by many others whose opinions were published in the collection of responses gathered by the old rabbi of Frankfort, Solomon Abraham Trier, and which will receive extended notice in the course of this article when the attitude of the society on the circumcision question will be considered. The most notable defence was that of M. A. Stern in answer to the attacks of Stein, Gutmann, Einhorn, Hirsch, and Mannheimer; the society was also defended by M. Hess in five leading articles in his newspaper. In these articles he applauds the act of the founders of the society; he states that the Jews have advanced but not Judaism, and that official Judaism is at fault, that life calls for reforms, and that this declare—

those made by Stern, and given at length in the course of this article. See Freund's Zur Judenfrage in Deutschland (1844), pp. 116-22; see also Allgemeine Zeitung des Judenthums, vol. VIII (1844), no. 1, p. 5; Orient, vol. V (1844), no. 6, p. 43.

1 Allgemeine Zeitung des Judenthums, VII (1843), no. 33.

2 "Der Frankfurter Reformverein vom Standpunkte des fortschreitenden Rabbinismus," Literaturblatt des Orients, 1843, nos. 46-8.

3 ibid. 1844, nos. 1 and 2.

4 ibid. 1843, no. 51.

5 Allgemeine Zeitung des Judenthums, VIII (1844), no. 7.

6 Zeitschrift für die religiösen Interessen des Judenthums, I (1844), 49-60.

7 ibid. 60-72. Frankel opens his article by saying that the society "cannot be considered Jewish, and belongs to Judaism as little as to any other religion," and closes by declaring that "the reform society is the most unfortunate attempt that has ever been made. It has condemned itself and has been condemned by public opinion"; see also ibid. 302, where he says "they were honest in their method, but their method was not that of Judaism."

tion is the first evidence that enlightened Jews have given of a clear understanding of the situation. He defends the society from the chief charges that had been made against it; these charges were that the three paragraphs of the Declaration are not far-reaching enough; that they are only negative (thus Frankel called them "articles of unbelief," and Einhorn "a confession of unbelief"); that they were indefinite; that the third paragraph discredits the patriotism of Jews who still believe in the personal Messiah and the return to Palestine; and lastly, that it was fathered altogether by laymen and non-theologians, while theologians alone could and should inaugurate such a movement. I cannot stop to give Hess's reply to these charges and criticisms, notably as I feel that space should be given primarily to the defence of M. A. Stern which also answered these points. The open letters of Stern written in answer to the attacks upon the society by Rabbis Stein and Gutmann are the most remarkable literary product of the agitation called forth by the formation of the Reform Society. He takes up the criticisms of Stein and Gutmann point for point and answers them without reserve, often sharply, sarcastically, and caustically. A brief résumé of his argument makes unnecessary the separate quoting of the objections of Stein and Gutmann, as these are indicated sufficiently in the reply. The first letters are addressed to Stein. The reason for laymen taking the initiative was that rabbis had not done so, although they had bewailed frequently the sorry condition of affairs in Judaism and had declared reform absolutely necessary. The Reform Society, inspired by these statements, had taken the bold plunge, but had indicated in its declaration only

1 The open letters to Einhorn, Hirsch, and Mannheimer in Nos. 6–8 of vol. VI of the Israellit des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts consist for the most part of mere personalities, and therefore I dismiss them with this reference; they were the third series of open letters; the first two series to Stein and Gutmann contain the gist of the defence.

the absolutely necessary doctrines that would appeal to the contemporary generation as expressing the idea of development in Judaism. In answer to Stein's designation of them as reformers he says, "We are not reformers; we could not and would not be. We are merely reformed; the age, advanced intelligence, possibly also progressive rabbinism, are the reformers. We desire to make no proselytes; we wish to induce no one, who is not of a like opinion with us, to join us; we have merely called upon such who think as we do to combine with us. Therefore the 'Declaration' is drawn up in such a way as to express our individual view." As for the third paragraph concerning the Messiah, rabbis had said the same thing time and time again, and Stein does not even advert to this paragraph in his criticism, hence he must agree with it.

"As to the second declaration Stein does not argue; he simply accuses us of not knowing the Talmud;" Stern answers sarcastically, and enters a flat denial claiming that they do know the Talmud; this, however, is not to the point; the point is the authority of the Talmud. "The Talmud shall receive acknowledgment for all that is of value in it. We have denied only its authority, not its historical value." It is the first paragraph of the Declaration, however, that has been made to bear the brunt of the hostile attacks; and yet, what does it say?—That the members of the society recognize in Mosaism the possibility of unlimited development; what does this imply but the principle of reform? something which progressive rabbinism, the religious standpoint of Stein, has declared time and again.

Stern then discusses the permanent element in Judaism; this is certainly not the ceremonies as progressive rabbinism has stated often, certainly not the belief in miracles, certainly not metaphysical truths which are rare in the Bible. "What then is the permanent element in Judaism? Nothing

1 Israelit des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts, 1844, 175. 2 ibid. 179.
3 ibid. 180. 4 ibid. 181. 5 ibid. 188.
else is unchangeably permanent except the glorious idea of its world-embracing destiny to which its whole history bears witness, nothing else but its divine mission to develop within itself the belief in God and to spread this over the whole earth. Therefore, too, it must be able to appreciate the ideas of all ages and the conditions of all places; therefore it must not be limited by any temporal institution. . . . It must eliminate all institutions that have outlived their usefulness, and must bear within itself the possibility of unlimited development." The Reform Society considered it a bounden duty to give expression to this thought; it is a jewel which has been recovered out of stunted rabbinical Judaism.

The purpose of the Reform Society was simply to make this general declaration, not to carry it out in practical reforms as applicable to special Mosaic laws; this is to be the work of the rabbis. Some of the members of the society, the writer among them, wished to go farther and specify certain Mosaic institutions that have outlived their original significance, but the majority decided otherwise on the ground that their chief purpose was to gain the adherence of all who believe in the principle that Mosaism is capable of unlimited development.

In answer to Stein's question in what the society was specifically Jewish, and whether the most orthodox Christian or Moslem could not become a member, he says that the first paragraph shows that this is impossible, because neither Christian nor Moslem believes in the possibility of the unlimited development of Mosaism, holding as they do that a new revelation was necessary for the salvation of mankind.

He denies the statement made frequently at that time that Bruno Bauer's essay on the Jewish question was

1 *Israelit des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts*, 1844, 190.
2 ibid.
3 ibid. 197.
4 "Die Judenfrage," in *Deutsche Jahrbücher* for Nov. 1842; published separately, Brunswick, 1843. This anti-Semitic essay was one of the literary and
the direct cause of the formation of the society. The deliberations looking to its formation began in September, 1842; in the beginning of November the writer had communicated with Dr. Riesser on the subject, and Bauer's essay did not appear till several weeks later 1.

He meets Stein's charge that the doings of the society retarded the civil emancipation of the orthodox Jews, by saying—"if you demand that we shall not retard your civil emancipation we may demand certainly with equal justice that you should not interfere with our spiritual emancipation, for what is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander. We are not enacting a farce, nor is our society a mere matter of convenience that we will abandon at your desire; we have a sacred duty to fulfill which is nothing less than to extricate ourselves from a thoroughly false religious situation 2." Stein had averred that the paragraphs of the Declaration were purely negative; Stern retorts by calling upon him to show the way and to give them something positive, fortified with "reasons taken not from policy but from Jewish theology, with reasons that do not presuppose the authority of the Talmud, and which would therefore not satisfy us 3." He denies that he is the author of the official documents of the society, and claims that he saw them only after they were published 4; he closes with

journalistic sensations of that day, and elicited many replies from Jews; the claim of the enemies of the Reform Society that this essay gave the impulse to its formation rested without doubt upon the passage of the essay in which Bauer comments upon the statement of the advocates of the emancipation of the Jews that they desire to return to pure Mosaism; he declares this to be senseless, since Mosaism means sacrifice, priestly caste, and peculiar property legislation; its logical consequence is the Talmud; both Old Testament and Talmud are chimerical and unreal; emancipation will be impossible until the Jews cease to be Jews and become men,—in other words, "when they become in reality men who will not permit themselves to be separated from their fellow men by any barrier mistakenly considered essential."

1 Israelit des neunzehnten Jahrhunderte, 1844, 198.
2 ibid. 199.
3 ibid. 200.
4 ibid. 201.
accusing the progressive rabbis, among whom Stein classed himself, of cowardice and with wishing to conciliate both parties, and hence with having no definite principles. "You and all who share your opinion are greatly mistaken," thus he addresses Stein in taking leave of the subject, "you will never succeed in conciliating the orthodox party; they will use you against progress so long as you permit yourselves to be used; but the moment you presume to act against their will you will be damned. The orthodox know full well that they cannot surrender one iota without endangering their whole position. You will alienate more and more the cultured and progressive elements because you refuse to satisfy the demands of culture, inasmuch as your practical reforms restrict themselves to a few changes in the service. . . . What is the gain of such a scarcely perceptible advance? Is this the only factor, the only institution in which salvation is to be found, or is it not rather in the purified religious consciousness for whose edification the external institutions will adapt themselves of necessity? . . . If you are not possessed of courage, then be content to lose yourselves among the crowd, and do not aspire to leadership; least of all should you glorify your faint-heartedness as the correct policy and call the courageous foolhardy. Let him who is cowardly and faint-hearted turn back and go to his home. Judaism will fulfil its mission without you and in spite of you; help and salvation will come from another place." 

In his open letter to Gutmann, Stern discusses first the Messianic question, and shows how the hope for the coming of the Messiah has developed in Judaism; he challenges Gutmann's statement that this hope runs like a red thread through the Bible; the Pentateuch says nothing concerning it, nor do many of the prophets; it is a late growth on the stem of Jewish thought, and thousands of the present generation have repudiated it; this being the case, how can they utter the prayers supplicating for the coming

1 Israelit des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts, 1844, 909.
of a Messiah and the rebuilding of Jerusalem; such prayer is really blasphemy, for it is equivalent to uttering a falsehood; "if we make supplication to God for something the direct opposite of which we wish for in our hearts, what is this but a mockery? does it not change prayer, the purest relation of man to God, into shocking blasphemy?" He therefore declares that he will cease to attend the synagogue as long as these conditions exist unless forced to do so by law, a possible contingency in view of certain proposed strange legislation. It is absolutely necessary for the Reform Society to institute a service which will express the honest convictions of the Jew of to-day. He calls upon the rabbis to revise the prayer-book as proposed by the rabbinical conference just held at Brunswick, and to eliminate altogether those prayers which are at variance with the people's belief; "the attempt has been made, it is true, to eliminate some of these prayers, but is a lie less a lie because it is uttered once instead of ten times?"

Since the authority of the Talmud was repudiated, the Bible was accepted naturally as the all-important authority; but the letter of the Bible is dead like every letter, and becomes living only if it receives the breath of the spirit; it requires human interpretation. The meaning of the first paragraph of the Declaration is this: "the progressive development of mankind is unlimited; if Judaism is to keep pace with this, if it is to share in the shaping of the future of mankind, i.e. if it is not to pass away, it must contain within itself the possibility of unlimited development. This is the plain meaning of the first paragraph of our Declaration."

There must be development in religion; the divine is perfect, it is true, but it must accommodate itself to human imperfection; hence a command suitable for one age may be outgrown by a subsequent age; thus, blood-revenge is

---

1 Isaiahide des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts, 1844, 287.  
2 June 12-19, 1844.  
3 ibid. 290.  
4 ibid. 294.
sanctioned in the Bible; but this does not mean that all future ages must regard this primitive institution as sacred. "Mankind outgrows laws which were formulated for earlier imperfect stages of civilization as a child outgrows its clothes; the law ceases to be operative of itself as soon as the conditions that gave it birth cease. Hence if we do not wish to surrender the sublime conception of the continual progress of mankind, we will have to concede that religion, the expression of the human cognition of God, must keep pace with this progressive development." He proceeds to explain the purpose of the Reform Society: "Away with all explanations that simply introduce new shackles of the law in place of the old ones; let us thank God that Judaism has no dogmas; away with attempts at compromise in this our time, in which scarcely any two persons think alike in religious matters. What we can and should do is to clear away that which is dead; for this we should unite in active endeavour,—this is the purpose of the Reform Society."

Gutmann had charged that the Reform Society denied divine revelation; Stern replies with a definition of revelation as the progressive advance of the spirit of man; belief in the literal revelation as described in the Bible, Exod. xix-xxi, is not defended by any but the most orthodox; the least rationalizing of this passage would lay any one open to the charge directed against the Reform Society, and surely Gutmann would not defend the literal acceptance of this passage which states that God descended upon Mount Sinai, that he spoke, that the elders saw God, that Moses approached God, &c., and continues, "It must be proved whether the positive element of Judaism consists of stories or of its history (in Geschichten oder in seiner Geschichte) of the manner in which it grew, or of that which it became;" he demands from Gutmann.

---

1 Israelit des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts, V, 296. 
2 ibid. 297. 
3 "Es muss sich zeigen, ob das Positive des Judenthums in Geschichten oder in seiner Geschichte, in der Art, wie es geworden, oder in dem, was es geworden, besteht." Ibid. 304.
a statement as to whether he accepts this passage of Exodus literally; if he does not he occupies the same platform as the Reform Society. Despite this spirited and full defence the society, one might almost say, "died a-borning." Yet although it proved so flat and wellnigh complete a failure as a practical organization, and although its founders did not grasp or comprehend the true significance of the development of Judaism, one point cannot be denied, nor may it be overlooked, and that is that the Frankfort Reform Society was an honest attempt to make open declaration of the sentiments that were entertained by a large section of Jews. Reform was an accomplished fact in the lives and thoughts of thousands; the commands of traditional Judaism were not observed by them; Judaism had entered upon a new stage; the Reform Society was a sign of the times; its promoters wished to square profession with practice. That its Declaration was inadequate and its method ill-chosen, that its procedure was violent instead of ordered, that it simply negatived instead of building up from a sure and positive foundation, that it represented revolution rather than reform, schism rather than continuous development, may not blind our eyes to the all-important merits of honesty of intention and recognition of the true state of affairs in Jewry. But their action was little more than a spasmodic outburst; the three articles of their creed evince all the limitation of their thought, and their failure to grasp the true idea of de-

1 See A. Rebenstein's remarkable article "Unsere Gegenwart" in Freund's Zur Judenfrage in Deutschland, II, 13 ff., 22 ff. This and the article by Dr. S. Holdheim having the same title (ibid. 149-71), are two most striking statements of the condition of religious affairs among the Jews of Germany at this stirring time, and of the true meaning and purpose of reform.

2 See the letter of Dr. Theodor Creizenach, one of the founders of the society, written on Sept. 2, 1843, to Dr. Wilhelm Freund, the editor of the magazine Zur Judenfrage in Deutschland, and published in Vol. II of the same, pp. 175-8; also the editorial article on the purpose of the society, in Israelit des neuns. Jahrh., VI (1845), 161.
velopment in Judaism, which is the key-stone in the arch of reform. This appears clearly and unmistakably from the first two paragraphs of the Declaration, viz. the cry "back to Mosaism," and the repudiation of the Talmud. It was fashionable in those days for anti-rabbinical and anti-Talmudical Jews to affect the style and title of professors of the Mosaic Faith (Bekenner des mosaischen Glaubens), indicating thus their hostile attitude towards the Talmud; this earned for them the sobriquets of Mosaites and Protestant Jews, for it was claimed that theirs was an attitude similar to that taken by the Protestants of the Reformation period in the history of Christianity; viz. the acceptance of the Bible and the repudiation of all subsequent tradition. Now the true knowledge of Judaism makes it clear that the Books of Moses and the remaining writings preserved in the Bible represent stages in the development of Judaism, as do the literary remains of every succeeding era; the Bible made Judaism as little as did the Talmud; Judaism brought forth the books of the Bible as well as the Talmud, and all other products of the Jewish spirit. Hence it is an utter misunderstanding of Judaism to disregard any phase of its development; each age had its needs and met them as well as it could; the Talmud and the codes served their purpose in the outworking of the faith, as well as did the Biblical books; what is true in either is eternal; what was temporary in either was for special times and circumstances, but from both as from every expression of the spirit of Judaism true reform draws its inspiration. It is folly to limit the possibilities of Judaism to the content of Mosaism; it is folly no less to attempt to erase from the record the centuries marked by the rise and rule of Talmudism; every mode of expression that Judaism has assumed, Mosaism, prophetism, Talmudism, rabbinism, even cabbalism, contributes its quota to the understanding of the essentials;

1 See five leading articles entitled "Der reine Mosaismus" (Pure Mosaism), in the *Israelit des neuen Jahrh.* II (1841), 1, 5, 9, 13, 17.
each represents the fitting of the eternal elements of the faith to particular circumstances; this is the principle at the root of the reform movement, and therefore those who interpreted it correctly defined it as a new phase in the age-long development, a new aspect produced by the new revelation of God in the unfolding of the ages. This the Frankfort reformers failed utterly to grasp. The third paragraph of their Declaration repudiating the belief in the personal Messiah and the return to Palestine, was correct in itself as a tenet of the reform movement, but should have been merely one of a number of statements instead of being posited as the only special declaration, the other two being of a general character.

The almost unanimous disapproval of the society was justified by the facts in the case, and it takes its place in

1 Holdheim particularly gave expression to this thought. I reproduce several of his significant statements on the subject: "The present requires a principle that shall enunciate clearly that a law, even though divine, is potent only so long as the conditions and circumstances of life, to meet which it was enacted, continue; when these change, however, the law also must be abrogated, even though it have God for its author. For God himself has shown indubitably that with the change of the circumstances and conditions of life for which he once gave those laws, the laws themselves cease to be operative, that they shall be observed no longer, because they can be observed no longer. . . . The present age and its guiding principle, as thus formulated, recognize the working of God in history; it believes truly and firmly in the providential guidance of the fortunes of mankind; it looks upon the deeds recorded in the history of mankind as the deeds of God, whereby he speaks as clearly as he ever did; a particular revelation of God to a single person is dispensable when God speaks to all and reveals his will to all" (Freund’s Zur Judenfrage in Deutschland, II, 165 f.). "True reform can rest only on the recognition of the truth that God commanded certain laws for certain times and certain conditions of life, and that it would be acting against the divine will to fulfill the law by a forced and casuistical interpretation of its meaning after the conditions have changed so essentially as to preclude the carrying-out of the law in its correct and original significance." Ibid. Salomon put this same idea in a most striking way at the Conference of Rabbis held at Brunswick in 1844, when he said, "The age also is a Bible through whose mouth God speaks to Israel" ("auch die Zeit sei eine Bibel, durch deren Mund Gott zu Israel spricht"), Protokolle der ersten Rabbiner-Versammlung, 91, Braunschweig, 1844.
the history of the reform movement not for any full and rounded interpretation it gave of the purpose of this movement, but as one of the significant births of that period of travail, the fifth decade of the nineteenth century. Still it is quite possible that this Reform Society would not have been the storm centre of so fierce a tempest had it confined itself to the theoretical statements comprised in its programme, and not become identified with the agitation that shook the Frankfort community from centre to circumference in connexion with the circumcision question. This it was which really roused its opponents. As mentioned above, the first draft of the Declaration contained five paragraphs, the third of which asserted that the members of the society do not consider circumcision binding, either as a religious act or symbol. Although this paragraph was eliminated from the final draft, it expressed the convictions of a majority of the members of the society, and when an instance really occurred of a father neglecting to have his child circumcised, the excitement aroused in the community knew no bounds.

The attention of the sanitary bureau of Frankfort had been called to the fatal outcome of a number of cases of circumcision; in order to prevent such mishaps in the

---

1 This man was not a member of the Reform Society, but his action was in sympathy with the expressed views of the members of the society; therefore the society was made the target for the shafts of the opposition. It was not long before a second similar case of neglect to have the rite performed occurred, and this time the offending father was a member of the society. *Israeit des neunz. Jahrh., V, 24.*

2 At this time an anonymous publication appeared entitled, *Circumcision historically and dogmatically considered,* by Ben Amithai (*Ueber die Beschneidung in historischer und dogmatischer Beziehung*); this publication was looked upon generally as a pronouncement of the Reform Society; the author put the question, "Is circumcision an absolute condition of Judaism, so that an uncircumcised child cannot be considered a Jew, or is it not?" (p. 5). He answered the question in the negative, and suggested another method of initiation into Judaism, viz. a solemn declaration by the father in an assembly of ten Israelites, that he desired to have the child received into the covenant made by God with Abraham and Moses.
future this bureau promulgated a measure placing the circumcision of Jewish children under the direct supervision of the sanitary office; the third paragraph of this measure ordered that "Israelitish citizens and inhabitants, in as far as they desire to have their children circumcised (sofern sie ihre Kinder beschneiden lassen wollen), may employ only persons especially appointed to perform the rite of circumcision." Members of the Reform Society and others who sympathized with them interpreted these words to mean that the rite of circumcision was to be performed or omitted at the desire of the father. It was not long before the actual occurrence took place that made the matter a living issue. The question as to whether circumcision was a condition sine qua non of entrance into Judaism had been discussed at the meetings of the Reform Society; it had become known that Riesser had urged that the society should institute active propaganda for the abolition of the rite; the final determination of the society not to include the circumcision paragraph in its Declaration had been one of the chief reasons why he had refused to be identified with it. Although it is true that at the time the agitation broke forth the society had not made any public official declaration pro or con the sentiments of its members were well known, and it became identified in the public mind with the anti-circumcision agitation. The aged rabbi of Frankfort, Solomon Abraham Trier, believing that one of the very fundamentals of Judaism had been wantonly disregarded by the individuals who had neglected to have their children circumcised, addressed the Senate on February 26, 1843, calling the attention of the law-making body to the importance of circumcision from the religious standpoint, and pointing out the dangers that would threaten the integrity of the Jewish community were the performance or omission of this rite to be left to the caprice of the individual father; he therefore requested the Senate to issue a de-

1 Isler, Gabriel Riesser’s Leben, nebst Mittheilungen aus seinen Briefen, I, 360.
finite declaration that should counteract the effect of that phrase in the regulation of the sanitary bureau, which had been seized upon by the opponents of circumcision, as a justification of their position, the phrase, namely, "in as far as they desire to have their children circumcised." The Senate answered him on March 10 by saying that it was not the intention of the regulation in question to abolish a religious ordinance of the Jews. This, however, was not definite enough, and the agitation continued unabated. The danger of calling in the aid of the State to decide upon the private concerns of a religious community, was pointed out by clear thinkers, but the old rabbi and his party felt that the very existence of Judaism was imperilled, and hence considered any and every step justified, even the employment of force through the legislative arm.

On August 4 Trier again appealed to the Senate, requesting that it declare that no child of Jewish parents could be received into the congregation as a co-religionist unless he had been circumcised; he made similar representations on September 15 and October 31; the Senate took action in the matter on February 13, 1844, by expressing its regret that certain members of the Jewish community gave cause for complaint to their co-religionists, and by stating its inability to take the step suggested by Trier.

This was a distinct defeat for the rabbinical party, and its ill-advised move to secure the support of the civil power against the nonconformists. It has been shown in a previous article how frequently this was done in those days; certainly nothing is more harmful to the true interests of religion than the use of force through the instrumentality of the government, to ensure the fulfilment of its behests and commands.

1 *Israelit des neunz. Jahrh., V, 69, 74, 84.*
2 *J. Q. R., XV, 501.*
3 For an excellent account of the numerous attempts to enlist the aid of the government against the reformers see Jost, *Geschichte der Israeliten, X, part iii, 225-34.*
Trier did not confine his activity to these attempts to secure governmental interference. He addressed also a communication to the rabbis of Europe asking for their opinions upon the Reform Society, and upon the significance of circumcision. His communication appeared as the introduction to the volume, *Rabbinical Responses on Circumcision*¹. He speaks of the Reform Society as schismatic, and as masquerading under the deceptive guise of reform, but as being in reality the opponent of positive Judaism; he denounces it as a new sect² standing outside the pale of Judaism³; he pleads for the preservation of positive Judaism which is exposed to the devastating hurricane of a misunderstood spirit of the age⁴; he asks for an opinion on the new sect, and invites suggestions as to what measures should be taken against such as refuse to have their sons circumcised through frivolity and unbelief. The communication was sent to eighty rabbis; forty-one responses were received, and twenty-eight were printed in the volume designated; these were from the rabbis Samson Raphael Hirsch of Emden, Nathan Marcus Adler of Hanover, Felsenstein of Hanau, Lazar Horwitz of Vienna, Jacob Aaron Ettlinger of Altona, S. Ullmann of Crefeld, M. Wetzlar of Gudensberg, Adler of Oberndorf, Samuel Hirsch of Luxembourg, Seligmann Bär Bamberger of Würzburg, A. Wechsler of Schwabach, H. Aub of Munich, S. D. Luzzatto of Padua, L. N. Mannheimer of Vienna, L. Adler of Kissingen, S. L. Rapoport of Prague, A. A. Wolff of Copenhagen, B. H. Auerbach of Darmstadt, Levy of Giessen, J. Bamberger of Worms, A. Sutro of Münster, J. Löwenstein of Gailingen, S. Fürst of Heidelberg, H. Traub of Mannheim, Wassermann of Mühringen, L. Schott of Randegg, J. Mecklenburg of Königsberg, and H. Schwarz of Hürben. All of these responses took strong ground in favour of circumcision; in fact it was stated that all the responses which had been

¹ *Rabbinische Gutachten über die Beschneidung, gesammelt und herausgegeben von Salomon Abraham Trier*, Frankfurt am Main, 1844.
² ibid. IX.
³ ibid. XIII.
⁴ ibid. VI.
received were uncompromisingly and unreservedly opposed to the Reform Society and its position. This was not quite in accordance with the facts in the case, for the response of Rabbi Elias Grünebaum was suppressed because of the difference of his views with those of the rabbi of Frankfort. Zunz also wrote a response which was, however, not included in the volume, but was published separately. In this the great scholar took positive ground against the abolition of the rite; he warns against heresy trials and ecclesiastical penalties; he urges that the father, who fails to have his son circumcised, continue to be recognized as a Jew; he would not have the synagogue closed to him nor give him pain, although he give pain to others. But circumcision is of the very essence of Judaism. It is not a ceremony but an institution; not the act of circumcising but the being circumcised is the kernel of the command. Other acts take place frequently in life; if neglected they can be atoned for and performed. In this case, however, a single omission is decisive, and the son who has not been circumcised by his father because of principle, will scarcely remain within Judaism for principle's sake.

It is not necessary to quote very extensively from the opinions contained in the volume published by Trier. Men of all shades of thought are represented in the volume; Samuel Hirsch the reformer, Isaac Noa Mannheimer the conservative, and Jacob Aaron Ettlinger the ultra-orthodox clasp hands in agreement upon the question at issue, although their reasons may not be the same. The twenty-eight responses present a practical unanimity of opinion to the effect that an Israelite who denies the obligatory character of the command to circumcise, and neglects to

---

1 This response was published in the Israelit des neuen Jahrh., V, 121-5, 199-32, with an editorial footnote that it had been suppressed by the committee that had the publication of the responses in charge; see explanatory statement of the committee, ibid. 176-7.

2 The response has been included in the edition of his collected writings, see Gesammelte Schriften von Dr. Zunz, II, 191-303, Berlin, 1876.
have his son circumcised on the ground that he does not consider it essential to Judaism, is to be considered a denier of the divine law, and a destroyer of the eternal covenant. S. R. Hirsch stated that by such declarations and acts, they (the members of the Reform Society) have cut themselves loose from Judaism, and the rabbi of the community to which they belong must treat them as no longer members of his community; they are apostates (*mumrim*).  

The response of N. M. Adler, rabbi in Hanover, is of interest because of his election shortly thereafter as chief rabbi of Great Britain. Adler considers the question from three standpoints, the Biblical, the historical, and the religio-philosophical; he shows that although commentators and philosophers may have differed widely as to the significance of circumcision, this one explaining it as a symbol of purification, that one as a sign of priestly selection, this one giving it a social, that one an ethical, and a third a sanitary interpretation, yet all agreed as to its being an absolute requirement for the Jew; he therefore concludes that the one who disregards the command is an apostate, and incurs all the sad consequences which the law ordains in the case of apostates; all association with him must cease; he must be looked upon as excluded from the congregation of Israel.  

The renowned scholar, S. D. Luzzatto of Padua, declared that the members of the society are heretics and deniers of the Mosaic Law, and that according to their own confession they stand without the pale of the Jewish religion. His response, however, evinces a beautiful spirit; although positive in his attitude of unfailing opposition to the Reform Society, and although he opines that no congregational office or honour should be bestowed on its members, or any gift or offering be received from them, yet he recommends leniency, and counsels that words of truth and peace be addressed to them; possibly thereby they

---

1 *Rabbinische Gutachten über die Beschneidung*, 4.
2 *ibid.* 13.
3 *ibid.* 14.
will be induced to renounce their error and return to the right path.

The Viennese preacher, I. N. Mannheimer, disputes the right of the few to break away from the great community; Judaism is a historical system; it rests not on philosophy; it is life, it is experience; it is made up of a thousand forces, and any violent action such as this of the Reform Society is treason to the spirit of Judaism. He apostrophizes the Reform Society thus: "Cut yourselves loose from us! you have nothing in common with us! You speak of the force which we apply to you and to your conscience; and do you expect us to submit humbly to your capricious procedure; do you expect for one instant that we shall or can permit that each and every one shall obey or disregard the commands of our religion according to individual whim or caprice, that any and every insignificant or irresponsible person shall arise and contemptuously disregard Talmud and commentators to-day, and Moses and the prophets to-morrow?" Further along he asserts that the refusal to have a child circumcised is equivalent to a renunciation of the covenant of God; he declares also that should such a case occur in his congregation, he would not admit the boy to any Jewish function, would not register him as a Jew, would not confirm nor marry him, nor permit him to be buried in a Jewish cemetery; in Austria no Jewish child is registered unless circumcised.

Finally the opinion of S. L. Rapoport, the celebrated scholar and rabbi of Prague, may be cited; he presents the argument from history, saying, that from the time of Abraham none have questioned the fact that circumcision is a necessary condition for entrance into Judaism; he indulges in the strongest terms of condemnation of the members of the Reform Society, speaking of them as "that frivolous company, which denies the fundamental principles of our religion, and confesses publicly that it does not

1 Rabbinische Gutachten über die Beschneidung, 77.  
2 ibid. 99, 100.  
3 ibid. 101.  
4 ibid. 102.
accept our traditions; "those reformers have no definite standpoint in Judaism; their only purpose is to break down all the preventive measures which the divine law has set up against human passions;" "we must exercise the greatest care and warn our co-religionists most earnestly to have no association of any kind with the members of this Reform Society, particularly not to form any matrimonial alliances with them." I refrain from quoting any further from these opinions, since the extracts which have been given indicate the sentiment that runs throughout the volume; as already mentioned, each and every one represented in this collection argued strongly and often passionately in favour of circumcision as an absolute requirement for the Jew; it is but just, however, that the other side also be given a hearing, and I therefore feel it necessary to introduce the opinions of the two leading reformers of the time, Geiger and Holdheim. Although Geiger was quite as opposed to the course pursued by the Reform Society, as were the strict traditionalists, still he sympathized with them in their opposition to circumcision; in a letter to Zunz, written March 19, 1845, he says in discussing Zunz's opinion on circumcision: "I was not in sympathy with the Reform Society; it had no clear idea of what it was striving for, neither was it honest enough in its utterances; instead of proceeding calmly and sanely, it aroused the greatest antagonism by attacking at once the rite of circumcision, which was considered a very fundamental of Judaism. . . . As for myself, I must confess

1 Rabbinische Gutachten über die Beschneidung, 26.  
2 ibid. 137.  
3 ibid. 140. See also his article, "Die Epoche des Maccabäer-Kampfes und die heutige Zeit—Eine Parallele," in Zeitschrift für die religiösen Interessen des Judenthums, I (1844), 117. 
4 See his letters of Aug. 25, 1843, and June 11, 1844, to M. A. Stern, Nachgelassene Schriften, V, 167 ff., 173 ff. 
5 Zunz had written in his response: "God forbid that we should tamper with this precept, which was in past times, and is still at the present day, reverenced as sacred by the whole Jewish people. Who will dare abrogate with impunity this holy rite?"
that I cannot comprehend the necessity of working up a spirit of enthusiasm for the ceremony merely on the ground that it is held in general esteem. It remains a barbarous bloody act . . .; the sacrificial idea which invested the act with sanctity in former days has no significance for us. However tenaciously religious sentiment may have clung to it formerly, at present its only supports are habit and fear, to which we certainly do not wish to erect any shrines. Geiger, however, did not express himself publicly in this wise; this was written in a private communication. Holdheim, on the other hand, issued a pamphlet entitled Circumcision, Viewed Religiously and Dogmatically; he considers the subject at length from three points: (1) is circumcision so important a condition in Judaism that the uncircumcised individual who has been born of Jewish parents is not to be considered a Jew? (2) is the father who neglects to have his son circumcised still to be considered a Jew? (3) what is to be the attitude of the Jewish religious authoritative body if circumcision is neglected? may it resort to force—in such cases as it has the power to do so—to compel a father to have the ceremony performed, or in case it has not the power, may it call in the aid of the civil authorities? The third question he answered with a

1 Nachgelassene Schriften, V, 182–3.
2 Ueber die Beschneidung in religiöso-dogmatischer Beziehung, Schwerin and Berlin, 1844.
3 The consideration of this third point was undoubtedly inspired by the utterances of Zacharias Frankel, the exponent of "positive-historical Judaism," in his magazine Zeitschrift für die religiösen Interessen des Judenthums, I, 60 ff. Frankel argued that if the father neglected to have his child circumcised the duty devolved upon the religious authoritative body. It is only through circumcision that the born Israelite receives the real sanctification. True, by the very fact of his birth he is included in the congregation, but he does not become a full member thereof till he is circumcised. Therefore the act is to be considered partly in the light of a sacrament. In Judaism even more than in Christianity the sacramental reception of the child devolves upon the spiritual representatives of the community as a duty. For in Christianity the child is entirely without the fold until baptized, while in Judaism it is partly
decisive negative; the individual's freedom of conscience may not be tampered with by the application of force; the religious leaders in Judaism may exercise only the task and the right to teach. In regard to the first two points, he contended that circumcision was a sign and condition of the theocratic-national, but not of the religio-universalistic covenant in Judaism; not circumcision then makes the Jew, but birth; circumcision is not an all-essential requirement in Judaism, therefore both the father who neglected to circumcise his son, and the son who was not circumcised, are to be considered Jews.

within owing to its birth. The religious authoritative body is not to punish the father, but to protect the child, and should call in the aid of the civil power, which is justified in interfering in such cases as threaten to disrupt Judaism.

1 It will not be out of place to refer in this connexion to a most interesting case that occurred a few years later. In 1847 a Mr. Hirsch, of Teterow, Mecklenburg-Schwerin, neglected to have his newly-born son circumcised; he expressed the desire, however, to rear the child in the Jewish faith, and insisted that it be entered in the registry of Jewish births and receive its name in the synagogue in accordance with the custom then existing in Mecklenburg. The teacher, Salinger, who officiated in the community, did not know how to proceed in this exceptional case; he applied to the Jewish directorate for guidance; this in its turn referred the case to Dr. David Einhorn, the chief rabbi of the province, for decision. Einhorn authorized the teacher to name the child in the synagogue, and showed that even from the Talmudic standpoint the uncircumcised Jew is not to be excluded from the Jewish community if he has not wilfully declared his purpose to cut himself loose; this is not the case in the present instance, for the father has declared expressly his desire to rear the child as a Jew, and certainly the innocent child is not to be excluded from the community for no fault of its own. He closes his letter of instructions in the following lofty strain: "May God bless the child, and adorn it with the virtues of an Israelite indeed, an Israelite of circumcised heart, and may all those who think that the integrity of our divine religion, which our forefathers sealed with their noble blood a thousand times as a covenant between God and Israel and all mankind, is threatened by such occurrences, and are therefore sorely troubled, derive consolation from the thought that the divine by its very nature is imperishable, and that Judaism rests on the indestructible pillars of right, truth, and peace, which will not totter even though the earth wax old like a garment and the heavens vanish like smoke." The child was named in the
The result of all this agitation was to leave the question, as to the necessity of circumcision as a *conditio sine qua non* of Judaism, much the same as it had been before. With the fewest exceptions, the authoritative voices had expressed themselves strongly in the affirmative. Holdheim and Hess stood alone among the theologians in their radical views on the subject; Geiger apparently agreed with them, but he did not give utterance to his views otherwise than in private correspondence. Practically the ceremony continued to be, and still is, almost universally observed; the rabbinical conference that met in Breslau in 1846 made a number of declarations of a practical bearing, but uttered no decisive opinion on the cardinal point of the essentiality or non-essentiality of the ceremony; at the meeting of the Central Conference of American Rabbis held in the city of New York in 1892, the majority of the members present voted that circumcision was not necessary in the case of proselytes to Judaism. There are many Jews to-day who feel as did the Frankfort reformers of 1843, that circumcision is a relic of barbarism, and should make way for some other method of initiation into Judaism, more in consonance with the universalistic interpretation of the faith. It is to be hoped that some representative rabbinical organization of the reform school, like the Central Conference of American Rabbis, will take up this question in the near future, and after considering it from all sides, make some positive declaration in accordance with the standpoint of reformed Judaism.

All things considered, the outcome of this whole agitation was a gain for the progressive movement. Although the extremists who had called the Reform Society into being did not meet with much sympathy, yet on the other hand it had become apparent that the days of usefulness of extremists at the other end of the scale, like Trier, were over, and that the community of Frankfort required a rabbi

of the new school. Events had been moving towards this end for some years, but it was not till 1844 that it was consummated. In March of that year, Leopold Stein, rabbi of Burgkunstadt in Bavaria, was elected as associate rabbi to Trier. This choice of the directorate was extremely displeasing to the old rabbi, and, had the circumstances and the year been the same, there would have been undoubtedly a repetition of the Geiger-Tiktin affair; but even during the short space of six years great changes had taken place in the religious atmosphere enveloping Jewry, and the strenuous experience of Geiger was not repeated. Still Trier did not accept the inevitable without a struggle; a few weeks after the election of Stein he refused to deliver his semi-annual derashah on the Great Sabbath; he had protested to the Senate of the city against the election of Stein; the Senate referred him to the directorate of the congregation as having jurisdiction in the premises. Trier resigned as rabbi in May.

Stein, who styled himself an adherent of the progressive rabbinical party, at once began reforming the service; as early as July, 1844, he introduced sixteen liturgical reforms; among them may be mentioned the change of the benediction שֶׁשֶׁהָיָה אֵלַי לָךְ וַעֲמֹדָה וְהָאֲשֶׁר רֹאִיתָה and the substitution of an appropriate German prayer for the שֶׁשֶׁהָיָה אֵלַי לָךְ וַעֲמֹדָה and the pac; and the substitution of German songs for the נְבָעָה לְאֵלֶּה וְלֹא נָעַמ and the לַעֲבֹד נְבָעָה; the introduction of the German sermon; and the singing of German hymns before and after the sermon.

1 J. Q. R., XVI, 44 ff.
2 Before the inception of the reform movement it had been customary for the rabbi to preach but twice or possibly three times a year, viz. on the Great Sabbath (i.e. the Sabbath immediately preceding the Feast of Passover) and on the Sabbath of Repentance (i.e. the Sabbath of the ten days between the New Year's Day and the Day of Atonement); these derashoth were not sermons in the homiletic sense, but were halakhic in character, being explanations of the laws to be observed in connexion with the holidays. The third annual sermon was preached occasionally on the Eve of Atonement. See Jewish Encyclopedia, Art. "Homiletics."
The activity of Stein in the reform cause, although by no means satisfactory to the members of, and sympathizers with, the Reform Society, for whom he did not go far enough, still had the effect of taking the wind out of their sails. The communal congregation having placed at its head a rabbi of the new school, it was felt generally that there was no need for a special reform society or congregation. In truth the Reform Society as an organization disappeared from the public communal life; it was heard from but twice again; once when it declared that the time had come for Sunday services to be introduced and appointed a committee of five to look for a suitable preacher, and to request the congregation to grant the use of the Andachtsaal for this purpose \(^1\), and again when, in June, 1845, it issued a circular letter, in which it expresses gratification at the progress of reform ideas; after calling attention to what was done at the Brunswick rabbinical conference \(^2\), it calls upon every Israelite to support the rabbis who are leading the hosts onward. It welcomes the formation of the Reform Association of Berlin \(^3\). It suggests a meeting of reformers from all over Germany in the fall of 1845, for the discussion of ways and means of uniting the various reform tendencies among German Jews. The letter ends with the words "let us remain united, firm and loyal, and the success of our efforts will discomfit the false zealots, will put to shame the selfish indifferentists, and Judaism will become the bond that unites us without separating us from our century, our fatherland and mankind \(^4\)." These words may be considered the valedictory of the Frankfort Society; considering that it had never in reality passed beyond the formative stage, the prominent rôle that it played during two eventful years is remarkable; that it gave a great impulse

---

\(^1\) *Allgemeine Zeitung des Judenthums*, IX, 709.

\(^2\) This conference met June 12–19, 1844; it will form the subject of a subsequent chapter in this study.

\(^3\) *Die Genossenschaft für Reform im Judenthume*, organized May 8, 1845.

to the progressive movement, not only in Frankfort, but throughout Germany, cannot be gainsaid; nor can it be denied, on the other hand, that its members, pursuing the method they did, showed that they did not have the correct understanding of the development of Judaism. The extreme individualism and the animus against theologians and rabbis, at once stamped the Society as partisan beyond measure, but more than all else the absolute inadequacy of its platform proved that its founders were not competent leaders in that stormy period of Jewish life. It represents, however, a groping for the light, and although it failed signally in the work it set out to do, still will it remain in Jewish annals as one of the most interesting episodes of a most stirring epoch. It had panegyrist and detractors; it aroused bitter passions. These things have passed. Looking back from the vantage-ground of sixty years after, we recognize that the Reform Society of Frankfort represented the extreme left of the hosts marching under the reform banner; in some respects it had separated from the main army, but with it all, its members desired to remain within Judaism, and we may write as its epitaph the closing words of its last public utterance, that its aim was to make "Judaism the bond which unites us without separating us from our century, our fatherland, and mankind."

CINCINNATI, O., U.S.A.

1 In addition to the articles and pamphlets referred to in the course of this chapter, the following may be mentioned as having been inspired by the Reform Society:—Das moderne Judenthum, die Frankfurter Reformfreunde und die Neue Zeit, von Albert Fränkel, Reutlingen, 1844. Die Rabbinerversammlung und der Reformverein; letzte Auflösung der Judenfrage, von Dr. W. B. Fränkel (an anti-Semitic screed by an apostate), Elberfeld, 1844. An die israelitischen Reformfreunde in Frankfurt a. M., an anonymous poem by a Christian lady, Israelit des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts, IV, 214. Über den jüdischen Reformverein in Frankfurt, von Prof. Dr. Nesselmann, ibid., V, 32. Zur Kritik der Beschneidungsfrage im Reformverein von Dr. J. Bergson, Literaturblatt des Israelit des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts, 1847, nos. 44, 45, 46, 47.
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Erst durch die arabischen Übersetzungen aus dem Griechischen


Es treten hier schon Prinzipien für die Erkenntnisquellen hervor, welche der arabischen Theologie entlehnt scheinen: 1. Die Schrift; 2. die Analogie (streitig); 3. die Übereinstimmung oder die "Gesamtheit"; 4. die Tradition, hebräisch und arabisch (אלהמש התרשוח ותרשוח ממור, 3. תרשבה), für die Analogie tritt der Sinn (ὺπίθεων Wahrnehmung) und der Intellect (אלהמש) ein; so erhalten wir die Canones des Saadia Gaon, der den Intellect voranstellt; freilich erscheinen dieselben auch noch bei dem Phantasten Abraham Abulafia (Jellinek, 1 S. auch Goldziher's Artikel, "Le Moutakallim juif abu'l-Kheyr," und "R. Nissim b. Jacob Moutazilite," in Rev. Ét. J., Bd. 47, pp. 41 u. 179.)
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Wir besitzen noch keine spezielle kritische Geschichte der arabischen Theologie, da bis vor kurzem die Hauptquellen dafür jüdische waren, und bei den Arabern wenig geschichtliche Sonderung der Nachrichten zu finden war. Der Einfluss der Philosophen Alfarabi und Avicenna ist erst in neuerer Zeit erforscht worden; letzterer verfasste auch eine Philosophia orientalis, welche auch von Juden copirt wurde. Meine frühere Andeutung, dass unter den sogenannten "Lauteren (d. h. wahrhaften) Brüdern," unter deren Namen eine vielbenutzte Encyklopädie verbreitet wurde, auch Juden zu finden sein mochten, reduziert sich durch den Zweifel an der Existenz oder Ausdehnung dieser Bruderschaft.

im Einzelnen zuweilen als Rationalist, indem er manche Erzählung der Bibel als innere Anschauung oder Vision auffasst. Ähnliches finden wir bei seinem Zeitgenossen Chaschan b. Chuschiel in Kairuwan, der auch in Bezug auf Glaubensartikel sich beinahe so ausspricht, wie 400 Jahre später Josef Albo (Geiger, w. Zeitschr., I, 399). Wir finden hier schon in nuce das Prinzip des Maimonides, dass die Prophetie eine Erscheinung der Einbildungskraft sei.— Mit Maimonides beginnt der Niedergang der Bedeutung des Orients für die jüdische Literatur überhaupt.


allgemeine Anerkennung und Verbreitung verschafft. Im 12. Jahrh.
traten Abtrünnige auf, wie Petrus Alfonsi, der arabische Formen der
Poesie auf lateinischen Boden versetzte, ibn Da'ud (Avendeuth), der Übersetzer,
Bearbeiter des einflussreichen Buches de Causis, Andreas, welchem
nach Roger Baco der Übersetzer Michael Scotus alles verdankte; um
1211 ist wahrscheinlich geboren der zum Islam übergetretene, aber ver-
dächtigte arabische Dichter Abraham ibn Sah. Der Versuch der Karäer,
in Spanien sich niederzulassen, wurde durch ihre Gegner vereitelt. Jener
Zeit gehören die jüdischen Religionsphilosophen: Juhuda ha-Levi, der
allerdings mehr der Philosophie und dem Karaismus sich entgegen-
stellt; Josef ibn Zaddik, zu dessen Zeit (nach B. Beer, "Philosophie
eetc.," S. 8) Glauben und Religion noch nicht entzweit waren, unter-
scheidet zwischen Auferstehung und zukünftiger Welt fast noch
energischer als Maimonides; der Märtyrer Abraham b. David behauptet
in seinem Buche "Die erhabene Religion" (nach Beer, S. 69) eine
Übereinstimmung zwischen Vernunft und Offenbarung, da letztere
nichts enthalten dürfe, was der wahren Wissenschaft widerspricht;
Aristoteles und Saadia stellt er hoch. Abraham ibn Esa's Philosophie,
welche N. Krochmal zum Teil auf ungeschobene Schriften basirte,
und D. Rosin bis in die Einzelheiten verfolgte, ohne ein scharfes
Bild der Genialität des Gelehrten zu zeichnen, verliert sich in den
Phantasien der Astrologie 1.

Bei der nachfolgenden Schilderung des weithin verbreiteten Kampfes
zwischen Haggada und Philosophie 2 ist es zu beachten, dass von Seiten
der Grammatiker schon seit Abul'-Walid der Midrasch von dem einfachen
Wortsinn (Peschat) streng gesondert wurde. Unter den
Philosophen fing man an, die Haggada philosophisch zu deuten. Zu
Spanien darf in damaliger Zeit auch Nordwest-Afrika gerechnet
werden, oder umgekehrt. Dort tritt Josef ibn Aknin, der spätere
Schüler des Maimonides, auf; in seinem dreifachen Commentar über
das Hohelied wird dieses idyllische Buch in eine Theorie des aktiven
Intellecctes verwandelt.

Die Bedeutung des Maimonides beruht auf seinen miteinander
zusammenhängenden Eigentümlichkeiten. Er ist hauptsächlich

1 B. Karppe (Étude sur les origines et la nature du Zohar, etc., Paris, 1901,
p. 193), glaubt, ibn Esa mit folgender Phrase zu charakterisieren: "Esprit
mathématicien formé à l'École de Gerbert, Almansor et Averroës, et
tempérament mystique." Man darf schwerlich annehmen, Herr K.
wisse, dass mit Almansor ein Astronom und ein Astrolog bezeichnet
werde; ibn Esa hat zu beiden so wenig Beziehung als zu Gerbert und
Averroës; s. Zeitschr. für Mathematik, xii, 31.

2 Quellen sind in Jew. Lit., § 11 verzeichnet, hier nur selten nach-
getragen.

Der Kampf um die Philosophie auf jüdischem Boden lässt sich in zwei Perioden teilen: die erste beginnt noch bei Lebzeiten des Maimonides, und zwar zugleich im Orient und Occident; die zweite fast nur im südlichen Europa.


1 Dieser Ahron aus Lunel ist verschieden von Ahron Cohen aus Majorca, Verfasser des *Orchot Chajjim*, der auf dem Titelblatt irrtümlich aus Lunel heisst.


1 Ich habe mir einiges Charakteristisches notirt, aber die Blätter verlegt, und halte es nicht der Mühe wert, die Stellen nochmals aufzusuchen.

Es scheint, dass dieser Streit, welcher zu Maimonides' Lebzeiten begann, seinen Höhepunkt erreichte durch dieses Werk, und ähnliche welche gefährliche Lehren einem weiten Leserkreise zugänglich machten, wie sie die Übersetzung arabischer Schriften des Maimonides in die Provence und Frankreich eingeführt hatte. Die Meinungsverschiedenheiten entwickelten sich von einzelnen Dogmen zu Prinzipien der Religionsphilosophie.


1 Vergl. dazu Jew. Lit., p. 87.
des nördlichen Frankreichs, in welchem er sie aufforderte, zwischen den Gegnern zu entscheiden. Er scheint mehr Sympathie bei den französischen Rabbinen gefunden zu haben; der gelehrte Simson ben Abraham aus Sens bekämpfte die Theorie Ahron's mit rein talmudischen Argumenten, blieb auch immer ein Gegner Maimonides' (siehe unten).

welcher, trotz seiner Achtung vor Maimonides, die Ansicht Salomon's und dessen Schüler verteidigte. Der jüngere Samuel b. Abraham Saforta (oder Sporta?) richtete an die französischen Rabbiner ein achtungs-aber eifervolles Schreiben, indem er durch gelehrt Argumente und Citate bewies, dass die haggadischen Stellen des Talmuds nicht in wörtlichem Sinne verpflichten, verteidigte die Ansichten des Maimo-
des, und verlangte von denen, welche sie verurteilten, Gründe dafür.

Die Stellung des Nachmanides (Moses ben Nachman aus Girona) in diesem Kampfe ist noch nicht genügend klargestellt (s. Hebr. Bibl. III, 1860, S. 74); die Stellen, die irgendwelches Licht darauf werfen, scheinen von den Herausgebern einigermaassen geändert worden zu sein. Sein System der Mystik contrastirte stark mit der nüchternen Philosophie; daher hat er, wie mancher Andere, wohl nur die hohe persönliche Autorität, nicht das System des grossen Talmudlehrers verteidigt, dessen Andenken durch das Verbot seiner Werke nicht beschimpft werden sollte. Es scheint, dass Nachmanides nicht minder den Bann gegen Salomon b. Abraham missbilligte, dessen Sache er in einem Briefe an Meir Abulafia vertrat. Dieser Brief ist längst veröf-

Die Ehrfurcht vor Maimonides scheint den Wendepunkt herbeige-
führt zu haben, und bevor mehrere der Briefe erlassen waren, dass die von den Gemässigten verlassene orthodoxe und fanatische Partei einen weiteren unbedachten und verhängnisvollen Schritt, der später, bis zu unserer Zeit, wiederholt wurde. Sie unterwarfen den jüdischen Glauben dem Urteile von Christen; sie beschuldigten die Schüler Maimonides' der Ketzerei und brachten die angeklagten Bücher auf den Scheiterhaufen. Sie selbst jedoch zogen daraus keinen Vorteil. Einige von ihnen, vielleicht auch Salomon selbst, welcher in seinem Fanatismus die gesamten Bücher des Maimonides als antichristlich denuncirt hatte, wurden der Verleumdung überwiesen, nach den barbarischen Gesetzen jener Zeit wahrscheinlich durch Ausschneiden der Zunge bestraft, und büsten schliesslich ihr Leben ein (vor 1235). Sie riefen aber den Zelotismus der christlichen Geistlichkeit hervor, welche diese Angelegenheit zum Vorwand nahm zu einem Vernich-
tungskriege gegen jüdische Literatur und Juden überhaupt. Nach einem in neuerer Zeit veröffentlichten Briefe des Arztes Hillel ben

1 Andere Briefe sind edirt in ישע בר נכד, Bamberg, 1875, S. 54-72, vergl. S. 110.


Auch im Osten hatte schon früher (1190) Samuel ha-Levi, Schulhaupt zu Bagdad, gegen Maimonides' Auferstehungslehre gestritten, eine Widerlegung des letzteren hervorgerufen, und war vielleicht gegen


1 Abschriften dieses Bannes wurden bis nach Europa verbreitet und riefen unter anderem eine Apologie "des Führers" hervor, deren Verfasser vielleicht Schemtob Palquera ist. Dieser erklärt in seinem Buche Reschit Chochma, S. 21, dass nur Ignoranten annehmen, das Studium der Wissenschaften sei verboten, weil sie selbst darin unwissend sind, im Gegenteil, jenes Studium sei dem Glauben förderlich.
nicht bloss erhielten sich die Spuren jener beiden Charaktere: Sefaradi (spanisch-portugiesisch, arabisch, wissenschaftlich) und Aschkenasi (deutsch-französisch [zarfati], romanisch u.a.w.), sondern der Streit um die Philosophie knüpft noch in den Ausläufern dieser Periode, z. B. bei dem Kabbalisten Schemtob ibn Schemtob (gest. 1430) und seinem Bekämpfer Mose Alaschkar (1495), ja selbst bis auf die Gegenwart herunter, an Maimonides und seine Gegner; ein eigentümliches Beispiel dafür ist Jechiel N. b. Samuel (oben S. 362).

Dieser Streit und Kampf hat außer der allgemeinen Bedeutung für die prinzipielle Auffassung des Judentums noch eine literarische und wissenschaftliche überhaupt. Es handelt sich um die Geltung der Haggada, also aller eigentlichen religiösen und wissenschaftlichen Anschauungen gegenüber der Halacha; und zwar scheint auch damals in extremen Kreisen die religiöse Praxis etwas gelockert; doch fehlt es an beweisenden Tatsachen: umgekehrt sehen wir, dass selbst ein Mann, wie Joseph Caspi, der in der Theorie soweit geht, die biblische Urgeschichte bis Abel mit einem Witze (הבר ב) abzumachen, eine Anekdot erzählt, wie er mit einer rituellen Frage bei dem Rabbiner des Ortes aufgehalten worden (diese Anekdot ist in ein Werk Jehuda Modena's hineingeraten); er erzählt nicht in frivoler Tendenz, da er selbst über Mangel an Frömmigkeit klagt.

Es stellte sich das Bedürfnis heraus, dem freien Inhalt der Haggada eine systematische Unterlage zu geben durch die "profane" Wissenschaft; die Theologie wird systematisch, die Exegese teilt sich in verschiedenen Tendenzen.

(An Appendix will contain the principal sources and a few additions and corrections.)

M. STEINSCHEIDER.
DIE JÜDISCHEN APOSTEL.

In seinem jüngsten großen Werke kommt Professor Harnack\(^1\) auch auf eine der wichtigsten Institutionen der christlichen Kirche, auf das Apostolat, zu sprechen, und kommt zu dem Resultate, dass auch das Judentum Apostel hatte, und das Judentum wäre auch hierin dem Christentum vorangegangen. Bei der grossen Bedeutung, die den Werken Harnack's mit Recht zugemessen wird, verdient das Resultat, zu dem Harnack gelangt ist, auch vom Standpunkte des Judentums genau erwogen zu werden, zumal es sich um das Apostolat handelt, eine Institution, von welcher die älteste Daseinsform der Kirche bedingt wird, und welche noch heute, wie z. B. in Ungarn, eine eminent politische Bedeutung hat, da der apostolische Charakter des Landesherrn ihm beträchtliche Rechte sichert, die sonst für die Kirche vorbehalten sind.

Haben nun die Juden Apostel gehabt? Diese Frage müssen wir mit Harnack entschieden bejahen. Die Sache an sich stand übrigens auch früher schon fest, denn Graetz hat ihr in gewohnter scharfsinniger Weise eine Untersuchung gewidmet\(^2\), in welcher die haupt- schlichsten Beweise, nämlich die Nachrichten der Kirchenväter Eusebius und Epiphanius, aber auch ein Passus des Codex Theodosianus, wie nicht minder einige talmudische Stellen, bereits zur Verhandlung gelangen. Ich selbst habe ferner eine wichtige Stelle des Hieronymus beigebracht\(^3\), und ist daselbst auch der hebräische Name Slias\(^4\) angegeben. Wie es schon die Art der christlichen Gelehrten ist, kümmern sie sich nicht um das, was von Juden gesagt und

---


\(^3\) In Ep. ad Galatas, 1. 1: Usque hodie a Patriarchis Iudaeorum apostolos mitti. Siehe J. Q. R., VI, 230.

geschrieben wird, folglich beruft sich Harnack nicht auf Graetz. Seiner Darstellung entnehme ich ferner, dass die Frage der jüdischen Apostel seitens christlicher Theologen noch gar nicht erörtert wurde, und so erscheint eine Discussion nicht überflüssig.

Die Angabe Harnack's, das Wort ἀπόστολος, wenn auch nicht ganz in technischem Sinne, komme in LXX vor (1 Reg. xiv. 6), ist irreführend, denn dort kommt nur das Verb ἐπιστέλλειν vor, entsprechend dem Hebräischen ישלח: "ich bin zu dir gesandt worden"; dass also der Prophet Achia "so genannt" werde, ist nicht richtig. Mit ebensoviel Recht könnte z. B. Jerem. vii. 25 angeführt werden, wo ושה ישלוח mit ἀποστέλλω übersetzt wird. Der Beweis also, dass weil ἐπιστέλλειν von ihnen gesagt wird, die Propheten im Alten Testament ἀπόστολος heissen (Justin, Dialog., § 75), steht auf schwachen Füßen.

Die ältesten Belege für die Bezeichnung "Apostel" liefert also das Neue Testament. Paulus spricht von Aposteln 2 Cor. viii. 23 und Philipp. ii. 25, und Harnack sagt mit Recht, dass er nicht so gesprochen hätte, wenn das Judentum keine Apostel gekannt hätte. Schön bemerkt Harnack, dass Paulus ein "Apostel" war, bevor er noch Apostel wurde, denn noch als Saulus, als er die Christen verfolgte (Act. viii. 2), hatte er Briefe von dem Hohepriester und dem Presbyterium in Jerusalem an die Brüder, d. i. an die Juden, in Damascus (ib. xxii. 5), oder, wie es an einer anderen Stelle heisst: er hatte eine Vollmacht von den obersten Priestern in Jerusalem (ib. xxxvi. 10). Die oberste Behörde in Jerusalem stattet also ihren Abgesandten mit Briefen und Vollmachten aus und sendet ihn an die auswärtigen Juden — das ist in Kürze die Definition des Apostolats. Paulus war ausgesandt worden, die abtrünnigen Juden, das ist die Christen, aufzuspüren, gefangen zu nehmen und nach Jerusalem zu senden; er hatte also ein religiöses Amt.

In gleicher Richtung bewegt sich die Aufgabe der jüdischen Apostel auch nach den anderen christlichen Berichten, die wir über sie besitzen. Justin sagt, die Juden senden von Jerusalem aus in die ganze Welt ausserlesene Männer (ἀνδρας ἐκλεκτοὺς), um die gottlose Haeresis der Christen zu verläumden (Dialog., § 17, cf. 117); diese Sendlinge waren durch Auflegung der Hand zu ihrem Berufe geweiht worden (ἀνδρας χειρονόμησαντες ἐκλεκτοὺς, ib. § 108), und das Auflegen der Hand weist gerade auf das Amt des Apostels, cf. Act. xiii. 3. Justin meint schwerlich, dass die Sendlinge eben bei ihrer Aussendung die Weihe der Handauflegung erhielten, sondern er bezeichnet damit den Charakter der abgesandten Männer, indem er sagt, es seien geweihte Männer gewesen. Nun ist aber die Ceremonie der Handauflegung (אתו פלех) aus den talmudischen Berichten zur Genüge be-

1 Loc. cit., p. 41.
kannt, und wir wissen, dass nur die im Judentum höchst stehenden Männer eine solche Weihe erhielten. Schon daraus erhebt die religiöse Wirksamkeit jener Männer; die Gesetzeslehrer höchsten Ranges wurden dieser Ehre teilhaftig. Ein Ausdruck an der letzten angeführten Stelle Justin's belehrt uns noch weiter darüber: jene Männer predigten (κηρύσσοντας), nach der eminente technischen Bedeutung, die dieses Wort im kirchlichen Griechisch hat.

Die nächst Bezeugung ist die des Eusebius① (in Jes.xviii. 1 f.). Er schreibt: "Wir fanden in den alten Schriften, dass die in Jerusalem wohnenden Priester und Aeltesten des jüdischen Volkes, nachdem sie Schriften aufsetzten, dieselben zu allen Völkern sandten, um bei den Juden überall die Lehre Christi zu verdächtigen, als eine neue und Gott entfremdete Haeresia, indem sie durch Briefe kundgaben, dass sie dieselbe nicht annehmen möchten.... Ihre Apostel aber, die papiernen Briefe tragend,... durchließen die ganze Erde, indem sie das Wort bezüglich unseres Erlösers verdächtigten. Noch jetzt ist es nämlich Sitte der Juden, Apostel zu ernennen, die encycliche Schreiben ihrer Führer antragen (ἀποστόλους δὲ εἰσεῖς καὶ νῦν άθεο ἑστὶν ιουδαίους ἐνομάζειν τοὺς ἐγκύκλια γράμματα παρὰ τῶν ἀρχίτων αὐτῶν ἐπικομιζόμενοι). Auch danach ist das Amt der jüdischen Apostel das der religiösen Belehrung, und zwar als Abgesandte der obersten Behörde zu Jerusalem, deren Briefe wohl nur die hauptsächlichsten Punkte der Belehrung enthielten, während die Apostel wohl noch die Aufgabe hatten, die Lehren des jerusalemischem Collegiums in Predigten zu verkünden.

Paulus, Justin und Eusebius zeigen uns die Apostel in ihrer Fehde mit dem Christentum; natürlich schliesst das nicht aus, dass andere Apostel und bei anderer Gelegenheit zu anderen Zwecken des religiösen Lebens ausgesandt wurden. Ich glaube als Apostel bezeichnen zu müssen die gelehrten und vornehmen Männer Joazar und Juda, die von der Behörde zu Jerusalem dem Josephus nach Galilaea mitgegeben wurden (Josephus, Vita, § 7); Josephus nennt sie


③ οἱ τε ἀπόστολοι αὐτῶν ἐπιστολὰς βιβλίας κομίζομεν. Der Ausdruck gründet sich auf LXX. Jes. xviii. 1, 2.
immer "Mitgesandte" (συμπρέπες, ib. §§ 12, 13, 14), ein Ausdruck, der dem Sinne nach sich mit "Apostel" deckt; von dem gleichfalls technischen Ausdruck "Presbyter" kommt im N. Testament auch συμπρέπεςτέρος vor. Vielleicht ist damit ein anderer Fall zu vergleichen, wo aus Jerusalem vier angesehene Männer nach Galilaea entsendet werden (Vita, § 39). Diese Männer verfolgten den Zweck, das Judentum vor dem Feind zu schützen; sie hatten also ein überaus wichtiges Interesse zu wahren.


1 Elci el ci ir mepa τῶν πατρόρχησ τῶν καλούμενοι.
2 Vielleicht ist damit zusammenzuhalten, was Origenes berichtet (Epist. ad Africanum, § 14), dass die Ethnarchen (d. i. Patriarchen) der Juden im Geheimen Todesurteile fallen.
ein Licht auf die Angabe des Josephus, dass seine Mitgesandten eine grosse Menge Geldes aus den ihnen gegebenen Zehnten bei sich hatten (Vita, § 12); allerdings meint Josephus, dass sie diese Zehnten in ihrer Eigenschaft als Priester einzuziehen berechtigt waren, was er, Josephus, trotzdem er ebenfalls Priester war, nicht tat. Es fragt sich jedoch, ob der parteiische und sogar gehässige Bericht des Josephus die Tatsachen nicht entstellte habe? Jene Männer, die das höchste Vertrauen der judäischen Behörde genossen und in schweren Kriegszeiten, auf gefährlichem Boden, in Galilaea, ihres Amtes walteten, dachten schwerlich an die eigene Bereicherung, sondern sammelten die Abgaben wohl zu Gemeindezwecken, was auch daraus hervorzuzeigen scheint, dass sie die Abgaben nicht in natura, sondern zu Geld gemacht aufbewahrten. Die Einsammlung von Zehnten konnte übrigens nur auf palästinischem Boden statt haben, denn im Auslande galt die Zehentpflicht nicht. Damit wird aber die buchstäbliche Auffassung von ἐμίδικαρα und ἀναρχαι des Epiphanius hinfällig, und so kann Epiphanius nur den entsprechenden Geldwert gemeint haben. Immerhin ist die Einhebung von Geldern nach Epiphanius noch immer nicht das Hauptgeschäft der Abgesandten, sondern liegt ihre Tätigkeit mehr auf religiösem Gebiete.

Eine Verordnung des Kaisers Honorius vom Jahre 399, gerichtet an den Propraetor Messala, spricht gleichfalls von den Aposteln (Codex Theodosianus, XVI, 8. 14). Danach werden Archisynagogen und Presbyter von den Juden selbst Apostel genannt, und diese werden von dem Patriarchen zu bestimmter Zeit zur Einhebung von Gold und Silber ausgesandt, und die von den einzelnen Gemeinden er-

1 Sie wurden aber gar nicht in priesterlicher Eigenschaft dorthin gesandt, ebensowenig wie Josephus, der doch auch Priester war, aber im Kriege diese Seite nie hervorgetrat.


3 Superstitionis indignae est, ut Archisynagogi, sive Presbyteri Iudaorum, vel quos ipsi Apostolos vocant, qui ad exigendum aurum atque argentum a Patriarcha certo tempore diriguntur, a singulis Synagogis exactam summam atque susceptam ad eundem reportent. Qua de re... fideliter ad nostrum dirigatur aerrarium. Noverint igitur populi Iudaorum removisse nos deportationis huiusmodi functionem. Quod si qui ab illo deeopolator Iudaorum ad hoc officium exactionis fuerint directi, iudicibus offerantur, ita ut tamquam in legum nostrarum violatores sententia proferatur.

4 Das wird im Monat Adar gewesen sein, in welchem ehemals der Schekel eingehoben wurde; da konnten die Boten zugleich die Festsetzung des Kalenders verkünden; cf. Mischna Schekalim, I, 1.

Gleichwohl erscheinen die Abgesandten auch im Talmud vorzugsweise als Geldsammler. In einer oft wiederholten Erzählung, die allem Anscheine nach historisch ist, kommt das wie folgt zum Ausdruck: "Es traf sich mit Rabbi Eliezer, R. Josua und R. Akiba, dass sie in die Gegend von Antiochia gingen, zum Zwecke von Einhebung

1 Das wurde im Jahre 417 widerrufen.
3 Pensio ist eine Dienstleistung; der colonus oder Sklave z. B. hatte opus et pensionem zu leisten, s. Marquardt, Privatleben der Römer, 2. Aufl., p. 138; siehe ferner, was ich in meinen Lehnbötern, II, 465, s. v. ש"ע darüber schrieb.
4 Iudaeorum Primates, qui in utriusque Palaestinae synedris nominantur vel in alii provinciis degunt, quacunque post excessum Patriarcharum pensionis nomine suscepero, cogantur exsolvere. In futurum vero... anniversarius canon de synagogis omnibus, Palatinis compellentibus exigatur ad eam formam, quam Patriarchae quondam coronarii auris nomine postulabant (Cod. Theodos., XVI, 8. 29). — Das aurum coronarium wäre auf griechisch τίλεια στεφανιων, und vielleicht steckt gar στεφανιων in dem vorhin erwähnten χρυ.— "Beide Palaestina" sind Palaestina Syriac und Palaestinae Phoenices, in welche damals Palaestina getheilt war.
5 Jeruschalmi Horajoth, III, 7. f. 48a; Lev. Rabba, V, 4; Deut. Rabba, IV, 8; Jalkut Prov., § 956. Die Varianten sind unerheblich.
6 עליךא גה, s. darüber meine Erklärung in Rev. des Ét. Juives, XLV, 40. Ich habe dort auf die Ansicht Neubauer's (Geogr. du Talmud, p. 312, n. 2) verwiesen, die da meint, die Gelehrten hatten die Mission, "pour combattre la propagande du christianisme parmi les Juifs." Obzwar das vorzüglich mit den christlichen Berichten stimmen würde, so ist im Texte dennoch nichts davon zu merken.

Die Erzählung, die für die "Apostelfrage" noch gar nicht — auch von Juden nicht — verwertet wurde, ist nach mehreren Seiten typisch und belehrend. Zuvor lernen wir in den Geldsammlern, in Eliezer, Josua und Akiba, die grössten Gelehrten des Zeitalters kennen; es bestätigt sich also, was Epiphanius sagt, dass die Apostel Beisitzer und Berather des Patriarchen waren, nach halbjudischen Begriffen Synedrial-Mitglieder, wie es überhaupt im Cod. Theodosianus (XVI, 8. 29) richtig heisst: Primates, qui in... synedriis


2 Wenigstens Akiba kann nicht mehr jung gewesen sein, und so waren wohl die Anderen auch schon in vorgerücktem Alter.

An der nämlichen Stelle des jerusalemischen Talmud werden noch zwei ähnliche Vorfälle erzählt: R. Chijja b. Abba machte eine Collecte im Lehrhaus zu Tiberias, es war aber dort einer vom Hause

1 Jeruschalmi: (τὸμος) ἀφανομιαὶ ὑλῆσαν; in Lev. R. fehlt das Fremdwort, in Deut. R. fehlt die ganze Phrase.
2 Deut. R. ἄνεος ἀναράμ, richtig nur Jeruschalmi und Lev. R.: νῦν οὖν ἀναράμ, was daran erinnert, dass nach dem Talmud die Frömmsten die Abgabe ἄνεος gab, d. h. eins von vierzig, während die Mittleren eins von fünfzig, die Lauen gar eins von sechzig geben (Kidduschin, 41a); vgl. den Midrasch, den ich aus Hieronymus anführe, in J. Q. R., VI, 255. — Im Verlauf der Erzählung, als Abba Juda so ausserordentlich reich geworden ist, heisst es von ihm in Deut. R., dass er den Rabbinen tausend Goldstücke gab.
Silvanus, dieser zeichnete ein Pfund Gold; da nahm ihn R. Chijja, setzte ihn zu sich und bezog auf ihn den Vers Prov. xvi. 16.— R. Simeon b. Lakisch kam nach Bostra, und es war dort ein betrügerischer Große — nicht, dass er wirklich ein Betrüger gewesen wäre, sondern im Vollzug der Gebote wendete er List an, er sah nämlich wie viel die Gemeinde auswarf, dann zeichnete er selber soviel; da nahm ihn R. Simeon b. Lakisch, setzte ihn neben sich und bezog auf ihn den Vers Prov. xvi. 16.


Noch ist ein Wort über die Zahl der Apostel zu sagen. In dem ältesten uns bekannten Falle, in dem des Josephus, der den Joazar und Juda seine Mitgesandten nennt, sich also mit ihnen auf die gleiche Stufe stellt, sehen wir ein dreigliedriges Apostel-Collegium; dieselbe Zahl repräsentieren Akiba und seine zwei Colegen, wie

1 Es ist derselbe, von dem oben die Rede war; er lebte Ende des zweiten Jahrhunderts.
2 ητί, also der 'Aσάχης des Epiphanius.
3 Auf der Reise nach Rom waren einmal R. Gamliel, R. Eleazar und R. Josua b. Chananja mit einander vereint, also drei, ein anderes Mal waren mit R. Gamliel die genannten Eleazar und Josua und auch Akiba, also vier (vgl. Frankel, Darke ha-Mischna, pp. 83, 84).—In der best bekannten Geschichte von Sendlingen einer Hochschule, in der von Abraham ibn Daud erzählten Begebenheit vom Sinken der babylonischen Hochschulen,

Nach dieser meiner eigenen Untersuchung komme ich wieder zu der Auseinandersetzung mit Harnack. Harnack fasst die Functionen der jüdischen Apostel wie folgt zusammen:

1. „Sie waren geweihte Personen und nahmen einen sehr hohen Rang ein.“ Das wäre ungefähr so zu formulieren: Sie waren durch die Ceremonie der Handauflegung ordinierte Männer und Mitglieder des höchsten jüdischen Gelehrten-Collegiums, des sogenannten Synedion.

2. „Sie wurden abgesandt in die Diaspora, um den Tribut für die Zentralstelle einzuheben.“ Richtiger: Sie wurden in die Provinzstädte von Palaestina und in die Diaspora abgesandt, um die Patriarchensteuer und die Gaben für den Unterhalt der Gesetzeslehrer einzuheben.

3. „Sie brachten encyklische Briefe dorthin, hielten den Zusammenhang mit dem Mittelpunkt aufrecht, berichteten über die Intentionen der Zentralstelle bez. des Patriarchen, hatten Ordre in Bezug auf gefährliche Bewegungen und sollten ihre Bekämpfung veranlassen.“ Füge hinzu: Auch hatten sie überall diese Aufgaben zu predigen und Unterricht zu geben.

4. „Sie übten in der Diaspora eine gewisse Aufsichts- und Disziplinargewalt aus.“


1 In der Affaire des Chananja waren die Sendboten R. Isaak und R. Nathan.

2 Paulus und Barnabas; Paulus und Petrus etc.— Eine jüdische Grabinschrift von Venosa nennt ausdrücklich duo apostuli et duo rabbbites; sowohl die Zahl, als der Umstand, dass die Apostel vor den Rabbinen genannt sind, macht die Inschrift höchst merkwürdig. Jene Apostel in Venosa waren schwerlich Apostel, d. i. Sendlinge im eigentlichen Sinne, sondern wohl nur jüdische Gelehrte von hoher Bedeutung.
Versammlung für den Patriarchen, welche mit ihm über dem Gesetze wachte."—Das ist ein Irrtum; die Apostel bildeten den Rat des Patriarchen ¹ auch schon vor ihrer Mission, und war ihre Aussendung darin bloß eine kleine Unterbrechung. Durch ihre Mission im Auslande bestiegen sie nicht neue Sprossen in der hierarchischen Rangleiter — eine solche gab es eigentlich gar nicht — sondern erfüllten nur eine Pflicht, die ihr Gelehrtenberuf mit sich brachte. Jeder Jude vom Gelehrtenstande hätte dasselbe getan, wenn er dazu auserlesen worden wäre, und wahrscheinlich haben es auch viele getan, ohne dass wir ihre Namen wüssten.

Ich füge ferner hinzu:—

6. Die jüdischen Apostel gingen aus einzeln, zu zweien, dreien, vieren etc., je nach Bedarf.
7. Über ihre Einnahmen und wohl auch sonstigen Verrichtungen führten sie Buch.
8. Die Juden kannten sie unter dem Namen "Gabeneinnehmer" (���ΐא, אẫ), oder einfach "Bote" (יושב).

Samuel Krauss.

Budapest, im März 1903.


¹ Sie waren seine προσέδροι.

Für babylonische Verhältnisse ist bezeichnend, was Raschi im Namen Scherira's in b. Gitten 60b mitteilt; danach waren in Babylonien für die den Akademien bestimmten milden Gaben eigene Büchsen (דיאקן = שצורה) aufgestellt.
JÜDISCH-ARABISCHES.

I.
Zu den Gentzäh-Dokumenten aus Kairo.


No. XIV. Die Übersetzung von D«n rU3 rt!>CN10 durch “the agent of the daughter of Hayyim” ist irrig. Der Herausgeber hat verkannt, dass i"LDN1D der Name der Tochter des Hayyim ist. Es ist arab. ii!y- «eigentlich “die, auf die man die Hoffnung setzt.” Das Masculinum kommt als Eigennamen mehrfach vor; vgl. Aqānī, Index, p. 660.

1.9 ist für Wefol wohl jT1B>i>N zu lesen; vgl. den Namen šOnibz Ja'kūt Geogr. Wörterb. a. v. Den Schluss des Documents hat der Herausgeber nicht übersetzt. Er lautet: “6 Kailag (Getreidemass) weniger §; und 5 (Kailag) weniger § (l. 12ntCN) und er hat zwei Dirham weniger § empfangen.”

Diese Notiz gehört wohl kaum zu dem vorhergehenden Texte.


Das Nähere ergiebt die folgende, nur in einigen unwesentlichen Dingen unvollständigen resp. unsicheren Übersetzung des für die Culturgeschichte ganz interessanten Documents.

Es hat Müsā mit dem Beinamen ibn 'Amrān ibn Ja'kūb aus Kābis dem Beth Din hier selbst eine Vollmacht, geschrieben in Kairawan von der Hand des Hillel [b. Moseh], vorgelegt, die besagte, dass er, nachdem Ja'kūb, der Vater des vorgenannten Müsā in Sicilien und sein Bruder Sahlūn in Alexandria gestorben waren, zu seinem Bevollmächtigten über ihre Hinterlassenschaft hier selbst und über
das, wofür kein anderer berechtigter Erbe als er, Musa, vorhanden ist, den Jusuf b. Ja'küb aus Tripolis bestellt hatte, der sich damals in Kairo aufhielt. Und zu dieser Erbschaft gehörten Kleider und Pelze und Mäntel mit Seidenborte und die sein Bruder als Privatbesitz hinterlassen hatte, und andere Dinge, von denen dieser Musa, als er in Sicilien war, dem Abraham b. David b. ʿIṣʿak ein Depositum: nämlich 4 Filzdecken aus Tälikän Stoff und 4 schwarze Kleider überwiesen hatte, und gab ihm Vollmacht, mit allem nach seinem Gutdünken zu verfahren, ausser dem, was bei Ben ʿIṣʿak deponiert war.


Datum.

Da der Text der Urkunde zum Theil etwas beschädigt ist, andererseits manche Stellen gewisse Schwierigkeiten enthalten, so seien einige Erläuterungen gestattet.

S. 575, 1. 2 von unt. wird ʿIṣʿak kaum als arab. gefasst werden können, allerdings ist auch die Annahme, dass es das aram. ʿIṣʿak "hier" sei, nicht ohne Schwierigkeit. — Das letzte Wort ʿIṣʿak ist wohl in Mutaḥāta = Muḥāta (Dozy "vérifier") zu ändern, cfr. Fīṣbūt S. 576, 1. 23.

S. 576, 1. 2. ʿIṣʿak ist und muss hier den Erbberechtigten bezeichnen.

1. 3. ʿIṣʿak bezeichnet nicht, wie der Herausgeber meint, Egypten, sondern den Ort, aus dem das Document stammt, Kairo.

Die Erbschaft zerfällt in zwei Theile: (a) Hinterlassenschaft des
Vaters, (b) Hinterlassenschaft des Bruders, die Richtigkeit der von
1.5 gegebenen Übersetzung vorausgesetzt. (Für יל ל.1...
Die Worte sind schwierig zu construieren; doch scheint hier für
sonstiges „persönlich“ (Doxy) zu stehen. Dem Sinne nach würde dies ja ganz gut passen. (Der Sohn,
Geschäftstheilhaber seines Vaters, hat auch Privatbesitz.) Im Folgenden ist zu lesen
אָכֶּסֶא וּמְרֵיה. 1.6 die Worte
1.6 ist vor sicher ein Verbum zu ergänzen. Die im Texte
gegebene Übersetzung ist natürlich nur ein Nothbehelf.
1.7 ist das erste Wort (wohl) für zu lesen; ib. ist die
Schreibung für zu beachten. Zu dem Namen vgl. Doxy
s.v.; ib. ist für wohl wie 1.6 zu lesen.
1.8 ist das unverständliche wohl in zu ändern
als (Doxy s.v.) zu verstehen.
1.10. Ob einen Mann aus Marseille bedeutet, ist wohl noch
ein zweifelhaft, da das Fehlen des R in dem Namen sehr auffällt. (Vgl. J. Q. R., XVI, 461, i. 8 u. Varianten.) Eher käme Mosul
in Betracht (i. ?).
1.11 ist PN zu zu ergänzen; darnach die Übersetzung.
1.13 ist die Übersetzung des eigenthümlichen wohl nur ein
Versuch. Termin. techn. für „vor Antritt der Seefahrt“ (?).
1.20 ist vielleicht in „aus Tinnin“ zu ändern. Oder = (?)(an falscher Stelle).
1.24. anstatt
In No. XVIII ist der Ausdruck mit unseren lexicalischen
Hilfsmitteln nicht zu deuten. Es scheint eine besondere Art von
Dinaren zu bedeuten. An einen Zusammenhang mit dem aus dem
Romanischen spät in das Arabische gewanderten „Diamant“
zudenken, wie der Herausgeber vorschlägt, ist, abgesehen von der
sprachlichen Schwierigkeit, schon aus sachlichen Gründen völlig
unmöglich.

II.
Zur Geschichte des Neftîd.

In der Festschrift zum siebzigsten Geburtstage A. Berlinsers hat
Harkavy einen merkwürdigen arabischen Bericht herausgegeben, der
die Geschichte eines angesehenen Juden aus der Zeit des Chalifen

1 Mit Imale und Auflösung des Hamza. 2 Plur. von (Doxy s.v.).
enthält, und ihn durch eine hebräische Übersetzung auch weiteren Kreisen zugänglich gemacht.

Da aber in dieser Übersetzung einige wesentliche Missverständnisse vorkommen, so erlaube ich mir hier ein Paar Bemerkungen zu dieser Publication zu geben.

S. 38 paenult. bemerkt Hark., dass S. 35 paenult. ff. der Text durch die Lücke im Anfange unverständlich sei. Ich kann dem nicht zustimmen. Es heisst "31K"VB3eiiJ oäjlleUi ^ t*.y 
JsOj löliSl(j-Jjla's*.:i JiJl (jjl^.V jä. i±m oslll» 

"Er liess nun sogleich den Netzrahlen. Dieser glaubte nun, er müsse sterben — von Ibn abl Bagal wusste er aber nichts; — deshalb parfumierte er sich und zog seine Leichengewänder an. Dann trat er bei dem Chalifen ein. Dieser verwunderte sich über das ungewohnte Parfüm (?) und über das Gewand, in dem er ihn noch nie gesehen hatte. Da enthielt er ihm nun den Grund und teilte ihm mit, dass er sich parfumiert, Leichengewänder angezogen und von seiner Familie Abschied genommen habe, weil er sein Leben für verloren hielt. Der Chalif versicherte ihn aber, dass er ausser Gefahr sei, beruhigte ihn und sagte ihm, dass er ihn wegen einer Sache, die ihm bedrückte und bekümmerte, habe holen lassen."

Im Einzelnen ist hierzu zu bemerken: Eine plötzliche Berufung eines Würdentragers zum Chalifen bedeutete für diesen sehr häufig die Einleitung eines peinlichen Verfahrens und unmittelbar darauffolgende Hinrichtung. — Der Leichewerden Spezereien mitgegeben, daher J. Der Text an der von mir durch Punkte angedeuteten Stelle scheint nicht ganz in Ordnung. Vielleicht Flash'm aufs Hebräische "er roch nun an ihm einen Geruch" (zu lesen für "בכירה ברקחה")

S. 39, l. 19, heisst es bei Harkavy: "כ senator כ בן עתיר לא יהפץ: ידוהים לאלחים איה חמה שמלאה חמה

Der Text aber lautet: "قدم لا يعانوا العاقبة في المستقبل بأن يظالم بما استمد سقوطهم من مسيرهم بدقة دفعة فيهم كانوا فيفرقون\n
Das heisst: "Dann werden sie in Zukunft nicht vor einem Gegenschlage sicher sein, indem man ihnen Unrecht thun wird für das, was ihnen vorher erlassen worden war, und sie zwingen wird, alles mit einem male zu bezahlen." — Der Sinn dieser höchst interessanten Stelle ist, wie man sieht, von Hark. ziemlich stark verkannt worden. Sie ist allerdings mehrfach arg verderbt. Für ist wohl "ולא" zu lesen.
THE HIGH PRIEST’S PROCESSION.

The notice concerning the High Priest’s Procession on the Day of Atonement, published from a Corfu MS. by Dr. Belleli in J. Q. R., XVII, 163 ff., has long been known, particularly from Solomon ibn Verga’s Miscellanea (ed. Wiener, p. 107), where, remarkably enough, Marcus, a Roman consul in Jerusalem, figures as the informant 1. The difference is that, according to Ibn Verga, the Procession took place before the Day of Atonement, when the High Priest transferred his residence to the sanctuary, and that the splendour of the Procession was greater when the High Priest left the Temple, for on that occasion all the inhabitants of Jerusalem participated in the function. It is thus evident that the writer of the Corfu MS. did not draw directly on Ibn Verga, but at all events the conclusions drawn by Dr. Belleli are unfounded.

SAMUEL POZNANSKI.

1 In most editions of the Mahzor Ibn Verga’s account is reproduced.

ZU MEINER NOTIZ ÜBER “DAS GEBETBUCH NACH JEMENISCHEM RITUS” (oben, pp. 189-92).

In dieser Notiz sind zunächst einige störende Druckfehler zu be-richtigen:

P. 190, l. 10, anst. ס ‘יולק מי; l. 11 sind die Punkte nach וריבך und יולק zu streichen; p. 191,
NOTE ON J. Q. R., XVII, 168

I am indebted to Dr. Poznanski for his annotations to the Genizah fragment published by me in vol. XVI, p. 690 sqq. of this JOURNAL. He has helped to bring the truth as to the real author of the fragment much nearer, at the same time strengthening my conviction that this is not Joseph b. Aknin. When we meet with the name Joseph b. Judah it is quite natural that Ibn Aknin is the first to flash on one's mind, but this is just a pitfall of which to beware.

SAMUEL POZNANSKI.

NOTE ON J. Q. R., XVII, 168.

1. 9, anst. יִלְקָא; 1. 12 anst. אֹבֶר; 1. 22 anst. שְׁאוּגָא; 1. 24 anst. יִבְּרוֹן; 1. 2, v. u., anst. איֵשֶר l. Ester.


Both names are so common that no conclusion can be drawn from any combination of them, unless it is accompanied by a more definite description. Dr. Poznański lays great stress on Ibn Aknīn’s title ראתם והסרי, but he mentions Judah b. Joseph of Kairuwan who had the same title, and calls attention to several other persons so distinguished. Thus this argument also fails to convince.

I am under the impression that this Judah b. Joseph of Kairuwan furnishes the key to the problem, and that the Joseph of the fragment was either his father or his son, both bearing the title סגן ויפל. We can, then, dispense with any argument pro and contra, derived from the quotation from Aaron b. Sargada. Knowledge of astronomy does not prove anything in this matter, as it figured in the syllabus of study of nearly every person of higher education.

I take this opportunity of adding one word to Prof. Steinschneider’s last article on Die Jüdische Literatur des Mittelalters (p. 160). The oldest polemical work against Christianity is David b. Al Moqammās’ Arabic treatise, “Fifty queries in Refutation of Christianity,” a fragment of which was published (as no. V) in this Journal, July, 1903.

H. Hirschfeld.

CRITICAL NOTICE.

PROF. J. FREUDENTHAL’S "LIFE OF SPINOZA."

Spinoza, sein Leben und seine Lehre, von J. Freudenthal, Professor der Philosophie an der Universität Breslau. Erster Band: Das Leben Spinozas. (Stuttgart, Fr. Frommann’s Verlag, 1904, pp. xiv, 349.)

The volume before us is the first instalment of a larger work, the second part of which is to treat of Spinoza’s philosophy. The first volume, however, is complete in itself. It treats of the life and times of the famous Jewish philosopher, and of his thought just as much and as popularly as is necessary for the due appreciation of his life and character.

“It is not often that any man in this world lives a life so well worth writing as Spinoza lived; not for striking incidents or large events connected with it, but because ... he was one of the very
best men whom these modern times have seen." This utterance of Froude indicates at once the delight and the difficulty that fall to the share of the would-be biographer of Spinoza. The whole range of biography contains but few subjects likely to sustain so well, and to repay so richly in inspiration, the historian's long labours of love. On the other hand, Spinoza's was an uneventful life, its scanty incidents are but poorly recorded, and there are many gaps. "Of Spinoza's private life," says Froude, "rich as it must have been, and abundant traces as must be extant somewhere in his own and his friends' correspondence, we know only enough to feel how vast a chasm remains to be filled." During the last decade or so, special efforts have been made to discover more biographical matter, and all likely places have been ransacked for the purpose. The results obtained have not quite realized the fond hopes of the great philosopher's innumerable admirers, partly, no doubt, because many of Spinoza's letters have been wilfully destroyed by timid correspondents who were afraid to leave behind them evidence of their contact with a notorious heretic. Still the results are of considerable importance none the less, as may be seen from Meinema's Spinoza en zijn kring (1896), and Professor Freudenthal's Die Lebensgeschichte Spinozas in Quellenschriften, Urkunden und nichtamtlichen Nachrichten* (1899), which, in Heinze's latest edition of Ueberweg's Geschichte der Philosophie*, has been deservedly described as "viel unbekanntes Material bringend, so höchst fördernd; eine sichere Grundlage für die bis jetzt noch immer in vielen Punkten nicht feststehende Lebensgeschichte Spinozas." A new Life of Spinoza, based on the latest evidence, has become a great desideratum. And it was but fitting that Professor Freudenthal should be the author of that new biography.

No living writer is better qualified to write on Spinoza than is Professor Freudenthal. As long ago as 1887 he made an important contribution to the study of Spinozism by his Spinoza und die Scholastik* (in a volume of philosophical essays published in celebration of the Jubilee of Zeller's Doctorate), and since then Spinozism seems to have been the distinguished Professor's favourite theme. The pages of this Review have shown some evidence of that in the interesting essay on the "History of Spinozism."* But length of

---

* This important essay seems to have been inadvertently omitted from the list of Professor Freudenthal's writings enumerated in the Jewish Encyclopedia, vol. V, p. 509.
devotion and philosophical acumen are not Professor Freudenthal's only qualifications for his arduous undertaking. Like Spinoza himself (as the late Professor Lazarus fondly insisted\(^1\)), his present biographer is a past *Talmudjäger* as well as a philosopher. And for the due appreciation of the many-sided Spinoza, such versatility is as indispensable as it is rare. The result is accordingly most gratifying. To say that Professor Freudenthal's book is the best biography of Spinoza that has yet been written, would convey no adequate idea of its excellence; it is the only one that may be recommended without reservation, and is likely to remain the standard authority for many years to come. The learned author is to be warmly congratulated on his eminently successful achievement.

That it is always helpful, and almost always necessary, to know something of the life-history and character of a thinker in order to properly estimate his thought, is a truth which is well-nigh become a platitude nowadays. But it was not always so. Spinoza was one of the first to advocate it, in a passage which Professor Freudenthal very appropriately uses as the motto of his book. The truth applies to Spinozism in no small measure. And Professor Freudenthal's book illustrates it admirably by the light which it throws on a number of points relating to the evolution of Spinoza's philosophy.

One of the oldest and most interesting problems connected with Spinozism relates to the external influences that have contributed to the shaping of it. "The whole history of past philosophy," the late Professor Adamson remarked\(^2\), "has been ransacked in order to trace the sources of Spinoza's system." Justinian and Grotius, Macchiavelli and Hobbes, Augustine and Aquinas, Crescas and Maimonides, Descartes and Bruno, Neoplatonism and Cabbala—the influences of all these, and more, have been detected in the writings of Spinoza, and their relative claims have been variously estimated by different authorities. In this conflict of opinions, what is of special Jewish interest is the fluctuation in the estimate of the Jewish factor among the manifold influences at work in moulding the genius of Spinoza. How widely critics have been divided in their views on this question may be seen by comparing the view of Joel with that of the late Professor Adamson. To Joel the Jewish factor appeared to be of paramount importance. Nor was Joel's view unique, or shared by Jews only. The late Professor Croom Robertson maintained that "Spinoza, while following Descartes, had, besides, distinctly independent views; the most characteristic aspect of him came from the

---

\(^1\) *Die Ethik des Judentums*, p. 438 f.

CRITICAL NOTICE

Jewish philosophy of the Middle Ages. On the other hand, Croom Robertson's great friend, the late Professor Adamson, one of the acutest and best read of recent philosophical critics, has estimated the amount of agreement between Spinoza and the Jewish mediaeval philosophers as "no more than is inevitable among comprehensive attempts at a philosophical explanation of things," and thought that "it would not be difficult to discover in him far greater resemblance to the classical thinkers than to Jewish writers." Now it would be idle to disclaim altogether a Jewish partiality in favour of a high estimate of the Jewish factor in Spinozism. Froude may be right when he postpones the possibility of writing faithful and literal history till the millennium, when perfect knowledge and perfect faith in God shall enable man to see and endure every fact in its reality, and perfect love shall kindle in him the one just emotion which is in harmony with the eternal order of things. Even Spinoza, with his deep knowledge, his intellectual love of God, and his abiding faith in the eternal order of things, fell short of Froude's ideal historian; when treating of his own people he at times betrays his righteous indignation because of their scandalous treatment of him. Still, however much one may allow for the personal equation and individual bias, there still remains ample justification for resenting Professor Adamson's slight estimate of the Jewish contribution towards Spinozism. In dealing with Spinoza, critics, Jewish as well as Christian, are at times given to exaggerate the importance of the smallest parallelisms of expression and thought. In the philosophic system of any philosopher, but especially in so comprehensive a philosophy as that of Spinoza, there are bound to be traces of many outside influences. So vast a structure must needs contain stones from many quarries; but the facts of supreme interest are the architectonic genius of the master-builder, and the total impression which his work conveys. Genius is as such necessarily unaccountable. But in striving to estimate the several influences exercised upon it, the total impression of a man's work is worth far more than a great mass of details. And there can be but little doubt as to the total impression which Spinoza's writings leave, the fine moral spirit which they breathe. Many streams meet in the Spinozistic deep, and diverse currents seem at times to agitate it, but it is the Hebraic spirit that moves upon the face of its waters. Spinoza was no moralist in the ordinary sense of the term, but contact with him affects one in a manner resembling nothing so closely as the inspira-

1 Elements of General Philosophy, p. 59.
tion one carries away from the great Hebrew prophets. Such is the
total impression which Spinoza leaves on his readers. That this is
what Christians as well as Jews feel, may be seen from the following
remarks of Mr. Duff, one of the most recent exponents of Spinozism.
"I shall have but ill repaid the dues of my nurture," so writes Mr. Duff,
"if I do not succeed in setting before the reader, in some measure,
the ripe wisdom, the large outlook upon life, the resolute faith in
goodness, the clear Jewish vision into the recesses of the human
heart, which have been to myself the constraining and the sustaining
force in this long labour of love."

One naturally turns to Professor Freudenthal for more light on
the question just touched on, and one is not disappointed. Not
that Professor Freudenthal has, in the present volume, formally put
and discussed the question, but he has anticipated, and in a manner
answered it in such a way that the reader never thinks of putting
it. The account which he has given of Spinoza's life and character
does full justice to the Jewish factor in the evolution of Spinoza.
Nowhere else does one find such clear, full, and sympathetic treat-
ment of the total Jewish atmosphere in which Spinoza grew up,
and of the Hebraic spirit which suffused his being, while at the
same time ample justice is done to all other factors in his philo-
sophical progress. Nowhere else can one find such a full and well-
balanced account of all the influences at work in the growth of
Spinoza's mind.

It is not only on questions of such general import that Professor
Freudenthal succeeds in throwing fresh light. There are also less
general problems which become far less perplexing under our
author's treatment. One such point we may select for special con-
sideration as an excellent illustration of how our author indirectly
disposes of a number of difficulties and misconceptions.

It has been long known that Spinoza had very nearly completed
his Ethica before taking up the Tractatus theologico-politicus. And
yet the Tractatus theologico-politicus was published in 1671, whereas
the Ethica was not published till after his death. This interruption
in the working out of his Ethica, and his subsequent reluctance to
publish it even after it had been finished, compared with the com-
paratively quick dispatch of the Tractatus theologico-politicus, have
attracted considerable attention, and led to some strange speculations,
as the following passage from Martineau will show. "It is natural
to ask," writes Martineau, "how it was that Spinoza after finishing
his Ethica left it to sleep the years away in manuscript, and turning

1 Spinoza's Political and Ethical Philosophy, p. x.
2 A Study of Spinoza, p. 57 f.
his back upon it threw himself immediately into another work, which he gave to the world as soon as he could complete it. . . . It may be taken for certain that he intended immediate publication, subject only to the condition . . . that by preserving the anonymous he could avoid the risk of odium and persecution. As he approached the closing section he would become anxious to determine this remaining doubt, and a motive is thus supplied for his April visit to Amsterdam. There he would be able to consult all the friends who had read the manuscript; there he could confide his purpose to the publishers most likely to give it success; there he would ascertain whether his papers had passed too freely from hand to hand for the authorship to remain secret. The result, we may well believe, awakened his fears and sent him back with a resolve to open his assault upon public errors from another side, and by a work which, never leaving his own desk during its progress, should be brought home to him by neither indiscretion nor treachery."

The most plausible explanation of the matter seemed to be that the Tractatus theologico-politicus was intended to demolish current views in order to clear the ground, as it were, and make room for the positive construction of his novel philosophy. Even so, however, difficulties still remained. Why did Spinoza put forward the vindication of freedom to philosophize as the primary object of the treatise? Why is the book so harsh in places, and its tone at times very unlike the philosophic calm so characteristic of the Ethics? Compared with the Ethics the Tractatus theologico-politicus has something of the combativeness of political conflict about it.

Professor Freudenthal's view shows us the Tractatus theologico-politicus in its true character, and in the light of that view all the supposed difficulties vanish. The Tractatus theologico-politicus, Professor Freudenthal holds, must not be regarded simply as an academic treatise, but as an urgent contribution to the practical politics of the time. It was written in vindication of the liberal policy of his friend and patron, Jan de Witt, against the intolerant divines of the dominant church, who were always urging hard, and sometimes successfully, for measures of oppression against all dissenters. In this book we see Spinoza taking an active and prominent part in the conflict between Church and State which was then agitating the Netherlands. Unhesitatingly he sides with the liberal-minded States-pensionary, and joins issue with the bigoted theologians, fighting them on their own ground by showing up their ignorance of the very scriptures on which they sought to base their authority and their claims to a salvation monopoly. This view of the matter seems fully justified by a very lucid and interesting account of affairs in Holland at the time, and puts a new complexion on the
book. It seems reasonable enough and probable enough that Spinoza should have put aside a speculative treatise like his *Ethics* in order to deal with a more practical and more urgent problem of the day. Many things in the book will also appear less harsh and more intelligible if it is remembered that Spinoza is leading a crusade against narrow-minded and presumptuous theologians.

Professor Freudenthal's view of the *Tractatus theol.igico-politicus* at the same time shows the injustice of the insinuations of excessive timidity and political nonchalance that have been made against the character of Spinoza. Martineau, speaking of the correspondence between Oldenburg and Spinoza, remarks: "When we remember what was passing in the streets of London and on the Northern Sea during the summer and autumn of 1665, it is strange to see how slight a vestige it has left on the correspondence of its witnesses and participators... Slight as were Oldenburg's allusions to the international crisis of the autumn of 1665, they were in the form of direct questions, apparently quite artless. Yet Spinoza's answer passes them by in silence, content to speculate on the psychology of an intelligent worm hypothetically imprisoned in the human blood. Whether his suppressed letters, if we had them, would remove the impression of political nonchalance... can never be known!" Sir Frederick Pollock has expressed it as his opinion that "on the practical points of legislation and administration Spinoza was far more enlightened than the accepted authorities of his time." That such political sagacity should go hand in hand with political nonchalance would be strange indeed. But the whole thing assumes a totally different complexion if we recognize in the *Tractatus theologico-politicus* the expression of his warm interest and active participation in the current politics of the day.

We shall be looking forward with great eagerness and pleasure to the appearance of Professor Freudenthal's next volume, which is to treat of the philosophy of Spinoza.

A. Wolf.

1 *A Study of Spinoza*, pp. 67, 70.  
2 *Mind*, 1903 (p. 409).
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And upon them that are left of you I will send a faintness into their hearts in the lands of their enemies; and the sound of a shaken leaf shall chase them; and they shall flee, as fleeing from a sword; and they shall fall when none pursueth (Lev. xxvi. 36).

Only be strong and of a good courage (Josh. i. 6).

I.

In an article on Zionism published in the Contemporary Review in 1899—before Mr. Lucien Wolf had abandoned his benevolent neutrality towards the movement—I wrote: "While the Western Christian is generally not unsympathetic towards Zionism, the Western Jew is generally in bitter or contemptuous opposition.... It is contended that Zionism is dangerous, plays into the hands of the anti-Semites with their cry of unpatriotism...that it is spiritually a misconception of the true future and mission of Israel; intellectually, a mere caricature of the exaggerated nationalism which has temporarily replaced the eighteenth-century cosmopolitanism; and politically, an undoing of all the constitutional rights Israel has won so painfully from civilized communities."
Thus, despite Mr. Wolf's oracular air of discovering deep truths and hidden perils, he has merely repeated the commonplaces of the controversy, and his elaboration of the above summary held nothing that I had not fully perpendeed before enrolling myself in the political movement for the establishment of a Jewish State. A vital necessity of the day could not, I decided, be dismissed as a "romantic anachronism," nor the effort to get a soil under the feet of the homeless and persecuted be fairly likened to the exaggerated nationalisms which would take the soil from under them. It is not even as if the apartness of the Jew was first meditated by Zionism—the apartness exists, a universal aloofness from that human brotherhood which Zionism is supposed to disturb. Apartness concentrated in a territory is far less against human brotherhood than apartness accentuated in every country on earth. The separateness of nations is a factor, not a foe, of the human brotherhood. As I have pointed out elsewhere, it takes two to make one brother. Geography without and psychology within are always fashioning different peoples, in whose development, with their respective contributions to civilization, we may impartially and fraternally delight.

The title of Mr. Wolf's paper, "The Zionist Peril," reveals rather the journalist than the historian. Mr. Wolf has not approached the study of modern Jewish history with the same scientific spirit that he brought to the study of Crypto-Judaism. Nay, it is somewhat significant that he has treated so largely of Crypto-Judaism without ever a flash of moral judgment upon this discreditable phenomenon, while his first outburst of righteous indignation is reserved for the efforts of Judaism to shake off the last vestiges of the Marrano period. If Zionism be a peril, so is the absence of Zionism, so is Judaism itself, and in any case the question for a race is not the lesser peril, but the truer ideal.

"The characteristic peril of Zionism" Mr. Wolf finds to
be that "Zionism is the natural and abiding ally of anti-Semitism and its most powerful justification!" This from the author of the luminous and voluminous article on "Anti-Semitism" in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*. Anti-Semitism has made a pretty protracted battle without either allies or justification. The wolf in Aesop had always a pretext for eating the lamb, whatever the lamb did, and a wise lamb, in such circumstances, will at least do whatever pleases itself most. This charge of justification of anti-Semitism accompanied the beginnings of the *Alliance Israélite* itself, for the *Alliance*, like the Anglo-Jewish Association, unifies Jewry politically, however embryonic its structure. As a matter of fact, the effect of Zionism upon the non-Jew is precisely the opposite to what the Jew, his nerves ruined by hereditary Marranoism, shiveringly apprehends. Zionism has uplifted the position of the Jews. It has already deposed the mediæval tradition of money-lending and "jewing," and the successful establishment of a Jewish State would make the same change in public opinion as has taken place towards the Japanese. It is Mr. Wolf who is the pessimist, not L. Humanity sympathizes with a strenuous aspiration. England has gone so far as to endorse our aims; in America Secretary Hay permitted me to publish his view that Zionist work would in no way impugn the patriotism of the American Jew. The press throughout the world has been sympathetic, in some quarters enthusiastic. "Almost thou persuadest me to be a Jew," writes a Christian journalist. Mr. Wolf's pessimistic dictum should be rewritten: "Zionism is the natural and abiding antidote to Anti-Semitism and its most powerful refutation." Even, however, if he is right it remains a pity that he has mixed up the spiritual perils of what he considers a reactionary ideal with considerations of a lower order. They throw doubt even on his higher argumentation by suggesting it is fear masquerading as philosophy.
Mr. Wolf explains his conversion from a benevolent neutrality to violent anti-Zionism. It is I, alas, who am responsible—my "attempted raid" on the Hirsch millions roused the sleeping philosopher. In styling me "the irresponsible and irrepressible Dr. Jim of Herzlian politics," Mr. Wolf is quite a Balaam. "Dr. Jim" is Prime Minister of Cape Colony. The process by which Mr. Wolf made up his mind that my charges against the trustees of the treasure were baseless is worth following. I accused the Jewish Colonization Association of incompetence and dubious legality. Mr. Wolf thereupon took the reports of this Association, and took the reports of the Zionist organizations, and finding that the Association recorded beneficent activity, and Zionism recorded barren debating, he concluded that my allegations were false. What delicious logic! In the first place, the charges against the Association had absolutely nothing to do with Zionism: they would have been as true or as false if Dr. Herzl had never lived, though my attention might in that case never have been called to the Association's incompetence. Secondly, the achievements of the Association with ten million pounds at its back are contrasted with the achievements of Zionism which started without a farthing, and which the self-sacrifice of myriads of poor Jews has never been able to subvention beyond a quarter of a million or so. Thirdly, Zionism was still organizing its followers, building its institutions, and preparing its plans, and particularly forebore to imitate the ubiquitous pettiness of the Association. Finally, even admitting the legitimacy of a comparison which only the starting of the two associations with equal millions could have warranted, the record of Zionism without the millions is certainly not more sterile than that of the millions without Zionism. Works of charity are but a small factor in the life of a people. My suggestion that the millions be fructified by Zionism follows
naturally from my conviction that they are fruitless at present. This suggestion constitutes "the raid." Mr. Wolf stoutly defends the treasure against my contention that Baron de Hirsch, "had he lived to know Dr. Herzl's scheme and to witness its progress, would have unhesitatingly given his millions to the Zionist exchequer." But Baron de Hirsch did know of the Zionist scheme, Mr. Wolf exultantly tells us. Herzl even consulted the Baron in 1895, and solicited his support. Mr. Wolf has seen the documents! This is Mr. Wolf's notion of a crushing refutation. Of my argument, even as stated by himself, he omits to consider a full half. Baron de Hirsch, though he may have known of the Zionist project, certainly did not live "to witness its progress." Dr. Herzl consulted him in 1895. In 1895! Before Herzl had proved even to himself that Jewry in congress would rally to his idea, and that myriads would volunteer for the work which the Baron—as he lamented to Mr. Lucien Wolf—was left to grapple with single-handed! In 1895 many an ardent Zionist of to-day said "No" to Herzl. And if Mr. Wolf forgets half of my argument, even as stated by himself, he likewise forgets half of it as stated by me. I said, had the Baron lived to witness not only the progress of Zionism but the failure of his own scheme. In 1895 the Baron's brain was occupied by a rival scheme of salvation. What would he have said to-day when, despite the Association's silence and Mr. Wolf's speech, Jewish public opinion is everywhere convinced of the futility of the Hirsch solution, viewed as a solution of the Russo-Jewish question? Even in his original deed Baron de Hirsch did not exclude Palestine. If he did, how is it that his trustees are pottering there to-day? And if he was not a Zionist, he certainly dreamed of a Judenstaat, though he saw it arising in the Argentine. The very articles of the Association provide for charters, fortifications, and other things not easily reconcilable with mere philanthropy, though, in its repudiation of the East African scheme, the Association flies from politics as from the plague. I will
not, however, seize the opportunity Mr. Wolf has given me to repeat my case against the Association, since it is infinitely more important to consider his case against Zionism.

III.

Mr. Wolf starts with the "Allgemeine Verwilderung" which followed the failure of Sabbethai Zevi to lead the Jews to Palestine, and would have us draw the moral not to be naughty nationalists. But the moral is only not to rely on miracle. Sabbethai Zevi's movement was not a rational political movement; it was a fantastic adventure which the Sultan crudely terminated. And yet Mr. Wolf gravely writes: "Re-nationalization had been shown to be impossible, not only for political reasons, but because the Jews themselves had ceased to possess the elements of a revival of their national life." "Not only for political reasons!" This is like saying the man died, not only because he was decapitated, but because he could not get a living. What chance did Sabbethai Zevi's followers get of showing whether they possessed the elements of a national life? As a matter of fact, the religious and political unity of the Jews was far greater in the seventeenth century than it is now—political Zionism is all but too late. But even now, so far from being "scattered, divided, and polyglot," the Jews are mostly clustered in Russia and Austro-Hungary (the "providential dispersion," of which Mr. Wolf tells us, having left strange clots and clumps), wherein they manifest a strongly-marked national existence and possess, whether through Hebrew or Yiddish, a unifying language. Whether these characteristic traits of theirs are agreeable to Mr. Wolf or not, is beside the question. When a people, even at the present day, produces a prolific literature both in Hebrew and Yiddish, and is found developing a national drama and initiating a national art, it requires some boldness to maintain that the Jews could not, at the
Mendelssohnian period, have evolved a worthy national life of their own, had Mendelssohn hit on the alternative policy of acquiring a soil for them, instead of depriving them of their dream of one. In any case, why were the Jews "at the turning-point of a road which led direct to re-barbarization"? The traditional form of Jewish life, even at its most superstitious, is no such terrible thing: contrasted with the general life of the European masses, with their various manners, morals, and Churches, it certainly is not peculiarly barbarous. It is even peculiarly literate, after its mediaeval fashion. It is in fact a civilization far antedating that of Europe. I do not even find that Graetz, whom Mr. Wolf professes to follow, ascribes the general demoralization to the failure of the Nationalist movement: he connects it with the breakdown of the Jewish democratic ideal under a new worship of wealthy ignoramuses. But so far from rescuing Jewry from the effects of this disintegration, Mendelssohn precipitated the final smash—the impingement of the Western world on the opened Ghetto. For to the specifically Jewish disintegration is now added the general disintegration which the Jews share with the post-Darwinian world, and they are not, like the other races, conserved by a territory which may become the unchanging background for a succession of beliefs.

IV.

The remedies employed by the Mendelssohnian movement were "in the domain of religion, a new steadfastness founded in reasonable theology and historical study, and in the domain of politics local assimilation and emancipation." The political remedy is at least intelligible. But what is "reasonable theology," and why should it be limited to twelve millions out of twelve hundred millions, or one per cent. of mankind? The fatal weakness of all Jewish religious reform lies in the attempt to maintain
a national church on a religion which has been carefully
denationalized. Or if the twelve millions must still keep
themselves separate to preach this “reasonable theology,”
why should they be so anxious to assimilate to their
environment in every other respect? You have more
chance of attracting attention by deviation from the
normal. All religious sects in history have been founded
by people already like their neighbours, but only anxious
to become differentiated. For a differentiated sect to be
anxious to become assimilated is indeed a suspicious re-
versal. When Mr. Wolf asks in horror whether “once
more we must perforce turn Jewish history topsy-turvy,
if we are to save Judaism and the Jewish people from
extinction,” he admits in his very question that we have
already once turned Jewish history topsy-turvy. Turning
it topsy-turvy “once more” is therefore only restoring
it to its natural position. If Mendelssohn had no scruple
in reversing the historical policy of some thirty centuries,
why should we pay such respect to the policy of a single
century? A people may well have several generations of
aberration: here in England we have Mr. Chamberlain
calling upon his countrymen to reverse the financial policy
of half a century. Mr. Wolf himself reverses his views
every few years, for, in the Encyclopaedia Britannica, he
declares roundly: “The idea that Zionism is a set-back
of Jewish history, an unnatural galvanization of hopes
long since abandoned for a spiritual and cosmopolitan
conception of the mission of Israel, is a controversial
fiction.”

Mr. Wolf gives as “the new Zionist postulate” that
Judaism is decaying, that emancipation is a fraud, and
that assimilation is an ethnical impossibility. Judaism is
indeed decaying, and emancipation is, if not a fraud, not
wholly genuine; but as for assimilation being an ethnical
impossibility, it is only too possible. Its fatal facility is
one of the greatest arguments for Zionism. Mr. Wolf
actually includes in his brief against Zionism one of the
main arguments on which the other side relies to win its case, and the vigour with which he presses the point, his triumphant demonstration of the Jew's ready adaptability to his European environment, make him a valuable ally. He reminds one of the K. C. whom his junior kept nudging to try to convey to him that he was not for the defendant, but for the plaintiff. No sane Zionist dreams of likening the Jewish problem to "the Negro and Chinese problems of the United States." We know that Jewish blood has intermingled in equal marriage with that of every white people. Long before "the Mendelssohnian solution" the Jews had lived in proud equality with the grandees of Spain at its proudest period.

No, "the Zionist postulate" embraces, not rejects, the assimilability of the Jew. As regards its two other items, if Mr. Wolf really thinks that Judaism is not decaying, and that emancipation is wholly genuine, I can only say that it shows how little a historian may see of the period in which he lives. He actually quotes Boerne's prediction that the Jew would, under the sunshine of freedom, cast off the cloak of orthodoxy he hugged around him in storm, and asserts that "the Jew still wears that cloak more proudly, more earnestly, more intelligently than in the old days." The cloak of orthodoxy? Mr. Wolf should come to America, where I write this, to see the effects of the sunshine of freedom. There is no King in Israel, and every man does what is right in his own eyes; every child even, for one of the saddest results of "Americanization" is the demoralization of the boys, and the disintegration of the old Jewish home-life. Never was there a profounder prophecy than Boerne's, never one more literally fulfilled. Not inaptly has the narrow old Judengasse of Frankfort been transformed into the broad modern Boernestrasse. With such purblindness for the present, no wonder that Mr. Wolf should survey Zionism without a trace of the insight he has brought to bear upon the past.
V.

Dismissing "the Zionist postulate" as absurd—and the item invented by Mr. Wolf is indeed absurd—Mr. Wolf now makes a discovery, which is a favourite discovery of the anti-Zionist. For does it not cut the very ground from under Zionism? The Jews are not a race at all; they represent merely a religion! Why then all this nationalistic pother? "Merely a religious community of great antiquity, which in consequence of inter-marriage during some two thousand three hundred years has acquired a more fixed physical type than younger religious communities. Given the same age and the same harsh history, and other religious communities would develop for themselves a racial identity not less marked than that of the Jews." The Jewish race then is not a race—it has merely been formed into one. What more need the Zionist claim? Whether this race has arisen by prehistoric causes or by causes within our ken, how does this affect its present differentiation? The Americans are not a people—they have merely been formed into one. Britain is not an island—it was merely broken off from France by the sea. "The European Jews then are a religious community of white men, not essentially different from the European Roman Catholics and Protestants." That is to say, the Jews, though racially and facially differentiated by a historic process of twenty-three centuries, may nevertheless be considered on the same footing as Catholics and Protestants not yet, nor ever likely to be, racially and facially differentiated! Mr. Wolf's scorn for the etymology, sociology, and anthropology of the Zionists is boundless. But how about his own logic and his own history? The "essential difference" between the European Jews and the European Christians must be sought in their origins. Behind the "religious community" of the modern Jews lies a territorial past. Israel is not "merely a religious community of great antiquity," it is the broken and scattered remains of a people with a soil,
and wars, and dynasties, and a magnificent epical literature 
that has moulded the thought and the art of half the 
world. Christianity began with denationalization, Judaism 
has never shaken nationalism off. In Judaism the two 
threads—territorial and religious—have lain entangled in 
that confusion which is the unavoidable legacy of the 
period when the two were one. To cut away the territo-
rial thread, and to disentangle the religious, would now 
be perfectly legitimate. We are the heirs of the past, not 
its slaves. But what is not legitimate is to deny the past. 
To pretend that the Jews are "merely a religious com-
munity," like Catholics and Protestants, that their whole 
literature, liturgy, and consciousness are not woven through 
and through with nationalism, is to obscure history in 
sophistry. In Ellis Island, off New York—where the Jewish 
tragedy may be seen in its most heartrending phase, as 
the refugees from Europe are turned back across the waste 
of waters at the very gates of their Paradise—this question 
of "Race or Religion" comes up in very practical shape. 
But the guardian angels of the port, whose flaming swords 
turn every way, have decided that "Hebrew" connotes 
"race or people" as much as its alphabetical neighbours, 
Greek and Irish. And in the Encyclopaedia Britannica, 
Mr. Wolf himself speaks of "the bond of a common race," 
and instructs the world that Jewish solidarity has been 
transferred from a religious to a racial basis.

Even, however, were the Jews "merely a religious com-
munity," that would not profit Mr. Wolf's case an iota. 
On the contrary, it is just religious communities that are 
driven to build up new countries so as to develop their 
religion freely, and under the most favourable conditions. 
New England was founded by Puritans who, although 
"anglicized," reacted against their old England so strongly 
that nothing but a new England in a new continent could 
satisfy their desire for differentiation. The Boers, like 
the Jews, have ever regarded themselves as a chosen 
people; but Kruger was never heard to boast of their
assimilability. Even, therefore, had there never been a Jewish State, it might be necessary to create one.

Mr. Wolf, however, is at great pains to prove that differentiation and assimilation can be combined. I have no doubt but that the Puritans, too, could have found a way of staying on in England, if they had put their comfort first. And comfort and social position is, after all, the real quest of the "Mendelssohnian movement."

VI.

"All that assimilation means," writes Mr. Wolf, "is that the Jews shall adopt the social manners and customs, and share in the unsectarian interests, traditions, hopes, and ideals of their non-Jewish fellow citizens." Is that all? The trouble is that Judaism is a religion in which the concept of secularity does not occur. To the Orient, all is religion, and religion is all. As the Prusso-Jewish conscript replied in bewilderment when asked to state his religion: "Die Christen haben Religion: wir sind doch Juden." In a Christian country "the unsectarian interests, traditions, hopes, and ideals" are six-sevenths of life, the other seventh being roughly representable by Sunday. And many of these interests, traditions, hopes, and ideals clash with the Jewish.

Yet to all this six-sevenths of non-Jewish life we are to assimilate without ever attempting to Judaize any of it, even when popular desire runs counter to every Jewish ideal. And at the same time as we are to absorb ourselves in the unsectarian ambitions of the particular people among whom we live, we are to pray for a restoration to Zion. For the school of Judaism to which Mr. Wolf belongs does not even remove Zionism from the prayer-book. And just as assimilation may be combined with Zionistic prayers, so may it be combined with matrimonial exclusiveness towards the very people to whom you assimilate. Mutual "intermarriage is no bar to assimilation." Indeed it is
not. In Germany there are whole groups of baptized Jews who still marry among themselves. It is not the Jew's power of assimilating that is in question, it is his power of remaining Jewish.

But Mr. Wolf is mistaken in imagining that mixed marriages are equally forbidden by the other great religions. A Protestant is perfectly at liberty to marry a Jew, though the Jew may not be at liberty to marry a Protestant. Catholic and Protestant may intermarry on certain conditions. Mr. Wolf confuses rarity of mixed marriage with prohibition of mixed marriage. Social circles that do not intersect do not intermarry. That is a simple induction from sociological facts. Equally, social circles that do intersect do intermarry. And conversely, social circles that will not intermarry should not intersect. While Protestant and Catholic households are not anxious to entertain one another, the Jewish anxiety for separateness—once safeguarded by the dietary laws—is now combined with a paradoxical anxiety for Christian society. Mixed marriage increases exactly with the growth of the common segment of the two circles.

Mr. Wolf's statistics to prove that the Jew is really not much more exclusive than the Protestant or the Catholic err, strangely enough, in his own disfavour. The Jew marries out not less but more than the Protestant or the Catholic. Mr. Wolf's statistics are vitiated by being made in Germany, where if only thirty-nine Jews per thousand marry non-Jews, it is because a large number of Jews have left the fold altogether, and their marriages are enumerated as Catholic and Protestant. In Australia the rate of mixed marriages for Jews is nearer thirty-nine per hundred than thirty-nine per thousand. I gladly present Mr. Wolf with this additional disproof of "the portentous Zionist theory of our unassimilability." For, despite his contempt for Zionist etymology, assimilation and fusion are, if not one, at any rate united. Nor need fusion be crudely physical: the assimilation whose reality Mr. Wolf so comically
labours to bring home to us is indistinguishable from the effects of physical fusion. I have elsewhere demonstrated from the fact that emancipated Jewish life leaves no specific deposit in language, that it contains no genuine variations from non-Jewish life, in short—that the modern Jews have died without knowing it. Mr. Wolf's samples of brilliantly assimilated Jews—Heine for Germany, Catulle Mendès for France, Beaconsfield for England—are an amazing selection for a thinker to whom the Jews are "merely a religious community." They fit very well into the Zionist scheme, but what are they doing in the synagogue galley? Once again I almost think that Mr. Wolf has forgotten he is for the plaintiff, not for the defendant.

VII.

No, assimilation is evaporation, the Mendelssohnian solution is dissolution. The transition from assimilation to fusion is merely a question of time. You cannot fix your own boundary to living, ever-moving forces. For a time you will nurse your children on two historic traditions. For a time the Jewish stream will run parallel with the non-Jewish. But gradually the stronger stream will absorb the weaker. The six-sevenths of life will obliterate the one-seventh. When the Jewish code clashes with the Christian—as in the recent American case of uncle and niece criminally indicted for intermarriage—it is not the Jewish code that will survive. For a time you may serve two masters, like the eighteenth-century Highlanders who paid taxes to King George and King Charles, but sooner or later one master will command all your service. The little Jewish immigrants into America are made to declaim "Allegiance to the Flag" in a form specially drawn up for Jewish schoolchildren: "Flag of our great Republic, inspirer in battle, guardian of our homes, whose Stars and Stripes stand for bravery, purity, truth, and union, we salute thee! We, the natives of
distant lands, who find rest under thy folds, do pledge our hearts, our lives, and our sacred honour, to love and protect thee, our country, and the liberty of the American people forever.” It is touching to hear the children reciting this in their quaint foreign accent, as they point to the flag which one of them upholds. And they appear to understand it: they declaim it with sincere emotion. How can the dream of Zion coexist with this sacred pledge to America for ever? President Roosevelt recently declared: “It is absolutely essential that the different peoples coming to our shores should not remain separate, but should fuse into one.” The United States are “the mills of God,” grinding the motley races into a new pattern. Assimilation without fusion is possible to races with territorial or colour boundaries. But races adventuring among other races of the same colour must either fuse or absorb, eat or be eaten. Only two homeless races in history have attempted to stand outside fusion. One is the Jewish race, the other is the gipsy race. But the gipsies have pitched their tents outside civilization; they have never attempted to become householders or city fathers. They have never sung the patriotic songs of local chauvinism. They have never yearned for “assimilation.” Hence they may truly be an eternal people. The Jews are an evaporating people. How else should one of the most prolific peoples in history number only twelve millions after all these centuries of existence? It is Mr. Wolf himself who has pointed out that scarcely any of the old Anglo-Jewish families survive. The Jewish people has been preserved from age to age by a mere remnant, but its survival thus far is no proof of its continuance under the crowning attack of “assimilation.” The Campanile of Venice fell at last. In the whole of modern Jewish history before the Zionist movement, there is only one statesmanlike episode—the refusal of civil rights by the Jewish community of Amsterdam.

Mr. Wolf says “the assimilability of the Jew is far beyond the reach of reasonable doubt, and if we may judge by our
experience of the last hundred years, it will soon be beyond the reach of reasonable cavil." It will indeed. The Jew will be assimilated away.

VIII.

But there is a reverse to the shield of "assimilation," as Mr. Wolf himself supposes the Zionist to retort. It is the unwillingness of the non-Jewish peoples to permit the assimilation, it is the resurgence of anti-Semitism even in countries where legal emancipation has been won. The wind is active, not the sun, "the cloak of orthodoxy" is hugged close. Israel is saved by his persecutors, as well as by his fools (though Mr. Wolf misquotes me as ascribing everything to the fools). In America itself, to which the Jew pledges himself for ever with so much emotion, he cannot join a University Club or a College "Frat," nor send his children to private schools, nor stay at certain hotels, nor enjoy general society. As for Europe, let us hear the man who knows it most intimately from East to West—Arminius Vambéry. "It is surprising that the Jew, treated as a stranger everywhere in Europe, still persists in ingratiating himself into the national bond."

But there is another aspect (which Mr. Wolf overlooks). The majority of the Jews are placed amid barbarous environments, in which even Mr. Wolf could not wish them to exercise their aptitude for assimilation. And yet he speaks of the greatest body of Jews in the world, the Jews in the Pale, as in a state of "arrested assimilation." Assimilation to what? to whom? To the Russian peasantry? Jews, then, have no inward spring of virtue or development! The people that Lecky described as the only torch-bearer in the dark ages exists now merely to be assimilated! And it is useless relying on the salvation of persecution. Mr. Wolf has spent several weeks in Russia and Roumania, and has concluded that emancipation cannot be staved off even there. Even under the present
appalling conditions there is no demand for Zionism in Russia, he tells us. There are 1,572 Zionist societies in Russia. But even were Mr. Wolf a correct observer of the contemporary, Russo-Jewish indifference to Zionism would argue nothing against that ideal. People rarely want what they ought to want, or what will do them good. As for the Jews of Poland, Mr. Wolf reminds us, they have already their political ideal—the independence of Poland. And their sacrifices for this ideal arouse an enthusiasm in that breast of his which all the sacrifices for Palestine leave cold. To redeem Palestine is reactionary; but to redeem Poland—that way heroism lies. Poor Polish dreamers! The Jews fought for the independence of Hungary, Kossuth himself is said to have had Jewish blood. And yet listen again to the Hungarian Arminius Vambery: “I was all ablaze with enthusiasm when in my childhood I became acquainted with the life of the national heroes of Hungary. The heroic epoch of 1848 filled my youthful heart with genuine pride; and even later, in 1861, when I returned from Constantinople by the Danube boat, on landing at Mohacs I fell on my knees and kissed the ground with tears of true patriotic devotion in my eyes. I was intensely happy and in a rapture of delight, but had soon to realize that many, nay most, people questioned the genuineness of my Hungarianism. They criticized and made fun of me, because, they said, people of Jewish origin cannot be Hungarians, they can only be Jews, and nothing else.” This was before the days of “the Zionist peril.”

Similarly pathetic is the patriotism of the Roumanian Jew. At the time of the Berlin Congress, Dr. Dulberg tells us, a section of Roumanian Jews resented the interference of their West European brethren on their behalf. “Imbued with patriotism for their native country, fired with the enthusiasm caused by the war fever, these misguided would-be Roumanian citizens rewarded their friends with a sort of polite request to mind their own business. The Roumanian statesmen... managed, by a number of
promises to a few influential Jews, to stifle all opposition to the granting of the Roumanian independence. To-day we see the result of that policy."

As his final word on Russia, Mr. Wolf declares that "the magnitude of the Russo-Jewish question excludes Zionism or any scheme of emigration from the category of effective remedies." It is a pity he did not point this out to Baron de Hirsch, who certainly did contemplate the removal of the Jews from Russia. In the fifteenth century the Spanish Peninsula was the Jewish Russia, in so far as it was the centre of gravity of Jewish life. Jews formed a considerable percentage of the population. Had the Wolf of the period contended that the emigration of so vast a body was impossible, he would have sounded plausible. And yet, when the Expulsion came, a good many hundreds of thousands did manage to emigrate—at the point of the sword. For the rest, Zionism does not contemplate so sudden and wholesale a migration as that of the Sephardic Jews. Nor is it likely to be burdened in its beginnings with more than a manageable minority.

IX.

"The Judenstaat itself," says Mr. Wolf, "could never be such a revival of the Hebrew Commonwealth as would respond to the dreams of those who most earnestly support it." But some of "those who most earnestly support it" have no such revivalist aspiration. They know quite as well as Mr. Wolf that history cannot repeat itself. Zionism, though it counts among its followers a faction that dreams of the religious revival of the old Hebrew State, has always strictly maintained itself as a political movement which, just because it is not tied to anything but politics, embraces all its groups in a healthy heterogeneity. This dream-state of orthodoxy never existed even in the heyday of Zion. Pobiedonostseff has such an ideal for "Holy Russia," but even M. de Plehve could not make it mate-
rialize. The old Hebrew Commonwealth, however the yearning retrospective vision of orthodoxy mis-sees it, pursued no such narrow ideal. It was never limited to Jewish inhabitants. A "mixed multitude" accompanied the original Exodus. The Mosaic code contains numerous provisions for the treatment of the alien, "the stranger that sojourneth among you." He could not be King—just as no one not native born can be President in the United States—but he could hold the Jew as his slave. He was treated with the greatest magnanimity on the noble maxim "Thou shalt not oppress a stranger: for ye know the heart of a stranger, seeing ye were strangers in the land of Egypt" (Exod. xxiii. 9). "No ancient constitution," says Professor S. H. Butcher, "accorded to strangers such a position as they enjoyed under the Mosaic code." Thus Mr. Wolf's argument that "no state nowadays can be founded on a racial basis" falls to the ground, if he means, as he surely does mean, no state limited to a racial basis. A racial basis, like a religious basis, is a splendid foundation for a state. The Uitlander element is amply provided for in the Pentateuch. All that Zionism needs is that the Jews should form the majority instead of the minority, that the laws and institutions should be the expression of their own national genius, instead of laws and institutions to which they can "assimilate." The alien minority would remain either resident foreigners or would seek naturalization. In the latter case they would call themselves Jews of the Christian or other persuasions. They would probably present no numerical difficulty, for the compulsory closing on Saturday in addition to their own Sunday would handicap Christians too severely, and they might even be driven to Judaism. Those orthodox Jews to whom such a constitution appears objectionable are not only below the level of the old Jewish State, but below the level of the Gentiles in whose bosom they have encamped themselves. Those very Jews are the ones who are most surprised that there should be any clannishness in other
folk. Want of imagination is perhaps at the back of the Jew's "ingratiating himself into the national bond." The Judenstaat, if it cannot be the millennial dream-State of orthodoxy—and no real State can ever vie with a dream-State—may quite well be a revival of the Old Hebrew State as it actually was, minus those features which the State would itself have outgrown, had the evolution of the Jewish people not been violently disturbed by divorce from a soil. It is this relegation of them to the realm of dream that has preserved slavery, sacrifice, and possibly even polygamy, as sacred constituents of the Hebrew Commonwealth; in the real world these institutions would long since have passed away, as their embalmed mummies would crumble at the first breath of the air of reality. Thus the State, in resuming its life, would continue its career, not at the point of interruption, but at the point of resumption; and the battle between Church and State—one of the skipped phenomena—could be taken as decided in the general modern sense. Even the Jewish Church would have modified itself, just as the Hebrew spoken to-day would have differed from classical Hebrew by at least the difference between Chaucer and Browning. Books like Job and Ruth and Ecclesiastes significantly sound the larger note, which is sustained and broadened in many passages of the Talmud. The Bible is not merely the textbook of a religion, but the life and literature of a race. It would have gone on being written. It is to the reduction of Israel from a State to a sect that the religious, no less than the secular, crippling of Jewish life has been due. The manifold manifestations of corporate life have, by the absence of a territory, been narrowed to the "religious" (in the Christian sense). Whoso failed to conform to the one-seventh of life dropped or was excommunicated from the fold. Hence the appalling impoverishment of Jewish life. Imagine England with no history but that of members of the Established Church, drained of all its heterodox forces from Cromwell to
Shelley. Mr. Wolf himself told us (in his presidential address to the Literary Societies' Union) that for two centuries "the whole intellectualty of the Anglo-Jewish community, which rose above the mediocre, ran in non-Jewish channels, while the best minds left Judaism altogether." It was the survival of the unfittest. And yet Mr. Wolf expostulates with me for saying that it is a wretched thing for a religion to be saved by its fools. Even the fools are now going the way of "the literary mind," for, so far from all being well in the best of all possible communities, the very leaf of The Jewish World which contains Mr. Wolf's optimistic address contains also statistics from "A Teacher" to prove that "Judaism in the West End is undoubtedly on the wane." "Stop the influx from other parts to the West End of London, and within a period of two or three generations the synagogue will be a thing of the past."

And while Jewry is left in the old chaos, unable to reconstitute itself, this tiny Anglo-Jewish community produces a Beaconsfield who reorganizes the British Empire.

X.

In the Encyclopaedia Britannica, if I remember aright, Mr. Wolf lays it down that a Jewish State, if not run on orthodox lines, would be deserted by its orthodox inhabitants. But where would they go to? Would they drop off the planet? Where could they find a better chance for the free exercise of orthodoxy? Mr. Wolf confounds the non-enforcement of orthodoxy with the prohibition of orthodoxy. Whether the synagogue is "established" or is independent of the State, Judaism will assuredly be the national religion. And if the orthodox were in a majority in the Judenstaat, they would be fools indeed to desert it. The national holidays, from Passover to Chanukah, would of themselves supply a more orthodox background than could be found in countries
with the counter-attractions of Easter and Christmas; not to mention the Saturday-Sabbath. And this background would have a continuous religious influence upon every inhabitant.

And just as Mr. Wolf confounds the non-enforcement of orthodoxy with its prohibition, so he confounds the permission of mixed marriages with their compulsoriness or their universal adoption. While it is obvious that the Judenstaat could never refuse to consider the marriages of its citizens with Britons, Americans, Germans, &c., &c., as illegal, it is equally obvious that marriages with foreigners would be as rare in the Jewish State as in any other. Every people, every circle of society even, marries within itself, by the laws of affinity, convenience, and least resistance. Mr. Wolf speaks as if the moment mixed marriages were not branded as illegal there would be a wild rush for alien alliances. The supposition is as uncomplimentary to his people as it is absurd and unpractical. The danger of disintegrating a religious community by mixed marriages only exists when the community has no territorial isolation, and even then mixed marriages are rather a symptom and an effect of antecedent disintegration than the cause of disintegration. Two really religious persons of different faiths are not likely to combine their lives. Nor should they, even if they happen to be Jew and Jewess of differing standpoints. The legitimacy of mixed marriages in a Judenstaat could no more destroy the State than Lord Rosebery's marriage to a Jewess or Mr. Chamberlain's marriage to an American tends to destroy England. This view of mine Mr. Wolf strangely describes as the abolition of the marriage restrictions of Ezra and Nehemiah. One wonders if he has ever read those marriage restrictions: "The land, unto which ye go to possess it, is an unclean land with the filthiness of the people of the lands, with their abominations, which have filled it from one end to another with their uncleanness. Now therefore give not your daughters unto their sons, neither take their daughters unto your sons, nor
seek their peace or their wealth for ever” (Ezra ix. 11, 12). Ezra but reproduces the Pentateuchal marriage-law, aimed against “the Amorite, and the Canaanite, and the Hittite, and the Perizzite, and the Hivite, and the Jebusite” (Exod. xxxiv)—whose appalling abominations are recited in the eighteenth chapter of Leviticus. The absurdity of putting the higher races of to-day—peoples so high that the Jew must needs be “assimilated” to them—on the same footing as the ancient idol-worshippers and sexual perverts, is too glaring for words. The Americans, to whose flag the Jew swears allegiance as to the symbol of Bravery and Purity and Truth, are classed with the extinct pagans who made their children pass through the fire unto Moloch. And this despite the fact that the Anglo-Saxon civilization which is common to England and America is founded on Hebraic ideals, as Mr. Israel Gollancz has eloquently illustrated by the affinity of English and Hebrew literature. So far from wishing to abolish the marriage-restrictions of Ezra and Nehemiah, I should be for maintaining them more strongly than ever in East Africa, where the Biblical conditions are reproduced of a Jewish territory with barbarian neighbours. Had Kruger prevented alliances between the Boers and the Kaffirs, he would have been even more of an Old Testament figure. But if the Synagogue is to distort the purely topical legislation of Ezra and Nehemiah into a prohibition of marriage between the Jews and the higher races, why does the Synagogue stop short at the merely matrimonial portion of the text? The Jew is forbidden by Ezra not only to intermarry with other peoples, but even “to seek their peace or their wealth for ever.” So far from “assimilating” to the English or the Americans, the Jew should draw his gaberdine closer as he passes by.

Fortunately no Jew in civilized environments does hold himself aloof from promoting the general welfare. Conversely, any people whose peace and wealth the Jew is permitted to seek, he is permitted to intermarry with.
Mr. Wolf’s strange obsession as regards the Jewish people and its potentialities—that it is placed between the alternatives of re-barbarization and assimilation—reaches its climax in his account of the East-African scheme, which, he says, “aims at the creation of a Ghetto in the British Empire.” A more brazen attempt to beg the question I have never come across. Certainly no Zionist aims at a Ghetto. Mr. Wolf, like a clever conjurer, tries to palm off “Jewish State” and “Ghetto” as one and the same thing. The East-African scheme aims at placing the Jew in the antithesis to Ghetto conditions, and still Mr. Wolf babbles of Gettos. At the same time he blames the Zionist for losing the opportunity of the J. C. A.’s help towards setting up this East-African Ghetto—the Zionist should drop his autonomy clause. But how the absence of this clause would make the colony less a Ghetto I fail to understand. The reason why we Zionists hold fast to the clause is that we believe no practical good can be done without it, and that we wish to remove the enterprise from the region of philanthropy, which is full of the ruins of colonies.

As regards the objection to autonomy “from an imperial point of view,” I leave Mr. Lucien Wolf to his delicious task of safeguarding the British Empire. His language, his picture of the perils to the British Constitution, strangely recalls the old pamphlets against the admission of the Jews into England, and it is indeed a curious irony that has put such arguments into the mouth of the biographer of Manasseh ben Israel. As if the British Empire were not the most motley collection of races ever held together in a single fabric! The argument that autonomy is necessary in the interests of the national customs of the Jews, Mr. Wolf meets by the amazing reply that these national customs are “strange and disagreeable.” The Ghetto “crystallizes the strange customs of the unassimi-
lated Jews." By the same jugglery by which Judenstaat becomes Ghetto, the parasitical oddities and superstitions that have grown up in the Ghetto are palmed off as the great underlying framework of Jewish national life. The centre of Jewish life is the Sabbath, and from a centre of edification it becomes in a Christian environment a centre of religious corruption. Yet Mr. Wolf has the hardihood to assert that "there is no essential restriction on the observance of the Jewish Sabbath." Of course there is no compulsory restriction. Such assertions leave me breathless. I merely reflect that by the Sabbath many of the crafts are closed to the Jewish masses, and most of the professions to the Jewish classes—journalism not excluded.

XII.

The Zionist peril is completed by the "development of a general Anschauung distinctly alien to the spirit of the nations among whom the emancipated Zionists now dwell."

This is reversing Ezra and Nehemiah with a vengeance. Mr. Wolf still boasts of "the Jewish mission," but the development in a missionary of a life-conception "distinctly alien to the spirit" of the heathen is a deplorable danger. Mr. Wolf speaks of the old Jewish State as having concentrated "the moral forces of the people for the miraculous work of converting the world to a higher spiritual life." Either the people has completed the work, in which case it may say "nunc dimittis," or it has not completed the work, in which case, is the establishment of a model State a bad way of going on with it? Perhaps we now need—for the world's good and our own—a new period of concentration, in which to fuse the spiritual spoils of the West with our own national genius. "We have emerged from the Ghetto," says Mr. Wolf, "better fitted to cope with the problems of that civilian life which is now the ideal of the modern world than almost any other people." So this is it at last—that mysterious Jewish mission. We can cope best with
the problems of civilian life! Civilian life—the six-sevenths in which Mr. Wolf has just been telling us we are to be indistinguishable from our neighbours. However, if civilian problems are what we now exist for, let us hasten to get a civilian platform on which to exhibit our superior solutions. “We have to show an example to the nations,” Mr. Wolf tells us. But only a nation can show an example to the nations. Become a nation, and then show your example.

But a nation Mr. Wolf refuses to belong to—unless it is somebody else’s. These superior sociological talents of ours—“is it possible, even if it were desirable, to bottle-up these forces in the squalid blind-alley of Theodor Herzl’s Judenstaat?” “Squalid blind-alley”! Was it desirable to bottle up Shakespeare in England or Dante in Italy? And oh, that squalid blind-alley of Athens! The anti-Zionists are indeed betrayed into strange propositions; but what else can follow from their perverted premise that the terrible tragedy of Jewish homelessness is a positive blessing both to the Jews and to the world? Their arguments, generalized, would deny the value of nationality altogether—no bad thesis, if only the anti-Zionists were not almost invariably chauvinists of the chauvinists. We have heard how the Polish anti-Zionists palpitate for the independence of Poland.

The real “squalid blind-alley” is the Jewish community, and Mr. Wolf himself has made the analysis. Its forces, too long “bottled-up” in the narrow bottles of a sect, seek expansion, and can only find it outside Judaism. I merely draw the conclusion and suggest the remedy—Judaism must enlarge itself, must resume its territorial basis, if it is to conserve these forces. No doubt the beginnings of a new Judenstaat would be rude and untempting, especially if everybody of Mr. Wolf’s culture keeps away; but Venice began with a few exiles on a marsh.

To imagine that forces are “bottled-up” by being nationally concentrated is a very shallow fallacy. The most widely diffused Jewish force, indeed the most widely
diffused force in the world—the Bible—was not the fruit of the Diaspora, but of the territorial period. Plato and Aristotle never journeyed to Oxford or to Göttingen to diffuse their philosophy. The architects of Greece did not live scattered all over the world to impress humanity with the beauties of Doric pillars or Corinthian capitals. Wagner deliberately "bottled-up" his forces in Bayreuth.

In truth, the rôle Mr. Wolf assigns to the Jews is not of producer, but of pedlar. Repressing his own Anschauung, he is to furnish his pack with the general stock of civilization, and then go about crying it as "Jewish."

XIII.

In a fine confused peroration Mr. Wolf tells us that "our mission is the Mendelssohnian mission as laid down in the famous letter of Moses Mendelssohn to Lavater. We have to show an example to the nations." I have heard all my life of the Mendelssohnian mission, but on going to the sources, lo! the mission proves a Mrs. Harris. Mendelssohn lays down no such mission in "the famous letter to Lavater." The old sage, with that same timidity of character which kept his activity largely anonymous, merely deprecated religious discussion, alleging that he preferred to argue by character rather than by controversy. One of the most satisfactory episodes in Mr. Wolf's own career is his controversy with Christianity in the pages of The Jewish World. Even supposing we generalize Mendelssohn's personal preferences into the notion that the Jewish mission is to convince through character, why cannot this be done in a State? A State carries infinitely more conviction than isolated individuals. "We have to show an example to the nations." I repeat, it takes a nation to do that. Show a nation with more virtue and less crime, more justice and less destitution, more learning and less brutality, than any other, and you will soon have all the world inquiring how it is done. There is thus
absolutely no opposition between "the Mendelssohnian mission" and Zionism!

It is amusing—after all this anti-Zionist cannonade—to find Mr. Wolf ending with the admission that "our highest traditional ideal is undoubtedly national!"

True, he adds that "it is not the nation of a kept principality." But no Zionist is craving for a kept principality rather than for independence. Also "it is the holy nation of the kingdom of priests." Well, there are Zionists too who take that view—"those who most earnestly support the Judenstaat." But Mr. Wolf is not to be found even in their camp. What, I wonder, are his reasons for not "promoting our highest traditional ideal"? Why does he preach a Judaism for jellyfishes, drifted hither and thither by the tides of history?

Mr. Wolf is, in brief, committed to this strange proposition—the Jews are a "religious community," whose miraculous mission has been, and still is, to convert the world to a higher spiritual life; but place them under conditions most favourable to the preservation of their religious individuality, and they will produce only a Ghetto of strange and disagreeable customs. And for climax of paradox this proposition is maintained, not by a Jewish Reformer, but by a Jew who took a recent opportunity to declare that he was "very far from sympathizing with the doctrinal and ceremonial aspects of Reform!"

XIV.

The proper answer to Zionism consists not in cries of peril, but in one of two opposition policies—either religious reconstruction with the conversion of Judaism into a missionary religion, or total fusion with the higher races and civilizations whom we have already Hebraized. The clue to our choice between the three policies lies in the thread which links us with the suffering Jewish masses. Any solution which excludes them must be itself excluded.
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The policy of re-creating them as a political entity has the advantage that it does not exclude religious reconstruction and the world-mission, though that solution excludes it. The policy of disappearance is at least as difficult as the policy of reappearance, and the time and energy spent in dissipating the Jews might as well be spent in re-creating them.

It is characteristic of Mr. Wolf's anti-Zionism that it takes neither of these high-roads. It remains as shapeless and invertebrate as his Judaism, which is defined only by its negative opposition to Reform. The real Zionist peril is the searchlight Zionism brings to bear upon flabby thinking or feeble conviction.

ISRAEL ZANGWILL.
AN EIGHTH-CENTURY GENIZAH DOCUMENT.

The document which is here published is taken from the inexhaustible treasury of valuable MSS. brought to Cambridge from Cairo by Dr. Schechter. It is written on vellum, and measures 32 by 29 cm. (Press-mark, T-S., 16. 79).

The document is interesting in the first instance from the palaeographical point of view, for it is distinctly dated. For this reason a facsimile is appended. The spelling שְׂמַעְבָּא in line 2 is especially noteworthy; as indeed is the combination רְמִיָּא נָרָא. In line 20 we have the more usual שָׂמַעְבָּא; at the early date to which the document belongs the spelling was evidently not yet fixed. On the other hand, the form שָׂמַעְבָּא also survived, though it is rarely found. An instance of it occurs in an Oxford document dated 1134 (MS. Heb. b. 12, Cat. No. 2,875), another in a Cambridge marriage document of the year 1534 (T-S., 16. 112). In a Cambridge document (T-S., 16. 189) the name is spelt שְׂמַעְבָּא. Another unusual spelling (שְׂמֵעָבָא) may be seen in a Kethuba dated 1049 (T-S., 20. 7). But in the vast majority of cases the spelling is, of course, שְׂמַעְבָּא.

But the intrinsic value of the document is also considerable. Apart from its importance on the history of documentary forms, it throws new light on the condition of the Cairo community in the eighth century; introduces us to a head of the community (Abi-'Ali Hasan of Bagdad)
of whom we have so far no other record in Cairo documents; gives us a clue to the occupations of the Jews (we have a family of apothecaries and a dealer in almonds); and adds a little to our knowledge of the topographical situation of the Jews in Cairo at the very moment when the city was being largely rebuilt. It is clear that in the year 750 Jews were already domiciled in the Qaṣr 'sh-Sham', the Palace of the Candle, where a few Jews and Copts still reside to-day. This vast palace or fortress was a town within the town, and unmistakably belongs to the oldest part of Fostat. It was possibly an ancient Roman fortress, and the title may even go back to the Persian fire-worshippers. (See Makrizi, I,307; Amélineau, "La géographie d'Égypte à l'époque copte," p. 548; Casanova, "Les noms coptes du Caire," Bulletin de l'Institut français d'arch. orient. du Caire, I, p. 142, cf. the plan ibid., p. 224.) It is interesting to remember that the two synagogues (Babylonian and Palestinian) referred to by Benjamin of Tudela were both situated in the Qaṣr 'sh-Sham', and it is possible that allusion is made to these in the passage discussed below. The term (Sayd-alanî, line 9) interpreted "of the apothecary's family" is, Prof. E. G. Browne kindly informs me, a nisba derived from the trade of selling drugs and medicines, and points to the fact that Joseph the Cohen belonged to a family which had carried on that trade; his father or grandfather would presumably have been a druggist (see As-Suyūtī's Lubbu'l-Lubdî, ed. Veth, Leyden, 1842, p. 164).

The MS. is in good condition. The vellum, it is true, is cut away at the foot on the left side, but none of the text has been lost by the cut. The few gaps in the body of the MS. may be easily supplied; but in line 15 the restoration is difficult. It is possible to read prav, which would give us in the eighth century what we have evidence of later, "two Academies" in Miṣr; but the gap is better supplied by bavvish. It will be noted that three words, which are written above the line in the original (in lines 2, 9, and 15), have been here printed on the line.
AN EIGHTH-CENTURY GENIZAH DOCUMENT

Otherwise I have reproduced the document exactly as in the original, and have not corrected some obvious slips of the scribe. At the end of line 19 the scribe had first written a broad final mem, within which he afterwards inserted the words which I have printed at the end of the line. In line 12, fourth word from the end, the scribe seems to have begun to write מַשֵּׁמַר in error for שלח (see T. B. Gittin, fol. 75 b). In line 5 (ninth and tenth words) the repetition of מ is a case of dittography. The reader will be able to check all the conjectures of the editor, with the aid of the facsimile.

The document is dated (line 20): Wednesday, Kislev 11, in the year 1062 of the “era used in Fostat,” i.e. the Seleucidian era (312–311 B.C.). Hence the date of the document is A.D. 750. In reducing Genizah dates to dates A.D. it is necessary to subtract 312. There are, however, some difficulties in the matter which will be treated more fully in connexion with some other Genizah documents to be published later on.

The substance of the document is as follows. Nahum, son of Abraham, son of Nehemiah, declares before witnesses that he possesses nine qirats (i.e. twenty-fourths) of a certain house in Fostat Misr. The house is described as in the “palace Alsham, in the lane . . . [the name of the lane is unfortunately obliterated] adjoining the house of Abi-‘Ali Hasan of Bagdad, the head of the Community.” The rest of the house is owned by Zur‘ah, son of ‘Amran, and Khiba, daughter of Hilal (Hillel) the Levite, an almond-merchant, son of Jabir, wife of Abi-Ishaq, son of . . . son of Nehemiah. Zur‘ah owns nine qirats, and Khiba the remaining quarter of the house. Nahum enters into an engagement with Zur‘ah and Khiba that he will not, by any conceivable means (among which are specified sale, grant or Waqf), dispose of his share in the house in such a manner, directly or indirectly, as may bring the share into the possession of a certain Joseph the Cohen, of the apothecary’s family, son of Ibrahim, known as Ben-Kish.
The obligation is to hold so long as Zur'ah and Khiba retain their shares of the property. This engagement is emphasized with every possible term of legal stringency, every imaginable reserve is repudiated, and the promise is reinforced by Nahum's assent, in case of breach, to a fine of twenty full-weighted and good dinars for the benefit of the two [Synagogues?] in Miṣr, the fine to be divided equally between the two.

The witnesses are Samuel son of R. Abraham, Sar Shalom bar Joseph, Isaac bar Hillel, and Isaac bar 怀抱.

The historical problems which this document raises are of some importance. But I have been urged to publish the document without delay, and I accordingly present this imperfect edition. Doubtless some of my readers will have suggestions to make on the details of the document.

I am deeply indebted to Mr. David Yellin of Jerusalem for help in reading the Arabic; indeed, several of the conjectures introduced are derived from his acute suggestions. To Mr. E. Worman, M.A., of the University Library, Cambridge, I have to express warm thanks for copying the MS. in the first instance. The suggestion made above, that the fine was to be applied to certain Fostat Synagogues, is confirmed by an early but undated fragmentary document (T-S. 12. 129), to which Mr. Worman has drawn my attention. A money fine is there described נוֹז הָאָרֶץ לְלַבְּנִים וְלַאֲלֵי בָּאָמִים וָאָשֶׁר.

I. ABRAHAMS.
(Ninth Article.)

XXIV.

A Poem attributed to AlSamau' al.

Paper, one leaf 15 x 10 cm., recto 19 lines, verso 21 lines.

The fragment to be discussed in the following pages is headed Qašīde by AlSamau' al. A title like this cannot fail to excite the keenest interest of students of ancient Arabic literature, assuming that the fragment can be proved to contain an authentic poem by the Jewish poet of Teimā. However uncritical it would be to treat it as such prima facie, it would be equally hasty to reject it without careful examination. It will, therefore, be best to set forth at once the evidence against the authenticity, and then collect the proofs in favour of the same.

There is no trace of this poem, or parts of it, in any collection of Old Arabic poetry, or works bearing on the subject, although one genuine poem and several doubtful ones of AlSamau' al have been handed down to us. The fragment is written in Hebrew characters, and contains

a comparatively large element of Jewish Agādā in its lines. In its vocabulary there are six words of Jewish character, the Arabic forms of which are first known to us from the Qorān. These words are ṭāḥmān¹ "merciful," qurbān "offering," al fir`āun “Pharaoh,” salwā “quails,” mann “manna,” muqaddas “holy.” Finally, in line 5 Abraham is alluded to as khalīl “friend [of God],” a term which occurs in the same connexion in Qor. IV, 124: “Allah chose Abraham as friend.” Thus, although the poem may be old, a superficial examination would place it later than the Qorān, and it could therefore hardly be the work of the famous Al-Samau‘al b. Ādiyā.

On the other hand, it must first of all be admitted that in the heading of the poem no other person is meant than the poet of Teimā. No other person called Al-Samau‘al (with the article) is known in history, the name being an equivalent of Samuel. We know of two members of the Jewish tribe of the Banu Koreīzā in Medina who bore the same name, but in the form of Shamwi ² (without the article). The poem itself belongs to the category of fākhr³, or heroic poetry, which also includes national and family glory. The famous five lines which made the poet proverbial for fidelity in Arabic literature are of the same character, as is also a poem ascribed to him, the authenticity of which is, however, doubtful. Now there is nothing improbable in the assumption that he also composed a song in praise of his faith and ancestral history. It appears even less unlikely if one recalls the fact that at that time Judaism was decidedly popular all over Arabia, and that many Arab tribes had been converted to the same. The immediate cause of its composition may have been rivalry

¹ It is, however, doubtful whether this word was used in the original; see the annotations to the translation.
² See R. E. J., X, p. 11.
³ See ver. 10.
between his clan and some Christian Arabs in the north of the peninsula. The circumstance that the Arab littérateurs observe complete silence with regard to this poem does not speak at all against its authenticity. It stands in so sharp a contrast to the spirit of Islam that, had they known it, they would purposely have let it fall into oblivion or even destroyed it. Parallel instances of their having tampered with pre-Islamic poetry are not wanting.

If we now consider the obstacle caused by the five words mentioned above, we soon come to the conclusion that they prove nothing. If they occur in the Qurān, this only shows that Mohammed had learnt them from Jews to whom they were quite familiar, and it is by no means astonishing that they were introduced into a poem of thoroughly Jewish character. The same also applies to Abraham being styled the "friend of God." The Qoranic verse in question is but an adaptation of the words Isaiah xli. 8, "Abraham my friend." There was no profound knowledge of the Bible required to know of this passage, as it occurs in a popular Haftārāh, and was therefore familiar even to less learned Jews.

We possess a whole series of poems composed by Arabian Jews prior to Islam, but none of them shows any trace of Jewish character. It is not likely, however, that they should have completely abstained from writing religious poetry, because Jewish poetry was in all ages prominently religious. If none of them has come down to us, it is easily explained by the circumstance that all old Arabic poetry was handed from one generation to the other by oral tradition. The wholesale slaughter of Jews in the wars of Mohammed, and their final expulsion from the peninsula would account for the loss of this whole class of poems.

1 See Nöldeke, Beiträge zur Kenntniss der Poesie der alten Araber, p. 77. The poem in question is by a Jewish author.
poetry. It is not, however, altogether improbable that a few lines, displaying the talent of one of their best poets, were saved and, at a later period, committed to writing. The corrupt form of many words, and the employment of such which do not fit into the metre, is easily explained by the circumstance that the text was written down from memory. This is a feature which the poem has in common with the bulk of old Arabic poems, the texts of which are anything but certain.

Now the metrical form of the poem, as well as occasional words mainly used in old poetry, are two more points of evidence in favour of its authenticity. Although the copyist wrote the poem as one would write a prose piece, he cannot have been quite unconscious of its poetic form, as he marked the rhyme \( li \) by employing \( as \) mater lectionis. Otherwise it is clear that he did not understand either the text or the metre. Proof of this is that at the end of line 17 there are two words too many. They are, however, only the remnant of a whole double line, fitting exactly, both as regards rhyme and metre.

There is still a word to be said on the elements of the Jewish Agadā dispersed through the poem. Line 5 is unfortunately not quite intelligible, but so much is clear that it contains an allusion to the Rabbinic legend of Abraham's rescue from the furnace, a legend which is reproduced in Qorān several times (XXI, 69; XXIX, 26). Line 6 not only refers to the offering up of Isaac, but also to the legend of the special creation of the ram, as recorded in Abōth, V, 6. Finally, line 19 alludes to the alleged twelve springs which poured forth from the rock mentioned in Qor. V, 160. (This is a combination of Exod. xv. 22 (Mechiltā) with xvii. 6.)

Now this display of Rabbinic lore, not all of which is reproduced in the Qorān, is so far removed from injuring
the authentic aspect of the poem, that it actually strengthens it. If we treat it as genuine, hypothetically, the poem represents the only Jewish document, hitherto known, which offers some little direct evidence of theological learning among the Arabian Jews in pre-Islamic times. Hitherto the only source for gaining an approximate estimation of this learning had been the Qurān, which, of course, allows but indirect inferences to be drawn. In AlSamau'āl we would see a type of a Jew who was versed alike in the culture and arts of his Arab countrymen as well as in his own national literature. This double education gave his class that spiritual superiority which we find reflected in ancient Arab history as well as in the Qurān.

Finally, there is some interest attaching to the spelling of several words in the fragment. This reveals a certain looseness which agrees very well with the suggestion that the poem was penned from memory. If this was so, the writer was free to employ some vulgarisms which appear in Jewish Arabic writings even of the earliest epoch. Apart from the one in the rhyme mentioned before, there occur ین (l. 1) and ین (lines 12 and 13), ین (l. 7); ین for ین (l. 16), and a free interchange between ین and ین, Hamza is entirely neglected.

The text published below is an exact reproduction of the original, except that it is brought into the proper form of a Qāṣida. In the transcription into Arabic characters, added for the benefit of readers less skilled in reading Arabic texts written in Hebrew characters, classic spelling has been restored as far as possible. The metre is Tawfīl.
בשמך רוחם, והיה ביריה לדומך

אל ואיה אלפים אלפים תשב ענווה
ויתנה מתכפכת קומת אמצעם ותליע
ונחננה רבי לעמו אלופים
שתחמם ב grâce ותליע
ואלה אלפים אלפים דון אלפים

5 ריאשון בנחת אלפים אלפים
ברא שבעה אלפים אלפים
ואמה ארצות בר זע אלפים
למבר עין אלפים אלפים
והנה את עני אלפים אלפים

10 ונשב נושה מי אלפים אלפים
ויתשת מע אמצעים של כל אלפים
ולא ברך מזרה בער ממאכל
לעך褰מחים עמו אלפים אלפים
ואמינו ב מותו אלפים אלפים

15 ומעמךFacadeיה מה מר אלפים אלפים
וניחstarted עפות מה מר אלפים אלפים
_partnerה עננים מה מר אלפים אלפים
כשהים אלפים אלפים

20 מסתת אלפים עד אלפים
מראתה אלפים מע אלפים
והי אלהים אלהים בשיר אלהים
ודת מדת מי אלפים supra מדריא
מדת עצה ואלף מדריא שעימה
וגם כן העם מול אלפים אלפים
והי אלהים אלהים בשיר אלהים
ריפור מתbraska כי אלפים אלפים
}

משרתם אלפים על כל מאלי

...
هذه قصيدة للسلام

الطويل
لا إيها السلم التي عاب سادتى
واحى مناقب قومه اختيارهم
اختارهم عما عوقد للذى
من النار والقرىان والإيحى التي
فهنآ خليل عربي النار حواء
وهنا ذبيح (٩) فداء بكوبه
وهنا رئيس أصطفاء وحفظه
فالله ضرفهم بما لم يبولهم
١٥ أنت للفريق ترى القلب ونحوه
وبلهم وسوسا ويلمع حيرة
لأمسى في المنبر المنكل التي
أنتس بني الجمر المقرى الذي
واخره البأرى إلى الشعب كي يرى
وكى ما يفزوا بالغينية أهلها
٢٠ أنتس بئي الجسر الذي نفيت لهم
من الشمس وال içازة كانت صيانه
السنا بئى السلوى مع الم والى
على عدد السوس لا يرى عينها
وقد مكروا في الصر عمارا مجددا
فلم يبل ثرو من لاس عليهم
وانصب نروا كالمؤمن إمامهم
السنا بئى الطرى المقدس والى
اليس تطأطأ لليل حتى تتبلا
وناجى عليه عبد وكليمة
Translation.

IN THY NAME OF MERCIFUL.

This is a Qasida by AlSamau' al.

1 O . . . . whom my lords blame (?),
Hear my voice, I am not unmindful of thee.

2 Let me recount the high qualities of a people which
Their God has chosen with signs and miracles.

3 He chose them from (?) a barren woman . . .
Whom my Lord distinguished on account of their pure descent (?).

4 From fire and sacrifice and trials to which
They submitted from perfect love of God (?).

5 The one is a friend around whom the fire produced
fragrant odours which covered the flexible twiga.

6 The other is . . . sacrifice which he redeemed by his lamb
which he created, but which was not the child of mountain
goats.

7 Then there is a prince whom he chose and distinguished,
And named him Israel the first-born.

8 God exalted them . . . . .
. . . . in this world and the next.

9 Did not religion attach to them to guide them,
And he covered (?) them with bounties and gifts.

10 . . . a glory which overflows the heart (?)
And kindles an inextinguishable fire in the bosom.

11 And it inspires whisper and illumines . . .
And casts into his vitals something akin to disquiet (?).

12 Are we not the people of Egypt which was chastised; we
For whose sake Egypt was struck by ten plagues?

13 Are we not the people of the divided sea, we
For whose sake Pharaoh was drowned on the day of (his) arduous
enterprise?

14 The Creator took the people out on the road,
That it might behold his wonders . . (?)
15 And that they might carry off the booty of its people
gold over . . . of the girdles.
16 Are we not the people of the sanctuary . . .
To whom clouds descended which shaded them the whole
journey?
17 From sun and rain they were their guard
Protecting their hosts from the fierce hot wind.
18 Are we not the people of the quails and the manna,
And they to whom the stone poured forth the sweetness of
water?

19 . . . . . . . . . . .

20 Its springs flowed according to the number of the tribes,
[Uniting] into a sweet, cool stream whose taste was not changed.
21 They tarried in the desert for renewed life [generation ?]
The Creator sustained them with the choicest of food.
22 The garments of their bodies did not wear out, nor
Did they require repairs (?) for their shoes.
23 He appointed a light, like a pillar, in front of them
Which illumined the horizon without departing.
24 Are we not the people of the holy mount . . .
Which crumbled to dust on the day of earthquakes?
25 Did not the mighty one humble itself completely?
But the Creator exalted it above every high position.
26 And his servant to whom he spoke, prayed upon it

Annotations to the Translation.
Verse 1 (a) seems to contain a kind of nusib. (b) Before לוה an
iambic word to be supplied.
2. (a) דוע_chunks against the metre. The second word might
perhaps be read בראת. (b) For בראת perhaps better to be read
בראת.
3. (a) At the beginning perhaps ויה to be supplied. Instead of אבת
one might read באת and refer the hemistic to Gen. xi. 30. (b) An
iambic word required at the beginning; for באת perhaps better באת.
4. (b) קים a syllable wanting.
6. (a) After ויה a syllable wanting.
7. (a)ויה probably refers to Gen. xxxii. 29, so does also (b).
8. (a) Perhaps רוח לפני המים, but the metre is not correct in both hemistichs.
9. (a) רוח, perhaps רוח (?). (b) בְּכָלַי a syllable too much.
10. (a) רְשוּ, probably רְשוּ, lit. leaves the heart behind; (b) lit. fixes a fire within the innermost ribs.
11. (a) והי הוא?
12. (a) See Exod. i. 12, 20.
13. (b) مع גֶּדו is probably corruption of something like גֶּדוֹ.
14. (a) Prob. הָנַענ (without the article); (b) a whole foot wanting. See Exod. xii. 35, 36.
16. (a) prob. א. (b) Probably to be read תֵּאָה קָנָה.
17. (b) For וַיַּשְּׁכֵר better to be read וַיֶּשֶׁר (†). See Deut. viii. 4; xxix. 4. (b) בַּעַד? אָסָה?

HARTWIG HIRSCHFELD.
EZEKIEL AND THE BABYLONIAN ACCOUNT OF THE DELUGE.

NOTES ON EZEK. XIV. 12-20.

Ezekiel was the prophet of the Babylonian exile. Led into captivity together with the King Jojachin in the year 597, he lived henceforth in the place Tel-Abib on the canal of Kebar in Babylonia, where he began his prophetic activity in the fifth year. He differed essentially from his predecessors through his style and the way in which he expressed his thoughts. He worked out his material carefully, sometimes laboriously. He is more of a scholar. He is thoroughly acquainted with the older prophetic writings, and often uses their language, or models his own upon theirs. But he is not only versed in the literature of his own people. His knowledge also extends to the literatures of other peoples. At the least he must have been familiar with the literature of the country in which he has spent the greater part of his life and in which he has displayed his prophetic activity.

It has already been pointed out for some time that in Ezekiel are to be found Babylonian similes and expressions. It is in perfect agreement with the scholarly nature of Ezekiel to make use of poetry and myth without regard to their origin. It was not necessary that they should be Israelitic. What he wanted was to clothe his idea in a picture, his thought in a poetic garb, and where it came from made no difference to him. He wished to express
himself classically. It therefore need not be surprising if we try to find in Ezekiel parallels to Babylonian literary products.

A very interesting passage in this direction is that in xiv. 12–20, which has a close relation to a passage occurring in the Babylonian account of the Deluge, and which therefore deserves a thorough investigation.

In vers. 21–23 Ezekiel desires to say that God would send to Jerusalem a fourfold punishment in order to exterminate all the sinners. A remnant, however, would remain to serve as a warning to the exiles. This announcement of the evil that was to befall Jerusalem, Ezekiel prefaces by a short speech in which he propounds the general principle of retribution. This is, indeed, quite in agreement with Ezekiel's habit to introduce his special prophecies by something general, be it a simile, an allegory, a symbolic act, or (as here) a general theory.

We shall reproduce here this speech in the original text and the Babylonian passage in question in transliteration and (both) in English translation, and then see what results follow from a comparison of these two passages.

**Text from vers. 12–20**

12 ויהי דבר הזה על ימי למסרים
13 ב אים אأنو יתי ותוחאם אלה עמל ממלוכ
14 מאייה יחיה על ים
15 חולותיה בא רבע
16 חברתי ממנה ארום מבום
17 ויהי שלושת האנשים האלה בזוהים
18 נינא לאו יאני
19 מה ברFromDateים יעל נמס
20 נאמ אורי יוהי
21 ולא היה רעה אַעְבּּר בְּאֵרֵם ושכלת
This word of Jhvh came to me:

Son of man, if a land sin against me by acting faithlessly, and I stretch out my hand against it, and break its staff of bread, and send famine into it, and cut off from it man and beast, and these three men were in it, Noah, Daniel, and Job, they would by their righteousness save themselves (lit. their own soul), says the Lord Jhvh.
15 If I send wild beasts throughout the land and they depopulate it, and it became waste, so that no one pass through it because of the beasts, though these three men were in it, by my life! says the Lord Jhvh, they would save neither sons nor daughters; they alone would be saved, and the land would be waste.

16 Or, if I send a sword into that land, and say: “Sword, pass through the land,” and I cut off from it man and beast and these three men were in it, by my life! says the Lord Jhvh, they would save neither sons nor daughters, but they alone would be saved.

17 Or, if I send pestilence into that land and pour out my fury on it in blood, to cut off from it man and beast,— and Noah, Daniel, and Job were in it, by my life! says the Lord Jhvh, they would save neither son nor daughter, they by their righteousness would save (but) themselves (lit. their own soul).

The idea is then here this, that a sinful people cannot be saved by the virtues of a few righteous men. Every one atones for his own sin. The pious, however, are saved through their piety.

Now let us look at the passage in the Babylonian account of the deluge.

After the flood was over the god Ea reproached the god Bêl, who was chiefly responsible for the deluge, for his rash action, and stated what he (Bêl) ought to have done to punish the sinful.

This passage reads in the transliteration as follows:
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180 Ṛu E-a pa-a-su ēpuš-ma ikaβbi
181 izakar(ar) ana ku-ra-di Ṛu Bel
182 at-ta ab(p)kal ilāni ku-ra-du
183 ki-i ki-i la tam-ta-lik-ma a-bu-ba taš-kun
184 be-el ḥi-ṭi e-mid hi-ṭa-a-su
185 be-el kil-la-ti e-mid kil-lat-su
186 ru-um-mi a-a ib-ba-ti-ik šu-du-uṭ a-a i[r...]
187 am-ma-ki taš-ku-nu a-bu-ba
188 nēbu lit-ba-am-ma nišē li-ṣa-aḫ-ḥi-ir
189 am-ma-ki taš-ku-nu a-bu-ba
190 barbaru lit-ba-am-ma nišē li-ṣa-a[h-ḥi-ir]
191 am-ma-ki taš-ku-nu a-bu-ba
192 lu-šaḥ-ḥu liš-ša-kin-ma māta liš[...]
193 am-ma-ki taš-ku-nu a-bu-ba
194 Ṛu Ira(-ra) lit-ba-am-ma māta liš-giš.

Translation.

180 Ea opened his mouth and speaks,
181 Says to the warrior Bel:
182 "Thou sage of the gods, warrior!
183 Why 17 didst thou not take counsel and didst bring
a flood?
184 On the sinner put his sin 18,
185 on the evil-doer put his evil deed 19!
186 (But) be merciful so that not (All) be cut off, be patient
so that not (All) [be destroyed] 20.
187 Instead of bringing on a deluge,
188 let lions 21 come and diminish mankind 22!
189 Instead of bringing on a deluge,
190 let tigers 23 come and diminish mankind 24!
191 Instead of bringing on a deluge,
192 let famine come and [smite 25] the land 26!
193 Instead of bringing on a deluge,
194 let pestilence come and waste 27 the land 28! "

Vol. Xviii.
Now, apart from the naming in Ezekiel of the three righteous men, we find a striking agreement between these two pieces of literature. As in Ezekiel the idea prevails here that every man has to suffer for his own iniquities (cf. II. 184, 185). While now a deluge makes the escape of the righteous impossible, other visitations would affect the guilty only. The punishments, which are enumerated here, are almost the same as those in Ezekiel: nēbu in I. 188, and barbaru in I. 190, correspond to the nēru in ver. 15, ḫukahhū in I. 192 to the rēbu in ver. 13, Ira in I. 194 to the rīr in ver. 19. If now the succession is not quite the same, and in the Babylonian account of the deluge the punishment of war is omitted, it is nevertheless beyond doubt that Ezekiel had this passage in mind when he wrote down his words in vers. 12–20. Cf., by the way, ver. 21, where rēb stands first, nēru second, nēru third; cf. also Ezek. v. 17.

In form, too, this passage in Ezekiel resembles the corresponding one in the Babylonian account of the deluge. Cf., e.g., the nū introducing the second punishment in ver. 15 with the nū in litbamma, līṣahhīr, &c. As in Ezekiel nāṣ stands alternately with (nāṣ) and in the Babylonian nīṣe (II. 188 and 190) alternates with mātu (II. 192 and 194). Worthy of notice is also the equality of the metre in both.

All this proves that Ezekiel made use of the Babylonian account of the deluge, and formed this short oration after the passage quoted.

Now this fact—of Ezekiel's dependence upon earlier models becoming apparent to an ever greater extent—leads to a much more important question, which I shall touch here only inasmuch as the present examination helps to answer it. In what relation does Ezekiel stand to Lev. xvii–xxvi, the so-called "Law of Holiness"? On account of the many similarities between Ezekiel and Lev. xvii–xxvi, several critics assumed that Ezekiel was the author of those chapters in Leviticus. Other scholars, however, for various reasons regard this theory as inadmissible. While now some
of them place Lev. xvii-xxvi before Ezekiel, others assign to those chapters a later date. One of the chief arguments of the latter is that Ezekiel could not be regarded as so unoriginal. Now the present investigation proves that Ezekiel was really not very original. After what has been said here it should be taken for granted that the similarities between Ezekiel and Lev. xvii-xxvi not only prove nothing for the posteriority of the latter, but unquestionably speak for the priority of those chapters in Leviticus. As we have seen Ezekiel has made the most liberal use of the literature which existed before him (Israelitish and non-Israelitish), and that not only as regards the thoughts contained therein, but also the phrases and expressions. For Ezekiel's way of writing it is only natural that when he wanted to speak of prescriptions and commands which had been fixed in writing and were known, he should make use of the same expressions which he found in the collections in question. Just as it is impossible for Ezekiel to have been the author of Jeremiah or of the Babylonian account of the deluge, so he cannot have been the author of Lev. xvii-xxvi. Leviticus must rather have been before his eyes, for only in this way can the striking agreements in both be explained. The originality of Ezekiel which, compared with that of the other prophets, is, as already pointed out, rather insignificant, may be said to consist chiefly in the way he works out the material before him (compilation, ornamentation, &c.), and in the untiring iteration and accentuation of the ideas of morality, and in constantly reminding Israel of its duties which had been formulated long before him.

APPENDIX.

In connexion with the foregoing remarks, which show to what great extent Ezekiel was influenced by the Babylonian language and culture, I should like to give here a new explanation of the expression מַעֲזֹב, so frequently occurring in Ezekiel and used when God addresses the prophet. This
DiK p appears to me to be formed after a Babylonian mār ameli. In the Code of Hammurabi, §§ 175, 176, mention is made of a mārat avelim, which means "the daughter of a freeman" (cf. Vera. col. 13, ll. 60, 66, 71, 88; col. 14, ll. 8, 10, 20, and see the translations of Scheil, Winckler, Johns, Kohler-Peiser, Harper). If there was a mārat avelim there must also have been a mār avelim ("son of a freeman," "freeborn son"), which might have been the prototype of šām mū in Ezekiel. This apostrophe would then have nothing to do with "the human weakness in contrast to the divine might" (see Toy, Ezekiel, Engl. transl., p. 96, l 39 sqq., and Kraetzschmar, p. 22; also Bertholet, p. 13; Buhl-Gesenius13, p. 12: "Sterblischer!"). Passages as Ps. viii. 5, Job xxv. 6, and Isaiah li. 12 would by no means speak against my assumption. There DiK p is used in a connexion, where human weakness is expressly spoken of. Indeed, in all the three passages, šām mū is used parallel with mū, so that DiK p denotes the weakness and frailty of man just as mū; cf. also Isa. xxxi. 3, where we find mū only; cf. also Num. xxiii. 19, Job xxxv. 8, Ps. lxxx. 18 (parallel with bērē mū), and Job xvi. 21 (parallel with bērē mū), also Ps. xlix. 3 and lxii. 10 (mū parallel with bērē mū). Why then did Ezekiel use only the expression DiK p if he wanted to emphasize his human weakness? This is, however, quite intelligible if we regard it as an imitation of a Babylonian mār ameli13. Whether now mū here stands for "freeborn son" (whence we might conclude that Ezekiel was a "free citizen" of Babylon or Tel-Abib), or in a weakened meaning simply for "man" matters little. I would, however, be inclined to assume that mū has here really the first meaning ("freeborn son," "free citizen") and is intended as a title. This would be in perfect agreement with Ezekiel's formalism.
NOTES.

1 Cf. Ezek. i. i, iii. 15. The name of the Kebar was found some years ago on a Babylonian contract-tablet from the time of Artaxerxes II (b.c. 464-424); see Hilprecht, The Babylonian Expedition of the University of Pennsylvania, Series A, vol. IX (1898), p. 28: "a large navigable canal not far from Nippur"; cf. also Jensen in Zeitschr. f. Ass., vol. XIII, p. 331 sq., Kotalla in Beitr. a. Ass., vol. IV, p. 556, and Haupt in Toy's English Translation of the Book of Ezekiel, p. 93, l. 16 sqq.

2 Cf. Ezek. i. 2.


4 Cf., e.g., Smend, Der Prophet Ezechiel (1880), pp. xxiv, xxv, where a number of passages is quoted in which Ezekiel's dependence on Jeremiah is evident.

5 Cf. D. H. Müller, Ezechiel-Studien (1895); see now especially the remarks of Haupt in the notes of Toy, Hebrew Text and Engl. Transl. of Ez.; see also Toy in Cheyne's Encyclopaedia Biblica, col. 1459. As to the vocabulary, see Friedrich Delitzsch, Specimem glossarii Ezechielico-Babylonici in Baer's Ezechiel-edition (Leipzig, 1884). Also when Ezekiel speaks of the writing- and drawing-material, he thinks of the clay-tablets used in Babylonia (cf. Ezek. iv. 1 rna ลำ ינוי, and see Toy, Translation, p. 98, l. 37 sqq. About Babylonian clay-tablets with plans, maps, &c., see ibid., p. 100 sqq.). See also the Appendix below.

6 It may be that he used similes, metaphors, and expressions of Babylonian life and literature, because he was sure that his hearers, members of the upper classes (see 2 Kings xxiv. 14-16), who had certainly made themselves well acquainted with the culture of their new country, would then understand him better. It is also possible that he believed he would in this way make his speeches more attractive (cf. Ezek. xxxiii. 32).

7 Cf. the short note of Haupt in Toy's Hebrew Text of Ezekiel, p. 63, on l. 15, and Translation, p. 122, on l. 14.

8 See Delitzsch, Wo lag das Paradies? p. 146.

9 Cf. Ezek. xxi. 5 : פַּרְדֵּס וְשָׁם לָא אִם לָא מִשְׁפַּטֶּךָ בֵּיתַהּ.

10 I follow the Massoretic text; see below, note 33. In order to bring into relief the poetic form I shall give the strophic division; see for the latter, D. H. Müller, Die Propheten in ihrer ursprünglichen Form, vol. I, pp. 131, 132, and vol. II, pp. 38, 39; see also the translation of Kraetzschmar, "Das Buch Ezechiel" (in Nowack's Handkommentar zum Alien Testament), pp. 140-2.

11 For the translation, see Toy, Engl. Transl. The adaptation to the Hebrew rendering is mine.
See, however, below (Appendix).

By ית in ver. 13 is certainly not "meant the special land Palestine" (Kraetzschmar, ad loc.). It is also by no means clear "that he (Ezekiel) aims exclusively at Israel or Judah" (Bertholet, p. 75). It is, on the contrary, a generally delivered oration. Already our Babylonian parallel speaks against "exclusively Israel." To the expression ית ית too much importance must not be attached (see Bertholet and Kraetzschmar, ll. 66); observe, e.g., in Ezek. xviii. 24 ית ית parallel with ית ית !

Cf. Ezek. xviii, especially ver. 4b and ver. 30a.

For transliteration and translation see P. Jensen, "Assyrisch-Babylonische Mythen und Epen" (in E. Schrader's Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek, vol. VI, Part I = KB., VI.), pp. 242, 243. The lines refer to Tablet xi (of the Gilgamic epos), which contains the Babylonian account of the deluge. Several signs have variants, for which see Jensen, loc. cit.

For קס as an interrogative particle see KB., VI., p. 420 (note on p. 112, l. 25), and p. 497 (note on p. 238, l. 121).

I. e. punish the sinner for his sins.

iii. e. punish the evil-doer for his evil deeds.

See, for the supplementation and translation of this line, Zimmer in Gunkel, Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit (1895), p. 427; see also Jastrow, Religion of Babylonia and Assyria, p. 505, and Pinches, The Old Testament in the light of the historical records and legends of Assyria and Babylonia, and edition, p. 107. Winckler (in Keilinschriftliches Textbuch zum Alten Testament, and edition, 1903, p. 93) takes this line quite differently. He translates: "aber der ... möge nicht vertilgt werden, der ... möge nicht ... werden," and remarks: "In (rummi und ?) iudud erwartet man Ausdrücke für 'gerecht, unschuldig,' die der Gegensatz zu den zwei vorhergehenden Versen verlangt." Rummi and iudud are, however, no doubt verbs; see already Delitzsch, Paradies, p. 145. ית has the same meaning as the Hebrew ית.

In the Babylonian text stands the singular (see Transliteration, l. 188), as in the Hebrew text (יְתַּרְתָּי). But do not destroy it altogether.


See note 22.

See Jensen KB., VI., p. 243, note 9. Winckler, loc. cit., reads קָּס [קָּס] and translates ["verheeren"].

See note 22.
Winckler, loc. cit., reads šum-[haṣ?] ; see, however, Jensen, loc. cit.

For this is the meaning of the words of Ea. True, Ut-napistim (the Babylonian Noah) has been saved, but he had first to be warned by a god (Ea) and summoned to build a ship. Besides, only Ut-napistim alone has been saved, while other righteous men may have perished. In case of the other punishments here enumerated, however, the escape of the righteous is much more possible.

The second plague is merely a strengthening of the first.

It is besides very probable, too, that in the elaboration of this short speech of his, Ezekiel had also—in the second place—been influenced by Lev. xxvi. If we look at it well the order of the penalties is there the same as in Ezekiel. Lev. xxvi. 19, 20 contains nothing else but the prediction of famine, to which ver. 26 is added supplementarily. Ver. 22 speaks of wild beasts (הַשֵּׁה הַר), ver. 25a of war (ירש קְרָב), ver. 25b of pestilence (דִּבְרָה), to which also seems to belong what is announced in ver. 16. Cf. also Lev. xxvi. 6. Linguistic similarities, too, are to be found. With מַעַשְׁוֵיהֶנָּה (Ezek. xiv. 13), cf. מַעַשְׁוִי־הָאֱלֹהִים (Lev. xxvi. 26); with מַעַשְׁוֵיהֶנָּה (Ezek. xiv. 15), cf. מַעַשְׁוָה הַמָּכָא (Lev. xxvi. 22); with מַעַשְׁוָה הַמָּכָא (Ezek. xiv. 15), cf. מַעַשְׁוָה הַמָּכָא (Lev. xxvi. 22); with מַעַשְׁוָה הַמָּכָא (Lev. xxvi. 24), cf. מַעַשְׁוָה הַמָּכָא (Ezek. xiv. 17a); with מַעַשְׁוָה הַמָּכָא (Lev. xxvi. 25); with מַעַשְׁוָה הַמָּכָא (Ezek. xiv. 17b), cf. מַעַשְׁוָה הַמָּכָא (Lev. xxvi. 26); with מַעַשְׁוָה הַמָּכָא (Lev. xxvi. 6b); with מַעַשְׁוָה הַמָּכָא (Ezek. xiv. 19), cf. מַעַשְׁוָה הַמָּכָא (Lev. xxvi. 3b). See also Ezek. iv. 16 and v. 17. That, nevertheless, this whole speech in Ezekiel has been conceived after the passage in the Babylonian account of the deluge and not after Lev. xxvi (which, as I said, may have influenced the arrangement of the penalties and the linguistic elaboration) follows clearly from what has been set forth above. The fundamental idea (the principle of retribution) is the same in both. Interesting is, in Lev. xxvi. 22, the expression עִמָּשְׁוַיָּה compared with עִמָּשְׁוַיָּה in ll. 188 and 190 in the Babylonian account of the deluge. Both words have got exactly the same meaning ("to diminish").

By the way, in the similar, somewhat differently composed, oration in Deut. xxviii. 15-68, the same chief penalties can be distinguished which are identical with those named here. Ver. 21, pestilence (ירש רְבָע), ver. 22 enumeration of different diseases, which apparently also belong to ירש; also vers. 27 and 35. Vers. 38-40 really speak of hunger, also vers. 23, 24; ver. 53-7, consequences of the famine; vers. 25, 33, 36, 48-52, apparently consequences of the war. Wild beasts are not mentioned here.

I may remark that for these orations (in Leviticus and Deuteronomy) are of the greatest interest the fragmentary tablets published in transliteration and translation in KB., VI., pp. 274-91, under the title "Es (?) und Atar-ḥēṣîs (?)" (cf. also Zimmern in Zeitschr. f. Ass., vol. XIV, pp. 277-92; see also Zimmern, Die Keilschriftdenkmäler und das Alte Testament, 3rd edition, p. 553 seq.). Cf., e. g., with Lev. xxvi. 29,
When the sixth year came, they laid [the daughter] for a meal, they laid the child (Zimmern, ZA., XIV, p. 388: Sohn) [for] ... filled themselves ... [].

When the fifth year came, the daughter looks on the entry of the mother, the mother opens not her gate to the daughter, the daughter looks upon the balance of the mother, the mother looks upon the balance of the daughter; with Lev. xxvi. 19, 20, a flood came to the innocent seed of the fruitful year; with Deut. xxviii. 33, 34 (above made his rain dear), below shut off, raised no flood in the cavity of the fountains, and p. 384, 11. 44-45 and 54, 55 (almost the same words); cf. also the Code of Hammurabi (Epilogue) Vers., col. 37, 11. 68-71, see ibid. 11. 7-9; with Lev. xxvi. 20, 21, and Deut. xxviii. 30, 31-34 ([Adad made his rain dear], below it was shut off, raised no flood in the cavity of the fountains), and p. 384, 11. 44-45 and 54, 55 (almost the same words); cf. also Code of Hammurabi Vers., col. 38, 11. 55-69; cf. also KB., VI., p. 394 (The King

...
of Kutha, col. 3, see also Zimmern in ZA., vol. XII, pp. 321, 325), ll. 3–6 (3 la-hum-mat ni-ji mu-ji mu-u-tu namidru a-ru-ur-tu 4 [n]a-mur-ra-tu ḫa- 
ba-ju ni-bi-ṣu-u ni-bi-ṣu-u 5 [ḫu-ṣa-a]ḫu di-bi-tu ma-la ba-ju-u 6 [ana 
si]-ṣi mu it-tar-da = Terror of the night-demons (so I would like to 
interpret iakummat nis miṣi; Jensen himself also feels the difficulty of 
his translation; see his note on p. 555; see also Delitzsch, Assyrisches 
Handwörterbuch, p. 665h), death, pest, earthquake, dismay, horror, . . ., 
hunger, famine, misery, as much as there is, has come [upon] them). 
Cf. also Zimmern in ZA., vol. XIV, p. 388, note 1; see also (especially 
for Deut. xxviii. 54, 56–7) Cuneiform Texts from Babylonian Tablets, Part XIII, 
pl. 49, 50, and cf. Micah vii. 2–6, especially vers. 5, 6. I intend shortly 
to deal fully with all these passages in connexion with other questions.

Vers. 15, 17, and 19 are in fact more similar to one another than 
ver. 13, so that ver. 15 looks in some degree like a new beginning. 
Ver. 13 is more general. Indeed, the iniquity of man, the cause of the 
punishments, is here spoken of at the same time. The expression רכש 
 aş-ṣam, too, seems to imply something more than hunger, something 
more general (state of general devastation). In fact, there follows imme-
diately upon it רכש אוNASf; cf. in Lev. xxvi. 26, where רכש אוNASf 
stands after all the plagues and punishments and looks like a summing-
up of all of them. In Ezek. iv. 16, רכש אוNASf seems to 
indicate general distress; cf. also Ezek. xii. 17–20 with Ezek. vii. 16, 17. 
Ezek. xiv. 14 too, compared with vers. 16, 18, 20, looks more like 
a general announcement that the righteous will be saved. In vers. 16, 
18, 20 follows then the fuller specification. Of course, such nuances 
must not be pressed, but yet they are not without any significance.

This shows, by the way, that the which stands here is not an "old 
error of the scribe" (Cornill, Das Buch des Propheten Ezekiel, p. 254), but is 
in its perfectly right place. The emendation in its, which Gesenius-Buhl 
(13th ed., p. 403) and Bertholet (p. 76) have accepted, is wrong; see also 
D. H. Müller, Die Propheten, p. 136, Haupt in Toy's Hebrew Text of Ezekiel, 
p. 63, note on l. 15, and Kraetzschmar, p. 141; compare the preceding note. 
It begins with its and is continued by its. That Ezekiel did not (as in the 
Babylonian) use its throughout, shows again how carefully he elaborated 
the style. Neither is the correction from ṭeqq ṭeqq into ṭeqq made by 
Cornill after Hitzig admissible. The difference in the wording between 
vers. 14 and 20 on the one hand, and vers. 16 and 18 on the other 
hand is very great indeed. In vers. 14 and 20 it reads ṭeqq ṭeqq, upon 
which then follows "will save their soul (themselves)." They save 
themselves by their own merits. In vers. 16 and 18 ṭeqq is not 
mentioned. Here stress is chiefly laid on the fact of their being saved, on 
the escape from the general ruin. Notice also that in vers. 14 and 20 the 
names of the righteous men are mentioned, but not in vers. 16 and 18. 
Cf. also D. H. Müller, loc. cit., Bertholet and Kraetzschmar, a.1. The 
reliability of the Massoretic text is being always more proved by the 
Babylonian-Assyrian monuments on one hand and by deepest possible
penetration into the Hebrew text on the other. Cf. also D. H. Müller, loc. cit., p. 137 above.


12 As to his being influenced at the same time by Lev. xxvi, see above, note 31. It is also possible that Ezekiel had before him another version of the Babylonian account of the deluge, which showed still greater similarities to his oration; see, for variants, Zimmern in KAT. 3, p. 553 sqq.

Hereby is also explained the contradiction, often emphasized, between this introduction (vers. 12-20) and the following verses 21-3 (see Bertholet, p. 76; also Smend, pp. 82-5. The explanation of D. H. Müller, ibid., pp. 135, 136, is untenable. According to the theory set forth in vers. 12-20, all sinners were to perish! In vers. 12-20 must not be said exactly the same thing, which in vers. 21-3 is applied to Jerusalem. Rather was this general introduction meant to illustrate to the hearers the familiar theory of retribution in a form known to them (see above, note 6), and on the basis of this theory to demonstrate to them the punishment of the guilty Jerusalem as inevitable. Entire agreement between the two pieces is, however, not necessary.


22 Weihhausen, Composition des Hexateuch, 3rd ed., p. 168 sqq.; Smend, pp. xxvi, xxvii, and p. 315, and others. P. 315, Smend says: "Nach alladem ist das Corpus Lev. xvii ff., das ohne allen Zweifel in die exilische resp. nachexilische Zeit gehört, für jünger als Ezechiel zu halten, zumal das von jenen Capp. unzertrennliche Stück Lev. xxvi eine handgreifliche Nachahmung Ezechiels ist." Baentsch (Das Heiligkeitsgesetz Lev. xvii-xxvi, 1893) divides Lev. xvii-xxvii into four parts: xviii-xx (= H'), older than Ezekiel (see p. 84, also p. 86 sqq.); xxi, xxii (= H'), dependence upon Ezekiel doubtful, although probable (p. 109), more certain on p. 115; xvii (= H'), relation to Ezekiel uncertain (see p. 118); xvi, see p. 125: "Danach kann es wohl als ausgemacht gelten, dass Lev. xxvi eine Nachahmung Ezechiels und darum jünger ist als dieser Prophet." For Lev. xxiii-xxv, see p. 44 sqq. Driver, although "favouring" the priority of Lev. xvii-xxvi, cannot, however, arrive at a positive result (especially as to Lev. xxvi);
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cf. Introd., 6th ed., 1897, p. 145 sqq., particularly p. 150; cf. also Driver's "Leviticus" in Haupt's SBOT, Engl. transl., p. 101: "It is impossible to speak positively on a question of such difficulty; yet the balance of probability seems rather to favor the priority of Lev. xxvi."


See above, note 4.

41 See above, note 4.

It is interesting to note how Ezekiel, in spite of his having absorbed the Babylonian culture, was in his religious thinking not in the least influenced by his surroundings. In this direction the observations of Gunkel in Schöpfung und Chaos, pp. 169, 170, are noteworthy, from which I should like to quote the following words: "Man lernte von den Babylonierm, wie die Welt gestaltet und entstanden sei, und welche älteste Geschichte sie gehabt habe. Alles dieses ist nur ein Wissen. Das Centrum der Religion berührt sie nicht." The same can be said of the later times; cf. my article "Talmudische und midraschische Parallelen zum babylonischen Weltschöp fungsepos," in Zeitschr. f. Ass., vol. XVII, p. 996, below.

42 The same may apply to לָלֶךְ in Dan. viii. 17.

SAMUEL DAICHES.
SOME TALMUDIC FRAGMENTS FROM THE CAIRO GENIZAH, IN THE BRITISH MUSEUM.

The particular volume of fragments which forms the theme of this article is described in the catalogue as "Os. 5531. Parts of Talmud and Halakhoth Gedoloth with fragments of a Talmudic compilation: vellum: fol. 14. folio: xii–xiii cent. Hebrew."

The fragments have been written by various hands, but the writing is, in all of them, clear and distinct, and very legible, except where the pages have been torn or rubbed. At the same time, in some cases, the similarity of certain letters renders it difficult to decide which one is to be read: for example, in fol. ii, א and א, צ and צ, cannot readily be distinguished, when the sense is no guide. With the exception of fol. xiv, the fragments have been collated; fol. xiv has been transcribed in full, owing to the large number of variae lectiones, which would have made a collation too cumbersome for practical purposes. The system which has been followed is that which has been adopted by R. N. Rabinowicz, in his great work דא רחצ ערב. The right-hand column gives the text of the Ed. Venetus of the Talmud (1510) or of the earliest printed text of הלכות ירושלים (1548), the words which show variation in the MS. being enclosed in round brackets ( ). The left-hand column contains the text of the MS., the variae lectiones being enclosed in square brackets [ ]. The dots in the MS. column indicate a gap in the text, those in the right-hand column, that the whole of the passage has not
been quoted. Where the v. l. of the DnsiD 'pnpT agrees entirely with the v. l. of the MS., the fact has been indicated by marking the words concerned with bent brackets { } and R. The symbols רביו 3313* ינרי0, with which Rabinowicz designates readings of the Hamburg, Florence, and Rome MSS. respectively, have been rendered by h, f, r; thus {R. h. f. יבּוּחַ} means that יבּוּחַ is read by Rabinowicz's own MS. and the Hamburg and Florence codices also.

The places where Rabinowicz's v. l. coincide with the BM. MS. verbatim are not many, but only those have been quoted: the inclusion of passages of only partial similarity would have involved the use of a far more complicated system of brackets and would have increased the limits of this article to much longer and far too cumbersome dimensions; moreover, this seemed unnecessary, seeing that Rabinowicz's books are accessible to all who desire to enter into the matter more fully. It is with the Ed. Venetus that the MS. has been collated; Rabinowicz's different readings have only been consulted en passant. Among the points of interest which this MS. reveals in Fols. I–VI, attention may be drawn to the following:—

1. Cases where a saying is attributed to another authority, or where a different Isnād or chain of tradition is given, e.g.:—

Fol. I a, Textus Venetus, reads פַּנָּה רְאָא אֲמוּרָא רְאָא, יִתְנָא. MS. has פַּנָּה רְאָא אֲמוּרָא רְאָא, יִתְנָא.

Fol. II b, Ed. Ven., has רְאָא, יִתְנָא, MS. has רְאָא, יִתְנָא.

Fol. III a (the last v. l.), Ed. Ven., has רְאָא יָשֵׁב וּרְאָא חֶסֶד אַרְּבָּא, MS. has רְאָא יָשֵׁב וּרְאָא חֶסֶד אַרְּבָּא.

2. 'וּרְאָא, יִתְנָא, for 'וּרְאָא, יִתְנָא, after a non-biblical quotation (Fol. III b, near end).

3. The common Aramaic use of the partic. piel in an active sense, like עֲבַד, עֶבֶד; e.g. Fol. IV b (v. l. No. 6), Text. Ven., has יְדִיב, תְּדִיב, MS. ... נַעְרֵי ... הָעֲבַד ... .

5. A different arrangement of Mishna and Gemara: e.g. Fol. IV a; 'תא and 'תש'' are omitted, and the Mishna and Gemara are welded together.

6. The Tetragrammaton is rendered by three yods, the middle one written as litera suspensa, e.g. Fols. IV a, IV b, V a, &c.

7. Scripture passages quoted in a different form: e.g. Fol. III b, v. l., No. 5.

(1) Text. Ven. has אֶשֶר שְׁמַעְתָּם יְהֹוָה (Joel iv. 19).
   MS. has בְּהֵמַת. So MT. and LXX (אֵלָהוֹ).

(2) Text. Ven. has אֶלֶף שָׂעֹל אל בַּיְתָהוֹ גֻפֶּה (2 Sam. xxi. 1).
   So MT.
   MS. has ......... עָלַי, compare with LXX (יֵהל) and Budde’s and Driver’s emendations.

Of course, these last two passages cannot be pressed, as the Scriptures were frequently quoted from memory.

I have to thank Mr. Israel Abrahams for much valuable help and guidance in this article, though, of course, he is not responsible for its many imperfections; I must also express my gratitude to the Museum authorities for their frequent kind assistance.

B.M. Or. 5531.

Fol. i recto, begins הָנת בַּרְצֹת הָרוּבִּים

T. Bab. Sabbath, 5 a.

(ונַה לע בַּרְצֹת הָרוּבִּים ...גֹּן שֶׁסֶּלֶךְ)

ויי בּ' היהת החוטה מלוכלך מצידה
הנה לְמוֹדֶהּ מצידה לחיה
cdn פּראָצְל' שֵׁבִידָיו יי כּוֹנֶה קָשָׁא
לְהוּ ד' אשָּר רַ נבֶּהַרְגָּכֶר שֶׁסֶּלֶךְ

[יתבַלְלָה] והוּ עָמוּר
[אֲבָנָיו] [לָמָּה]
[אֱמוֹת רַבָּה] (אָכְמָל)
[אֲבָדָא] (אַיּוֹלָא)
There is a hiatus from nma W nanN 13 tOK ,m till'ND
nina'JB>. It is thus not easy to see in what the variation differed
from the Venice Text but the MS. is shorter, viz.:—

Fragment ends on recto at !>3'p**'pni''n 'ON pan 'n nDN
4,0i>pn!>N.

MS. resumes on verso at Sabbath, 5 b, Tin 'no 'ONTO 'HDD

* Fragment starts at Sabbath, 5 b, Tin 'no 'ONTO 'HDD.
Here fragment ends.

Fol. 2 begins on recto at Sabbath, 6 a, and seems quite clear, though in this fragment a and b are very similar.

There is a gap after which would scarcely allow for and then the text proceeds, which is most surprising.

A map of the area...
SABBATH, FOL. 6 b.

Fragment ends on recto at Sabbath, 7 a.

Fragment resumes on verso at Sabbath, 7 a.

The MS. is very faulty, but appears to differ from the Venice edition.

Fol. 3 begins on recto at Sabbath, 118 b.

This fragment has been corrected by a later hand in the following sentence:

(1) There is a bracket or stroke after 'אברע in the following sentence:

אברע (just before) לוכחיים ממח' ארבע | והם שא ארצה והמש (just before)
(2) The second stroke or bracket occurs in the same series of words lower down on the last line of the printed page in the Venice edition:

... ומכה למקף מיתא ארבע | חמש זאמ

(3) An א and ב are written over the following words:

השארא זיל לקף ארבע.

(This seems to have been done by the first scribe.)

(4) Another bracket or stroke after רע in the sentence רע שיאה מוקפ.

(5) There is a gloss on מוסר, indicated by three dots, e.g.—

וכול תביה (מרגיש וב לקף מיתא[マークス by מותר]! להז' ת'י' י'לב
שכרעת מסר חתא [buscar חתא רוח] מסר וב חזרת ת'י' [R.h.f.r]
(השא responsável לקף ארבע סבך[マーケス by מותר]
[● ● ● ● מוסר (מעתקה[マークス by מותר])
[● ● ● ● ארבע מותק חמש חמש מערד
[● ● ● ● נוגד[マークス by מותר]]
[אף', ר' חמרה[マークス by מותר (מעתקה]
[● ● ● ● ארבע מותק חמש חמש מערד
[● ● ● ● נוגד[マークス by מותר]]
[אף', ר' חמרה[マークס by מותר (מעתקה]
[● ● ● ● ארבע מותק חמש חמש מערד
[● ● ● ● נוגד[マークス by מותר]]
[אף', ר' חמרה[マークס by מותר (מעתקה]
[● ● ● ● ארבע מותק חמש חמש מערד
[● ● ● ● נוגד[マークス by מותר]]
[אף', ר' חמרה[マークס by מותר (מעתקה]
[● ● ● ● ארבע מותק חמש חמש מערד
[● ● ● ● נוגד[マークス by מותר]]
[אף', ר' חמרה[マークס by מותר (מעתקה]
[● ● ● ● ארבע מותק חמש חמש מערד
[● ● ● ● נוגד[マークס by מותר]]
[אף', ר' חמרה[マークס by מותר (מעתקה]
119 a, line 1.

Fragment ends on recto at N3H1.)

Fragment resumes on verso with continuation of quotation on verso with continuation of quotation.
A stroke or bracket after the word אַ—

Note 'וְו וּנְו similarly.

Mishna quoted only till בּלֶלֶף (שַׁעֲרָה).
Here fragment ends.

Fol. 4 a begins T. Bab., Baba Mesia, 82 a, JDB>0niipe>3W $>yai>

by a later hand in the margin, its place in the text is marked by a dot, before "ba

Baba Mesia, 82 b.

כוסות (למשנה)

 comer, etc. (no change made)

by a later hand in the margin, its place in the text is marked by a dot, before "ba

119 b, line 1.
There is no mark "ןכ here indicating the end of the division: the divisions of 'ןכ and 'ןכ differ from Ed. Venet.

Here Baba Mezia, 83 a, begins.

Note, note, not, as above.
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Fragment resumes at חכמה רואנה עלים.

[מְסַמְרָה יִפְרָד] [יִסְדָּא אָפֶל [יִפְרָד]
[מְסַמְרָה יִפְרָד] [יִסְדָּא אָפֶל [יִפְרָד]
[מְסַמְרָה יִפְרָד] [יִסְדָּא אָפֶל [יִפְרָד]
[מְסַמְרָה יִפְרָד] [יִסְדָּא אָפֶל [יִפְרָד]
[מְסַמְרָה יִפְרָד] [יִסְדָּא אָפֶל [יִפְרָד]
[מְסַמְרָה יִפְרָד] [יִסְדָּא אָפֶל [יִפְרָד]
[מְסַמְרָה יִפְרָד] [יִסְדָּא אָפֶל [יִפְרָד]
[מְסַמְרָה יִפְרָד] [יִסְדָּא אָפֶל [יִפְרָד]
[מְסַמְרָה יִפְרָד] [יִסְדָּא אָפֶל [יִפְרָד]
[מְסַמְרָה יִפְרָד] [יִסְדָּא אָפֶל [יִפְרָד]
[מְסַמְרָה יִפְרָד] [יִסְדָּא אָפֶל [יִפְרָד]
[מְסַמְרָה יִפְרָד] [יִסְדָּא אָפֶל [יִפְרָד]
[מְסַמְרָה יִפְרָד] [יִסְדָּא אָפֶל [יִפְרָד]
[מְסַמְרָה יִפְרָד] [יִסְדָּא אָפֶל [יִפְרָד]
[מְסַמְרָה יִפְרָד] [יִסְדָּא אָפֶל [יִפְרָד]
Fragment ends at וודו והשממ.
SOME TALMUDIC FRAGMENTS FROM CAIRO GENIZAH

Fol. 5 begins Baba Mezia, 85 a, near the end, the text continues.

1. This is added over the line.
2. An "n" is added over the line above the "n" of "בנר".
Fragment ends on recto at NS'in 3T ^ WIPK.

MS. resumes on p. 85 b, rWo5> n'^ WD1.

1 There is a mark which seems to denote that the missing word was probably inserted on the margin, but that portion is unfortunately torn off. "mS ? is inserted above the line in the same faint manner as the mark in Note 1.

2 In margin ר"ש רמס... *ד"צ above דק.

3 In margin ר"ש רמס... *ד"צ above דק.
There are several illegible glosses in the margin.

MS. ends at TDUD .TOW p'DB.

Fol. 6 begins Baba Mashià, 86 a, near the end, מטב א海绵נה 86

1 מִשְׁאַרְיָא (משארית, שחרית).
2 לֶשׁ הַתּוֹרָה (לשתורה).

1 מִשְׁאַרְיָא (משארית, שחרית).
2 לֶשׁ הַתּוֹרָה (לשתורה).

There are several illegible glosses in the margin.

MS. ends at TDUD .TOW p'DB.

Fol. 6 begins Baba Mashià, 86 a, near the end, מטב א海绵נה 86

1 מִשְׁאַרְיָא (משארית, שחרית).
2 לֶשׁ הַתּוֹרָה (לשתורה).

1 מִשְׁאַרְיָא (משארית, שחרית).
2 לֶשׁ הַתּוֹרָה (לשתורה).

There are several illegible glosses in the margin.

MS. ends at TDUD .TOW p'DB.

Fol. 6 begins Baba Mashià, 86 a, near the end, מטב א海绵נה 86

1 מִשְׁאַרְיָא (משארית, שחרית).
2 לֶשׁ הַתּוֹרָה (לשתורה).

1 מִשְׁאַרְיָא (משארית, שחרית).
2 לֶשׁ הַתּוֹרָה (לשתורה).

There are several illegible glosses in the margin.

MS. ends at TDUD .TOW p'DB.

Fol. 6 begins Baba Mashià, 86 a, near the end, מטב א海绵נה 86

1 מִשְׁאַרְיָา (משארית, שחרית).
2 לֶשׁ הַתּוֹרָה (לשתורה).

1 מִשְׁאַרְיָא (משארית, שחרית).
2 לֶשׁ הַתּוֹרָה (לשתורה).

There are several illegible glosses in the margin.

MS. ends at TDUD .TOW p'DB.

Fol. 6 begins Baba Mashià, 86 a, near the end, מטב א海绵נה 86

1 מִשְׁאַרְיָא (משארית, שחרית).
2 לֶשׁ הַתּוֹרָה (לשתורה).

1 מִשְׁאַרְיָא (משארית, שחרית).
2 לֶשׁ הַתּוֹרָה (לשתורה).

There are several illegible glosses in the margin.

MS. ends at TDUD .TOW p'DB.

Fol. 6 begins Baba Mashià, 86 a, near the end, מטב א海绵נה 86

1 מִשְׁאַרְיָא (משארית, שחרית).
2 לֶשׁ הַתּוֹרָה (לשתורה).

1 מִשְׁאַרְיָא (משארית, שחרית).
2 לֶשׁ הַתּוֹרָה (לשתורה).

There are several illegible glosses in the margin.

MS. ends at TDUD .TOW p'DB.

Fol. 6 begins Baba Mashià, 86 a, near the end, מטב א海绵נה 86

1 מִשְׁאַרְיָא (משארית, שחרית).
2 לֶשׁ הַתּוֹרָה (לשתורה).

1 מִשְׁאַרְיָא (משארית, שחרית).
2 לֶשׁ הַתּוֹרָה (לשתורה).

There are several illegible glosses in the margin.

MS. ends at TDUD .TOW p'DB.

Fol. 6 begins Baba Mashià, 86 a, near the end, מטב א海绵נה 86

1 מִשְׁאַרְיָא (משארית, שחרית).
2 לֶשׁ הַתּוֹרָה (לשתורה).

1 מִשְׁאַרְיָא (مشארית, שחרית).
2 לֶשׁ הַתּוֹרָה (לשתורה).

There are several illegible glosses in the margin.

MS. ends at TDUD .TOW p'DB.

Fol. 6 begins Baba Mashià, 86 a, near the end, מטב א海绵נה 86

1 מִשְׁאַרְיָא (משארית, שחרית).
2 לֶשׁ הַתּוֹרָה (לשתורה).

1 מִשְׁאַרְיָא (משארית, שחרית).
2 לֶשׁ הַתּוֹרָה (לשתורה).

There are several illegible glosses in the margin.

MS. ends at TDUD .TOW p'DB.

Fol. 6 begins Baba Mashià, 86 a, near the end, מטב א海绵נה 86

1 מִשְׁאַרְיָא (משארית, שחרית).
2 לֶשׁ הַתּוֹרָה (לשתורה).

1 מִשְׁאַרְיָא (משארית, שחרית).
2 לֶשׁ הַתּוֹרָה (לשתורה).

There are several illegible glosses in the margin.

MS. ends at TDUD .TOW p'DB.

Fol. 6 begins Baba Mashià, 86 a, near the end, מטב א海绵נה 86

1 מִשְׁאַרְיָא (משארית, שחרית).
2 לֶשׁ הַתּוֹרָה (לשתורה).

1 מִשְׁאַרְיָא (משארית, שחרית).
2 לֶשׁ הַתּוֹרָה (לשתורה).

There are several illegible glosses in the margin.

MS. ends at TDUD .TOW p'DB.

Fol. 6 begins Baba Mashià, 86 a, near the end, מטב א海绵נה 86

1 מִשְׁאַרְיָא (משארית, שחרית).
2 לֶשׁ הַתּוֹרָה (לשתורה).

1 מִשְׁאַרְיָא (משארית, שחרית).
2 לֶשׁ הַתּוֹרָה (לשתורה).

There are several illegible glosses in the margin.

MS. ends at TDUD .TOW p'DB.

Fol. 6 begins Baba Mashià, 86 a, near the end, מטב א海绵נה 86

1 מִשְׁאַרְיָא (משארית, שחרית).
2 לֶשׁ הַתּוֹרָה (לשתורה).

1 מִשְׁאַרְיָא (משארית, שחרית).
2 לֶשׁ הַתּוֹרָה (לשתורה).

There are several illegible glosses in the margin.

MS. ends at TDUD .TOW p'DB.

Fol. 6 begins Baba Mashià, 86 a, near the end, מטב א海绵נה 86

1 מִשְׁאַרְיָא (משארית, שחרית).
2 לֶשׁ הַתּוֹרָה (לשתורה).

1 מִשְׁאַרְיָא (משארית, שחרית).
2 לֶשׁ הַתּוֹרָה (לשתורה).

There are several illegible glosses in the margin.

MS. ends at TDUD .TOW p'DB.

Fol. 6 begins Baba Mashià, 86 a, near the end, מטב א海绵נה 86

1 מִשְׁאַרְיָא (משארית, שחרית).
2 לֶשׁ הַתּוֹרָה (לשתורה).

1 מִשְׁאַרְיָא (משארית, שחרית).
2 לֶשׁ הַתּוֹרָה (לשתורה).

There are several illegible glosses in the margin.

MS. ends at TDUD .TOW p'DB.

Fol. 6 begins Baba Mashià, 86 a, near the end, מטב א海绵נה 86

1 מִשְׁאַרְיָא (משארית, שחרית).
2 לֶשׁ הַתּוֹרָה (לשתורה).

1 מִשְׁאַרְיָא (משארית, שחרית).
2 לֶשׁ הַתּוֹרָה (לשתора).
These words are pointed thus.

Margin perhaps or or or ?

pointed thus: above it is torn off.

written thus.

written twice {R}.

written above.

Above is?

written above.

written above above above.
SOME TALMUDIC FRAGMENTS FROM CAIRO GENIZAH

MS. ends

MS. resumes, Baba Mezia, fol. 86 b, τν, τν, ρφ.

Here spelt as in printed edition, not, as before, חָנִית.

[Pointed characters.
1 The final letter is much longer than the usual waws of this MS., but in the next line it is quite plain each time it occurs.
2 Above is ... are quite clear; there are traces of a ד and ב.]
Baba Mezia, 87a.

MS. ends at "א" לאפרו עמירם אבריהם הלוי (לא ויתת לֵכְמָה אָמֶר) אָמָרָם'

HERBERT LOEWE.

1 Prob. misprint.
One of the most interesting features connected with the teaching of Maimonides is his attitude towards superstition. There has never been much doubt amongst Jews that they must not have recourse to witchcraft and other illegitimate methods of probing into the future, or of protecting their lives and property from injury. The question has, however, remained whether these practices are efficacious but wicked, or, on the other hand, merely futile. To Maimonides, who was a disciple not only of the Rabbis but also of the Greek philosophers, it seemed clear that this question admitted of only one answer. Superstition was just folly, and nothing more; it was therefore forbidden by the Torah, which aimed at making men perfectly wise.

The views of Maimonides on this subject are perhaps most clearly expressed in the letter which he wrote, towards the end of his life, to the wise men of Marseilles, who consulted him as to the genuineness of astrology. Almost the first sentence of the letter is characteristic of the man, for it shows him uniting rationalism with belief in revelation. "Know, my masters, that there are only three sound grounds for a man's belief. Firstly, belief may be based on a proof that appeals to the reason, as in the case of arithmetic, geometry, or astronomy. Secondly, it may depend upon the evidence of one of the five senses, as when we see that a thing is black or red, or taste that it is bitter or sweet, or feel that it is hot or cold, or hear that a sound is clear or confused, or perceive that a smell is disagreeable or pleasant. Thirdly, belief may be based upon the traditions we have received from the prophets
and the righteous. We should make a mental analysis of the subjects of our belief, and should trace them back to one of these three sources. Should any one believe something for a cause other than these three, he is a simpleton who believes everything." Reasoning upon the matter from this point of view, Maimonides makes short work of astrology, which is supported neither by reason nor by reliable authority. It is true that thousands of books have been written on the subject, which have gained wide credence, but this is because many persons believe all they read, especially if it is contained in an ancient book. The wise men of Greece, who were true philosophers, denounced astrology, which was only valued by "the Chaldeans, the Egyptians, and the Canaanites." The Persians also perceived that it is valueless.

Maimonides carefully distinguishes, as did Isidore of Seville six centuries earlier, between the true science of astronomy and the pseudo-science of astrology. According to the Greek philosophers, man and other creatures, as species, are governed by God through the intermediary action of the heavenly bodies, whilst the events that befall individuals depend only upon chance. This view gives no support to astrology. Still less can astrology be reconciled with the Jewish view, that all human events are governed by God's justice. Astrology is inconsistent with the belief in man's freewill, which is the basis of all true religion. In his Guide to the Perplexed (II, 10)\(^1\), Maimonides further develops his view of the influence of the stars upon terrestrial events. Every star affects a particular species. Thus the moon has a peculiar influence on water, producing the tides. Following Ptolemy, Maimonides believes that the waters in the seas and rivers are greater in volume at full moon than at new moon, and he thus accounts for spring and neap tides. Similarly, the

---

\(^1\) In my references to the Guide to the Perplexed, I have made great use of Dr. Friedländer's English translation. In dealing with Maimonides as a Talmudist, I have mainly followed Weiss.
sphere of the sun affects fire; that of the other planets, air; whilst the fixed stars produce the revolution of the earth. Each variety of animals or plants is governed by an individual star.

In his letter to Marseilles, Maimonides admits that certain passages in the Talmud appear to imply that the aspect of the stars at the time of a man's birth produce certain effects upon his future life. Such utterances, he tells us, must be rejected or regarded as allegorical. This attitude is, of course, perfectly sound from the standpoint of traditional Judaism. The narrative and homiletical portions of the Talmud and Midrash have never been regarded as absolutely authoritative. Even the pious Rashi does not scruple to say upon occasion, "Our Rabbis have explained this as they have explained it"; that is, in a way which seems incorrect. Maimonides, however, adds a bold expression of opinion, which really amounts to a declaration that reason is supreme over the whole domain of thought. "A man should never cast aside his intellect; his eyes are intended to look forwards and not backwards." It may be noted that the denunciation of astrology, contained in this letter, is quoted with admiration by Jacob Emden, an eighteenth-century Rabbi, who had no sympathy with the philosophy of Maimonides, and believed that the Guide to the Perplexed was the work of a heretic, and that it had been falsely attributed to the pious codifier of Jewish law.

In this same letter Maimonides tells us that he had himself studied deeply astrology and the various religions of the world. "Probably there remains no book on these subjects, translated into Arabic from other languages, which I have not read and carefully considered." His main authority on such matters is the book of Nabatean Agriculture, which was translated into Arabic by the descendant of a Chaldean family who had been converted to Mahometanism. Maimonides considers that it contains an account of the Sabeans or star-worshippers, and he quotes from it all sorts of extra-
ordinary tales regarding Adam, Noah, and Abraham. Adam, it appears, brought from India to Babylon some wonderful things, such as a golden tree in full growth, and two leaves, each large enough to cover two men. The branches from another tree move like serpents when they are thrown upon the ground, whilst a certain plant renders its possessor invisible. The stars are the only true gods, and they impart inspiration to men, either directly or through trees dedicated to them. When the prophet Tammuz died, all the images gathered together in the temple at Babylon, which is dedicated to the sun, and there lamented his death. Maimonides mentions a number of superstitious practices enjoined in this work, and he declares that the motive of certain Biblical precepts is the desire of God that his people should avoid any acts resembling those of the idolaters (Guide to the Perplexed, III, 37). Some of his illustrations are undoubtedly telling. Thus one ceremony recommended in the book of Nabatean Agriculture is that of grafting an olive branch upon a citron-tree. This can be well contrasted with the Mosaic precept, forbidding the cross-breeding of animals and plants.

Amongst other books of the same class, mentioned by Maimonides, is the book of Tomtom, an Indian author, several of whose books on magic were translated into Arabic. Maimonides cites from this work the custom followed by men of wearing a woman's dress when worshipping Venus, and by women of wearing a buckler and other armour when worshipping Mars. He thinks that the Mosaic prohibition against wearing clothes distinctive of the opposite sex may have reference to these idolatrous ceremonies. A similar remark applies to the eating of blood, which is mentioned as a religious ceremony by Tomtom, and which is entirely forbidden in the Pentateuch. Again, the passing of children through the fire to Moloch is regarded by Maimonides as a species of witchcraft. He supposes that this ceremony was intended for the benefit of the child, and did not involve it in any injury. He
identified a relic of this practice as still existing in his own day, for midwives took a young child, wrapped in its swaddling clothes, and swung it over a fire, upon which incense of a disagreeable smell had been placed. This superstition was the more dangerous, because young children are entrusted to women "who are generally weak-minded and ready to believe anything, as is well known."

In studying books on idolatry and superstition, Maimonides was inconsistent with himself. In his Code of Jewish Law, he condemns the study of other religions; indeed, he could not fail to do so, if he was to remain faithful to the authority of the Talmud. Thus he writes: "The idolaters have composed many books about the principles and rites of their religions. God has commanded us not to read these books nor to reflect upon anything contained in them" (On Idolatry, ii, § 2). Further: "Not only are we forbidden to turn our minds to idolatry, but any thought that tends to disturb our belief in the principles of the Law is prohibited. We are warned not to consider such things nor to reflect on them, lest we be attracted towards them. The mind of man is feeble, and not everyone can clearly grasp the truth." I suppose it to be the fact that Maimonides held that these studies, which are dangerous for the ordinary man, are perfectly safe for the philosopher. This was precisely his view with regard to all forms of speculative theology.

Astrology may be a pseudo-science, but it has at least a certain dignity, which is lacking in other forms of superstition. The astrologer with his astrolabe is a picturesque figure, but we cannot refrain from a pitying smile when we hear a man mumbling an incantation, or see him wearing a nail from the gallows in order to cure himself from a swelling, or a fox's tooth in order to induce slumber¹. We may be sure that Maimonides had a healthy contempt for such practices, and he characterizes them in fitting terms. Thus in his Guide to the

¹ See Sabbath, 67 a.
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Perplexed, I, 61) he writes: "You must beware of sharing the error of those who write amulets. Whatever you hear of them or read in their works, especially in reference to the names of God, which they form by combination, is utterly senseless: they call these combinations shemoth (names), and believe that their pronunciation demands sanctification and purification, and that by using them they are enabled to work miracles. Rational people ought not to listen to such men, nor in any way believe their assertions." So also, in his Code, after an enumeration of superstitions, he sums up his view of the matter in the following terms:—

"All these things are false and vain—the foolish customs of ancient idolaters. It befits not Israel, who are of approved wisdom, to be attracted by such folly or to imagine that it is of profit, as it is said 'There is no enchantment in Jacob or soothsaying in Israel.' And it is said, 'For these nations whom thou drivest out listen to enchanters and soothsayers, but the Lord thy God hath not made thee thus.' Those who believe in such things and who think that they are true and rest on wisdom, but have been forbidden by the Law, are fools and lacking in knowledge, and are to be classed with women and children, whose intellect is imperfect. The wise and perfect in knowledge know by clear proofs that all these things which the Law has forbidden do not rest on wisdom, but are vain and foolish—attractive only to the ignorant, who have abandoned the ways of truth. Therefore the Law, in warning us against these vanities, saith, 'Thou shalt be perfect with the Lord thy God'" (On Idolatry, xi, 16).

These are very enlightened principles, but hardly suitable to the codifier of Talmudic Law. Writing in this capacity, Maimonides is obliged to admit that various absurdities are admissible. Sometimes he merely mentions them without comment, as when he tells us that we may wear such amulets as are well approved by experience, when we walk abroad in the public street upon the Sabbath.
Sometimes, again, he is forced into various compromises and inconsistencies, in order to reconcile his views with those of the Talmud. Here is an example:

"A person bitten by a scorpion or serpent may whisper a charm over the wound even on the Sabbath, in order to settle his mind and to strengthen his heart. The thing is of no avail whatever, but, seeing he is in danger, he is permitted to do it, in order that he may not feel troubled. Those who whisper upon a wound a charm, consisting of verses from the Law, or who read such verses over a child to save it from fear, or who place beside an infant the scroll of the Law or phylacteries in order to send it to sleep, are not only guilty of superstition, but are amongst those who deny the Law. They treat the words of the Law as a mere bodily medicine, whereas they are a spiritual medicine, as it is said, 'And they shall be life unto thy soul.' The man, however, who is in health may read verses and psalms so that the merit of their perusal may shield him, in order to save himself from trouble and injury" (On Idolatry, ii, §§ 11, 12).

Elsewhere Maimonides suggests another defence for the permission given by the Talmud to employ methods of healing, apparently superstitious. The beneficial effects produced by the nail from the gallows or the tooth of a fox cannot be accounted for by reason, but they were considered by the Rabbis to be facts established by experience. Such methods of healing were comparable to "the hanging of the peony over a person subject to epileptic fits, or the application of a dog's refuse to the swellings of the throat, or of the vapours of vinegar and marcosite to the swellings of tumours. The Law permits as medicine everything that has been verified by experiment, although it cannot be explained by analogy" (Guide to the Perplexed, III, 37).

The whole position of Maimonides in these matters was vigorously assailed by Solomon ben Adrath of Barcelona (commonly known as the Rashba), a celebrated thirteenth-
century Rabbi. He points out that Maimonides states, in the very chapter of his Guide just cited, that only such cures as are recommended by reason are permitted, and other cures are prohibited. Thus he seems to be inconsistent with himself. Besides, who is to say what things are established by reason? Shall we rely on the authority of Aristotle and Galen, and call every practice superstitious that did not commend itself to their understanding? Are we in fact to consider them infallible authorities? Surely, continues the Rashba, we find that some substances are shown by experience to possess mysterious qualities, for which we are unable to account. Thus iron is drawn upwards towards the magnet, although this movement is contrary to the nature of all heavy bodies. Solomon, whose knowledge embraced the whole vegetable world, “from the cedar in Lebanon to the hyssop by the wall,” is clearly indicated by the Scriptures, as having discovered the hidden properties of all herbs. We must not think that the opinions of natural philosophers can set bounds to the whole field of human knowledge.

I have just referred to King Solomon’s medical knowledge. It was generally believed by the Rabbis that he composed a certain “book of medicines,” mentioned in the Talmud, although the name of the author is not there stated. We are told that Hezekiah put away this book and was commended for doing so (Pesachim, 56a). Most of the commentators, and notably Rashi, consider that this action of Hezekiah was praiseworthy, because the possession of the book caused people to rely upon human means of cure from sickness rather than upon divine aid. Maimonides, in his commentary on the Mishna, denounces this view. If the book had been a genuine medical work, Hezekiah would not have suppressed it. Just as a starving man must seek for food to save his life, so a sufferer from any ailment must obtain suitable medical treatment and

1 Responsa of Rashba, 413; see also brief Responsa, 167.
thank God for thus providing him with means of relief. The "book of medicines" must have been in some way injurious, although it was undoubtedly written by Solomon with a good purpose. Probably it contained an account of talismans and other superstitious methods of treating sickness. Solomon enumerated them for information only but Hezekiah suppressed the book, because he found that his people made actual use of the talismans about which they read. Maimonides thinks that it is also possible that the book treated of poisons and their antidotes, and was therefore a dangerous weapon in the hands of the unscrupulous.

It may be added that the nature of Jewish tradition respecting Solomon quite prepares us to expect the belief that a "book of medicines" composed by him would deal with magic. Josephus tells us in his Antiquities that God taught King Solomon 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."

Witchcraft is another gross form of superstition which has always been condemned by Judaism. Here again the question arises whether the wizard is aided by the powers of darkness, or whether he is a mere deceiver. The Mishna in dealing with the subject distinguishes between the wizard who really practises sorcery, and the pretender to magical powers who deceives the eye by sleight of hand (Sanhedrin, vii). The former is guilty of a capital offence; the latter is exempt from punishment by man, although he has acted wrongly. Maimonides does not explain this passage in his commentary on the Mishna, but he incorporates it in his Code (On Idolatry, xi, § 15). This is perplexing, as immediately afterwards he declares that all such superstitious practices are in reality inefficacious. Perhaps the distinction intended is that whilst
the wizard pretends to do something miraculous, the person who “deceives the eye” is a mere conjurer, who does a thing which although wonderful is consistent with the ordinary workings of nature. As an example of this conjuring, Maimonides might have cited the performance of the father of Karno, who produced bundles of silk from his nostrils. The donkey that turned into a log of wood, on being given water to drink, was the product of witchcraft, properly so called (Sanhedrin, 67 b). Stories of this kind appear to be related by the Talmud quite seriously, and we are doubtless intended to understand them as the narrations of actual events. On the other hand, in the parallel passage in the Jerusalem Talmud, we find one story which seems to indicate a healthy scepticism. A wizard was seen by one of the Rabbis to throw a stone into the air, whereupon it descended as a calf. He told the tale to his father. “If you ate the calf,” said the latter, “this was indeed witchcraft; otherwise it was a mere trick.” The general trend of opinion in the Talmud is, however, in the opposite direction, and in like manner many of the contemporaries and the immediate successors of Maimonides were quite convinced that real results could be achieved by means of magic and sorcery. Nachmanides was a man of genius and piety; he had a genuine admiration for Maimonides, but still he reprobates the view that witchcraft is unavailing. “We cannot deny,” said he, “things which are of notorious efficacy, and which are admitted by our Rabbis.” Again, he explains the scriptural references to Azazel by means of the “science of necromancy,” and continues thus: “We must silence those who pretend to scientific wisdom, being led by the Grecian (Aristotle), who denied everything except what was manifest to his own perception, and who proudly imagined that nothing was true except what he and his wicked disciples could verify.”

Maimonides does not entirely reject the belief in dreams,

1 Nachmanides on Deut. xviii. 10-12.
to which there are several references in his Code. Thus he tells us that "those who have a bad dream must fast on the next day, in order to arouse themselves to an examination of their actions and to repentance. They must so fast even on Sabbath" (On Fasts, i, § 12). Again: "A person who is excommunicated in a dream, must afterwards seek for ten learned men to release him from the ban" (On study of the Law, vii, § 12). On the other hand, he believes that most dreams are vain; they are like straw which contains a few grains of wheat (Preface to Commentary on the Mishna). He therefore omits several laws relating to dreams. Thus the Talmud gives a kind of incantation, suitable for those who have seen an evil dream (Berachoth, 55 b). Maimonides omits this formula, and also a prayer, far less objectionable in nature, given in the same passage. This prayer still finds a place in the Jewish ritual.

It has been conclusively shown by Weiss that Maimonides, in codifying Talmudic legislation, sought to free it from many unworthy elements. He leaves out entirely certain superstitious laws, such as those based on the idea that even numbers are unlucky. The following regulations of the Talmud are also omitted by Maimonides:

(1) "If a man's voice is heard from a pit, declaring that he divorces his wife, we must take precautions lest the sound proceed from a demon. If we see a human form with a shadow, and the shadow of a shadow, we may rest assured that it is not a demon" (Gittin, 66 a).

(2) "If we hear a voice from heaven proclaiming that a man is dead, we permit his wife to marry again" (Yebamoth, 122 a).

(3) "A man must not greet another at night-time, for we fear lest the being whom he sees is a demon" (Megillah, 3 a).

(4) "We should not pray for what we require in Aramaic, because the angels do not understand that language" (Sabbath, 12 b).
(5) "He who extinguishes the Sabbath light because he is in fear of heathens, of robbers, or of an evil spirit, or to enable a sick person to sleep is absolved" (Mishna, Sabbath, ii, 5). Maimonides omits this altogether from his Code, and in his commentary on the Mishna he explains the "evil spirit" as a species of melancholia, which alters the ordinary nature of man, so that light and company become distressing to him. In the Guide to the Perplexed (I, 7) Maimonides explains the term "demons" metaphorically, and declares that it may be rightly applied to the wicked, who are not human in the true sense of the word, but use for mischievous ends the gifts of intelligence and judgment with which they have been endowed. Finally, he passes over without comment the remark of the Mishna that "the destroying spirits were, in the opinion of some, created on Friday evening at twilight" (Aboth, v, 9).

(6) "We must not inquire from demons on the Sabbath (i.e. regarding our lost property). R. Jose adds that we must not do so even on week-days, because such a course is dangerous" (Sanhedrin, 101 a). Maimonides omits this altogether. It may be interesting to quote the form in which this provision appears, four centuries after the time of Maimonides, in the Shulchan Aruch, the most authoritative compendium of traditional Judaism. To the text by R. Joseph Karo I have added, in brackets, a note by his contemporary, R. Moses Isserles: "To traffic with demons is forbidden, but some permit us to ask them about a theft (or in any like case. Some permit us, in any event, to adjure them in God's name. Most of those, however, who meddle with such transactions do not emerge from them in peace; therefore, he who guardeth his soul will keep far from them)." (Yoreh Deah, 179, § 16.)

In other cases Maimonides avoids giving a superstitious reason for a law in his Code, although such a reason may be assigned to it by ancient authorities. Thus the Talmud relates that when R. Jose entered a ruin in order to pray, he was warned by the prophet Elijah not to do so. A ruin
should be avoided for three reasons: lest one be suspected of entering it for an immoral purpose, lest it should fall on one, lest it be haunted by demons (Berachoth, 3 a). Maimonides contents himself with stating that one should not pray in a ruin, without giving any reasons whatever (On Prayer, v, § 6).

The Talmud tells us that if a woman's first two husbands die, she must not marry a third husband, because it would bring him bad luck (Yebamoth, 64 b). Maimonides includes this law in his Code, but adds that if the woman has actually married again, her third husband need not divorce her (On Prohibited Marriage, xxi, § 30). In one of his Responsa (§ 143) Maimonides treats this provision with something approaching contempt, as depending on mere chance. He states that in Andalusia marriages of this kind were permitted by Isaac Alfasi and Joseph ibn Migash. Maimonides was himself accustomed to sanction them in Egypt. Later authorities laid great stress on this law, stating that if the woman married again, she must be divorced, for "a dangerous practice must be prevented even more than one which is otherwise forbidden" (Tur Eben Haezer, 19).

As a final illustration, I may cite the words of Maimonides with regard to the way in which we are to regard the precept to attach a Mezuzah to the door-post. Nothing may be written upon the inner side of this parchment-roll except the two statutory passages from Deuteronomy. On the outer side we may write, in accordance with the prevalent custom, the word "Shaddai" (Almighty). "Those who write upon the parchment the names of angels have no share in the world to come. Not only do these fools fail to carry out a divine precept, but they treat the religious duty of proclaiming the Unity of God and acknowledging the love and service due to him, as though it provided them with an amulet for their own profit, because they fancy in their folly that they will thus obtain vain temporal prosperity" (On Phylacteries, &c.,
v, § 4). It is instructive to contrast this statement with older authority for the view that a Mezuzah guards the house to which it is affixed. The Mechilta points out that even the drops of blood, sprinkled upon the doorposts of our fathers in Egypt, sufficed to hinder the destroyer from entering their houses. How much more then should the Mezuzah be efficacious, seeing that God’s name is so often written upon it, and it is suspended by day and night. If it fails to shield us, this can only be because our sins divide us from our God. Again, in the Jerusalem Talmud (Peah, i, 1), we read that when a certain noble presented R. Judah the Prince with a precious pearl, the Rabbi dispatched in return a Mezuzah, and declared it to be a far more excellent gift. Whilst the pearl would require to be jealously guarded from thieves, the Mezuzah would itself watch over the safety of its possessor. R. Joseph Karo, in his commentary upon the words of Maimonides which have been quoted, can only excuse him by explaining that the Mezuzah, although guarding the house, must not be placed there in order to do so, but in obedience to God’s will.

When it is remembered that the activity of Maimonides covers in the main the last forty years of the twelfth century, it will be seen that his attitude towards superstition deserves to be accounted as a special claim to the gratitude of all lovers of light.

H. S. Lewis.
THE GOD OF SINAI AND JERUSALEM.

One element in the religion of Chaldea has survived in that of Israel. The god of Ur and Harran was the God of Sinai and Jerusalem, of Abraham, of Moses, and of David. If the evidence for this proposition falls somewhat short of proof, it is sufficient to establish a strong presumption, while the hypothesis will be found to illustrate many obscure places of the biblical record, and thereby to receive confirmation. I must not be understood to assert an absolute and original identity, but only that one important source of Israel's faith was, by this channel, derived from the banks of Euphrates. And it is no unworthy ancestry.

"Lord, prince of the gods, who alone in heaven and earth is exalted,—father Nannar, lord of the hosts of heaven, prince of the gods,—father Nannar, lord, great Anu, prince of the gods,—father Nannar, lord, moon-god, prince of the gods,—father Nannar, lord of Uru, prince of the gods...—Lord, thy deity fills the far-off heavens, like the vast sea, with reverential fear! Master of the earth, thou who fixest there the boundaries [of the towns] and assignest to them their names,—father, begetter of gods and men, who establishest for them dwellings and institutest for them that which is good, who proclaimest royalty and bestowest the exalted sceptre on those whose destiny was determined from distant times,—chief, mighty, whose heart is great, god whom no one can name, whose limbs are steadfast, whose knees never bend, who preparest the paths of thy brothers the gods...—In heaven, who is supreme? As for thee, it is thou alone who art supreme!—As for thee, thy decree is made known in heaven, and the Igigi bow their faces!—As for thee, thy decree is made known upon earth, and the spirits of the abyss kiss the dust!—As for thee, thy decree blows above like the wind, and stall and pasture become fertile!—As for thee, thy decree is accomplished upon earth below, and the grass and green things grow!—As for thee, thy decree is seen in the cattle-
folds and in the lairs of the wild beasts, and it multiplies living things!—As for thee, thy decree has called into being equity and justice, and the peoples have promulgated thy law!—As for thee, thy decree, neither in the far-off heaven, nor in the hidden depths of the earth, can any one recognize it!—As for thee, thy decree, who can learn it, who can try conclusions with it?—O Lord, mighty in heaven, sovereign upon earth, among the gods, thy brothers, thou hast no rival."

I have thought it worth while to quote this magnificent hymn from the *Dawn of Civilization* (pp. 654, 655), and to point out by means of italics the chief attributes assigned to the god. Truly it is a noble creed which is here set forth, and neither in its mythic nor in its ideal elements unworthy to be compared with the higher faith of Israel. "Outside Uru and Harran, Sin did not obtain this rank of creator and ruler of things" (ibid.). We have now to establish the points, not merely of resemblance, but of possible and probable connexion between the cultus of those cities and the religion of the Old Testament.

The feast of the New Moon, celebrated in historic times as a feast of Jahveh, affords a distinct presumption of the existence of a lunar element in the concept of the latter. And it is more than probable that the Sabbath also is lunar in its origin, marking the successive phases of the moon. It is well observed in the *Encyclopaedia Biblica* (art. "Sabbath," § 6 versus finem) "That full moon as well as new moon had a religious significance among the ancient Hebrews seems to follow from the fact that when the great agricultural feasts were fixed to set days, the full moon was chosen." The same authority observes (§ 1) "The grammatical form of sabbāth suggests a transitive sense 'the divider,' and apparently indicates the Sabbath as dividing the month. Now compare the language of Gen. i. 14, noting especially לְאַהֲבָּא and לְהָרָא with that of Exod. xxxi. 13: אוֹ אַהֲבָּא וְהָרָא יְהֹוָה יְהֹוָה יִמְנוֹל יִמְנוֹל."

The phases of the moon, it may be inferred, serve for signs divinely appointed, while the religious celebration of these phases constitutes a sign as between Jahveh and
his people. Prof. Delitzsch traces back the Sabbath to Babylonia (op. cit., pp. 40, 98). I would suggest that its origin may be sought at Uru.

"Your fathers dwelt beyond the River of old time, and served another god." This could be no other than the god of the land of their sojournings, to whom they stood in a relation of clientship; and they sojourned in Ur and Harran. When with this tradition in our minds we take into consideration the circumstance that the grand revelation of the Torah of Jahveh to Israel, the constitution of the nation by the establishment of its sacra, is always believed to have taken place in a theophany upon the Mount of God, and that this mountain bore the name of Sinai, the hypothesis of a connexion between Sin and Jahveh is much strengthened. It is further confirmed by the significant facts that (1) the feast of the new moon, "undoubtedly familiar to the ancient Israelites," is yet "completely ignored in the Book of the Covenant and in Deuteronomy"—in other words (as I formerly observed) it was a part of the national religion, and of the priestly tradition, but was disapproved by the prophetic reformers; and (2) doubtless for a similar reason, the Sinai of J and P appears as Horeb in E and D. Both cases appear to me the result of a distinct effort to separate the concept of the God of Israel from the ancient Worship of the Moon.

When writing in vol. X on "The Origin of the Tetra-

---

1 Josh. xxiv. 2 (E2 according to Bennett, the words which I have omitted being marked as a redactional addition).
2 Ur in J, Gen. xi. 28, xv. 7, but in each passage marked by Ball as a redactional addition, in P, chap. xi. 31. Harran, on the other hand, is represented by J as the birth-place of Abraham, and the home of Laban, while in P it is merely a halting-place (a long halt) in the migration from Ur (E.B., art. "Haran," §).
3 w "inin J, Exod. xix. 20, 23 and perhaps xxxiv. 2, 4 (Lex.). Cp. Deut. xxxiii. 2 (The Blessing of Moses), אֶל מְטֵנָיו, אֶל מְטֵנָיו, and in Num. x. 33 (J* according to Paterson), אֶל מְטֵנָיו; then note in Exod. iii. 1 (E), אֶל מְטֵנָיו, and in 1 Kings xiv. 8, אֶל מְטֵנָיו.
grammaton," I pointed out that the formula by which the god of a community was invoked "would readily pass in usage into an appellation distinguishing the god himself in his character of tutelary deity, while on the other hand it would become at once the motto and the name of the city thus entrusted to his care." The palmary instance of this principle is furnished by the divine name Assur, applied not only to the god, but to his people, his city, and his land. It may be worth while to ask whether the names of Ur and Harran, of which the former is usually interpreted as equivalent to the Ass. alu, "city," and the latter as = harrānu, "road," were not rather, in their primary signification, titles of the god there worshipped. In fact, the name Or, Our (thus transcribed by Maspero 2) occurs as a divine title in the inscriptions of Sham'al, the modern Zenjirli, in the eighth century B.C.: a piece of evidence which has an important bearing upon a class of biblical words, names, and phrases, in which the same root is employed.

First among these I would place the well-known appellation of a considerable clan of the tribe Manasseh (settled, it may be observed, in Gilead, a region exposed to Aramaean influence), יהוה, or as I should prefer to read it (in accordance with the principle suggested by Mr. G. Buchanan Gray 3) יָהָוָה, "God grant light." It is not in the daytime, in the climate of Syria, that light is sought or needed. Such a supplication can only be addressed to the chief luminary of the night.

In the proper name יָהָוָה, as well as in the Phoenician יֹהָוָה, the divinity of יהוה is affirmed, and in יהוה the god is identified with Jahveh. The last is especially important

1 See, however, the note in E.B., art. "Assyria," col. 349. The uncertain differences of form there mentioned were perhaps not original but adopted for convenience of distinction.
2 Histoire ancienne des peuples de l'Orient classique, II, 155, n. 4.
3 Hebrew Proper Names, p. 218.
4 The form יָהָוָה is cited from the Greek of Num. xxxii. 41 [4]. E.B., s.v. "Jair."
for our purpose. It was borne by three historic persons. The first of these was David's Hittite captain; and it may be presumed that it was bestowed upon him by his master. The second was the priest of Jahveh in the Temple of Jerusalem, in the age of Isaiah, and it may be added, an associate of that prophet. The third was himself a prophet who suffered martyrdom under Jehoiakim. We are here in the main stream of Jewish tradition.

Suppose, now, that the Chaldean Ur derived its name from an epithet of the moon-god Sin or Nannar. There can, I think, be little room for doubt that the Biblical נֵבֶר was originally so called to distinguish it from the *Uru-salimmu* of the Tell-el-Amarna tablets, famous above all fame by its later name of Jerusalem. But if *Uru* signifies the Moon, *salimmu*, as Mr. G. Margoliouth has pointed out, means "complete." The very name of Jerusalem signifies Full Moon!

The same ingenious writer goes on to observe: "The ground-plan of Harran, the city sacred to Sin, described as we are told, 'a crescent-shaped curve in honour of its patron' (Maspero, *Struggle of the Nations*, p. 26). We are thus led to think that the term נֶבֶר (Shalem) was meant to denote the moon-disk at its full, and that the city was, in honour of the god, so built as roughly to represent a circle."

It is a real pleasure to illustrate and confirm this bold conjecture. Maspero's description of the plan of Harran is indeed a little less precise in the French, "La ville affectait vaguement en son honneur la forme courbe d'un croissant."
but the hypothesis derives strength from the facts that the ground-plan of the Chaldean Uru was an oval, which in the plan given by Maspero from Taylor, bears an obvious, though unnoticed resemblance to the gibbous moon; while that of Larsam, which was sacred to the Sun-god Shamash, "formed almost a circle upon the soil." "A low circular platform, about four and a half miles in circumference," is the description of Loftus, from which that of Maspero is derived. On the other hand, "Uruk and Eridu resembled in shape a sort of irregular trapezium"; these cities were not dedicated to the heavenly bodies. And that it is no mere fancy to attribute significance and intention to the plans of ancient cities may be proved from the amusing Chinese examples given by Frazer (G. B.2, I, 48, 49). The citations in the same work, II, 155 et seq., ibid. 457, illustrate the sympathetic and favourable influence upon the prosperity and increase of every human undertaking attributed to the waxing moon, and enable us to understand, not only the ground-plans of Harran and Ur, but also the reason why "an ancient legend ascribes the invention of the bricks [of Chaldea] and consequently the construction of the earliest cities, jointly to Sin, the eldest son of Bel, and Ninib his brother." Now it is noteworthy that, as we learn from the Tell-el-Amarna correspondence, there was a Bit-Ninib belonging to Uru-salimmu. It looks much as if Uru-salimmu and Bit-Ninib were a joint foundation under Chaldean influence. I cannot doubt that the name נִינוֹב was changed to דִּבְּרָט for precisely the

1 Dawn of Civilization, p. 625.  
2 Ibid., p. 612.  
3 Cf. Gen. xi. 3.  
4 Dawn of Civ., p. 753. Ninib was, inter alia, a god of field-labour, ibid., 576, n. 3. A point which may concern us in the character of this deity is his association with the planet Saturn. If the Sabbath be regarded as originally dies Saturni, then the celebration of New Moon and Sabbath at Jerusalem may be traced back to the cultus of Sin and Ninib. The labourer ceases work to worship (at the moon's phases) the divine patron of his toil.  
5 Was Bit-Ninib perchance identical with Beth-lehem?
same reason that Sinai was changed to Horeb, and the feast of the New Moon ignored by the prophetic codes.

It is probable that the writer of Gen. xiv was acquainted with the original form, and that he has purposely modified it by omitting the divine name נִזְיָא. It may indeed be considered that אלה also from an attribute might pass into a title, and is possibly so employed in the Phoenician אלהלְגָּדוֹלָ הסנהנה. In translating the cognate terms of a foreign language, with reference to their derived or acquired meanings, by words which in our own tongue are not related to one another, we are liable to miss, not merely an external resemblance, but an underlying connexion in thought. Those who in ancient times ascribed to the waxing moon a propitious influence on the increase of their estate, would be likely when worshipping it at the full (ךֶבְשָׁא) to impute to the blessing of the divinity the "wholeness" (ךֶבְשָׁא) of their condition, the peace which in ages of war could only be secured by victory. It is not then surprising that David who established the cultus of Jahveh in the city of דִּבְנַה, David whose Hittite captain bore the name of רְבֵא, should have bestowed upon his son that of דִּבְנַה, an ascription of praise to the Moon-god. I would seek for the difficult הַנִּלְתָּר a similar interpretation (cp. Judg. vi. 24, דִּבְנַה כָּלָי). As in Israel, Greece, and Rome, as in China, so in Babylonia, the God of Heaven, Anu, occupies the highest place. To exalt therefore the Moon-god to supremacy, he must be identified with the Spirit of the Sky. And in the Hymn to Nannar this course is actually taken. So, too, the Moon is regarded as "lord of the hosts of heaven,"

1 E.B., art. "Solomon."
2 Cf. Lat. integer, integritas.
3 This equivalence of peace and victory appears curiously in the inscription of Uni (a minister of the Sixth Egyptian Dynasty), Dawn of Ge., 4th ed., pp. 420, 421, with note comparing the expression "came in peace," with its Arabic counterpart بِسَلَام.
4 See the general treatment of this topic in Tylor's Primitive Culture.
for as Mr. G. Margoliouth has acutely observed, "It was
the moon who was seen to gather around him the glorious
hosts of stars." In vol. XI, pp. 242, 243, I have dealt at
some length with the myth of the למש, the Mountain of the
World, which is at the same time the Mountain of the
gods, and which was symbolized by the staged temple-
mounds of Chaldea, including that of Nannar at Uru,
drawing the conclusion that the mythical למש is the dwelling
of למש, and that למש and למש were originally equivalent
to the latter deity, the Zeus of a Semitic Olympus; and
pointing out that the expression למש is applied by
Solomon to the temple in a poetical citation which is
probably derived from the סיר הסשה, while the למש of
this passage (1 Kings viii. 13) is described as למש in ix. 8.
I have now to add that in Hab. iii. 11 it is the moon that
stands in his למש; appears, that is to say, in the character
of למש. It may well then be the deity of the moon who
in Gen. xiv bears the name of למש, has the king of
Salem for his priest, and is invoked in oath by Abram,
who also accepts his blessing. The creative activity
ascribed to the god must be discussed at a later stage.
I must, however, lay stress upon the significant fact that
the writer carries back the cultus of Jerusalem to an age
when the first father of Israel was but a stranger in the land.

In the time of Amenophis IV, circa 1415 B.C., the city
was in danger of falling into the hands of the Habiri. It
did not fall into those of the Israelites until it was captured
by David. Before this crisis of its fortunes Jerusalem

1898, p. 583.
2 Should we not read מ? "The balance of the rhythm seems to
require a separate predicate to 'the sun'," Davidson, in loc.
3 Gen. xiv. 22, where מ is probably a gloss.
4 Josh. xv. 63 (J), Judg. i. 21, xix. 11. "It seems probable that in the
place of the problematical Adoni-bezek, king (ver. 7) of some nameless city,
the original of Judg. i (J) had Adoni-zedek, king of Jerusalem." "Of the
capture [ver. 8], . . . there is no trace in the history," Moore in Internat.
Crit. Comm.
was occupied by a clan of whom we only know that they invoked their god with the significant appellation \(ywb\), which is both explained and established by such passages as Ps. ix. 14, \(כָּבָּלָהֵים נְעָשָׁה יְהוָה בִּזְרֵיָּוְן=וְוָיִוֶּשׁ בְּanness סָוִיָּאָוֻיָוְן\). Cf. xliv. 6, \(לָזָּר בְּאָרוּץ עַל הָרָי אָבוֹתָו\), as well as lxiii. 6 and Zech. x. 5, where the “trampling warriors” fight. Clearly, the “Jebusite” war-cry survived in the traditions of Jerusalem.

Assuming what David seems to have assumed, the identification of \(n\) with \(ד'ט\), I am now in a position to explain with some degree of confidence the nature of the mysterious \(ד'ט\) and \(ד'ט\). It appears from the corrected text of 1 Sam. xiv. 41 that these were in fact lots by means of which it was believed that Jahveh delivered a response to alternative inquiries. We may presume that in popular belief the god was in the lots, and that therefore they were attributes or symbols of him. I venture to suggest that the lot Urim, or “Brightness,” represented the bright crescent of the Moon-god Ur; and the lot Tummim, that is, “Wholeness,” the dim unlighted disk, “the Old Moon in the New Moon’s arms”; that they were, in short, the familiar symbols of Phoenician art. These were perhaps the gods which “Rachel,” i.e. Ashtoreth, stole from her father “Laban,” or Sin.

In the interpretation of the Book of Genesis, we need, so to speak, not one key but a bunch. There is a large and delightful element which is neither mythical nor legendary nor historical but romantic. There is an element, perhaps even in the oldest sources, of artificial construction, a scheme of origins and relations. And then, underlying alike the genealogy and the romance, there are the

---

1 Cf. A. Hom. Merc. 532 et seq., with the note in Lang’s translation: “It appears from Philochorus that the prophetic lots were called θρια. They are then personified, as the prophetic Sisters, the Θριαι.”

2 When I come to treat of Ashtoreth I shall have occasion to discuss these symbols at some length.
materials of which these are composed, the dramatis personae:—(1) the Tribe, which is regularly identified with (2) the Eponymous Ancestor, who in turn can hardly be distinguished from (3) the tribal god, whether we regard the last as a deified individual, or a divinity euhemerized. And under the influence of Jahvist monotheism the euhemerizing process has undoubtedly moulded the traditions transmitted to us, whatever their origin. We have also to bear in mind (a) that distinct, even though cognate or allied tribes, might worship similar or identical gods, by various appellations. I have already suggested that כזראא, נטשל, יִתְמַטְפָּה, are predicates of one divine hero. And in the same way it is easy to suppose that the clan ריאז might adore the Moon-god as Giver of Light, while the whole House of Joseph invoked him as Giver of Increase, and yet another tribe called upon him to hear them from his heavenly mansion by the name of יִתְמַטְפָּה. (b) For the purpose of the general scheme, it was necessary to exhibit the same Person in different connexions, and with this object variant synonyms were employed or even invented. It is only in gender that כזראא differs from כזראא, while כזראא stands related to כזראא as the stall-fed heifer to the Ashtoreth of the flock.

The supposed identity of the “place-name” כזראא with the Ass. Harrānu = road has already been disputed by Winckler, and the same scholar has also suggested that כזראא is an intentional distortion of כזראא. My own belief is that כזראא and כזראא and כזראא are synonymous epithets for the moon. The כזראא of Gen. xxiv. 10. (J) is presumably identical with כזראא. Now כזראא and כזראא, on this hypothesis the Moon-god and his consort, are represented as the parents of כזראא, who is nothing else but a personification of the famous sanctuary, or, still more precisely, its primitive object of worship, the Sacred Stone (Gen. xxviii. 22). Can

we then trace any connexion between the cultus of Sin and that of Bethel? I think we can.

As Osiris is at once a bull-god and a moon-god, as Hathor is the Sky, and at the same time a Cow, so in like manner is the god of Ur the mighty bull of Anu 1, that is, of Heaven. The synthesis, which to us appears so strange and monstrous, is in truth, as is proved by its recurrence, quite normal, and becomes intelligible when we have grasped the modes of thought of which it is the product. In accordance with the general doctrine of Animism a Spirit of the Sky must be assumed; and from all that we know of the thoughts of Early Man we may infer that he would regard this spirit as capable, like others, of taking the bodily form of the living creatures which surrounded him. The play of his fancy, though not limited by reflection, would be governed by the suggestions of circumstance. Thus it is natural enough that the sky-god should be conceived in the form of that strong-winged and keen-sighted denizen of the air, the Hawk. But what point of likeness or analogy can be found between the visible sky and the bodily semblance of a bull or cow? In fact there is one, and one only. It is to be found in the horned Moon. The moon's horns are those of the celestial cow or bull, just as at other times sun and moon are conceived as the eyes of Horus, the divine hawk. Thus a synthesis is formed in which the worship of Moon and Sky is associated with the religion of Pastoral Life. And further, in accordance with the doctrine of Sympathy, the ancient nomads of whom we speak, who depended for subsistence on their herds and flocks, would regard the influence of the waxing moon as the source of increase of their wealth. We shall now be prepared to understand the identity of the Bull of Anu with the Calf of Bethel and of Sinai.

I do not know if it has ever been pointed out that in

1 Dawn of Civ., p. 626 and p. 653, n. 6. The parallel shows how unsafe is the assumption that the lunar and pastoral attributes of Ashtoreth were borrowed in the first instance from Egypt.
tracing back the origin of the calf-worship to the foot of Horeb, and ascribing it to the act of Aaron, E is making a great, and, we may be sure, an unwilling concession, to the traditions of Bethel\(^1\). Such a circumstance could never have been invented by an opponent of these rites. We may take it that he could not deny what was universally accepted, the Mosaic origin of the cult, any more than it was possible to deny that of the worship of Nebushtan; he could only give a hostile representation, or else an apologetic explanation of an undoubted fact. And if it originated at Horeb, or rather Sinai, it was presumably a cult of the god of Sinai, the god Sin, identified with Jahveh. But the prophets of Israel had good reason to repudiate it. It was a lascivious and orgiastic worship. "The people," we are told in E (Exod. xxxii. 6), "sat down to eat and to drink, and rose up to play;" ℀ Киев. Dr. Frazer has shown us that the practice of sexual intercourse in connexion with ritual observance has a wider signification than that of mere indulgence. On the principle of Sympathetic Magic it was believed to promote the fertility of crops\(^2\). And further, there is reason to believe that in some cases the human agents were considered to enact the union of a divine pair. Certainly we cannot suppose that the bull-god was in theory without a mate, or that his worshippers attributed to him a chastity greater than their own. Here then is the deity of whom פִּֽהַשֶּׁךְ is a fitting predicate, and here is the origin of the folk-tale in Gen. xxvi. 8. פִּֽהַשֶּׁךְ is, on this theory, the bull-god playing with the heifer his mate.

The establishment of a cult requires the sanction of the god, and is usually therefore ascribed to himself or his representative. In this case it is the work of זַבֵּר, a name

\(^1\) [Prof. Kennett's paper on "The Origin of the Aaronite Priesthood" was not yet published when the present article was passed for press by the writer. See January number of the Journal of Theological Studies.]

which has never yet received a satisfactory explanation. I venture to regard it as a divine name, parallel both in form and meaning to that of מָזוֹן, and derived from the root מָזוֹן—signifying therefore **him that maketh pregnant, or causeth to conceive**. No epithet could be more appropriate.

In the endeavour to gain an insight into the traditions of Bethel we must, I think, postulate three successive strata of belief and worship:

1. **The cultus of the Stone, set up by בּוֹזֵקָא**.

2. **That of the divinity of the Flock, whether fem. (זָרֶר, נְזֵלָם) or masc. אֶלּוֹ, the latter also addressed by the invocation בּוֹזֵקָא**.

3. **Of the deity of the Herd, fem. בּוֹזֵקָא, masc. בּוֹזֵקָא; בּוֹזֵקָא also refers to this god**.

It is probable that the third incorporated and modified elements derived from the second. For as Dr. Benzinger points out, the nomads of the wilderness did not breed cattle. And I must add that though "Isaac" has "Rebekah" for his wife, yet the victim substituted for him in boyhood is not a calf but a ram. It would seem then that if Beth-el owed anything to Sinai, it must be the second element of her cultus, rather than the third. If, on the other hand, the last is connected with the cultus of Sin, it is more probably derived from Harran.

The god of Harran, according to Maspero, was worshipped under the form of a conical stone, perhaps an aerolite surmounted by a gilded crescent. The conical stone was indeed a common habitation or embodiment of divinities, both male and female, over a wide area. And it is not at

1 For בּוֹזֵקָא, implied in בּוֹזֵקָא (Lex.), cf. בּוֹזֵקָא בּוֹזֵקָא.
2 E. B., art. "Calf."
3 Gen. xxii. 13.
5 See Perrot and Chipiez, *Phoenicia* (Eng. trans.), vol. I, Figs. 19, 29, 30, 58, 192, 199, 202, 205, 206, 223, 232, and tail-piece to chap. iv; *References in text*, vol. I, pp. 61, 69; 79, 80; 275, 276; 280; 283; 307; 315; 319; 348; vol. II, pp. 235, 237 (figs. 153, 156); p. 242 (figs. 165, 167);
all improbable that the Ark of Jahveh originally contained just such a stone, hallowed by anointing to secure the objective presence of the god amid his people.

Traditions, we may confidently assume, concerning the *instrumenta* of the cultus must have lingered in the exiled priesthood from the age of Ezekiel to that of Ezra. When therefore, in the later strata of the Priestly Code, the ark, with its attendant cherubim of gold (Exod. xxxvii. 1, 7), and the sacred objects of the ideal tabernacle, are ascribed to the inspired artificer מְנָעָן בְּנֵי אָנָבי (Exod. xxxi. 2), the statement is not to be dismissed without inquiry into its significance. The name מְנָעָן has a parallel in the Phoenician מְנָעָן, and may point to memories of Phoenicians employed by Solomon, or to the mythical prototype and patron of these craftsmen, such as the Egyptian Thoth or the Cretan Daidalos. מְנָא, a mutilated form, recalls the priest מְנָא, already mentioned, who built the new altar under Ahaz. (At this time also Phoenician artists may have been employed.) At the head of this little genealogy stands one מְנ, whom I am inclined to identify with the associate of Aaron in E (Exod. xvii. 10–12, xxiv. 14), a figure so dignified in position, yet so unimportant to the narrative, that it must, I think, have had place and function in previous tradition. What if he were regarded as the maker of the ark, and were in truth identical with מְנ מְנ? In fact in the Septuagint he appears as Ωρα.¹

Wherever the full moon was seen to rise in its glory from behind a range of mountains—Sinai, or Lebanon, or those which part the plains of Tigris and Euphrates from Persia²—his worshippers might naturally regard these lofty summits as the god’s true mansion or מְזָר. Such a conception may perhaps underlie the obscure proverb
in Gen. xxii. 14: "Jahveh appeareth in the mountain." And if, after all that has been said, I may now assume that the god of Uru-salimmu was indeed the Full Moon, we shall the better understand why, in the vision of Ezekiel, the glory of the God of Israel entered the temple by the eastern gate, coming from the way of the east; (Ezek. xliii. 2, xliv. 2).

If יוהי or ויהי be grammatically equivalent to יוהי or ויהי; and if the deity thus invoked were once identified with the god י体育馆 or י体育馆; it follows that this appellation may legitimately be interpreted in the sense of the Creative Word, י体育馆, Let there be Light. Creation, on this view, began with the utterance of the Name; and the First Day, with the first rising of the Moon.

In this sense, the salutation י体育馆 or י体育馆, might naturally be employed as a ritual greeting on the appearance of the luminary, and from this use might readily be transferred to the myth of its creation. We can then see both the reason why Moses chose it to invoke the God of Sinai, and also why in E, and all subsequent texts, this meaning is replaced by the interpretation which I have hitherto adopted, God will be with us.

It is not at all an improbable supposition, that the author of the Priestly Code, who fetches Abram from Ur of the Chaldees, may have derived thence the main outlines of his cosmogony. The traditions, on this subject, of Chaldea would reach him with the prestige of antiquity and authority. He would regard them as not wholly alien, a testimony, authentic although corrupted in transmission, to the Truth which Israel alone possessed in purity. And that his materials were in fact borrowed from a foreign source, may be proved not only from the polytheistic language of Gen. i. 26, 27, but still more clearly from the rationale of idolatry which these verses imply. If Man is created in the image of God, it follows

1 Compare the language of Ps. cxxi.

2 It is in fact the exact equivalent of the tribal appellation י体育馆.
that God has human form, and that the artificer is justified in thus representing him. It is indeed possible that P intended a protest against the conception of deities bearing the forms of animals, the denizens of water, earth, or air (cp. Exod. xx. 4). But contrast the language of II Isaiah!

We may presume that in general the natural order of creation as conceived by the Babylonian mind would correspond to the established order of the gods, the triad of Heaven (Gen. i. 8), Earth, and Sea (vv. 9, 10), the provinces of Anu, Bel, and Ea, taking precedence of that which was composed by Sin, Shamash, and Ishtar, the Moon, the Sun, and the brightest among the Planets (cp. Gen. i. 14-19). But where, as at Uru, the Moon-god was exalted to the supreme place by identification with the God of Heaven, this order could not be maintained. It was now (we may believe) supposed that Time, the succession of days and seasons, began with the first moon-rise, and that the Light of the Moon was the רְבָּעָן, the first and chiefest part, of God's creation. To the Moon-god, as in

1 For these triads see Maspero, *Dawn of Civ.*, pp. 538, 649 ad fin., 650, 658, 66a. Ramman afterwards replaced Ishtar.

2 Compare Gen. viii. 22 (J) with i. 14.

3 Gen. i. 1-3. Read בֵּית ῥֵבָעָן. The בֵּית is the בֵּית естьהוֹי. The apodosis commences at רַאשָׁת. Compare Wellh., *Prot.*, Eng. trans., p. 387, and see below on Prov. viii. 22. The construction here placed upon Gen. i. 1-3 makes it necessary to take the clauses ...רַאשָׁת, ...רַאשָׁת, ...רַאשָׁת, as temporal, the articles of a long protasis. Smend (cited by Addis) objects to such an involved period as “against the genius of Hebrew.” With good reason; the writer was paraphrasing a foreign source. The proof of this lies in the fact that the Babylonian Creation-epic opens precisely in this manner. And the same phenomenon is presented by the opening of J, Gen. ii. 4b-6. The apodosis begins ver. 7, רַאשָׁת.

Parallels may be found in a wide range of sources, from the “strange old song” of the Dinkas, quoted by Mr. Lang (I think in *The Making of Religion*, but have not the volume at hand), to a well-known hymn of the Rig-Veda (Mandala X, 121, if I may trust my memory) which commences: “In the Beginning was neither Anything nor Nought,” not anything, since that would presuppose creation; nor yet nothing, since אֵּמִית אֵּמיִית אֵמיִית. A narrative of creation must begin by answering two questions: (1) What existed before anything was made? (2) What
his proper nature the Source of Increase of all things capable of growth—*auctor* (so to speak) *crescentium*—as well as in his secondary character of the Heavenly Bull, who is at the same time the "begetter of gods and men," the Origin of Life might well be attributed by his worshippers. And where the soul or spirit is identified with the breath, a life-giving power may naturally be ascribed to the wind, regarded as the Breath of Heaven (cp. Gen. ii. 7 with i. 2). We may therefore read without surprise in the Hymn to Nannar how his decree "blows above like the wind, and stall and pasture become fertile"; it "is accomplished upon earth below, and the grass and green things grow"; it "is seen in the cattle-folds and in the lairs of the wild beasts, and it multiplies living things."

And the creative decrees of Gen. i. 11, 20 (cf. verse 2 b), 24, operate in like manner. But it must be observed that the God of Israel is never represented as, in a literal sense, the father of gods and men; and that if, as is likely enough, such a conception existed in popular thought—e.g. among the worshippers at Bethel—then, this is one of those elements in the common religion of antiquity which the teachers of Israel have silently set aside.

The decrees of the Hymn to Nannar, equally with those of Gen. i, may be regarded as the commands of an all-powerful sovereign. But it is probable that the conception of the Creative Word goes back to a mode of thought older than political authority, as old perhaps as those beginnings of speech when the inarticulate cry passed into the imperative call for common action. This is the notion that the utterance of a formula possesses an inherent power to produce the effect desired, a notion which (like others hereafter to be discussed) is common ground to Magic and Religion. So, in the cosmogony of Heliopolis, Tûmû, on the day of creation, had "cried across the waters, 'Come unto me,' and immediately the mysterious lotus had unhappened before anything was done? "In the Beginning," says Faust, "was the Deed."
folded its petals, and Ra had appeared at the edge of its open cup as a disk, a new-born child, or a disk-crowned sparrow-hawk. In that of Hermopolis, Thot, a Moon-god, lord of the voice, master of words, of books, of incantations, "had opened his lips, and the voice which proceeded from him had become an entity; sound had solidified into matter, and by a simple emission of voice the four gods who preside over the four houses of the world had come forth alive from his mouth without bodily effort on his part, and without spoken evocation." In the Babylonian "Creation-epic," when Marduk is chosen by the gods to be their champion against Ti'amat, they first invest him with the supreme imperium, the fata of Heaven, "the attributes of a king," and then it is related how

They clad their champion in a garment, and thus addressed him: "Thy will, master, shall be that of the gods. Speak the word, 'Let it be so,' it shall be so. Thus open thy mouth, this garment shall disappear; say unto it, 'Return,' and the garment shall be there." He spoke with his lips, the garment disappeared; he said unto it, "Return," and the garment was restored.

The king, as representative of divinity, has a prophetic character, and gives utterance to the self-fulfilling Word of God. We cannot, I think, doubt that in the creed of Uru, the same power would be attributed to "Father Nannar."

A less august but more artistic method of creation is employed in the Making of Man. It is the craft of the Potter, or perhaps in a more advanced civilization, the Sculptor's art. We may compare the process mentioned in J (Gen. ii. 7, 19) with the result described in P.
And so among the gods of Egypt, "Pthah had modelled man with his own hands; Khñnum had formed him on a potter's table." In Chaldea, too, Ea "was a potter, and had modelled men out of the clay of the plains," while a legend related by Berosus told how Marduk "begged his father Ea to cut off his head and mix clay with the blood which welled from the trunk, then from this clay to fashion new beasts and men."

An entirely distinct conception is set forth in three of the most splendid passages of the post-exilic literature—Isa. xli. 12–14, Prov. viii. 22–31, Job xxxviii. 4 et seq. In these the Universe, the framework of Heaven, Earth, and Sea, is regarded as an architectural construction. Their materials must be measured and weighed (Isa. xli. 12). The foundations of the earth are laid like those of a building, and its plan marked out with the line (Job xxxviii. 4). This implies the trained skill, or counsel, of the craftsman. Who then was the Architect of the Great King? The Second Isaiah (xli. 13, 14) states this supposition only to reject it, as he presently rejects (ver. 18) the anthropomorphism which is accepted in Gen. i. 26, 27. But in the one sublime passage of the Book of Proverbs (a passage which must be reckoned among the great formative influences of Christian theology) the divine architect, standing in a subaltern relation to the Creator, is identified with the Wisdom which is presupposed in creation. And, like the Light of Genesis, the Wisdom of Proverbs is the first-fruit of God's way and works. If there were any doubt as to the mythical origin of the conception here presented in so ennobled a form, the doubt is removed by one clearly mythic touch, when Wisdom is described in language more appropriate to the Bull of Anu, or the Calf of Bethel, as

2 Ibid., p. 633.
3 Ibid., p. 545. Cf. p. 540, n. a. The Encyclopaedia Biblica (art. "Creation," § 15, n. 4) commends the more prudent course of cutting off the head of Tiamat, on the quaint ground that it stands to reason.
It is no doubt a sense of this incompatibility which has led scholars such as Frank, Toy, and Haupt to read in ver. 30, ἡγαθή, in the sense of "nursling," for ἡγαθή, master-workman. Be that as it may, the whole tenor of the context requires us to conceive this first-fruit of Creation in the character of a ἀρχιτέκτων. And this Architect of the Universe, identified with the ἀρχιτέκτων of Gen. i. 3, is in my opinion no other than that inventor of the building art, the Moon-god of Ur and Harran. It should be observed that in Job xxxviii. 4–7 the Creator appears in the character of Lord of Hosts (though that term is not employed) already attended by the Stars of Morn—the morning of the First Day, before the rising of the Sun.

It was then, we may suppose, this Builder of the World, assuredly regarded as the Founder of Ur-Kasdim, and perhaps also of Urusalem, who in Gen. xiv appears as the god of Salem, and of whom it is said in the citation from the book of Jashar to which I have previously referred, that he set the sun in the heavens, yet hath determined to dwell in darkness—a point to which we may have occasion to recur. He, as I believe, it was, who was invoked in the Phoenician proper name, and upon the twin pillars placed in front of the Temple, which bore, as I shall venture to affirm, not the unmeaning names of Jachin and Boaz but the significant inscription. It is a remarkable circumstance that this formula, and the names of ancient kings, have alike their parallels in those which were borne by the last sovereigns of Judah.

1 The conception of the divine Founder, expressed in and כנהוים, is also implied in the traditional form כנהוים, if that be derived from the root כנהוים, and signify "Foundation of Shalem." Cf. Isa. xxviii. 16, Job xxxviii. 6b. The Qerṣ perpetuum represents a further sophistication, disguising the associations of כנהוים.

In order to constitute Jerusalem the capital of Israel, it was a religious and political necessity to identify the god of Jerusalem with the god of Israel. The names כנהוים and כנהוים, compared with כנהוים and כנהוים, compared
The reader has perhaps observed that I am accustomed to assume, provisionally, that the older narratives of the Pentateuch represent real traditions and adumbrate historic facts; not because I regard them as authoritative, but because I consider this assumption, where the contrary cannot be proved, the best way to elicit their true intention and significance. Now just as the Ark, the Serpent, and the Calf are traced back in these traditions to the age of Moses, so the two דִּדְתִּי which stood before the temple at Jerusalem, and were presumably symbols of the god within—upon my view the god אֹהֶל, or אִים—being in fact, as Robertson Smith made it probable, candelabra or cressets such as are shown upon the coins of Cyprus before the temple of Paphos, the sanctuary of a lunar deity—had also their prototype in the legendary עשִי of alternate cloud and fire, by day and night, wherein Jahveh led his people through the wilderness. It may well be that this impressive image is actually derived from the fires of the temple cressets, smouldering in the sunshine and glowing after nightfall, dim or radiant like the Lamp of Night. In both cases the smoke conceals and the fire manifests the very presence of the deity. Compare the language of Gen. xv. 17, and the names of אֹהֶל and נָרִי. This double aspect of the God of Sinai runs all through the Theophanies of Exodus, but appears with especial clearness in that of Exod. xxxiii. 23

We shall now be prepared to apprehend the significance with the ancient עֶשֶׁי, are memorials of this compromise. It is of some importance to observe that in this way ritual and mythical traditions of Chaldean origin, attached to the local cult, may have been incorporated among those of Judah, and perhaps have left their traces in our oldest source.

1 *Religion of the Semites*, and ed., pp. 487 ad fin., 488. "In most of the Assyrian examples it is not easy to draw the line between the candelabrum and the sacred tree crowned with a star or crescent moon." For the coins of Cyprus, showing both star and crescent surmounting the temple with its sacred Cone and Candelabra, see Perrot and Chipiez, *Phœnicia*, Eng. trans., vol. I, figs. 58, 199. Cf. figs. 81, 82, 83, and 232 (Stele from Libybaeum).
of the terms employed in that solemn invocation of the God of Israel, the Blessing of Num. vi. 24. 便 ידיה וישמרֵי, this is the Unsleeping Guardian of Ps. cxxi, the divine Keeper of Israel, who, as I believe, bestowed his title of asherי upon the capital of the northern kingdom ①. יארויהו בראת ירחין—thus was he invoked by the clan תָּנָד—so was he worshipped by the king who named his son רַב מָשָׂא.

Turn now to the Talmudical citations which I owe to the pamphlet of Mr. George Margoliouth: "He who pronounces the benediction on the new moon at the proper time is like one who welcomes the very presence of the Divine Glory," and again, "If Israel had only been favoured to welcome the face of their Father which is in heaven once in the month, it would have been sufficient for them ②." We are now in a position to perceive the literal meaning of יא אומנ יא וניי. All these expressions, later on so marvellously spiritualized, afford, in my opinion, the evidence of a very simple and natural myth by which the bright Moon was regarded as the Face of the Sky-god, Lord of Heaven ③, and Leader of the starry Hosts, דנהת יבִלע השמים. From this supposition there follows an important consequence. The "place-names," Israelite or Phoenician, לנה, מִנָּה, θεοῦ πρόσωπον, may now be regarded as epithets of the deity worshipped in these spots, the lunar god. This then was the mysterious antagonist with whom Jacob wrestled until the breaking of the day, but who was then obliged to part with him ④! The myth is transparent. The wrestling-bout of the hero with the god serves to account for the monthly obscuration,

① "That this place derives its name from a man called Shemer (זמר, 1 Kings xvi. 24) is very unlikely." Nöldeke in E. B., art. "Names," § 10.
② Hebrew-Babylonian Affinities, Appendix, citing Tractate Sanhedrin, fol. 42 a.
③ In other words: "'The god who dwells in the heaven,' to whom the heavens belong." There is no difference.
④ Gen. xxxii. 31 proves that this was the god of Penuel.
or else the occasional eclipse, of the moon's light. In one point of view, Jacob's opponent is identical with his old master Laban, and this consideration will enable us to understand some of the obscure and confused details in the story of his service. During two weeks of years he serves for the daughters of Laban, and meanwhile the flocks of his master increase from little to multitude. These are now partitioned between master and man, and as I must suppose the white were originally assigned to Laban — i.e. the bright moon — and the dark or mottled to his antagonist. From this point the increase is in Jacob's favour, until the sons of Laban make complaint, "of that which was our father's hath he gotten all this glory." (ברא), and then — a mythical touch — we are told (xxxii. 2 E): אֶרֶץ עֵין אֶלֶף לְהוֹוָה אֲנָשָׁה אֱמוֹת נְכֵלָיָם שלושה. In the event the riches of Laban are transferred to his servant, now become his rival (ver. 16). It has taken in all a period of twenty years to accomplish this result (vers. 38, 41), and we hear but without details (vers. 7, 41) that Jacob's wages have been changed ten times. These ten changes cannot be fitted into the six preceding years, since they must have coincided with the breeding season. E may have had before him a form of the story in which Jacob served ten years for the elder, ten for the younger daughter, and ten for the flock, making up a full month of years, reckoned not by weeks but by decades.

On the whole these narratives seem to point at once to a real parallel and a conscious rivalry between the God of Aram and the God of Israel, to whose favour (xxxii. 5, 7, 13, 24, 29, 42, 53) Jacob's prosperity is due. In the verse last cited while Laban, as I understand, invokes the god of Harran, Jacob calls to witness him of Bethel. What if po (לֶּאָבִי) stand for an original (םָרָה אֶלֶף) and so,
perhaps for יָלָע? It was, I presume, the Syrian deity whose blessing Jacob extorted—a reconciled antagonist. If so, at Penuel he was identified with the God of Israel.

As in Canaan, so at Carthage, the moon was reputed the Face of the Lord of Heaven: and when the Carthaginian paid his vows לֶא יְבֹשְׁשׁוּacularא, he did but address the goddess in that character in which in fact she is represented on her stelai, as Mother and Mistress of the Moon, nursing the Disk and Crescent like a babe between her breasts.

To this subject I shall have occasion to recur.

More than a quarter of a century ago, a lad watching the glory of the August moon above the waves upon our southern coast, in the hours preceding an eclipse, sought expression for the feelings thus inspired in lines, which the "natural piety" acknowledged by a better poet impels me to rescue from oblivion. If the reader will grant me this indulgence, he will perhaps find in them an unconscious illustration of what is so impressively avowed in Deut. iv. 19 and in Job xxxi. 26.

GREY HUBERT SKIPWITH.

RHYTHM OF THE MOON-WORSHIPPERS.

O thou who art ever changing,
O thou who art eternally unchanged,
Heavenly Orb,
hear us.

Pure Beauty,
Serene Glory,
Goddess of the Night,
hear us.

2 For the fact, see E. B., art. "Phoenicia," § 12, col. 3747.
3 For the meaning, turn to Perrot and Chipiez, Phoenicia, Eng. trans., vol. I, fig. 19a; cf. vol. II, fig. 61.
Friend of the sick,
Guide of travellers,
Guard of the sleeping world,
  hear us.

Throne in heaven,
Crown of the starry glory,
Mother of lights,
  hear us.

Be we thine,
Be thou ours,
Glorious and beautiful,
True and lovely,
  Be thou all.
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This is one of several evidences of wilful contraction by the copyist.

1 A men mina. — * R omits from the preceding maTr; A ie? Tya co ni2»c; both continue ttNYi.— * Evidently a copyist's misreading (from a faded text?) for vn, since the brother is a Levite; R vla; for A see the following note.— * R inverts: n<:cnna'cn cnt z-fm po vnn man Si; this was also the order in the source from which BM is derived, as the context and the rest of mrud prove; likewise in the source of EA, which have, however, preserved only (E rwon) mien e<n D'rtnjjd|apr pw, they omit by dittolepsy from v to D'rtnjjd|apr pw, the | Asher probably indicates a disturbance in the text); EA also omit tvon in the text; cp. note xi.— * R dv: A vha; op. text below after hire 'ti.— * Instead of Tnpn: R Train: A cm; cp. text below after hire 'ti.— * R omits noi nev, leaving only the words na'tvit>d np:n rvr'aim. This is one of several evidences of wilful contraction by the copyist.— * EA men 'ti.— * EA insert vfdn. — " EA omit vrrsn. E has here rwowi tcni, and from what intervenes between these two words the following sentence is formed: rwaion na'cn wi rrnir'ti and put above after rveMM.i (perhaps from a correction in the margin); A has | indicating a disturbance in the text before him. — * A omits till the next vnr; the word seems redundant here. — * E has here rveMM.i, and continues till the next vnr; A omits rveMM.i. — * EA cttinai, R omits vnr. — " EA cttinai, R omits vnr.
After (E and Ed. O לֶאֹּבָה (E and Ed. O לֶאֹּבָה) 19 = text, except A לֶאֹּבָה; evidently לֶאֹּבָה, the abbreviation of לֶאֹּבָה, was read לֶאֹּבָה and as this gives no sense it was turned into לֶאֹּבָה in Ed. Ferrara. — 15 R רָדָה רַדֶּה; evidently לֶאֹּבָה, the abbreviation of לֶאֹּבָה, was read לֶאֹּבָה and as this gives no sense it was turned into לֶאֹּבָה in Ed. Ferrara. — 15 R רָדָה רַדֶּה; evidently לֶאֹּבָה, the abbreviation of לֶאֹּבָה, was read לֶאֹּבָה and as this gives no sense it was turned into לֶאֹּבָה in Ed. Ferrara. — 15 R רָדָה רַדֶּה; evidently לֶאֹּבָה, the abbreviation of לֶאֹּבָה, was read לֶאֹּבָה and as this gives no sense it was turned into לֶאֹּבָה in Ed. Ferrara. — 15 R רָדָה רַדֶּה; evidently לֶאֹּבָה, the abbreviation of לֶאֹּבָה, was read לֶאֹּבָה and as this gives no sense it was turned into לֶאֹּבָה in Ed. Ferrara. — 15 R רָדָה רַדֶּה; evidently לֶאֹּבָה, the abbreviation of לֶאֹּבָה, was read לֶאֹּבָה and as this gives no sense it was turned into לֶאֹּבָה in Ed. Ferrara. — 15 R רָדָה רַדֶּה; evidently לֶאֹּבָה, the abbreviation of לֶאֹּבָה, was read לֶאֹּבָה and as this gives no sense it was turned into לֶאֹּבָה in Ed. Ferrara. — 15 R רָדָה רַדֶּה; evidently לֶאֹּבָה, the abbreviation of לֶאֹּבָה, was read לֶאֹּבָה and as this gives no sense it was turned into לֶאֹּבָה in Ed. Ferrara. — 15 R רָדָה רַדֶּה; evidently לֶאֹּבָה, the abbreviation of לֶאֹּבָה, was read לֶאֹּבָה and as this gives no sense it was turned into לֶאֹּבָה in Ed. Ferrara. — 15 R רָדָה רַדֶּה; evidently לֶאֹּבָה, the abbreviation of לֶאֹּבָה, was read לֶאֹּבָה and as this gives no sense it was turned into לֶאֹּבָה in Ed. Ferrara. — 15 R רָדָה רַדֶּה; evidently לֶאֹּבָה, the abbreviation of לֶאֹּבָה, was read לֶאֹּבָה and as this gives no sense it was turned into לֶאֹּבָה in Ed. Ferrara. — 15 R רָדָה רַדֶּה; evidently לֶאֹּבָה, the abbreviation of לֶאֹּבָה, was read לֶאֹּבָה and as this gives no sense it was turned into לֶאֹּבָה in Ed. Ferrara. — 15 R רָדָה רַדֶּה; evidently לֶאֹּבָה, the abbreviation of לֶאֹּבָה, was read לֶאֹּבָה and as this gives no sense it was turned into לֶאֹּבָה in Ed. Ferrara. — 15 R רָדָה רַדֶּה; evidently לֶאֹּבָה, the abbreviation of לֶאֹּבָה, was read לֶאֹּבָה and as this gives no sense it was turned into לֶאֹּבָה in Ed. Ferrara. — 15 R רָדָה רַדֶּה; evidently לֶאֹּבָה, the abbreviation of לֶאֹּבָה, was read לֶאֹּבָה and as this gives no sense it was turned into לֶאֹּבָה in Ed. Ferrara. — 15 R רָדָה רַדֶּה; evidently לֶאֹּבָה, the abbreviation of לֶאֹּבָה, was read לֶאֹּבָה and as this gives no sense it was turned into לֶאֹּבָה in Ed. Ferrara. — 15 R רָדָה רַדֶּה; evidently לֶאֹּבָה, the abbreviation of לֶאֹּבָה, was read לֶאֹּבָה and as this gives no sense it was turned into לֶאֹּבָה in Ed. Ferrara. — 15 R רָדָה רַדֶּה; evidently לֶאֹּבָה, the abbreviation of לֶאֹּבָה, was read לֶאֹּבָה and as this gives no sense it was turned into לֶאֹּבָה in Ed. Ferrara. — 15 R רָדָה רַדֶּה; evidently לֶאֹּבָה, the abbreviation of לֶאֹּבָה, was read לֶאֹּבָה and as this gives no sense it was turned into לֶאֹּבָה in Ed. Ferrara. — 15 R רָדָה רַדֶּה; evidently לֶאֹּבָה, the abbreviation of לֶאֹּבָה, was read לֶאֹּבָה and as this gives no sense it was turned into לֶאֹּבָה in Ed. Ferrara. — 15 R רָדָה רַדֶּה; evidently לֶאֹּבָה, the abbreviation of לֶאֹּבָה, was read לֶאֹּבָה and as this gives no sense it was turned into לֶאֹּבָה in Ed. Ferrara. — 15 R רָדָה רַדֶּה; evidently לֶאֹּבָה, the abbreviation of לֶאֹּבָה, was read לֶאֹּבָה and as this gives no sense it was turned into לֶאֹּבָה in Ed. Ferrara. — 15 R R contracts the two names into לֶאֹּבָה; Neub. marks no difference from A; O A and E are different.
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This page contains a text in Hebrew with English annotations. The text is a passage from The Jewish Quarterly Review. The annotations are in the margin and include corrections and notes on the text. The page appears to be discussing a historical or literary topic, with references to biblical or rabbinic sources. The annotations provide context and clarify certain passages, indicating that the text is being studied for academic or scholarly purposes.
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The text appears to be a series of annotations or comments, possibly related to a historical or religious text. The annotations are written in a combination of Hebrew and Arabic script, with occasional Latin and Greek letters. The text is marked with various symbols and notations, indicating the presence of a critical edition or commentary. The content is dense and appears to be discussing details of an itinerary or journey, possibly of religious or historical significance.

The text is marked with numerous references to different editions and interpretations, suggesting that it is part of a scholarly discussion or study. The annotations are interspersed with symbols and abbreviations that denote different readings or interpretations of the text.

The overall tone of the text is scholarly and scholarly, with a focus on detailed analysis and commentary. The annotations are likely intended for readers with a strong background in religious or historical studies, given the complexity and density of the text.
In MS. BM follows here a piece that belongs earlier, viz.: beginning
p. 6 of Ed. Asher, last line, and ending p. 4; this is not due to misplacing of leaves of BM, for the straying piece is not on a separate leaf, nor does it begin and end at the first and last lines but distant from them; therefore the writer of BM must have had the misplacement before him. At the beginning of the errant piece he wrote on unconcerned, although the passage gives no sense; but here he endeavoured to produce some sense by inserting the words which are here put in brackets between the end of the stray piece and the resumption of the broken text, viz.: 

The words which occur both at the break of the text and at its resumption, and the mention of Yisrael, are suggested from the part immediately before the irruption, so that it seems that the copyist became aware of the misplacement and also of the place where the text had been interrupted.
TRANSLATION.

He built, on the other side of the river, on the banks of an arm of the Euphrates which there borders the city, a hospital consisting of blocks of houses and hospices for the sick poor who come to be healed. Here

1 A valuable work, *Bagdad during the Abbaside Caliphate, from Contemporary Arabic and Persian Sources*, appeared in 1900, written by Mr. Guy Le Strange, which helps to explain Benjamin's account of the Moslem metropolis. The Caliph Mansur in 762 selected it as the Capital of the Empire. Numerous references in the Talmud prove that a Jewish settlement was there long before. Mansur built a double-walled Round City two miles in diameter on the western side of the Tigris. It formed the nucleus of suburbs, which spread over both banks of the Tigris. A very fair idea of the metropolis may be obtained if we imagine the Round City as situated on the Surrey side of the Thames, having the "Elephant and Castle" for its centre. At this spot stood the great Mosque of Mansur, where the Friday services were held, and where the Caliph took a prominent part in the service on the Bairam, at the close of the Ramazan fast. The Round City being subject to periodical inundations, the government buildings were gradually transferred to the eastern side of the river. The Royal Palaces, in the grounds called the Harim, which were fully three miles in extent, occupied the site similar to that from Westminster to the City. At one time there were as many as twenty-three palaces within the royal precincts. The Caliph, when visiting the Mosque in state, left the palace grounds, and proceeded over the main bridge, corresponding to Westminster Bridge, along a road which in Benjamin's time led to the Bazzrah Gate quarter. At the close of the ceremony in the Mosque, the Caliph returned, crossing the Bridge of Boats, and proceeded to his palace by a road corresponding to the Thames Embankment. The members of his court and the nobles entered barges and escorted him alongside the river.

The Arab writers mention that certain palaces were used as state prisons, in which the Caliphs kept their nearer relations in honourable confinement. They were duly attended by numerous servants, and amply supplied with every luxury, but forbidden under pain of death to go beyond the walls. Lebrecht, p. 381, explains the circumstances under which the Caliph Moktafi imprisoned his brother and several of his kinmen. There were large hospitals in Bagdad: the one to which Benjamin alludes is the Birmaristan of the Mustansiriah, in Western Bagdad, which for three centuries was a great school of medical science. Its ruins, close to the present Bridge of Boats, are still to be seen. The reader must bear in mind that at the time when Benjamin visited Bagdad the Seljuk Sultans had been defeated, and the Caliphs stood
there are about sixty physicians' stores which are provided from the Caliph's house with drugs and whatever else may be required. Every sick man who comes is maintained at the Caliph's expense and is medically treated. Here is a building which is called Dar-al-Maristan, where they keep charge of all the demented people who become insane in the towns through the great heat in the summer, and they chain each of them in iron chains until their reason becomes restored to them in the winter-time. Whilst they abide there, they are provided with food from the house of the Caliph, and when their reason is restored they are dismissed and each one of them goes to his house and his home. Money is given to those that have stayed in the hospices on their return to their homes. Every month the officers of the Caliph inquire and investigate whether they have been restored to reason, in which case they are discharged. All this the Caliph does out of charity to those that come to the city of Bagdad, whether they be sick or insane. The Caliph is a righteous man, and all his actions are for good.

In Bagdad there are about 40,000 Jews, and they dwell in security, prosperity and honour under the great Caliph, and amongst them are great sages, the heads of Academies engaged in the study of the law. In this city there are ten Academies. At the head of the great Academy is the Rabbi R. Samuel the son of Eli. He is the head of the Academy Gaon Jacob. He is a Levite and traces his pedigree back to Moses our teacher. The head of the second Academy is R. Hanania his brother, warden of the Levites; R. Daniel is the head of the third Academy; R. Elazar the scholar is the head of the fourth Academy; and R. Elazar, the son of Zemach, is the head of the order, and his pedigree reaches to Samuel the prophet, the Korahite. He and his brethren know how to chant the melodies as did the singers at the time when the Temple was standing. He is head of the fifth Academy; R. Hisdai, the glory of the scholars, is head of the sixth Academy; R. Haggai is head of the seventh Academy; and R. Ezra the head of the eighth Academy; R. Abraham who is called higher than ever in power. They, however, took little interest in political affairs, which were left entirely in the hands of their viziers.

1 Asher and the other printed editions give the Jewish population at 1,000. Pethachiah makes the same estimate, which, however, is inconsistent with his statement, that the Head of the Academy had 2,000 disciples at one time, and that more than 500 surrounded him. The readings of the British Museum and Casanatense MSS. solve the difficulty; the word forty is inserted. It would be wearisome to specify in these notes all the places where a superior reading is presented by these MSS.; the student will, however, find that not a few anomalies which confronted Asher are now removed.
Abu Tahir is the head of the ninth Academy; and R. Sakkai, the son of Bostanai the Nasi, is the head of the Sium. These are the ten Batlanim, and they do not engage in any other work than communal administration; and all the days of the week they judge the Jews their countrymen, except on the second day of the week, when they all appear before the Rabbi Samuel, the head of the Yeshiba Gaon (Jacob), who in conjunction with the other Batlanim judges all those that appear before him. And at the head of them all is Daniel the son of Hisdai, who is styled "Our Lord the Head of the Captivity of all Israel." He possesses a book of pedigrees going back as far as David, King of Israel. The Jews call him "Our Lord, Head of the Captivity," and the Mohammedans call him "Saïda ben Daoud," and he has been invested with authority over all the congregations of Israel at the hands of the Emir al Mumenin, the Lord of Islam.

For thus Mohammed commanded concerning him and his descendants, and that the seal of office over all the holy congregations that dwell under his rule be given him, and that every Mohammedan or Jew, or one belonging to any nation in his dominion, should rise up before him (the Exilarch) and salute him, and that any one who should refuse to rise up should receive one hundred stripes.

And every fifth day when he goes to pay a visit to the great Caliph, horsemen, Gentiles as well as Jews, escort him, and heralds proclaim in advance "Make way before our Lord, the son of David, as is due unto him," the Arabic words being "Amilut an ta'lik Saïda ben Daoud." He is mounted on a horse, and is attired in robes of silk and embroidery with a large turban on his head, and from the turban is suspended a long white cloth adorned with a chain upon which the cipher of Mohammed is engraved. Then he appears before the Caliph.

1 The last or tenth Academy.
2 This appellation is applied in the Talmud to scholars who uninterruptedly apply themselves to communal work.
3 The first line of Exilarchs which ended with Hezekiah in the year 1040 traced their descent from David through Zerubbabel. Hisdai's pedigree must have been through Hillel, a female branch of the Royal line (see Grätz, vol. VI, note 10). Pethachiah writes (p. 19) that a year before his arrival at Bagdad Daniel died. A nephew, David, became Exilarch jointly with R. Samuel, the Head of the great Academy, whose authority over all the communities in Asia became paramount. Samuel had an only daughter, who was learned in the Scriptures and the Talmud. She gave instruction through a window, remaining in the house, whilst the disciples were below, unable to see her.
4 The office of Exilarch had but recently been revived, and the Mohammed here referred to may have been Mohammed El Moktafi, the Caliph Mostanshed's predecessor.
and kisses his hand, and the Caliph rises and places him on a throne which Mohammed had ordered to be made for him, and all the Mohammedan princes who attend the court of the Caliph rise up before him. And the Head of the Captivity is seated on his throne opposite to the Caliph, in compliance with the command of Mohammed to give effect to what is written in the law—"The sceptre shall not depart from Judah nor a law-giver from between his feet, until he come to Shiloh: and to him shall the gathering of the people be." And the authority of the Head of the Captivity extends over all the communities of Shinar, Persia, Khorasan and Saba which is Al Yemen, and Diar Kalach and all the land of Aram Naharaim (Mesopotamia), the dwellers in the mountains of Ararat and the land of the Alans¹, which is a land surrounded by mountains and has no outlet except by the iron gates which Alexander made, but which were afterwards broken. Here are the people called Alani. His authority extends also over the land of Siberia, and the communities in the land of the Togarmim unto the mountains of Asev and the land of Gurgan the inhabitants of which are called Gurganim who dwell by the river Gihon ², and these are the Girgarshi who

¹ The Alans throughout the Middle Ages occupied Georgia and the regions of the Caucasus. As to the Iron Gates which Alexander made, Yule in commenting on Marco Polo's text (Travels of Ser Marco Polo; edited by Sir Henry Yule, 3rd edition, London, John Murray, chap. iii) says that Benjamin was the first European traveller to mention this pass. Benjamin and Marco Polo both record the general belief current at the time that the Pass of Derbend was traversed by Alexander. It is still called in Turkish "Demis-Kapi" or the Iron Gate, and the Persians designate it "Sadd-i-Iskandar"—the Rampart of Alexander. Lord Curzon, however, in his valuable work Persia and the Persians, vol. I, p. 293, conclusively proves that the pass through which Alexander's army marched when pursuing Darius after the battle of Arbela could not have been at Derbend. Arrian, the historian of Alexander's expeditions, writes that the pass was one day's journey from Rages (the noted city mentioned in the Book of Tobit) for a man marching at the pace of Alexander's army. But Derbend is fully 500 miles from Rages. In Lord Curzon's opinion, confirmed by Spiegel, Droysen and Schindler, the Sirdara Pass, some forty miles from Teheran on the way to Meshed, must have been the defile which Alexander's army forced. I think it will be found that Marco Polo's geography is less reliable than that of Benjamin. In the third chapter referred to above, Marco Polo speaks of the Euphrates falling into the Caspian Sea.

² Probably the Oxus, called by the Arabs "Jaihun." Rabad I, a contemporary of Benjamin, speaks of the land of Gurgan in like terms in his Sefer Hakabalah.
follow the Christian religion. Further it extends to the gates of Samarkand, the land of Tibet, and the land of India. In respect of all these countries the Head of the Captivity gives the communities power to appoint Rabbis and Ministers who come unto him to be consecrated and to receive his authority. They bring him offerings and gifts from the ends of the earth. He owns hospices, gardens and plantations in Babylon, and much land inherited from his fathers, and no one can take his possessions from him by violence. He has a fixed weekly revenue arising from the hospices of the Jews, the markets and the merchants, apart from that which is brought to him from far-off lands. The man is very rich, and wise in the Scriptures as well as in the Talmud, and many Israelites dine at his table every day.

At the installation of the Head of the Captivity, he gives much money to the Caliph, to the Princes and the Ministers. On the day that the Caliph performs the ceremony of investing him with his authority, he rides in the second of the royal equipages, and is escorted from the palace of the Caliph to his own house with timbrels and fifes. The Exilarch appoints the Chiefs of the Academies by placing his hand upon their heads, thus installing them in their office. The Jews of the city are learned men and very rich.

In Bagdad there are twenty-eight Jewish Synagogues situated either in the city itself or on the other side of the Tigris; for the river divides the city into two parts. The great synagogue of the Head of the Captivity has columns of marble of various colours overlaid with silver and gold, and on these columns are sentences of the Psalms in golden letters. And in front of the ark are about ten steps of marble; on the topmost step are the seats of the Head of the Captivity and of the Princes of the House of David. The city of Bagdad is twenty miles in circumference, situated in a land of palms, gardens and plantations, the like of which is not to be found in the whole land of Shinar. People come thither with merchandise from all lands. Wise men live there, philosophers who know all manner of wisdom, and magicians expert in all manner of witchcraft.

Thence it is two days to Gazigan which is called Resen. It is a large city containing about 5,000 Jews. In the midst of it is the Synagogue of Rabah—a large one. He is buried close to the Synagogue, and beneath his sepulchre is a cave where twelve of his pupils are buried.

Thence it is a day's journey to Babylon, which is the Babel of old,

1 It is interesting to compare this account with that of the Installation of the Egyptian Nagid (J. Q. R., IX, p. 717).

2 This is a well-known sage, whose name often occurs in the Talmud.
that now lies in ruins thirty miles in extent. The ruins of the palace of Nebuchadnezzar are still to be seen there, but people are afraid to enter them on account of the serpents and scorpions. Near at hand within a distance of a mile there dwell 3,000 Israelites who pray in the Synagogue of the Pavilion of Daniel, which is ancient, and was erected by Daniel. It is built of hewn stones and bricks. Between the Synagogue and the Palace of Nebuchadnezzar is the furnace into which were thrown Hananiah, Mishael, and Azariah, and the site of it lies in a valley known unto all.

Thence it is five parasangs to Hillah, where there are 10,000 Israelites and four Synagogues; that of R. Meir, who lies buried before it; the Synagogue of Markeshisha, who is buried in front of it; also the Synagogue of Rab Seiri, the son of Chama, and the Synagogue of R. Mari; the Jews pray there every day.

Thence it is four miles to the Tower of Babel, which the generation whose language was confounded, built of the bricks called Agur. The length of its foundation is about two miles, the breadth of the tower is about forty cubits, and the length thereof two hundred cubits. At every ten cubits' distance there are slopes which go round the tower by which one can ascend to the top. One can see from

1 The Babel of Bible times was captured by Sennacherib; after stopping up a dam of the Euphrates, the country was placed under water and the city destroyed. Nebuchadnezzar restored the city, he also erected a magnificent palace for himself—the Kasr—also the Temple of Bel. Herodotus, Book I, chaps. 178-89, fully describes these edifices, and dwells upon the huge extent of the metropolis, which was estimated to have a circuit of fifty miles. Xerxes destroyed the city. Alexander the Great contemplated the restoration of Bel's Temple, but as it would have taken two months for 10,000 men to merely remove the rubbish, he abandoned the attempt. The ruins have been recently explored by Germana. The embankments which regulated the flow of the Euphrates and Tigris have given way, and at the present time the whole region round Babylon is marshy and malarious. In the words of Jeremiah, li. 43, "Her cities are a desolation, a sterile land, and a wilderness, a place wherein no man dwelleth."

2 The Valley of Dura mentioned in Daniel iii. 1 is here referred to. See Dr. Berliner's Beiträge zur Geographie und Ethnographie Babyloniens; also Layard's Nineveh and Babylon, p. 515.

3 Bereshith Rabba, chap. xxxviii, says the tower was at Borsippa, and the ruins here spoken of are probably those of the Birs Nimrud, fully described by Layard, Nineveh and Babylon, chap. xxii. p 496. He says: "The mound rises abruptly to the height of 198 feet, and has on its summit a compact mass of brickwork 37 feet high by 28 broad. . . . On one side of it, beneath the crowning masonry, lie huge fragments
there a view twenty miles in extent, as the land is level. There fell
fire from heaven into the midst of the tower which split it to its
very depths.

Thence it is half a day to Kaphri, where there are about 200 Jews.
Here is the Synagogue of R. Isaac Napcha, who is buried in front of
it. Thence it is three parasangs to the Synagogue of Ezekiel, the
prophet of blessed memory, which is by the river Euphrates. It
is fronted by sixty turrets, and between each turret there is a minor
Synagogue, and in the court of the Synagogue is the ark, and at
the back of the Synagogue is the sepulchre of Ezekiel. It is sur-
mounted by a large cupola, and it is a very handsome structure.
It was built of old by King Jeconiah, king of Judah, and the 35,000
Jews who came with him, when Evil-merodach brought him forth
out of prison. This place is by the river Chebar on the one side,
and by the river Euphrates on the other, and the names of Jeconiah
and those that accompanied him are engraved on the wall; Jeconiah
p. 67 at the top, and Ezekiel at the bottom. This place is held sacred
by Israel as a lesser sanctuary unto this day, and people come from a
distance to pray there from the time of the New Year until the
Day of Atonement. The Israelites have great rejoicings on these
occasions. Thither also come the Head of the Captivity, and the
Heads of the Academies. Their camp extends over a space of two
miles, and Arab merchants come there as well. A great gathering
like a fair takes place, which is called Fera, and they bring forth
a scroll of the law written on parchment by Ezekiel the Prophet,
torn from the pile itself. The calcined and vitreous surface of the
bricks, fused into rock-like masses, show that their fall may have been
caused by lightning. The ruin is rent almost from top to bottom. No
traces whatever now remain of the spiral passage spoken of by the
Jewish traveller." Cf. Professor T. K. Cheyne's article, "The Tower of
Babel," in the new Biblical Cyclopaedia. Nebuchadnezzar, in his Borsippe
inscription, records that the tower, which had never originally been
completed, had fallen into decay, and that the kiln-bricks had split.
These are the Agur bricks mentioned by Benjamin; cf. Isaiah xxvii. 9.
Al-ajur is the word still used by the Arabs for kiln-burnt bricks.

1 Niebuhr, vol. II, 216, gives a full account of his visit to the tomb.
Layard, speaking of Birs Nimroud, says: "To the south-west in the
extreme distance rise the palm-trees of Kifli, casting their scanty shade
over a small dome, the tomb of Ezekiel. To this spot occasionally flock
in crowds, as their forefathers have done for centuries, the Jews of
Bagdad, Hillah, and other cities of Chaldea.... It is now but a plain
building, despoiled of the ornaments and MSS. which it once appears to
have contained" (Nineveh and Babylon, p. 500). Alcharizi composed a
beautiful ode when visiting this tomb (chap. xxxv, also chap. 1).
and read from it on the Day of Atonement. A lamp burns day and night over the sepulchre of Ezekiel; the light thereof has been kept burning from the day that he lighted it himself, and they continually renew the wick thereof, and replenish the oil unto the present day. A large house belonging to the sanctuary is filled with books, some of them from the time of the first temple, and some from the time of the second temple, and he who has no sons consecrates his books to its use. The Jews that come thither to pray, from the land of Persia and Media, bring the money which their countrymen have offered to the Synagogue of Ezekiel the Prophet. The Synagogue owns property, lands and villages, which belonged to King Jeconiah, and when Mohammed came he confirmed all these rights to the Synagogue of Ezekiel. Distinguished Mohammedans also come hither to pray, so great is their love for Ezekiel the Prophet; and they p. 68 call it Bar (Dar) Melicha (the Dwelling of Beauty). All the Arabs come there to pray.

At a distance of about half a mile from the Synagogue are the sepulchres of Hananiah, Mishael, and Azariah, and upon their sepulchres are large cupolas; and at times of disturbance no man would dare touch the Mohammedan or Jewish servants who attend at the sepulchre of Ezekiel.

Thence it is three miles to the city of Kotsanath, where there are 300 Jews. Here are the sepulchres of Rab Papa, Rab Huna, Rab Joseph Sinai, and Rab Joseph ben Hama; and before each of them is a Synagogue where the Israelites pray every day. Thence it is three parasangs to Ain Siptha, where there is the sepulchre of the prophet.

---

1 This Mohammed, as in the case referred to p. 61, must have been a predecessor of the reigning Caliph, as the Prophet never was in Babylonia, and in no case would he have granted favours to the Jews. It should be noted that the British Museum MS. on which our text is based, as well as the Casanatense MS., generally style the Prophet מִכְהָן. The MS., on which the Constantinople editio princeps is based, had probably all passages where this epithet or other objectionable remarks were used excised by the censor, and it will be seen that the passage before us, with reference to the grant of land by Mohammed, as well as that on p. 69, referring to Ali, the son-in-law of Mohammed, do not appear in any of the printed editions. Dr. Hirschfeld is of opinion that, on the one hand, the epithet is the translation of the Arabic ماجح، a term against which Mohammed protested several times in the Koran, because it means possessed by a jinn, like a soothsayer. On the other hand, the word was chosen having regard to Hosea ix. 7. This was done long before Benjamin's time, by Jefeth and others.

Nahum the Elkoshite. Thence it is a day's journey to Kefar Al-Keram, where are the sepulchres of Rab Chisdai, R. Azariah, R. Akiba, and R. Dosa. Thence it is a half-day's journey to a village in the desert, where there are buried R. David and R. Jehuda and Abaji, R. Kurdiiah, Rab Sechora, and Rab Ada. Thence it is a day's journey to the river Raga, where there is the sepulchre of King Zedekiah. Upon it is a large cupola. Thence it is a day's journey to the city of Kufa, where there is the sepulchre of King Jeconiah. Over it is a big structure, and in front thereof is a Synagogue. There are about 7,000 Jews here. At this place is the large mosque of the Mohammedans, for here is buried Ali ben Abi Talib, the son-in-law of Mohammed, and the Mohammedans come hither . . . .

M. N. ADLER.

(To be continued.)
THE MENDELSSEHNIAN PROGRAMME.

The substance of Mr. Lucien Wolf's paper on the Zionist Peril printed in this Review (October, 1904) seems to be the thought that the great political and cultural achievements of Western Jews during the nineteenth century are in danger of receiving a setback at the hands of the Zionist dreamers. As I am not a follower of the Zionist heresy, it cannot be my object to defend the movement by refuting objections to it, or by presenting counter arguments in its favour. I have, however, a few thoughts on assimilationism which is the antithesis to Zionism, and which Mr. Wolf associates with the name of Mendelssohn. In the following pages I propose to show that the Mendelssohnian programme of assimilation, while it may have proved beneficial to the Jews, has been disastrous to Judaism, and that therefore the problem of the conservation of our religion is in need of another solution than the one afforded by the Mendelssohnian formula.

Assimilation, we are told, is not fusion. It must stop short of intermarriage. Eat and drink with your neighbour, go to the same schools, read the same books, take an active part in the communal and national life—only your daughter you shall not give unto his son, nor his daughter shall you take unto your son. The old rabbis knew human nature better when they apprehended that eating and drinking with our neighbour would lead to intermarriage; indeed, in proportion as the rabbinical bars have been let down, intermarriage has become more frequent. Assuming, however, that the tendency to intermarriage may be checked, what effect will continued
endogamy have upon the Jew and his relation to the outside world? It seems to me that the typical physical and mental Jewish traits will become still more prominent as generation follows generation, and thus accentuate the difference between Jew and non-Jew. But the Jewish physiognomy, it is maintained, even without the admixture of foreign blood, tends to approximate towards that of the environment. Granted that such a physiological approximateness exists, granted even that many of the traits acquired in the centuries of ghetto life will disappear, a minority refusing to coalesce with the majority must always be looked upon as alien. Just because the Jews are whites, their stubborn resistance to fusion must become a source of friction, even more so than in the case of the unassimilable black or yellow races. But the modern state, it is said, is built on economic, not theological-racial, lines. The citizens of a state may have a variety of interests in common without necessarily belonging to the same stock or sect. This is all quite true on the surface, but on the surface only. Wherever men live together, they will not merely transact business with one another, or accept office from one another. Business and civic association leads to social intercourse, and social intercourse leads to fusion. The state creates the nation, and the nation the race. Where a nation or a race is in the making, new elements are welcomed, or at least admitted, upon the tacit understanding that they will be absorbed. When the process of fusion is fairly well advanced, the unassimilable elements are recognized as such, and a race problem ensues. It is the cry of the anti-Semite that the Jew thrives best where the national consciousness is weak. So much, however, must be conceded that, if reference be had to material progress solely, the programme of assimilation has been beneficial to the Jews, and that life has become pleasanter than in the pre-Mendelssohnian era of general barbarization. Racial differences are most brutally expressed at the bottom,
and most keenly felt at the top. The large middle class is little disturbed by the social ban: the privileges of citizenship and the freedom of engaging in all the pursuits of life are no small blessing, unknown to the Jew of pre-emancipation times, so eagerly yearned for by our brethren in Eastern Europe.

At what cost to Judaism, however, has the Western Jew won these privileges? It is Riesser, I believe, who emphatically repudiated the thought that the religious reforms were being introduced for the purpose of justifying the demand of citizenship, maintaining that political equality was due to the Jews as an inalienable right, irrespective of the ritual of the synagogue, and that even to seem to barter away any portion of their religion for civic privileges were ignoble. The trend of affairs, however, from the days of Mendelssohn onward, shows that the Jews were preparing themselves for political and social (the one seemed to guarantee the other) emancipation by discarding of their own free-will those elements in their life which they regarded as non-essential to their religion, or as late and unwarranted accretions, and which, nevertheless, constituted a barrier to amalgamation. We need only mention the Judeo-German speech which was simply the result of seclusion in the ghetto, although, through association with things sacred, and through its devotional literature perused by the women and the unlettered, it had sunk deep into the Jewish soul. Suffice it to say that the things discarded, no matter how aesthetically repellent or whether originally foreign, were all elements of Jewish life, and that therefore with every such element of Jewish life which disappeared there likewise went a portion of Jewish consciousness. On all sides the aim was clearly the obliteration of differences. To be a Jew no longer meant to live like a Jew, but apparently to worship in the synagogue rather than in the church, and on Saturday rather than on Sunday. A distinction unknown in Jewry was created between the profession within the
synagogue and the life without. It was also assumed that the Christian neighbour was a Christian only on Sunday and just an ordinary citizen during the remainder of the week. Christian elements in the civic life were either ignored or else, divested of their religious significance, secularized. The movement was clearly centrifugal, away from the Jewish life, away from the Jewish past.

The leaders, long after the people had begun to solve in the line of least resistance the problem forced upon them by their sudden emersion from seclusion, supplied the formula. The dispersion, as Mr. Wolf so well puts it, must be accepted as, humanly speaking, an irrevocable fact. The prayers for the coming of the Messiah, the gathering of the dispersed, and the restoration of Jerusalem were cut out. The long-cherished hope of re-nationalization, the very backbone of the Jewish life for eighteen centuries, was declared void. The nation was pronounced dead. "Disband" was the watchword. Instead of a united Israel, there were now multitudinous débris awaiting incorporation into the larger and smaller nationalities of the world. On the grave of the defunct nation national Jewish churches were to rise. The reformers addressed themselves to the task of saving the religious side of Judaism by casting overboard its national features. They meant to conserve the Jewish religion by abandoning its old-time rigidity and by making it flexible to meet changed cultural conditions. The "spirit of the age," however, with its superfine aestheticism and chilling rationalism, seemed to consign Judaism, robbed of its anchorage in life and without a great hope to sustain it, to a slow, lingering death.

Historicism, characteristic of the nineteenth century as rationalism had been of the eighteenth, completed the dismantling of the disabled craft. Interesting and useful investigations were made into the beginnings of the Jewish sermon and the Jewish prayer, of Jewish law and Jewish belief, of Jewish sects, of Jewish customs, of Jewish life in
short; and scholars were so busy tracing the beginnings of things that they neglected the things themselves. It seemed as if, in order to forge weapons against the autonomy of the rabbis and their rigid system, the master minds of the newer Judaism bent their energies upon raising the dead and distant past with its laxities and uncertainties, its clash of opinions, its play of divers forces, its spontaneity and flexibility—in the place of the fixed and petrified result, the indefinite unfolding process. The whole fabric of Jewish life now seemed a bundle of disconnected facts, mere rags and tatters. Inconvenient beliefs, as that in the resurrection of the body, were charged to the credit of Parseeism, or some other foreign religion. The men at the helm believed that they were steering their ship into the safe haven of beginnings only in these latter days to find it pre-empted by Babylonians and Sumerians. Jewish consciousness, driven from life, retreated into the studies of a few learned rabbis who quite resolutely and not unsuccessfully combated the Christian estimate of Judaism as an inferior religion: the dispute turned not upon the live present, but upon the remote past, and was concerned with fine distinctions as to whether the hypocrite Pharisee was the rule, as the Christian scholars maintained, or the exception, as the Jews asserted.

The layman had neither the knowledge nor the desire to be drawn into all those feuds about distant periods of history. To him, if he was of the average, life was inexorable: sabbath observance proved an economic impossibility; a Jewish education for his children, beyond the mere rudiments, unprofitable and undesirable. And to those who belonged to the cultured classes the Christian estimate of their own religion came in their daily reading supplied by Christian writers; the Jewish refutations never reached them. And so they drifted still further away, mentally. And while they sometimes remained themselves nominal Jews, from habit or association or from less ignoble
motives, they had no scruples about leading their children to the baptismal font. *Sauve qui peut!* was the principle. For, on the continent of Europe, the emancipation, alas! remained incomplete: what was granted on paper was refused in life. And so we lost a host of men, our very best minds; by natural selection, we who have remained in the fold are on a fair way to becoming a most stubborn, but also a most mediocre, set of Jews.

And where, as in Anglo-Saxon countries, the open breach through apostasy has been rare, we are fast becoming paganized—not Christianized, mind you—from within. Our environment is only nominally Christian. Christianity is but the veneer; behind it is the ugly reality of unregenerate heathenism. The conversion of pagan Europe to the teachings of the Galilean Jew, begun nineteen centuries ago, is by no means carried to an end. Moreover, the movements which set in with the Renaissance have all had for their aim the resuscitation of classic paganism at the expense of Christianity. State and Church are divorced: while the Gospel is preached within the sacred edifices of Christendom, its spirit as well as its letter are flagrantly violated in the large life without. Take, for example, the glaring contradiction between the position of the Church on the divorce question and the utter disregard of it in the law courts of the state. Few of us Jews have had the opportunity of an acquaintance with Christian church life, and with truly Christian men and women. Most of us, in business or in society, come into contact with nominal Christians. From them comes that disintegrating influence upon our character. As the sorcerer of old, who, unable to curse Israel in the open, sought to ensnare her in the orgies of the Dionysiac cult, so to-day the materialism of the age has engulfed the nominal Jews, those who do and those who do not visit the synagogue (on the high holidays), who are given to a life of gain and pleasure, and are utterly devoid of the higher culture of mind and spirit. Our homes are un-Jewish. We raise our children in an un-
Jewish atmosphere. We surround them with no Jewish associations, no Jewish memories. The Jewish child of tenderest age is taught to lisp the name of Christ before it learns the holy name of God. I am referring to the widely spread celebration of Christmas in our homes. It is just the impressionable minds of babes that ought to be kept free for Jewish associations. And for the very reason that the Christmas celebration in Jewish households is stripped of its religious character which is given to it by our Christian neighbours, it means a step backward into paganism long suppressed by Christianity. Jewish youths and maidens are, moreover, sacrificed to the Moloch of material success and frivolity. Our Christian neighbours presumably amuse themselves; somehow, however, theatres, public eating-houses, summer resorts, are crowded by Jews. And just because these nominal Jews, who neither live nor think as Jews, by the sheer force of the social ban constitute in every community a compact society apart which is labelled "Hebrew" or "Jewish," modern Jewry, unhallowed by the glamour of a religious idea, unsustained by a spiritual hope, presents the sore spectacle of an ethnic aggregate of Jews according to the flesh, a prey to every fad and religious vagary ("Christian science," for instance), as well as to every disintegrating influence, themselves a disintegrating factor in the larger society of which they are a part.

And the attitude of this larger society is clearly and unmistakably one of hostility. If the state is, perhaps, constructed on economic lines, society is not. Unreasoned and unreasonable emotions wield a tremendous power for the very reason that they well up from the depths of the soul. Instinct, not reason, governs society. And instinct inexorably decrees fusion. It laughs at assimilation, which is never a perfect imitation, and therefore ludicrous. It tolerates least of all a vulgarity which has not the native stamp. It cares little for morals, and a great deal for manners. The Christian (?) clubman is not concerned with
fine and hair-splitting theological distinctions. He sees in
the Jewish organization, in spite of all its latitudinarianism,
an alien body. He will here and there recognize the
individual Jew as an exception, and he will demand, not in
so many words, but clearly enough to him who has ears to
hear, that that Jew sever his social connexions with his
Jewish brethren, in other words, renounce his Judaism.
What baptism does for the Jew on the continent, mere
renunciation of Judaism will accomplish in the Anglo-
Saxon countries, although affiliation with a Christian
religious body will facilitate matters, and is being resorted
to by the ultra-fashionables. For where, within Jewry
itself, the various synagogues of a community are so many
rungs on the social ladder, with the “Temple” on the top,
communion in the Unitarian or Episcopalian church confers
vastly superior social prestige.

And in proportion as our homes are paganized the
synagogue is secularized. The pulpit has been turned
into a lecture platform. Discussion has taken the place
of exhortation. The didactic tone predominates. It is
not soul thrilling soul, but mind addressing itself to mind,
and heart, perchance, appealing to heart. And where the
discourse turns away from the trivial, humdrum, un-heroic
personal moralities, it relapses into crypto-Zionistic appeals
to the race consciousness. The service, as a whole, lacks
atmosphere, and the note of piety and conviction is wanting.
Religion with us in these latter days, the progress in all
other domains notwithstanding, seems to have reverted
to its crudest beginnings—ancestor worship. We entomb
the mortal remains of our dead in costly mausoleums, and
spread a pall of dolorous mourning over our sabbaths and
holy days, the seasons of spiritual joy. The high holidays
are fast losing their significance; instead of days of penitence,
they are made into social functions, grand parades. The
eve of Atonement has become an occasion for the display
of finery in the pew, and of music (orchestral) in the choir,
and of oratory in the pulpit. The call to repentance is
wanting. The prayers are declaimed to a passive audience. The centre of the day's devotions is again the memorial service for the dead. Where pastor and flock meet but once a year, the discourse turns upon the communal and racial rather than upon the personal and human. And while the elders honour their religion by the sacrifice of one day, young Israel indulges in an excellent meal and such other pastime as may be at hand within the privacy of the Jewish club.

And what anarchy of thought in the utterances, oral and written, of our representatives! what lamentable lack of backbone in our leaders! Whatever vagary is pronounced by some Protestant divine who has perchance reasoned himself out of Christian doctrine is at once heralded from our pulpits and in our press as time-honoured teaching of Judaism. Judaism, it seems to me, is a tangible reality given over into the custody of the competent and well-informed; it is sufficiently determined by its original impetus and the mould into which it was cast in its early career to run a definite course throughout its history. Of course, it may be expanded within definite bounds, broadened through the assimilation of extraneous matter, but it cannot be deflected out of its natural course or purpose, if we may so say. The student of English knows what is English and what is not; what is a permissible innovation, and what may pass as English by a charitable stretch of the imagination, and what is simply a schoolboy's blunder and a solecism which is not English at all. And the student of Judaism equally knows how to distinguish between what may pass as Jewish and what is a religious solecism, perpetrated in sheer ignorance or quackery, or, like the argot of the street, picked up in the gutter of religious fads, which is not Jewish at all. Judaism is a system of doctrine and thought capable of definition: it competes with similar systems of thought, and clearly antagonizes others. That, however, which, unsystematically and as occasion demands, is proclaimed as Jewish teaching
by our spokesmen, is very frequently Jewish only because it is delivered by Jews to Jews, racially speaking.

It is high time that we call a halt to the centrifugal movement originating with Mendelssohn. I prefer for the purposes of this paper to place myself above the parties, and, from this higher position, I look upon Zionism as a timely counter-movement of a centripetal character. Never mind the dreams of a redeemed Zion and of the Judenstaat. Twentieth-century Jewry will, I believe, both in the East and West, settle down to an acceptance of the dispersion as, humanly speaking, irrevocable. So much of the Mendelssohnian doctrine has come to stay. The cry of the assimilationist, however, “Go out into the world!” will be reversed. “Go back to Judaism!” will be the watchword of the twentieth-century Jew. Or, if we combine the two, we may say: “Go out into the world—but come back as better Jews.” What Mr. Wolf designates as Jewish culture proceeding from Mendelssohn and his disciples, was in reality non-Jewish culture possessed by Jews. Not culture for the Jews, but Jewish culture, must become our aim in the future—that culture which, while absorbing the best that the human mind has produced everywhere, and that our environment may offer, shall be strong enough to reject that which is a deadly poison, and keep only what it may take up into its system as a vitalizing and energizing force. There were assimilationists in Alexandria who coquetted with Hellenic culture, and persuaded themselves that the divine Plato borrowed his wisdom from the divine Lawgiver. What a pity, some one has said, that the seventy who rendered the Law into Greek did not at the same time take back with them a Hebrew translation of Plato! The Mendelssohn of Alexandrian Jewry was that fine exemplar of wisdom and piety, of the culture of both mind and soul, Philo the Jew. Like Mendelssohn, he also remained loyal to the Jewish cause, and, although he expounded the entire law in a symbolical manner, was faithful in his observance of the
ceremonial laws, abstaining from forbidden food and the like. And just as Mendelssohn's own family chose the more direct road, by baptism, of entering Christian society, so did Philo's own nephew, Tiberius Alexander, the banker's son, so thoroughly Romanize himself that he was made procurator of Judea, and during the Jewish war acted as adviser in the Roman camp against his own people. In the sequel the Jewish colony of Alexandria was absorbed by the new sect which dressed up the simple faith of the Jew in the pretentious garb of Greek metaphysics, by no means scorning the Philonian contribution. Quite different was the Jew of Mohammedan Spain who, abreast of the movements of the day, at home in the literature of the Arabs, an adept of science and a serious thinker, realized through it all that Hellenic wisdom produced blossoms, but no fruit, and that it behoved him to follow the good old road of Jewish tradition rather than the devious paths of foreign sophistry; he accordingly refused to lose himself in his environment, and created that exquisite Jewish culture which stands matchless in our history.

A generation ago in this country "conservative" meant hats on, more Hebrew, the second holiday; and "radical" hats off, English, the Sunday sabbath, &c. To-day "conservative" should mean something else than the etiquette or language or time of the service. To counteract those disintegrating influences which corrupt our character and threaten our very existence, such must be the meaning of true conservatism, the conservatism of to-day and not of yesterday. Hats on or off, Hebrew or English, Saturday or Sunday—what do these ritualistic quarrels signify in the face of the graver dangers of to-day? I know only of one radical Jew in history, Paul of Tarsus; all the rest of us are conservatives. The aim of the Reform movement in the nineteenth century was from its very start conservative. It meant, while it relaxed its hold upon the peripheral positions, to conserve the centre at all hazards. We shall probably still differ as to what is essential and what is
not. And some will seek to persuade us that the essentials cannot be defended unless the line of defence is widened and ramparts are erected on all sides. Before the citadel of our faith is reached, there must be outer forts. Certain it is that the negative, destructive aspect of our reformation is, among the younger generation, not raised in the atmosphere of German iconoclasm, giving way in this country to a positive, constructive, conservative attitude. Those who in Detroit (Conference of 1903) voted in favour of the maintenance of the traditional sabbath, and who constituted the majority, were for the most part young men who freely admitted that the Sunday sabbath had proved a failure.

We must seek to strengthen the Jewish consciousness and bring back the Jewish life which has almost disappeared. There must be less of convenience, and more of duty; less wavering, and more firmness; less doubt, and more conviction. We must not be ashamed of Judaism, nor hide ourselves with it, nor apologize for it. If we mean to remain loyal to our religion, let us not put a lukewarm construction upon such loyalty, but be very earnest about it. Our homes must be opened wide to Jewish influences and Jewish associations. The board about which we gather must once more be hallowed by prayer and thanksgiving. The sabbath eve cheer must be revived and the queen sabbath re-enthroned, in the home at all hazards. A tone of seriousness must enter our households, and frivolity disappear from them; our very mirth must be softened and subdued. The "Hebrew School" must be reopened. Our Saturday and Sunday sessions are not sufficient for building up in our children a strong Jewish consciousness. Every Jewish boy and girl should be taught to read the Scriptures in the original. Daily sessions, an hour or two after school-hours, are an imperative necessity. Those of maturer age must be organized into clubs for study along Jewish lines. The synagogue must be open daily—not in order to be turned into a concert- or lecture-hall, but to be used for legitimate, serious, Jewish purposes.
There is no reason why the merchant or the wage-earner should not give a half-hour in the morning and a half-hour in the evening to his devotions, on his way to and from his place of business. The pulpit must be reconsecrated and devoted exclusively to its own purposes. We have a multitude of able and eloquent preachers; let us have, in the larger centres at least, thoroughly trained and competent leaders of Jewish thought, men who shall give their time and energy to serious meditation, and who, by the wisdom of their judgment, the weight of their scholarship, the breadth of their culture, the holiness of their life, shall inspire confidence in their counsel and guidance. The world admires individuality, character, colour. The Jew who will be firm enough to be himself will command respect, and the rabbi who will be firm enough to be the Jew will command attention.

The pure historicism which tears up but does not build, which places a relative value upon all events in history, and discerns absoluteness nowhere, which, perchance, knows the beginnings of movements but not their ends, which, in short, seeks for cause and neglects the meaning, must be given up. Jewish doctrine must be reformulated, restated in the terms of all the newer knowledge—not capitulate to every pseudo-science and pseudo-philosophy, but hold its own and defend its position with the weapons which true science and true philosophy will readily furnish. The Jewish creed is, after all, very simple. "All this is everlasting true and established with us, that he is the Lord our God, and there is none beside him, and we are Israel his people." One God, man created in his image, and Israel his anointed servant—such is the sum of our religion, upon which all the rest is but a commentary. The One God is necessarily a holy, spiritual being, inhabiting eternity and diffusing his glory throughout the world, its King and Sovereign. Man, created in the image of God, can never stray altogether away from his Maker, with whom he may commune in prayer, and who, though a
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stern Judge, is also a loving, forgiving Father, who causes his children to share in his own everlasting life. Israel, the chosen servant of God, his prophet and apostle, is at once the organ of divine revelation and the redeemer of mankind, by whose agency the kingdom of God shall come, and about whom all humanity shall unite in acknowledging the sovereignty of the divine will. In Israel the divine presence indwells; through Israel the divine purpose is to be realized. Israel's prerogative is a high one, but so also her duty. She must conquer the world for the kingdom of God. Such is the meaning of her dispersion; such that of her martyrdom. She is the Mother-Church founded by God—like him in and for the world, but not of it. She must lend no ear to the allurements of the hour, her eye fixed upon her future triumph, her mind dwelling upon that day on which she accepted the priesthood of the Most High. The Roman Catholic Church answered the hostile movements of the nineteenth century with the dogma of the infallibility of her head. Israel, with equal firmness, must meet the Anti-Semitism of the day with the unequivocal reaffirmation of her divine election.

The centrifugal tendencies of the assimilationist programme have resulted in placing our corporate existence in a condition ad interim waiting for the last man to desert us. "I shall not die, but live!"—in these ancient words the newer formula expresses itself. We shall live, not as stragglers behind the movements of the world, nor as counterfeits of the world's realities, nor as footnotes to the world's texts. We shall live in a world of thought of our own making, for the sake of which alone Providence has ordained that we continue our separate existence. We shall live the Jewish life, for which we must be prepared to make sacrifices, believing as we do that only through that life may we find favour in the sight of God and man, and realize whatever potencies there lie in us as children of God.

Max L. Margolis.

Berkeley, Cal., U. S. A.
ALLGEMEINE EINLEITUNG IN DIE JÜDISCHE LITERATUR DES MITTELALTERS.

(Concluded from Vol. XVII, p. 369.)

ANHANG A.

LITERATUR, QUELLEN.

Hier folgen in der Regel nur die blossen Titel (selten eine Bemerkung dazu) der bereits benutzten Schriften mit Anschluss der aus der letzten Zeit zu meiner Kenntnis gelangten und beachtenswert erschienenen, nach den Hauptrubriken und untergeordneten Gesichtspunkten der Einleitung, chronologisch geordnet; jedoch sind die Schriften eines Autors stets unter der ersten zusammenge stellt mit Ausnahme von Rubrik VII.


I. SOCIALES.

a. SKLAVEREI (S. 309).


2. Mielsiner. Das Verhältnis der Sklaven etc. . . . 1859 (auch englisch?).


Es versteht sich von selbst, dass ich manches nur aus Catalogen und Citaten, also mitunter unvollständig, angemerkt habe, namentlich aus den allerletzten Jahren, in welchen diese Einleitung zum Abdruck kam.— Format 8° ist nicht angegeben.

1
6. Slavery among Hebrews (American Jews’ Annual 1885?).
7. Grünfeld, R. Die Stellung der Sklaven bei den Juden nach bibl. u. talmudischen Quellen ... 1886 (38 S.).
8. Winter, J. Die Stellung der Sklaven bei den Juden etc. nach talmud. Quellen ... 1886.

b. GEMEINDEWESEN (S. 310).

c. SOCIALISMUS.


II. RECHT (S. 314).

(Eherechts unten Abt. III.)

2. **Maschow.** De iuribus Iudaearum. Wittenb. 1684, 4°.
7. (**Anonymus.**) Mos. peinl. Recht ... Braunschweig u. Hildesheim 1778.
15. **Frankel, Z.** Der gerichtliche Beweis nach talmudischem Recht. Berlin 1846.
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55° THE JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW

41. Nathanel. Das bibl.-thalmud. Recht ... 1888.
47. — Das mos.-thalm. Strafgerichtsverfahren. 1901.

(Anhang zu “The Hebrew Union Coll.” Systematisch, aber nicht historisch; Quelle: babyl. Talmud.)
56. **Mielsiener, M.** The rabbinical law of hereditary succession. 4*, Cincinnati (1901 ?).


(Die Behauptung, dass das jüd. Recht nicht von andern beeinflusst worden sei, wird von N. M. Nathan (Oriental. Litztg. 1903, Col. 129) mit Recht zurückgewiesen.)


(Max Eschelbacher, Monatsschr. 1903, S. 181–192, weist nach, wie der Verfasser durch Mangel an Rücksicht auf die jüd. Prozessordnung das Hehlertum als im jüd. Rechte geltend annimmt.)


III. FRAUEN (S. 316).

a. EHE.

8. Duschak, Mor. Mosaisch-talmud. Eherecht. Wien 1864 ; vergl.:

b. STELLUNG UND ANSEHEN.

(Uber die Literatur s. Hebr. Bibliogr. XIX, 9-8a, Letterbode XII, 49; Charakteristik des deutschen Mittelalters, bei Zunz, Zur Gesch. S. 172-3.)
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22. — "Oholiba." 1863.


27. **Carronge (?)**, A. La femme dans l'Ancien Testament. Thèse. Montauban 1897 (74 pp.).


31. **Passigli, Ugo.** La donna ebreo. Trieste, typogr. Morterra, 1899 (18 p.). (Estratto dal Corriere israelitico, anno XXXVII.)

32. **Aguilar, Gr.** Les femmes d'Israël etc. Traduit par A. Marsdon. Paris 1900.

33. **Block, Isaac.** Le judaïsme et la femme. Nancy 1901 (20 p.).

34. **Cleave, L.** Woman and Moses. London 1902.

IV. GEBRÄUCHE (S. 317).

a. ALLGEMEINES

2. Recueil des lois, coutumes et usages observés par les Juifs de Metz. Traduit (1742). (Rev. Ét. J., XII, 288.)
11. Epstein, A. Die Wormser Minhagbücher. (In Gedenkbuch Kaufmann 1900.)
12. Büchler, A. Sitten und Gebräuche in Ofen. (Ungarisch in Geschichte der Juden in Pest 1901.)

(Tel est le titre de la couverture, mais à l'intérieur on lit: "Étude des mœurs actuelles des Israélites de Tlemcen, précédée d’une notice complète sur Rabbenon Ephraim Al-Nagoua, dit le Rab., etc." Rev. Ét. J. 45, 148.)


1 Die alten סדרים, auch jüdisch-deutsch, mehr liturgisch, in einer Menge von Ausgaben (Catal. Bodl. etc.), sind hier übergangen.
b. Besonderes.

14. Wibel, Jo. Chr. Erklärung über die bei den Juden gewöhnliche Benennung einer Hochzeit "Brauloft". (Früh aufgelesene Früchte 1738, Bd. 3, S. 93.)


(Begräbnis- und Trauer-Gebräuche.)


23. Hoffmann, J. C. De pietate gentilium et Ebraeor. in defunctos. s.l. 1757, 4°.
32. Rothschild, A. Unsterblichkeitsglaube und Auferstehungsglaube kein Hindernis für Feuerbestattung. (In Jüd. Literaturbl. n. 34, XXII. Jahrg. 1893.)
34. Andrat, L. Le culte des morts chez les Hébreux. Nîmes 1895 (54 pp.).

V. BILDUNG UND ERZIEHUNG1 (S. 320).

(Die Aufzählung von Autoren bei Fürst, im Litbl. VIII, 102 A, 196-7 (=Literaturgesch. S. 66 ?) ist ein Abdruck aus Wolf, Bibl. hebr.,

---


5. *Zornii, Petri.* Diss. de scholis publicis quas antiqui Judaei etc. Ploenae 1716.
14. *Norrelius, Andreas.* Diatyposis Academiarum apud Hebraeos in qua tituli multitudines docentium ... memorantur etc. Upsala 1746. (ZfHB. 1900, S. 14, n. 298, u. 1904, S. 30.)
16. — Progr. quo discipulorum sap. hebr. virtutes ex capitis Patrum recensentur ... ib. 1755.


30. Rapaport, S. L. דְּרָכָה הָעָמִד וְעָלַת הָעָמִד. (In der Zeitschrift ¥ 5, Wien 1874, S. 195.)
32. Astruc, A. L’enseignement chez les anciens juifs. (Separat-Abzug ?) 1881 (30 S.).
34. Strassburger. Geschichte der Erziehung und des Unterrichts nebst Bibliographie der jüdischen Pädagogik. Stuttgart 1885. (Besprochen von mir in Deutsche Litztg. 1886, S. 149.)

37. Wiesen, J. Geschichte und Methodik des Schulwesens im talmudischen Altertum. Strassburg 1892 (VI und 49 S.).


(Ein populärer Vortrag, welcher die Eigentümlichkeit und Entwicklung der Lehranstalten nicht systematisch erschöpft, sondern durch Sentenzen und Anekdoten charakterisiert, im Ganzen mehr die Tendenz als die Formen und Einrichtungen der Anstalten ins Auge fasst. S. 68 wird ein Aberglaube, welcher in zufällig von Kindern geäußerten Versen Divinisationen sah (Kledomantie, a. Bouché-Leclercq, “La Divination dans l’Antiquité”) als “sinnreiche Deutung” dargestellt. S. 74 wird der 119. Psalm als das “poetische Programm” der altjüdischen Schule bezeichnet, ohne anzudeuten, dass er eine Compilation sein dürfte.)


VI. KUNST.

a. MUSIK (S. 325)¹.


3. Der Talmud über Schauspiel, Musik und Gesang. (Ben Chananja 1861, S. 37.)


7. Ackermann. (In Winter und Wünsche, Die jüd. Lit. Bd. 3, Trier 1896; s. meine Anzeige in Deutsche Litztg.)


14. Allgemeine Regeln über Musik, מחтемישפוק, enthieilt MS.
16. Stellen aus verschiedenen Schriften habe ich mitgeteilt in Gräber's Beth Ozar ha-Safrut 1887, S. XXVII ff.; nämlich (a) aus Saadia's Buch der Religionen, nach der anonymen Paraphrase; (b) aus Abraham Bar Chijja, Megillat ha-Megalle (nicht in MS. München 10) nach Jakob b. Chajjim; (c) Jesaia b. Isak, Commentar zu Avicenna's Canon.

b. DENKMÄLER UND INSCHRIFTEN (S. 327).

5. Description des objets d'art religieux hébr., de la collection de...
15. Gaster, M. Hebrew illustrated Bibles of the ninth and tenth centuries and a Samaritan scroll of the law of the eleventh century, together with eight plates of fasc &c. Published for the first time. London 1902.
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Ét. J. XLV, pp. 112, 132. (Die Figuren ohne Kopfbedeckung in der Haggada lassen einen nichtjüd. Künstler vermuten.)


24. Hildenfinger, Paul. La Figure de la Synagogue dans l'art du moyen âge. In Rev. Ét. J. XLVII, 1903, pp. 47, 187.


(Beginnt mit der Haggada von Sarajewo und deren Datierung, kennt nicht meine der Orient. Litttg. 1898 n. 10 (auch Sonderabdruck) gegebenen Gründe für eine spätere Zeit.)


c. MÜNZMEISTER, MÜNZEN, MEDAILLEN.

1. Ein Jude wird im XIII. Jahrh. zum Inspektor der Münzen an der Kasse angestellt. (Gutachten von Navavi bei Goldsieber, Rev. Ét. J., XXVIII, 94.)

2. Juden als Minenarbeiter im XVI. Jahrh. (P. Grünebaum in Rev. Ét. J., XXVII, 125.)


5. Elias Lazarus Zacharias und dessen Bruder Abraham waren 1738 Münzmeister in Schlesien. (L. Geiger, Ztschr. IV, 196.)


9. **Schwab, M.** Über eine Münze der Sammlung Strauss, in Jerusalem geprägt, berechnet 1241 (wahrscheinlich ist bloß das Wort יבנוה nach יבנה zu zählen, also 1697). In Rev. Ét. J. XXIII, 1892, p. 137.


**VII. GRABSCRIFTEN (Jahrg. XVII, 374).**

Ich habe geglaubt, die Bibliographie der Grabscrifen so vollständig als möglich zu geben, wobei ich mir nicht verhehle, dass mir kleinere Mitteilungen, besonders in Zeitschriften, entgangen sein werden. Wichtige und umfassende Schriften sind teilweise charakterisiert oder eingehend besprochen, teilweise durch Citate, minder bedeutende oder mir nicht zugängliche Nachrichten durch bloße Angabe des Ortes erledigt.

Ich stelle unter a. die Schriften zusammen, welche nicht auf einen einzelnen Ort beziehen, wie die unter b. folgenden, bei denen der Ort zuerst in Parenthese angegeben ist.
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a. Allgemeines.

1. *Nicolai, J.* De sepulchris Hebraeorum etc. Lugd. Bat. 1706, 4°.
   (Mit Abbildungen und Karten.)

1a. *Pinner, M.* Melchior Cabrera und Rebhunel Abraham, Grabdenkmale von
   Rabbinern und berühmten Männern in Europa und dem heil.
   Lande. Berlin 1861 (im unvollendeten Cataloge).

2. *Goldziher, Ign.* Der Mythos bei den Hebräern 1876, S. 337 ff.,
   enthält einiges über “Grabesorte” bei Hebräern u. Muham-
   medanern.

3. *Longperier* im Journal des Savants 1874, p. 648 (auch in *Œuvres de*
   Longperier par M. Schlumberger t. VI, p. 112).
   (Gibt ein Referat über “Inscriptions de la France par F. de
   Guithery.” Es ist ihm fast nichts von dem bekannt, was in HB.
   V, 1862, S. 51 über Paläographisches in Firkowitsch, Abne Sikkaron
   und die Krim’schen Inschriften (angeblich aus dem 7. Jahrh.)
   herangebracht ist.)

   Roma 1878 (s. HB. XXI, 93).

5. *Chwolsohn, D.* Corpus inscriptionum Hebr., enthaltend Grab- und
   Inschriften . . . mit 4 photogr. u. 2 prototyp. Tafeln. Petersb.
   1882, Fol. (527 S., HB. XXI, 124).

6. *Clermont-Ganneau.* Épigraphes hébr. et grecques sur les ossuaires
   juifs inédits. Paris 1883.
   (S. D. Kaufmann, Göttinger Gelehrte Anz. 1886, S. 144; cf. H. De-
   renbourg, Elasar le Paitan, Rev. Ét. J. XII, 1887, p. 437; Einstein,
   Monatschr. 1887, S. 536.)

7. Über die symbolischen Figuren in jüd. Katakomben in Italien s.
   *S. Kruus,* Zur Katakombenforschung. In Festschrift Berliner
   1893, S. 204-14.
   (Die Bedeutung des Lulab (Palme) als Siegeszeichen (S. 209,
   211) ist unwahrscheinlich. Die Frage nach dem heidnischen
   Ursprung der Katakomben (S. 212) ist interessant.)

8. *Gänzburg, David de.* Études épigraphiques (bezieht sich auf
   verschiedene Grabschriften). In Rev. Ét. J. XVIII, 1889,
   pp. 312-18.

9. In einer im Jahre 1900 entdeckten Grabsöhle zu Jerusalem fand
   man in griech. (u. aräm.) Schrift griech. Namen: Erotario,
   Protas, Papos (so). In Jerusalem, VII, Heft 3, 1900, S. 256.

10. *Büchner, A.* L’Enterrement des Criminels d’après le Talmud et le

b. Locales.


24. (Znaim) In הלחם 1863, S. 114, angeblich aus den Jahren 5073, 5173 (HB. VI, 128).
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und bei Pressel, Geschichte der Juden in Ulm, 1873, S. 1 u. 25 (HB. XVIII, 126 Nichts von Grabschriften).


32. (Überlingen) Löwenstein, L. Geschichte der Juden am Bodensee etc. Gailingen 1879, S. 107 ff.; s. HB. XIX, 77.


34. (Tlemcen) Weil, M. Le Cimetière israél. de Tl. Avignon 1881 (12 u. 1 S.).


44. (ALGER) Bock, J. Grabschriften in Algier (französisch). 1888.
47. (SCHLESIEN) Brann, M. Alte jüdische Grabsteine in Schlesien. (Im Jüdischen Volkskalender für 5650 [1890].)

63. (PRESSBURG) Weiss, Isak, oder S. אלבֵי הַיָּהָהוֺ, 2 Teile: (1) Grabschriften, (2) Kurze Biographien der Gelehrten Press- burgs. Paks 1900 (11, 86 u. 1 Bl.).
64. (TARENT) Grabschriften im Museum von T. In J. Q. R. XIV, 1900-1, p. 111. (Nach p. 114 Griechisches aus d. III. Jahrh.)


   (Die Verf. benutzen nicht die Literatur der neuen Zeit, auch nicht die des Catal. Bodl. — Voranging ein Artikel in Narodni Politica 1902.)


   (Der Wert dieser Grabschriften besteht darin, dass sie das vermeintliche Alter anderer widerlegen. Die indischen, im Marathi Dialect mit Sanskritlettern, aus d. Jahre 1852 ff. zeigen, wie die Juden auch im Osten die Landessprache in ihre Friedhöfe einführen.)

76. **(Madrid.)** Grabschriften aus einem MS., bei H. Derenbourg, Notes critiques sur les manuscrits arabes de la Bibliothèque Nationale de Madrid. Paris 1904 (pp. 48).


VIII. SPRACHEN (XVI, 380).
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a. CHALDAISCH (S. 385).


6. Jastrow, M. A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud etc. London 1903.


b. GRIECHISCH (S. 380).


c. Persisch (S. 736).

verkenne, dass einige Nummern ebenso gut, einige vielleicht noch besser, in eine andere Gruppe einzureihen wären; eine so geringe Aufzählung wird derjenige, der sich näher dafür interessiert, schnell durchlaufen.

1. Autoren.


(Dasselbe hebräisch scheint von David Melammed Chefsz, Jerus. 1877, 40 Bl. 12°, bei Luncz, Luach E. J. VII, 93.)

7. Schahin min J-nNB'mc Commentar (richtiger Versification) des Pentateuchs, herausg. von Simeon Hakam, bisher Genesis in 2 Teilen. Jerusalem 1902. (Das Datum für den Verf. lautet בּוֹמַת הָמָא 2 וְאָכָשְׁוּ הָלָאָלָא הָוּכָי.)

2. Bibel.


    Dasselben Verfassers Psalmübersetzung besprach Éthée in Literatur-Bl. f. orient. Philol. I, S. 186 ff.\(^1\)

\(\text{7 a. ITALIENISCH (S. 745).}\)


\(\text{b. SPANISCH (S. 750).}\)

    Über das Jüdisch-Spanische als Beitrag zur Aufhellung der Ausprache des Altepanischen. (Romanische Studien, hrsg. von Böhmcr, 1878.)


    (Antoine de Montoro, geb. 1404 in Montoro, Provinz Cordova, war

\(^1\) Fleischer's Edition der Erzählung der Märtyrerin Suleika ist aus ZDMG. abgedruckt in den kleineren Schriften derselben, III (1888), 425.
Jude [Rafael Ramiro de Avellanoy su testamento, Madrid 1900].


In Proben jüdisch-deutsch. Übersetz. der 5 B. M. S. XXVII–VIII ist von einem Pentateuch 1489 bei Dubno die Rede! (De Rossi, Varr. Lect. p. cxxx, n. 51.)

ANHANG B.

Berichtigungen und Zusätze. (Einiges von Rabb. Dr. Felix Perles in Königsberg Mitgeteilte ist mit P. bezeichnet.)

VOL. XV.


P. 311. Literatur der Statuten, s. meine Miscelle 45: Statuten, in ZfHB. VIII, 1904, p. 124.
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P. 313, letzte Zeile. Gen... lies Deuteron.

P. 314, B: Recht, in Bezug auf Originalität dem römischen Recht gegenüber. — Fasel's Schriften bieten keine historische Entwicklung, erörtern aber gewisse Grundbegriffe und vergleichen die Anschauungen Anderer. Auch Frankel betrachtet den Talmud als ein Ganzes.


Der Socialist Arthur Ruppin: Die Juden der Gegenwart, Berlin 1904 (eine ernste Studie, die viel Wahres darthut), betrachtet den Talmud, "seine scharfsinnige Klügelei und haarspaltende Dialektik der eigenartigen Geistesbeanlagung der Juden entsprechend"
(S.121): die jüdische Rasse(!) charakterisirt radikales Denken. Bezeichnend heisse die Methode des Talmuds "Pīpūl (Pfefferung)." Herr R. hatte besser gethan, diese komische Etymologie zu unterdrücken. Pfeffer und Disputation sind scharf; Spr. 27, 17 wird bekanntlich auf die Gelehrten angewendet.

P. 322, Z. 14 v. u. lies נבריא.


**VOL. XVI.**


P. 391. Über יהלום נב נב ותניא at meine Arab. Lit. der Juden S. 277, n. 33, dazu MS. Bodl. 2333 und 2494 (letzteres ist im Index, p. 1013 nachzutragen); s. auch Gaster's Introduction zu seiner Ausgabe, p. 10.


P. 739, v. Z. ließ ωτη.


P. 752, Z. 12 v. u. lies: Jacob b. Machir, d. i. Profatius, s. unten zu XVII, 368.


1 Die “Testamente” (Wisaja) seien “ohne Zweifel” christlichen Ursprungs. Allein nur die arabische Bezeichnung, wie die hebräische (נשא) des (letztwilligen) “Befehls” vermittelt das Testament; das Alter hebräischer sogen. Testamente ist noch nicht ermittelt.


**VOL. XVII.**


P. 368, Z. 6, Jakob b. Machir (oben zu XVI, 752) wird von Carmoly zum Dekan der Universität Montpellier ernannt, was unberufene Redner weiter verbreiten, s. ZfHB. VIII, 156.
Inhaltsübersicht:

303. Nationalität.
304. Geographische Bestimmungen.
305. Religiöse Entwicklung.
308. Politische Verhältnisse.
311. Cultur:
314. Das Gute.
320. Das Wahre.
323. Das Schöne.
Bd. XVI, p. 320, XVII, p. 734. Sprache.
354. Der Kampf zwischen Haggada und Philosophie.

M. Steinschneider.
THE TALMUDICAL PARTICLE

In the Jewish Quarterly Review, XVII, 270, the editor of the Genizah Fragments remarks with regard to the word standing on line 9 הלב: "read הלב נ". This emendation is not necessary. For the spelling is not only legitimate, it is even the more original. In a codex of the Munich Library, which belongs to the oldest Talmud MSS. and contains the Tractates Pesachim, Yoma, and Chagiga, the Particle in question is in most cases written הלב. Rabbinowicz, who cites this fact, thinks that arose from הלב (Dikduke Soferim, VI, Introd., p. 1). But this does not well express the meaning of the Particle. We may rather find in the Fragment of Tractate Kerithoth (written in 1123), edited by Schechter and Singer, the true explanation of הלב, written also, and commonly, הוואל כב הלב ("since it is so"; therefore). From this we could get quite as well הלב. I have called attention to this circumstance in J. Q. R., IX, 147 f. Subsequently Harkavy published in the Hebrew periodical סמואחז המשור (1896), p. 95, a portion of Hai Gaon’s Dictionary, in which Hai gives it as a fact that the Talmud shortened הוואל כב הלב into the single word הלב (or הלב). Cf. my book, Die älteste Terminologie der jüd. Schriftauslegung (1899), p. 38. Moreover, in the Fragments edited by Ginzberg the form is also found on p. 271, l. 4.

Budapest.

W. BACHER.

NOTE TO J. Q. R., XVII, 279, l. 9.

Instead of הלב read הלב כב הלב. Compare Baba Bathra, 14 b: הלב כב הלב כב הלב.

W. BACHER.
THE HIGH PRIEST'S PROCESSION.

I presume Dr. Poznański did not mean it in earnest when he wrote that "in most editions of the Mahzor Ibn Verga's account is reproduced." My belief is founded on the careful examination I have made of 194 books of Hebrew liturgy in the British Museum and the Guildhall Library, which include all rites, and extend from the year 1485 to the year 1892. In all these I have found no trace at all of the procession of the High Priest. Wishing to leave nothing unexplored, I have gone through all available translations and a number of little volumes containing partial prayers or descriptions of customs and rules connected with the Day of Atonement. It follows that, unless he refers to quite recent editions unknown to me or to some rarities of his private collection, Dr. Poznański's statement requires revision.

When my article was published I was not familiar with Ben Verga's compilation. Mr. Marcus N. Adler called my attention to two extracts of it inserted in the Bpi>, which led me to the knowledge of its source, the mirp B3B>. I read the latter from beginning to end, and the conclusions I arrived at differ but slightly from what I set forth in my previous paper. Solomon Ben Verga composed his book during his stay in Salonica or Adrianople with material collected from all sources. He was in possession of a rather extensive and various learning, but he picked it up at random, and used it with no heed or power of discrimination. The first event he relates is the capture of Jerusalem, accomplished, as he says, by Augustus, who was another person than Octavius, and the latter's political rival, the Emperor Mark-Antony, formed a league with the Greek King Cassius. The material for this disfigurement of history the writer, whose Hebrew language and style are fluent and dainty¹, purports to have found in

¹ Making due allowance for the occasionally wrong use of genders in verbs and adjectives, the language in the first two-thirds of the book is correct and fine with a rich and expressive vocabulary. I disagree with Wiener taking exception to the twelfth section, which he considers an obscure and inelegant translation from the Latin. Like all pieces of elaborate writing, it only requires for a thorough understanding a certain
the Record Office of the kings of Aragon! In the second section, Ben Sira is represented by him as living after the destruction of Jerusalem, as converted during a persecution, the circumstances of which he was unable to trace, and finally as having written the Ecclesiasticus for his new fellow religionists, the Christians. Further on we read of a discussion between a King Alfonso and a Thomas, and we are at a loss to make out whether he means the Aquinas or Torquemada. The vast erudition and the respect for Jewish lore displayed in the debate plead in favour of the former, whereas chronology and the mention of Abrabanel's name stand for the latter. The fact of the matter is that both—King Alfonso and Thomas—convey in the book the view that Ben Verga's father (one of our author's sources) used to take of the social and civil conduct of the Jews in Spain some time before the expulsion.

Coming now to our particular point, we can, with every probability of being in the truth, say that Ben Verga used for the description of the High Priest's pageant a document found by him in his new residence, the late Byzantine empire. This hypothesis is supported not only by the fact that the description is given only in MSS. of the Rumania rite, but also and chiefly by the occurrence in it of the word ἱεράπουσία, a term denoting an official position in the Byzantium of the Middle Ages. The two MSS. seen by me exhibit the account in a different and shorter form than the one given in the mss.t33B, but the former's greater simplicity is just a safe indication of its pre-existence. Moreover, the procession taking place after the Day of Atonement's service was finished is in perfect accordance with the לְכַטּוּר רָאֵי הַבָּשָׁם of the Mishna, where, on the contrary, we find no hint at any ceremony attending the seclusion of the High Priest one week before the Great Solemnity. The place that Ben Verga assigns to the Chiefs of Academies (ןַגְּרוֹבִּים) is an item borrowed from the procession following the appointment of the Nassi in Persia which is fully described earlier in the book.

The foregoing considerations make it clear to my mind that Ben Verga found the account somewhere in the Balkan Peninsula, and modified it in some way to meet the requirements of his fanciful representation of the magnificence of Jerusalem and the gorgeousness of her spectacles. As to the Roman consul who in the לֵבָא צְבָא is, although in a dubitative form, identified with Marcus Ambivius, we hardly need waste our time to show that it is all an invention.

amount of attention.—On the authority of the oldest known edition and of the Latin version וֹרֵב (Brudo) is to be put after וּסֵמָא on p. 108 of Wiener's text.
Marcus Ambivius held for a very short time the office of Roman procurator in Judaea, and positively had no opportunity of sending to Rome so detailed a specification of the architecture of the temple and the ceremonies performed therein. The constant use of the imperfect tense (וֹי with the participle) throughout this part of the book is by itself a sufficient proof that the writer of the description never saw the temple, the pageant, or any parade of similar character in Jerusalem. Besides this, he does not himself know whether he describes Ezra's or Herod's temple.

I will not deal here with the Passover sacrifice, of which the gives a handsomely graphic description, but I cannot help remarking that Ben Verga's statement, according to which King Alfonso ordered once this ceremony to be revived in his own palace, affirms something which was too good to be true. It only does credit to the fertile imagination of the Spanish author.

L. BELLELI.

THE HIGH PRIEST'S PROCESSION AND THE LITURGY.

The error (concerning the Machzor) to which Dr. Belleli rightly objects was the result of a mere misprint for which Dr. Poznanski was not responsible.

The "Procession" passage does, however, occur in editions of the Machzor.

It may be found, for instance, in some editions of the widely used . Thus, in the Warsaw edition (1894) it is printed before the Mussaf service of the Day of Atonement.

Again, in the very fine—in many ways the finest extant—edition of the Machzor by the late Isaac Berlin (Hanover, 1837), the whole passage is given in a German translation immediately after the title-page of the Day of Atonement service.

I. ABRAHAMS.
CRITICAL NOTICES.

DR. FRIEDLÄNDER'S NEW EDITION OF
MAIMONIDES' GUIDE.


The new edition of Dr. Friedländer's well-known, and deservedly well-known, translation of Maimonides' _Guide for the Perplexed_ suggests pleasant thoughts that bring sad thoughts to the mind. A quarter of a century has elapsed since the Committee of the Hebrew Literature Society persuaded the learned Principal of Jews' College to take upon himself the onerous, if honourable, task of rendering the _Guide_ into English. Time has wrought many changes during the interval, some of them regrettable enough, as the following extract from Dr. Friedländer's Preface to the second volume may suggest: "The Hebrew Literature Society, under whose auspices the first volume of the _Guide_ was published, has since ceased to exist. The present volume and the next are, as it were, the posthumous work of the society, which may thus be said to have continued its publications beyond the limits of its short existence. This is chiefly due to the generous efforts of Mr. F. D. Mocatta." And now, to the universal sorrow of Jewry, Mr. Mocatta, too, has been taken from us. That is sad, though not altogether without compensations. The higher functions of the defunct Hebrew Literature Society are now, and have been for many years, exercised by the JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, while the Union of Jewish Literary Societies is carrying on the more popular part of the work of the older society. Happily, too, though Mr. Mocatta could but ill be spared, Anglo-Jewry can still boast of more than one Maecenas. There is even some likelihood that the memory of Mr. Mocatta will be worthily perpetuated by the establishment of a Mocatta Museum and Library, from which the aims of the Hebrew Literature Society, which he
had so much at heart, would receive no little advancement. Such an institution, moreover, would render an invaluable service to that comparative and historical treatment of Judaism which, though with obvious and inevitable limitations, received its first noteworthy expression in Maimonides' *Guide for the Perplexed*.

By his translation of the *Guide*—a translation of which the late Prof. David Kaufmann has expressed a very high estimate—Dr. Friedländer has put his numerous disciples and readers under a great obligation. Unhappily, the first edition of the translation, in three volumes, was not only too costly for most students, but has long been out of print, and very difficult to procure. With characteristic considerateness, Dr. Friedländer has devoted his scant leisure and much-taxed strength to remedy this by preparing the present edition, in which the three volumes of the first edition have been reduced to one volume, and the price has been more than correspondingly reduced, so as to bring the work within the reach of all students of theology and Jewish literature.

In reducing the thousand pages, or so, of the first edition to less than half that number in the new edition, something had of course to be sacrificed. Although the pages of the new edition are larger, and the type is smaller (though readable withal), all the notes have had to be eliminated. Two references to notes (pp. xxxix f.) raise the reader's hopes only to disappoint them again. The notes are all gone, and will be missed, especially by students of the Arabic text and of the Hebrew versions of the *Guide*. Still, the essential requirements for the study of the book are there. In addition to the translation, the volume contains a short *Life* of Maimonides (reproduced, without alteration, from vol. I of the first edition), an account of the Moreh Nebuchim Literature (reproduced, with additions, from vol. III), and all the Indexes of the first edition except the Ritual Index with its solitary reference.

Turning first to Dr. Friedländer's *Life of Maimonides*, it is very gratifying to observe that Dr. Friedländer's contention, that Maimonides was at no time a crypto-Mohammedan, has prevailed over the opposite view of Carmoly, Geiger, Graetz, and Munk, and is now generally accepted. The view that Maimonides was for a time a pseudo-apostate was based, to a considerable extent, on the lenient

---

1 *The Jewish Encyclopedia* (vol. IX, p. 81 a) erroneously gives 1889 as the year in which it was first published. The first volume was published in 1881, the second and third volumes were published in 1885.


3 Another reminiscence of the first edition is met with on p. 382, l. 5, where the reference to p. 205 should have been altered to p. 349.
attitude towards compulsory conversion adopted in the Letter concerning forced Apostasy, which is commonly ascribed to Maimonides. Originally, Dr. Friedländer endeavoured to demolish this argument by an attempt to disprove the authenticity of this letter. The long note (vol. I, pp. xxxiii-xl) in which the case was stated against the Maimonidean authorship of the letter does not reappear in the present edition, but Dr. Friedländer is still of the same opinion. On the other hand, Prof. D. S. Margoliouth, while siding with Dr. Friedländer against the supposed pseudo-apostasy of Maimonides, holds that the letter under consideration was written by Maimonides. In reply to the argument that “if Maimonides were the author he would probably have written in Arabic,” Prof. Margoliouth contends that certain expressions in the Hebrew betray it to be a translation from an Arabic original; the other arguments he considers to be mostly subjective in character, and inconclusive. The Jewish Encyclopedia is very amiable, and agrees with everybody. In one place (vol. I, p. 81 a) we are told that “Maimonides wrote this essay . . .,” soon afterwards it is added that “some scholars . . . on very good grounds . . . doubt Maimonides’ authorship of this essay,” while elsewhere (vol. II, p. 18 b) we are assured that the genuineness of this same essay or letter “has been convincingly refuted by M. Friedländer.” Who shall decide when specialists are divided? Be that as it may, Dr. Friedländer’s main contention, that Maimonides was never a pseudo-Mohammedan, is really in no wise affected even if the letter is regarded as a genuine writing of Maimonides. For, as Prof. Margoliouth puts it, “the fact of his taking a lenient view of the act of pronouncing the Mohammedan profession of faith, and thinking the matter one not worth dying for, surely need not prove that he had himself followed that course” 1.

Among the few additions to the Moreh Nebuchim literature, two are of special interest, not only for their intrinsic worth, but also as further contributions from Jews’ College—namely, the delightful little book on Maimonides by Mr. Israel Abrahams and David Yellin, and the manuscript fragments of the Arabic text of the Guide recently discovered, in the Cairo Genizah at Cambridge, by Dr. H. Hirschfeld, who thinks that they are in Maimonides’ own hand-writing 2.

Coming to the text of the translation, it is readily seen that the translation has been carefully revised throughout for the new edition. Not only are the errata of the first edition corrected now in the body

1 J. Q. R., vol. XIII, p. 54I.
of the book, but there are also many other improvements tending mostly to greater precision and lucidity of expression, and occasionally indicating a different interpretation. A few examples may serve to illustrate the varying degrees of importance attaching to the emendations.

P. 20, last line, "authors," in place of "orators" vol. I, p. 51.
P. 48, l. 23, "common sense," instead of "innate ideas," vol. I, p. 125; the view expressed in the note seems, therefore, to be abandoned.
P. 24, l. 10 f., "Thus we find, 'Who sitteth over the circle of the earth' (Isa. xl. 22), Who remains constantly and unremittingly over the sphere of the earth; that is to say, over the things that come into existence within that sphere." The older version continued thus after the quotation from Isaiah: "Who presides constantly and unremittingly over the circuit of the earth; that is to say, over its revolution; the prophet refers in this term to those things on earth which are in perpetual revolution" (vol. I, p. 59). The revised rendering obviates no slight difficulties, and shows a modification of the standpoint adopted in note 3, vol. I, pp. 59 f.

It is very interesting to observe how in quite a number of instances the new renderings have obviated difficulties and the need of explanatory notes.

Abraham Abulafia's mnemonic for the 177 chapters of Maimonides' Guide, י"פע, reminds one, appropriately enough, of the Talmudic story (to which Maimonides himself refers several times) about the four Rabbis who visited Paradise with such different results. For centuries the Guide has been such a Paradise to thousands of Jewish intellectuals—teaching sometimes piety to rationalists, and sometimes

---

1 We venture to suggest, in all modesty, that a slight difficulty, and the need of the explanation given in the first edition, might have been similarly obviated in the second sentence on p. 185, by a closer adherence to Ibn Tibbon. This is the passage: "For the common substance at first received four different forms, and each form was endowed with two qualities, and through these four qualities the substance was turned into the elements of which all things are formed." Why not "and, through these qualities, the four (forms) became the elements." &c.? This would obviate even the appearance of inconsistency. Cf. Abarbanel ad loc.
rationalism to pietists; sometimes piloting safely between the Scylla of mental anarchy and the Charybdis of blind traditionalism, but sometimes unwittingly encouraging those predisposed to revolt against all authority. At times the rationalism of the Guide may indeed have proved a cankerworm to some simple Jewish minds. But on the whole Jewish legend is certainly right in representing Maimonides as one who miraculously cured people of worms gnawing at their brain. When the Jewish mind was gradually yielding to the stupefaction of mysticism, or straying in the mazes of Pilpulism, the severe and sober rationalism of the Guide acted as an invaluable antidote against the sleeping sickness which threatened the Jewish intellect. In the Guide multitudes of Jews received their first introduction and stimulus to philosophical thinking. Passing by the crowds of obscure, though earnest, thinkers who have left no footprints in the sands of time; passing by also many distinguished Maimonists, and even anti-Maimonists, we may single out Spinoza and Mendelssohn, Maimon and Krochmal, as worthies who drew their first inspiration from the Guide. Spinoza, it is true, appreciated the merits of Maimonides about as little as Mendelssohn appreciated those of Spinoza, about as little indeed as Maimonides himself appreciated the merits of the Jewish philosophers who had preceded him. But Spinoza's indebtedness to Maimonides was very real, for all that. Mendelssohn gladly avowed his obligations to the Guide for his hunchback, and much besides. Solomon Maimon's reverence for Maimonides is attested by his confession about the efficacy of his vows by the name of Maimonides, in his struggles with himself—though he unhappily used those vows too sparingly. Krochmal paid homage to the Guide by the very title of his own Guide for the Perplexed of the Time. By the very manner, however, in which Krochmal modified the title of the older book before adopting it he also indicated the defects of the old Guide, the inevitable weakness of all such guides—an inherent incompetence to satisfy completely many ages in succession. Be that as it may, Maimonides' Guide for the Perplexed, even apart from its supreme historical interest, contains much that is still suggestive and stimulating, and well deserves the new lease of life which this cheap, convenient, and revised edition of Dr. Friedländer's scholarly translation is sure to win for it.

A. Wolf.

1 See Leo Wiener, The History of Yiddish Literature in the Nineteenth Century, p. 33.
Nachman Krochmal was certainly one of the most remarkable personalities among the Jews of the nineteenth century. His services as the father of Jewish science have been, and are, universally acknowledged. And yet he is, in a sense, one of the most neglected, though undeservedly neglected, of Jewish thinkers. His ambitious work, *The New Guide for the Perplexed* (literally, *The Guide for the Perplexed of the Time*), was not published till more than a decade after his death. Though more than half a century has elapsed since it was first published it has only reached a second edition, and unhappily both editions have been printed in Lemberg, fully maintaining the unenviable reputation of that town as a place for spoiling books. As yet the new but already aging *Guide* has

---

1 Dr. Landau, however, charges the printers with a gratuitous blunder when he asserts (p. 13 n.) that *Neboche*, on the title-page, is wrong, and should be *Nebucha*. The one is as legitimate as the other, cf. Esther iii. 15 with Exod. xiv. 3. See Dr. Friedländer's note, vol. I, p. 7, of his translation of Maimonides’ *Guide*. In Buxtorf’s Latin translation the headings are given throughout as *Mose Nevochim*, with an o.
not been translated from the original Hebrew into any modern language. Nor, although Krochmal has had no little share in the training of some distinguished Hebraists, can one speak of a Krochmal literature in any language. As regards English readers, the only source of information accessible to them is Dr. Schechter's delightful essay in his Studies in Judaism. So there is room for more work in this direction. Dr. Landau reminds us that the majority of Hebrew readers are still at the standpoint to which Maimonides' Guide led them. Is not that also true in a measure of some modern seminaries, which never seem to get beyond the old answers to older questions, to the detriment of more living problems and books not yet antiquated?

Zunz, the friend of Krochmal, and editor of his Guide, has pointed out long ago that Krochmal relied on the philosophy of Hegel much in the same way as Maimonides relied on the philosophy of Aristotle. But, although almost every page of Krochmal's Guide has, according to Dr. Schechter, blossomed forth into an independent treatise, no one had hitherto paid any special regard to the exact relation in which Krochmal stood to Hegelian philosophy. And that is what Dr. Landau has set himself to determine as precisely as possible. The pamphlet before us treats of Hegel's influence on Krochmal's Philosophy of Religion and Logic. In the Introduction, Dr. Landau gives a succinct and interesting account of Krochmal's life and work. (Why, by the way, do Dr. Schechter and Dr. Landau go out of their way to throw cold water on Moses Mendelssohn, seeing that according to their own accounts Krochmal was such an admirer of the German Socrates?) In the first chapter he deals with Krochmal's "Philosophy of Religion," as contained in the Guide, chaps. I-IV, and cites corresponding passages from Hegel. As an appendix to this chapter there follow two notes on Cabalistic parallels to certain Hegelian doctrines. In the second chapter Dr. Landau discusses Krochmal's "Logic," as contained in the Guide, chaps. XVI and XVII, furnishing parallel passages from Hegel. The works of Hegel which are quoted and referred to are the Philosophy of Religion, the Logic, and the Phenomenology.

In his Preface to Krochmal's Guide, Zunz states that he intentionally omitted some of Krochmal's references to various books. It is therefore quite possible that Krochmal himself indicated precisely his indebtedness to Hegel's works, and that but for Zunz's arbitrary omissions Dr. Landau's laborious comparison might have been obviated. But what has become of the manuscript of the Guide? Dr. Landau does not say anything about it. So we are probably meant to assume that it is lost. And, assuming the need for such
an inquiry, we may state at once that Dr. Landau has made out his case. There are many unmistakable traces of Hegelian thought in Krochmal's *Guide*. Dr. Landau is sure to strengthen his case yet more when he comes to treat of Krochmal's "Philosophy of History," as he promises to do shortly. For, in all probability, it was just in his attitude towards history that Hegel's influence was most real.

While admitting Dr. Landau's main contention, we owe it to Krochmal not to forget that his real significance does not depend on what he assimilated from Hegel. Hegelian modes of thought and expression were only more or less suitable aids and means to the evolution and representation of Krochmal's characteristic attitude to Jewish history and literature. His remarkable familiarity with Rabbinical literature, and his shrewd insight into its latent wealth—these were his real merits, and these were peculiarly his own. This truth seems obscured by Dr. Landau's mode of treatment, though unintentionally no doubt. Moreover, such merciless dissection of special passages from Krochmal's *Guide*, and such minute comparison with parallel expressions in Hegel, give the essay an appearance of fragmentariness which does not help to make it pleasant or easy reading. All this is largely inevitable, and it is not altogether fair to find fault with Dr. Landau on that account. We only mention it in order to make a suggestion. A corrected edition of Krochmal's *Guide* is certainly desirable. One of the chief merits of Dr. Landau's essay is that it throws light on a number of corrupt or obscure passages in the extant editions of Krochmal's *Guidr*. Most of Dr. Landau's material would be very serviceable as notes to a complete text. If Dr. Landau could see his way to undertake the task of re-editing Krochmal's *Guide*, with notes, &c., his work would be altogether more satisfactory both to himself and to his readers.

A. Wolf.

**KARAITES FEASTS AND FASTS.**

المقالة الرابعة من الكتاب المسح بالمرشد. *Die karäischen Fest- und Faststage, von Samuel ben Moses ha-Ma'arabi. Herausgegeben nach einer Berliner Handschrift. Inaugural-Dissertation... von JUDA JUNOWITSCH. (Berlin, 1904. 21 u. 35 SS. (Text) in 8°.)*

Wir erhalten hier aber nicht den ganzen IV. Abschnitt dieses Gesetzbuches, wie man aus dem Titelblatt schliessen könnte, sondern nur die ersten 18 Capitel desselben (der ganze Abschnitt besteht aus 31 Capiteln), was sehr zu bedauern ist, ebenso hat es Junowitsch unterlassen, eine Uebersetzung zu dem von ihm edirten Text zu liefern, und hat sich nur mit einigen äusserst dürftigen Noten begnügt.

Eine Uebersetzung ist zwar, in Anbetracht des leicht verständlichen Textes, nicht durchaus notwendig (höchstens sollen die verschiedenen Benennungen von Geräten, von verbotenen und erlaubten Arbeiten usw., auf p. 2, 12 u. 16, übersetzt werden), dafür aber sollte die Abhängigkeit Samuels von seinen Vorgängern und die Stellung seines Werkes innerhalb der karäischen religionsgesetzlichen Litteratur in entsprechender Weise beleuchtet werden. Samuel al-Magribi ist nämlich, wie die meisten späteren karäischen Autoren, in erster Linie Compilator und Epitomator, verdient aber trotzdem eine gebührende Beachtung, einmal weil er der letzte Verfasser eines vollständigen karäischen Gesetzbuches in arabischer Sprache ist, und dann weil er sich einer durchaus gedrängten, übersichtlichen und systematischen Anordnung des Stoffes zu beileibeigen weiss. Selten nur ergeht er sich in kurzen Digressionen (s. z. B. p. 9, H. 13-21), und auch seine Polemik gegen die Rabbaniten artet nur hin und wieder in eine persönliche aus (vgl. z. B. p. 25, l. 18). Er scheint sogar in grösserem Masse als seine Vorgänger von der rabbinischen Praxis und der rabbinischen halachischen Litteratur beeinflusst zu sein (s. z. B. Note 5, 40 usw.).

Von diesen Vorgängern wäre nun vor Allem Aron b. Eliazum zum Vergleich heranzuziehen, was aber bei Junowitsch fast gar nicht geschieht. So vgl. z. B. zu p. 4, l. 3, über die zum Pesachopfer zu verwendenden Tierarten, плъ д фол. 37 с; zu p. 5, l. 4, über den für das Schlachten und Geniessen dieses Opfers bestimmten Ort. ib. 39 с; zu p. 6, l. 2, über das Verhältnis zwischen/Haivore Aes Mgreens и сммн/ib. 42 d; zu p. 12, l. 6, über die am Wohnfestes in der Diaspora, ib. verbotenen Arbeiten, ib. 49 b; zu p. 23, l. 14, über die Feier des Wohnfestes in der Diaspora, ib. 56 с usw. Oft aber ist es notwendig, zum Verständnis der Worte Samuels auf ältere Quellen zurückzugreifen. So ist die Ansicht, dass das Pesachopfer den Sabbat verdränge (המרא רדוח שומע), nicht nur den späteren Karäern eigen, wie Junowitsch behauptet (Note 16), sondern wird bereits von Benjamin al-Nahawendi vertreten, vgl. R. É. J., XLV, 179, wobei der von Samuel angegebene Grund, dass das Gebot des Pesach, ebenso wie das der Beschneidung, dem des Sabbat vorangegangen war (p. 7, l. 3: הילניק לאו יאוש מי אימأنش תקנתקע כהרי אלימא 본 (למחנה לבר), bereits von 'Anân erwogen und zurückgewiesen wird, s. ib. 181 (daher die richtige Auffassung Landauers in Note 19; l. auch hier "Decalog" anst. "Dialog"). Ebenso hätte bei den
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Der Text ist auch hier nur nach der Berliner Handschrift (Cat. Steinschneider, II. Abt., nr. 201) ziemlich correct editirt. Es sind nur viele Druckfehler stehen geblieben, auch hat sich der Herausgeber mit Unrecht an der äusseren Gestalt der Handschrift bei den Absätzen der Ueberschriften (p. 1, wo die Ueberschrift bis הָבָאָה reicht, und p. 25, wo durch die Ueberschrift ein Satz auseinandergerissen ist) gehalten. Ausserdem ist zu bemerken, dass p. 4, 2 v. u. (gegen Landauer in Note 13) aufrecht zu halten ist, vgl. in p. 5, 1. 6, und dass Holz nicht mit Junowitsch (Note 46) in Holz zu verbessern sei, da bei den Karäern die erstere Form gebräuchlich ist, s. z. B. הָבָאָה, fol. 50 b. Mit einigen Noten textkritischen Inhalts hat ausser Landauer auch Nöldeke die vorliegende Edition versehen.


1 So z. B. p. 1, 1. ult. אֶלִיאוֹנָא לְאַבָאָה

Note 1 zu: p. 1, 1. ult. תְּשַׁבֶּת הָבָאָה; p. 2, 1. 20 לְאַבָאָה לְאַבָאָה; p. 3, 1. 17 anst. 12 לְאַבָאָה; p. 4, 1. 17 לְאַבָאָה; p. 5, 1. 17 לְאַבָאָה; p. 6, 1. 5 לְאַבָאָה; ib. 1. 7 לְאַבָאָה; p. 7, 1. 6 לְאַבָאָה; ib. 1. 23 ist der Verweis auf n. 31 zu streichen; p. 9, 1. 12 לְאַבָאָה; p. 10, 1. 4 anst. 38 ל. 8; p. 12, 1. 7 ל. 8; ib. 1. 12 ist jedenfalls falsch; p. 13, 1. 14 מִקְרָשָׁר; ib. 1. 20 מִקְרָשָׁר; ib. 1. 23 מִקְרָשָׁר; p. 14, 1. 2 מִקְרָשָׁר; ib. 1. 23 מִקְרָשָׁר; p. 16, 1. 7 מִקְרָשָׁר; ib. 1. 9 מִקְרָשָׁר; ib. 1. 20 מִקְרָשָׁר; p. 17, 1. 17 מִקְרָשָׁר; p. 18, 1. 3 מִקְרָשָׁר; ib. 1. 20 ist zu ergänzen מִקְרָשָׁר; p. 19, 1. 9 ist der Verweis auf n. 31 zu streichen; p. 21, 1. 8 מִקְרָשָׁר; p. 22, 1. 23 מִקְרָשָׁר; p. 23, 1. 10 מִקְרָשָׁר; p. 24, 1. 4 מִקְרָשָׁר; p. 25, 1. 10 מִקְרָשָׁר; p. 26, 1. 8 מִקְרָשָׁר; ib. 1. 20 מִקְרָשָׁר; p. 28, 1. 13 מִקְרָשָׁר; p. 30, 1. 1 ist der Verweis auf n. 110 zu streichen; p. 31, 1. 13 מִקְרָשָׁר; p. 35, 1. 3 anst. 80 l. 89; ib. 1. 6 ist der Verweis auf n. 89 zu streichen.
satz zu דת אונס (אונס גלות) 1. — Note 76 verrät die Stellung der Frage, die selbstverständlich bejahend zu beantworten ist, eine geringe Kenntnis der karäischen Litteratur, wo fast eine stehende Formel ist.

Da nun die Aufmerksamkeit der Doctoranden sich Samuel al-Magribi's al-Murschid zugewendet hat, so werden wir wahrscheinlich in absehbarer Zeit das ganze Werk nach und nach erhalten. Es wäre aber zu wünschen, dass die einzelnen Herausgeber wenigstens vollständige Abschnitte (ihre Zahl beträgt 12) liefern und so eine allzugegrosse Zerstückelung dieses Gesetzbuches verhüten möchten.

SAMUEL POZNAŃSKI.
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edition (which is to include the whole Mishnah) contains punctuated 
Hebrew text, German translation and notes. PP. 32. Price 75 Pf.

Records, Yahweh, Moses, Canaan, Rise of the Prophets, Monarchy, 
Amos and Hosea, Isaiah, Social Life of Jerusalem, Reforms of Josiah, 
Exile, Ezra and Priests' Code, Messianic Idea, Doctrine of a Future 
Life. PP. xiii, 274. Price 5s.

QUARTERLY STATEMENT, Palestine Exploration Fund, Jan. 1905 
(London, 38 Conduit Street, W.). Tenth Quarterly Report on the 
Excavation of Gezer (R. A. Stewart Macalister); the Immovable East 
(P. G. Baldensperger); the Roman Road between Kerak and Madeba 
(G. A. Smith); Modern Personal Names in Palestine (R. A. S. Macalister 
and E. W. G. Masterman); the Birth-place of St. John the Baptist 
(C. Schick); Notes, &c. (Price: Free to subscribers of not less than 
half a guinea.)

I. Raffalovich, יאדו לְהַיִשָּׁי: “A Teacher's Handbook of Picture 
Lessons, forming a First Year's Course in Conversational Hebrew for 
Children.” (Merthyr Tydfil, Welsh Educational Publishing Co., 
1905.) PP. iv, 98 + 10.

M. Rahmer, “Vokabularium und Grammatisches zum zweiten 
Kursus der Tefillah Kezarah ” (Frankfurt a. M., Kaufmann, 1904). 
Hebrew Prayer Book, with German Vocabularies, section by section. 
Seventh edition. PP. 96 + 46. Price 1 M.

S. REINACH, "Cultes, mythes et religions" (Paris, Leroux, 1905). Part I. Contents: I. Le Tabou; II. Phénomènes généraux du totemisme animal; III. Les survivances du totemisme chez les anciens Celtes; IV. Totémisme et exogamie; V. La domestication des animaux; VI. La théorie du sacrifice; VII. Pieds pudiques; VIII. L'origine du mariage; IX. L'histoire du folklore; X. L'art et la magie; XI. L'amphidromie; XII. L'art plastique en Gaule et le druidisme; XIII. La prohibition de l'inceste et le sentiment de la pudeur; XIV. La flagellation rituelle; XV. L'"Orbis alius" des Druides; XVI. Les Vierges de Séna; XVII. Teutatés, Esus, Taranis; XVIII. Succellus et Nantovella; XIX. Tarvos Trigaranus; XX. Bas-relief inédit autrefois à la bibliothèque de Straubourg; XXI. Esumopias Crusticus; XXII. Celtica; XXIII. La religion des Galates; XXIV. Les carnassiers androphages dans l'art gallo-romain; XXV. Le voile de l'oblation; XXVI. Δίος προσώπου διώξεως; XXVII. L'origine des prières pour les morts; XXVIII. Le roi supplicié; XXIX. Le culte de l'âme; XXX. Satan et ses pompes; XXXI. Le Christianisme à Byzance et la question du Philopatris; XXXII. Les Apôtres chez les anthropophages; XXXIII. L'évolution en théologie; XXXIV. Samuel Zarza; XXXV. Antoinette Bourignon. 48 illustrations. Pp. vii, 8+468.

A. RUPPIN, "Zeitschrift für Demographie und Statistik der Juden" (Bureau für Statistik der Juden, Berlin-Halensee, Westfäische Strasse 46). The first part of this new monthly appeared Jan. 1905. Annual subscription 6 M.

— "Die Juden der Gegenwart" (Berlin, Calvary, 1904). Contents: Das Judenthum unter dem Einflusse der modernen Kultur; Zur jüdischen Bevölkerungsstatistik (Zahl und Wohnsitze der Juden, Bevölkerungsbewegung durch Geburt und Tod, Die Übertritte und Austritte, Die Mischehen); Biologische Verhältnisse; Das Geistesleben (Die geistige Beanlagung, Die Sprache, Die Religion, Erziehung und Unterricht); Die Erwerbs- und Berufs-Verhältnisse (Allgemeines, Die Juden in Handel und Industrie, Die Juden in den freien Berufen, Die Juden und der Ackerbau); Die Moralität (Die Kriminalstatistik, Sittlichkeit und Charakter); Die staatsbürgerliche und politische Stellung der Juden; Die Nationalitätsidee (Das jüdische Volkstum, Der Zionismus). Pp. 6+296. Price 4.80 M.

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF HEBRAICA AND JUDAICA


B. v. SCHOTTENFELD, "Was muss man vom Talmud wissen?" (Berlin, Sternitz, 1904). Pp. 71. Price 1 M.


B. Wolff-Beckh, "Kaiser Titus und der jüdische Krieg" (Steglitz, 1905). Pp. 35. Price 1.80 M.

D. Yellin, "תנורת שלמה in the Hebrew Bible" (Jerusalem, Luncz, 1905). On the pronunciation of Hebrew in its modern revival as a living language.


— — "Readings (Hebrew) in Minor Prophets. For school use. Pp. 80. Price 1s.


I. A.
MACMILLAN & CO.'S PUBLICATIONS.

LIBERAL JUDAISM. An Essay. By CLAUDE G. MONTEFIORE.
Crown 8vo, 3s. net.

Jewish Chronicle.—"Mr. Montefiore has written so attractive and forcible a book that it must arrest general attention. . . . The book is at once timely and well conceived."

Times.—"A work of extraordinary interest. . . . It must be regarded mainly as a personal confession of faith; and we do not know where it would be possible to point to a better statement of what religious theism means to a liberal believer in it."

MANUAL OF JEWISH HISTORY AND LITERATURE.
Preceded by a brief Summary of Bible History. By Dr. D. CASSEL. Translated by MRS. HENRY LUCAS. Second Impression. Pott 8vo, 15. 6d. net.

Jewish World.—"Before Mrs. Lucas's excellent translation there was no good text-book which, in a moderate compass, presented the main facts of later history with clearness and precision. . . . As regards the book's accuracy and value, the many editions that have been printed in Germany, and the well-known name of the author, are a sufficient guarantee."

JEWISH LIFE IN THE MIDDLE AGES. By ISRAEL ABRAMAHMS.
Crown 8vo, 7s. 6d. net.

Jewish Chronicle.—"With a full equipment of modern scholarship, he has reconstructed for us and for posterity every aspect of mediaeval Jewish life, and his results are indispensable to every future historian of the Middle Ages."

LES JUIFS EN ROUMANIE DEPUIS LE TRAITÉ DE BERLIN (1878) JUSQU'À CE JOUR. Les Lois et leurs Consequences. Par EDMOND SINCERUS. 8vo, 5s. net.

Jewish World.—"A book that ought to command much attention, and which has evidently been written with much authority."

ASPECTS OF JUDAISM: being Eighteen Sermons by ISRAEL ABRAMAHMS and CLAUDE MONTEFIORE. Second Edition, including two additional Sermons. Fcap. 8vo, 3s. 6d. net.

Jewish Chronicle.—"The study of a work by these two authors is like an intimate acquaintance with a charming and cultured person—it is a liberal education in itself, a study fertile in interest, and fruitful of good. . . . There are not many books published in the present day of which it can be said that they will do no harm, and unlimited good. But of this book it is possible to say so, and higher praise cannot be given."

PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS FROM FRENCH HISTORY.
By Baron FERDINAND ROTHSCHILD. With Seventeen Photogravure Portraits. 8vo, 10s. 6d. net.

Times.—"Baron Ferdinand Rothschild has made a study of the leading personages in French History, and he has produced in Personal Characteristics from French History an extremely entertaining collection of their more famous utterances and bons mots; or, as he prefers to call them, their *répétitions*. . . . There is not a dull paragraph in the entire book."

THE JEWISH YEAR. A Collection of Devotional Poems for Sabbaths and Holidays throughout the Year. Translated and Composed by ALICE LUCAS. Fcap. 8vo, gilt top, 2s. 6d. net.

Jewish World.—"Of the book as a whole, it is almost impossible to speak too highly, within the bounds of moderation. . . . It should find a place in every Jewish home. . . . One of the best volumes of its class ever given to the community."

MACMILLAN & Co., Ltd., LONDON.
MACMILLAN & CO.'S PUBLICATIONS.

DESCRIPTIVE CATALOGUE OF THE HEBREW MSS.
OF THE MONTEFIORE LIBRARY.

Compiled by HARTWIG HIRSCHFELD, Ph.D.
8vo, stiff boards, 5s. net.

Jewish Chronicle.—"Dr. Hirschfeld deserves very cordial thanks for his latest work.... Excellent."

JUDAISM AS CREED AND LIFE.

By the Rev. MORRIS JOSEPH.
Extra Crown 8vo, 5s. net.

Jewish Chronicle.—"A good, a convincing, and a serviceable book.... A treatise which may be read with delight by the adult, and may also serve as a school-book for the young.... Mr. Joseph writes with fervour of manner as well as with sobriety of method, and Judaism exerts a new fascination in his pages—at once full as they are of information and of charm. Never before has Mr. Joseph so fully revealed both the extent of his knowledge and the graces of his style. English Jews will be deeply grateful to him."

Jewish World.—"A great work on the Jewish Religion, not a mere booklet, or essay, not even an ordinary handbook, but a comprehensive and satisfying exposition of its principles and practices. To say that this treatise fills a gap in our scanty bibliography of Anglo-Judaica would express inadequately the value of the work. It is a contribution to Jewish literature which proves to be indispensable.... A work which appeals at one and the same time to the scholar and to the uninformed, to adults and young people."

THE BIBLE FOR HOME READING,
EDITED, WITH COMMENTS AND REFLECTIONS FOR THE USE OF JEWISH PARENTS AND CHILDREN,

By C. G. MONTEFIORE.

Part I. To the Second Visit of Nehemiah to Jerusalem.
Second Edition, Crown 8vo, 4s. 6d. net.

Jewish World.—"A book that every Jewish father and mother should carefully study and keep as a reference book while training their children in the most important of all subjects of instruction."

Part II. Containing Selections from the Wisdom Literature, the Prophets, and the Psalter, together with Extracts from the Apocrypha.

Crown 8vo, 5s. 6d. net.

Jewish Chronicle.—"The scholarship, the spiritual insight, the attractive style which distinguished the first part of Mr. Montefiore's Bible for Home Reading are displayed in their fullest development in the second part, now happily published. But, good as the older book was, the new is even better. Mr. Montefiore had indeed a great responsibility. How wonderfully he has risen to the occasion, how splendid a use he has made of the opportunity, we shall endeavour to show. But we cannot refrain from saying that this book is the despair of a reviewer. One cannot hope to do justice to such a work when its 800 pages are full to overflowing of learning simply utilized, of moral truths reverently enunciated, of spiritual possibilities forcibly realized, while over all there hovers a charm indefinable, yet easily and inevitably felt by any reader of the book. We will, however, try to indicate some of the excellences of Mr. Montefiore's book, the publication of which is the most important literary event of recent years, so far as the English-speaking Jews are concerned.... As masterly as it is spiritual, as scholarly as it is attractive."

MACMILLAN & Co., Ltd., LONDON.

Printed at the University Press, Oxford, by Horace Hart, Printer to the University.
## CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOME HEBREW MANUSCRIPTS IN CAIRO.</td>
<td>By Prof. Richard Gottheil</td>
<td>609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(with Two Facsimiles)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THE RABBINICAL CONFERENCES, 1844-6.</td>
<td>By the Rev. Dr. David Phillipson</td>
<td>656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLEANINGS FROM THE YEMENITE LITURGY.</td>
<td>By the Rev. G. Margoliouth</td>
<td>690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THE ARABIC PORTION OF THE CAIRO GENIZAH AT CAMBRIDGE.</td>
<td>By Dr. H. Hirschfeld</td>
<td>712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Tenth Article.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHILO OF ALEXANDRIA.</td>
<td>By J. H. A. Hart</td>
<td>726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THE ARABIC ORIGINAL OF THE REPORT OF R. NATHAN HABABLI.</td>
<td>By Prof. I. Friedlaender</td>
<td>747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THE ITINERARY OF BENJAMIN OF TUDELA (continued).</td>
<td>By Marcus N. Adler</td>
<td>762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOTES ON OLD TESTAMENT HISTORY.</td>
<td>By Stanley A. Cook</td>
<td>782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRITICAL NOTICES.—A Thirteenth-Century Hebrew-French Glossary:</td>
<td>by Prof. W. Bacher, Castani's</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by Dr. H. Hirschfeld</td>
<td>Annals of Islam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIBLIOGRAPHY OF HEBRAICA AND JUDAICA.</td>
<td>By I. A.</td>
<td>810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

London:
MACMILLAN AND CO.,
NEW YORK: THE MACMILLAN COMPANY.
Price 3s. 6d. Annual Subscription, Four Shillings Sixpence.
PUBLICATIONS OF THE
Jewish Historical Society
of England.

A BOOK OF ESSAYS. By S. A. HIRSCH, Ph.D., Joint-
Editor of the Greek Grammar of Roger Bacon and a Fragment of his
Hebrew Grammar. Extra Crown 8vo, 7s. 6d. net.

Jewish Chronicle.—"A fine volume—by far the finest yet issued by Messrs. Macmillan for the
Jewish Historical Society. . . . Throughout the book is bright and entertaining. It is also a real
contribution to learned research. Such a rare combination should win for the volume very wide
popularity and success"

JEWISH HISTORY. An Essay in the Philosophy of History.
By S. M. DUBNOW. From the Authorized German Translation.
Globe 8vo, 2s. 6d. net.

Jewish World.—"In a small book of 160 pages, which can be read through in two or three
hours, there is enough food for thought to last as many years. And the whole is presented in so
attractive a manner, with a felicity of diction and incisiveness of phrase which one rarely sees in
translations from the German, that the reader finds himself borne along with delightful ease, and
almost forgets that he is engaged in the difficult study of historical philosophy,"

JEWISH WORTHIES SERIES. Vol. I.
MAIMONIDES. By DAVID YELLIN and ISRAEL ABRAHAMS.
Illustrated. Globe 8vo, gilt top, 2s. 6d. net.

Jewish Chronicle.—"Doubtless destined to take rank at once as the classical biography of
Maimonides. . . . A model biography."

THE LETTER OF ARISTEAS. Translated into English,
with an Introduction and Notes, by H. St. J. THACKERAY, M.A. Reprinted
from The Jewish Quarterly Review, and published for the Jewish Historical
Society of England. 8vo. Sewed, 1s.

Jewish World.—"Reliable and scholarly."

MENASSEH BEN ISRAEL'S MISSION TO OLIVER
CROMWELL. Being a Reprint of the Pamphlets published by
Menasseh Ben Israel to promote the Readmission of the Jews to
England, 1649-1656. Edited, with an Introduction and Notes, by
LUCIEN WOLF, Past-President and Vice-President of the Jewish
Historical Society of England. With Portrait. Super Royal 8vo,
21s. net.

Jewish Chronicle.—"It is a book deserving of the highest praise, both for the freshness of its
materials and for the vividness with which they are presented."

SONGS OF EXILE. By Hebrew Poets. Translated by
NINA DAVIS. Royal 16mo, gilt top, 2s. 6d.

THE ETHICS OF JUDAISM. By M. LAZARUS, Ph.D.
Translated from the German by HENRIETTA SZOLD. In Four Parts.
Part I, Crown 8vo, 3s. 6d. net. Part II, Crown 8vo, 3s. 6d. net.

Jewish Chronicle.—"The first two volumes issued by the Jewish Historical Society under its
new and wider powers deserve a very cordial reception. . . . Miss Davis's translation of some of
the best poems of Mediaeval Jewish writers, and Professor Lazarus's interesting presentation
of the principles of Jewish ethics, are equally admirable."

THE JEWISH HISTORICAL SOCIETY OF ENGLAND
TRANSACTIONS. Volume IV. Sessions 1899-1901. Super Royal
8vo, stiff boards, 16s.

MACMILLAN & Co., Ltd., LONDON.
וְיֵשׁ תַּכּוֹן לָהֶם יְשֻׁרֵעָה קְרֵאָה לָהֶם. שֶׁהֲשָׁמְרוּ עֲשַׂרִים לָאָרֶץ מִזָּהָבָהּ שֶׁיֵּשׁ לָהֶם עַל עַד הַשְּׁעָרִים שֶׁיֵּשׁ לָהֶם עַל הַחַלָּם שֶׁיֵּשׁ לָהֶם עַל הַבַּיִת שֶׁיֵּשׁ לָהֶם עַל הַנָּחָל שֶׁיֵּשׁ לָהֶם עַל הַגּוֹאָלֶה שֶׁיֵּשׁ לָהֶם עַל הַיָּרֵדֶשׁ שֶׁיֵּשׁ לָהֶם עַל הַנֶּרֶס שֶׁיֵּשׁ לָהֶם עַל הַבָּמָה שֶׁיֵּשׁ לָהֶם עַל הַקְּרֵבָה שֶׁיֵּשׁ לָהֶם עַל הַשַּׁעַר שֶׁיֵּשׁ לָהֶם עַל הַנּוֹשֵׂא שֶׁיֵּשׁ לָהֶם עַל הַנּוֹשֵׂא שֶׁיֵּשׁ לָהֶם עַל הַנּוֹשֵׂא שֶׁיֵּשׁ לָהֶם עַל הַנּוֹשֵׂא שֶׁיֵּשׁ לָהֶם עַל הַנּוֹשֵׂא שֶׁיֵּשׁ לָהֶם עַל הַנּוֹשֵׂא שֶׁיֵּשׁ לָהֶם עַל הַנּוֹשֵׂא שֶׁיֵּשׁ לָהֶם עַל הַנּוֹשֵׂא שֶׁיֵּשׁ לָהֶם עַל הַנּוֹשֵׂא שֶׁיֵּשׁ לָהֶם עַל הַנּוֹשֵׂא שֶׁיֵּשׁ לָהֶם עַל הַנּוֹשֵׂא שֶׁיֵּשׁ לָהֶם עַל הַנּוֹשֵׂא שֶׁיֵּשׁ לָהֶם עַל הַנּוֹשֵׂא שֶׁיֵּשׁ לָהֶם עַל הַנּוֹשֵׂא שֶׁיֵּשׁ לָהֶם עַל הַנּוֹשֵׂא
SOME HEBREW MANUSCRIPTS IN CAIRO.

In addition to the treasures drawn out from the Cairo Genizah, there are a few other MSS. to be found in that city which do not seem to be so well known, and yet deserve some attention. Reference has been made to them by various travellers, but no one, to my knowledge, has looked at them with some care. I have gone to the trouble of making a short list of these MSS., if only with the result of bringing them to the ken of scholars. To describe them accurately would have occupied more of my leisure than I was able to give to such work: it would have been attended with peculiar and almost insurmountable difficulties. Persuasion, bakshish and limitless time are needed to overcome the peculiar circumstances attending upon such a labour in Egypt. I found this to be especially true among the Jews. I continually encountered a dead-weight, against which everything seemed powerless except one or more of these forces. In most cases I had to work with a motley horde of sluttish, unkempt, and unwashed men, women, and children peering over my shoulders and into my face. My haste to get away may have been indelicate—but very necessary in view of my natural wish to carry away no more than I had brought. And for such a work books of reference are needed, not a single one of which was to be found in the whole city. Not even news
of the *Jewish Encyclopedia* had reached the banks of the Nile! I have added a description of two MSS. in Alexandria and of one in Jerusalem: it will be seen that they belong, with a certain right, within the scope of the present article.

The only MSS. in the following list that seem to be of real value are the Biblical codices: the holy books preserved with especial reverence in the synagogues. The Jews call them קְרֵיָה הָרִיאת "Crown of the Law" in Hebrew; مَقْصُورَة (pl. مَقْصُورَات) in Arabic—following the usual designation of the Koran copy by the Mohammedans. In Syria, Mesopotamia and Arabia, where a similar custom prevails, the name given is מצה (a "crown")¹. Among the Rabbanite Jews these volumes are usually wrapped in from six to ten different covers, each presented by some pious worshipper for this very purpose. In some cases they are stored on a shelf placed in the Ark itself; in others, a special cupboard is affixed to the wall by the side of the Ark, and the MSS. are laid in it. I have not heard that they are ever used or opened during the service; but on Simḥat Torah they are carried around in company with the Sefarim. In only one or two cases is an intelligent care taken of the MSS.—in the Zaradel Synagogue at Alexandria and in the Rambam Synagogue at Cairo. For the rest, they are looked upon with great awe and with an intense superstition. They are regarded as amulets; but their real value is not appreciated. In the worst possible state are the MSS. kept in the Ark and in the two side-cupboards of the Karaite Synagogue at Cairo. The only one that is preserved with a little care is the Codex of Moses ben Asher. A wooden box with a glass cover has been provided; into this the pages of the MS. have been stuffed: the word is no exaggeration; the box is not large enough, and the pages must be fitted to its size! The others are tied up in bandana

¹ For similar volumes at Aleppo and Kutais in the Caucasus, see E. N. Adler, *Jews in Many Lands*, pp. 163, 181.
handkerchiefs, or rags of equal cleanliness, and stuffed into the cupboards. Their resting-place touches a wall, through which water seems to percolate, in such manner that damp and mould are gradually eating their way into the parchments. Pages that fifteen or twenty years ago must have been quite legible are becoming a mass of pulp. And yet, on Saturday mornings, these “Keters” are covered in their repose with gold-embroidered velvet drapings and reverently kissed by the worshippers! I made very strong remonstrances to my good friend the venerable Hakam Bashi of the Karaites—“Cheleby E. Mangouby, Grand Rabbin Israelite Caraïmé,” as his visiting-card runs. Some one must have done the same a year or two ago, for the MSS. have at least been separated, and the subject-matter and date (ta’arikh) written upon the outside. This is the work of the Grand Rabbi himself.

One need not be a bookworm to develop enthusiasm for these Bible codices. They are magnificent in their grandeur, veritable chefs-d’œuvre of the scribal art. One stands before some of these venerable monuments with feelings not unlike awe; immense masses of parchment, the pages ranging from twenty to fifty centimetres in height. Think of the love, the veneration, the piety, the sacredness that are here embodied; the amount of money spent, the effort expended, and the care with which the finished volumes were prized. First there was the getting of the skins; then they were prepared and cut and deeply ruled with a stylus. After this, the writer set to work—and one wonders with what sort of a pen or stylus (or, perhaps, was it a brush?) he formed these huge characters, that sometimes reach a centimetre and a quarter in height. And when he was done, it was the turn of the Nakdan or punctuator, who added the signs of the vowels and the symbols of the accentuation. Then came the Masorite to revise it, and to see that the minutiae of the text-tradition were all there, and to write the small Masora in between the columns and the large Masora on the top and the bottom of the page;
or, perchance, this last was done by a professional also, for he could show his taste for ornamentation in allowing the Masora Magna to develop into embellishing lines of embroidery, festoons, garlands, animals, and what not in order to enliven the pages of stiff and unbending columns of square characters (No. 68). At the end there were still further Masoretic notes to be added—as to the number of letters and words, and where the middle of the book is to be found and such like conceits. If the Masorite was a learned man he joined on some Masoretic treatise; if a poetaster, he drove forward in rime and metre (Nos. 2 and 14), or perpetuated the eternal differences between Ben Asher and Ben Naphtali (Nos. 17, 69). In some cases one and the same scribe wrote (בַּלַס), punctuated (וּלָם), and Masorated (בּסַר) the volume (Nos. 13, 14, 27). In other cases the offices—and the honours—were divided, but both the writer and the punctuator might be known to fame, as in the codex mentioned in No. 63, where the scribe was no less a person than Solomon ben Yeruham and the Masorite, Aaron ben Moses ben Asher.

Yet not all was finished. The chapter on Jewish art in Hebrew MSS. has not yet been written—not even attempted. It is a much longer chapter than one would imagine. It was not only in the extravagances of the Passover Haggadah and the more simple illustrations of the Fables that the scribe passed into the illuminator; nor was the theological bias against the pictorial art as pronounced as is generally imagined. Jewish tombstones in Amsterdam, Hamburg, Florence, Rome, Pisa, Leghorn, and even Prague, are faithful witnesses to the contrary. And so are the Hebrew Bibles. After the scribe and the Masorite came the illuminator. Sometimes he contented himself with headings only or with initials (No. 25); these were usually in gold upon a coloured background, though at times

1 Sometimes he also corrected it, and then he wrote סטראפ תכונת ותהל. See Bodl. Hebrew MS. No. 2322 (Catalogue, col. 808).
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Enlivened by examples from the animal world (No. 62). The next step taken was to furnish borders for special portions of the text (Nos. 16, 17, 37), notably the song of Deborah, the blessing of Moses, the song of Hannah, and the like. Then came full-page ornamentation, often only in gold, consisting of circles and ovals and various kinds of linear and geometric figures, plaits and interlacements; of such kind are the few pages of introductory ornamentation in the Moses ben Asher codex (No. 34), the only illustration allowed being that of the altars and vessels of the tabernacles (ibid.; also No. 16). At the last, the work of the illuminator and ornamenter was combined with that of the illustrator. A few attempts at pictorial embellishments in ink (No. 12) must have preceded the freer use of colours. No. 7 is a splendid example of the art of illustrating and beautifying MSS. as understood by these Jewish painters; not so much for the value of the pictures themselves and the subjects, as for the extreme delicacy of the drawing and colouring of the borders. But in the justly celebrated Bible in the Casa di Alba at Madrid, done by the Rabbi Moses Arragel and his associates, the reverse seems to be the case, and the subjects of the many illustrations very justly to deserve the praise that is poured upon them.

No wonder that such codices were highly prized; not many of our rich men would put their wealth into these books as rich Jews did in former times. Few of these MSS. even are to-day in Jewish hands. Ten magnificent Bible MSS. are in the possession of the Jewish community of Rome; two superb codices were in the possession of the late Mr. Henriques de Castro (I admired them in Amsterdam some years ago, but I do not know where they now are): Dr. Gaster has some fragments. In former times

---

1 See Appendix II.
2 See Jewish Encycl., s.v. Arragel.
3 I shall publish a short catalogue of these in the Zeitschrift für Hebräische Bibliographie.
4 A note has gone through the press concerning an illuminated MS. of
they were perhaps the only fortune that a man left to his son: "I, Jacob Meborak, have bought this Bible for Isaac my son . . . I give it to him as an absolute present: he shall neither sell it nor exchange it" (No. 25). "These first four books of the prophets have been acquired by Ha-Kohen ben David . . . and he has given them to his son David ha-Kohen . . . they shall be for ever to him alone and to his seed after him. May God in his mercy open for him the gates of understanding! . . ." Sometimes the name only of the Maecenas for whom the MS. was written is mentioned (Nos. 13, 14). But another one is most careful to give the exact persons who should take charge of the precious volumes: "It is holy to the Lord; it shall not be sold or exchanged, in order that it pass not out of the possession of the two great princes (Nasi) . . . Josaiah . . . and Hezekiah, the sons of the Nasi Solomon ben David ben Boaz, &c., &c." (No. 63). When the volumes passed in a commercial way from one owner to another it was not out of order to write the bill of sale on a fly-leaf of a volume, and to have it properly attested by the subscribing witnesses (No. 12); or the fact of its having been bought is simply recorded (No. 6).

I see little reason to doubt the data here given. In some cases there is, however, room for suspicion, and I am afraid that fervid zeal has run away with the morals of the scribe. At least, I should consider it somewhat dangerous to follow his lead in ascribing No. 2 to Natronai Gaon. That Jacob Aboab wrote No. 3 I should not care to affirm: the real superscription of the scribe has been quite obliterated, and one must pause in the face of such evidence as that.

the Bible presented to the Stadtbibliothek in Frankfurt on the Main by the Baronesa de Rothschild.

1 According to Montfaucon, a Bible MS. in Bologna has the following superscription: א"ז כמך ורבדו פשה א' ורב ותמי תבכר; but it is of the twelfth or thirteenth centuries. See Cataloghi dei Codici Orientali, p. 323. It is probable that the confusion has arisen through confusion with the name of some scribe who had written a model codex. See e.g. the Spanish
The sanctity attached to such Bible codices was perforce fervent. They were often model-codices and used to correct the ordinary copies that were current. They were therefore called at times "טֶרֶשׁ הָאִלֶּה תִּנְסֵי" (twice in Nos. 3 and 63), and it was said of them: "נַעֲרֵי לֹא הָנָה יָבִיטֵם" (No. 2); "נַעֲרֵי לֹא הֶבְּךָ" (No. 3); "נַעֲרֵי לֹא הָבִיטֵם" (Nos. 17, 18). The abbreviation טֶרֶשׁ is not yet used; in its place we find סַכָּה (No. 14), מָעָה (No. 34), the Persian "רַשָּׁה (ibid., and No. 14); and the Arabic "רַשָּׁה (ibid.). But there is an unpleasant side to this sanctity; the frequent imprecactions upon those that remove the volume from the place in which it has been set: "And every one that steals it, or sells it, or removes it, or takes it away from Jerusalem, the Holy City, may God not be willing to forgive such an one; for then may the wrath of God burn and his zeal; and may God

Codex written in 1396 by Ezra b. Jacob b. Adret (Ginsburg, Introduction, p. 494). The so-called Ezra-scroll in the Fostat Synagogue is, of course, only a pious superstition.

1 Codex Ginsburg i (Avignon, 1419) has(!) מַכַּה וְלָא תִּנְסֵי רַה נִנְסֵי, and MS. Ginsberg מַכַּה וְלָא תִּנְסֵי רַה נִנְסֵי, and MS. Ginsberg מַכַּה וְלָא תִּנְסֵי רַה נִנְסֵי. Does this refer to the model "Codex Jerusalem," which was for many years in Saragossa and was used by Abu al-Walid? The MS. belonged at one time to the Isma'ili community in Barcelona, an interesting reference. See Ginsburg, Introduction, pp. 741, 748; Zedner, Catalogue, p. 97, and Margoliouth, Catalogue of Hebrew and Samar. MSS., I, p. 27. A Massoretic Pentateuch, written 1289 in Barcelona, is in a Synagogue of Magnesia (E. N. Adler, Jews in Many Lands, p. 154).

A more unusual expression is גָּרֵיסָה, which I have found in only two cases: in a MS. belonging to the Jewish community in Rome containing the Prophetic books with נַעֲרֵי הָאִלֶּה תִּנְסֵי; and in Codex Vatican xi (Catalogue, p. 13) גָּרֵיסָה. The latter MS. is a copy of the Psalms written for the same Isaac b. Joshua b. Shabbethai of Calo (p. 13). גָּרֵיסָה is, of course, only a variant of the word סַכָּה, which is quite common. A Bill of Sale, dated 1462, at the end of a Bible MS. in the Laurentiana at Florence has גָּרֵיסָה סַכָּה (cf. Bisconi, Bibl. Mediceo-Laurentiana, p. 24). See below, No. 14.

2 A German MS. of the year 1309 is called רַבָּה, Ginsburg, Introduction, p. 564. One of the model codices is cited as מַכַּה וְלָא תִּנְסֵי, as is the case with the Ezra-scroll in the Fostat Synagogue (ibid., pp. 494, 741, 748).
separate him from all the tribes of Israel, so that evil come to him. And may all the curses mentioned in the Law, the Prophets, and the Holy writings cleave to him. Amen!” (No. 18); or, “And any one that changes a word in this Mahzor or this writing, obliterates one letter of it, or tears out of it a leaf—without having carefully studied and found out that in which we have erred, in the consonants or the vocalization, or the Masora, or in regard to a letter intentionally either omitted or added—may there be to such an one neither forgiveness nor pardon; may he not see the bounty of God, nor look upon the goodness treasured up for them that fear him: but be like an unclean woman and like a leper put away, so that his limbs break and the strength of his might (metaphor!) be shattered, his flesh wither away so that it be not seen, and his bones be cast away so that they be not noticed. Amen!” (No. 34). It is the reverse side of the medal!

There are some further points even in these few codices which the student will be able to value. Thus, the list of apocryphal books (No. 62) is not without its interest. Jews did not generally take an interest in the Gentile Bible. But then we may add to this the marginal notes (No. 7) in regard to the division of the Books of Samuel, Kings, Ezra, and Nehemiah “according to the Gentiles.” In this same codex the Book of Esther is simply called “Ahasuerus.” I have no means of telling if this occurs in other MSS. That the Antiochus Megillah should be added as if a part of the Bible (No. 15) shows the deep interest that attached to that record. In Syriac Bible MSS. this has happened to the story of Eleazar and of the Mother and her Seven Sons.

1 MS. Brit. Mus. Or. 5626 (Sefardic) has a list of eighteen passages in which the translators of the LXX are said to have altered the text.
2 But see Bodl. Library, Hebrew MSS. No. 4 (Neubauer, Catalogue, col. 2).
3 I have since found the Megillah in the Vatican Codex xxvi of the Ketubim (year 1438). See Assemani’s Catalogue, p. 22; in Codex Plut. i. lii of the Laurentiana at Florence (Job, Ezra, Megillat Antiochus; small 4to, a columns), and in Bodleian MSS. No. 30 (year 1480), 31 (year 1483, Pent. Haft. Megill. Ant.), see Catalogue, col. 7.
Some of the MSS. belonged to Persians or Bocharists settled in Jerusalem (Nos. 18, 27).

And, finally, of more than ordinary interest is the mention of the name "Hillēi" or "Hillali." Unfortunately the colophon in No. 12 is almost completely worn away, so that only portions can now be rescued from oblivion. But there is evidently a name "... ben Mordecai ... el-Hillali," and in another place it is directly stated, "This is the book called el-Hillali." Is this then the codex that is known, from other citations, to have existed? But in No. 18 we have a Masorite who corrects the volume, who is known by the name "Michael ben Uzziel ben Joseph ben Hilleli." Do these data throw any light upon the mystery, or do these Hillelites still remain in the clouds of speculation?

Note.—The photographic reproductions of the Moses ben Asher codex have very kindly been made for me by Mr. Jacques Galitzenstein, of Cairo. They have been so successfully done that the text that shows through the page containing the superscription can be read if held before a looking-glass.

I have in most cases hesitated to attach a date where no indications are at hand, and both Hebrew bibliography and paleography are sciences entirely unknown in Cairo.

1. In the Synagogue Rabbi Hayyim Capusi (whose grave is in the Hosh Menasce of the old cemetery) situate in the 'Atfet R. Hayyim, a part of the Darb al-Naṣir; MS. in square characters on parchment, containing the last half of the Bible from Psalms

Hilleli or Hillali variants are usually found in Sefardic MSS. See Ginsburg, *Introduction*, pp. 567, 590, 775. In two instances the codex is cited as י' ז' פל' (ibid., p. 432), which agrees with the statement of Zacuto (*Yad ha-Ḥaṭaḥ, ed. Filipowski, p. 220*) that the original MS. was taken from the province of Leon at the time of a severe persecution. According to Zacuto, it had been written by one Hillel b. Moses b. Hillel. The many variants cited in the Masora have been collected by Ginsburg in his *Massora*, III, pp. 106 et seq. Cf. also *Ibn Saphir*, II, 192–213. The interesting incunable discovered by Freimann in the Laurentiana purports to have been collated with a Hillali codex ז' ה' נ' ח'. (Z. H. B., VIII, 144). Upon the Hilleli codices mentioned in this article I hope to write on another occasion.
to the end of Chronicles; two columns to the page, complete Masora, square folio. Seems to be of the thirteenth or fourteenth century.

2. In the Synagogue of Rabbi David ben Abraham Abi Zimra (RaDBAZ). MS. in all respects similar to the preceding; parchment, two columns to the page, complete Masora, containing the Bible from Joshua to the end of Kings. It is evident that originally this whole Bible was written in three parts or volumes; of which the Pentateuch only is missing. On the frontispiece a later hand has written:  

In the Earl of Leicester's Codex (Sefardic c. 1250), a similar set of verses is found. The variants are taken from Ginsburg's Introduction, p. 733.

L. verse wanting.

Evidently a mistake. It makes no sense, and does not agree with the second half. A passive participle of some verb ending in י is required.

L in place of this.  

L. verse wanting.

L. for this מַתִּיר וְאַתִּיר תִּירָם.  

L. verse wanting.
which verses say no more than that the MS. has been carefully written, with all the Masoretic paraphernalia that is needed; and that the differences between Ben Asher and Ben Naphtali have been noted.

3. In the Radbaz Synagogue: small folio MS. on parchment, the whole Bible in Spanish cursive script, fully vocalized and provided with accents. Not old. On the title-page the following:

זה השфр בתב אתות מתרא ארבע ניכר והודל 컴퓨터 תוקפ אבוב בעל סמר
מנורה והאואר והגי קורש והגיהו על כ ב בר ישראל גיון ב
קורש והגיהו היא די מזריכ

Probably the reference here is to the rabbi at Venice who lived towards the end of the seventeenth century. At the end there is a complete "Ta'arikh" signed by Aboab; but, for a reason that is not apparent, it has been obliterated by means of red paint, of which I was unable to scrape off sufficient to see what was beneath. The learning of the scribe who wrote the above quotation is sufficiently exhibited by his adscription of the Menorat Ha-Ma'or to "Jacob" Aboab.

4. In the Radbaz Synagogue: octavo volume on parchment of some 300 leaves, containing a cabalistic commentary on the Pentateuch. The "learned men" of the Synagogue supposed it to be the work of Abi Zimra himself. It appears to me to be a copy of the Zohar. Oriental script.

5. In the Egyptian Synagogue (קמ למשרור) in the Darb el-Mizriyyim. Immense folio of a portion of the Pentateuch, from the words נינא בנום יכ לולע עמי השעיה (Num. xvi. 26) to the end; parchment, 49 x 49 cm., three columns to the page, full Masora. On the last page and in the same hand as the body:

אני מנשלת יב
מרור העם חכמי השם הוהי הוא לאך ההכמס ר' דוד
להנוך חכמים ר' שמעון; וק בותרי כוס השם אברכים כלפיים וחקלפים
לבריאת עולם הוא מעון ומון סמוי בורדו ומעהוא שמו י penchant לו
ואורו ויהי וחל ושם לכל הוראה וקח בכם קריו缤纷; ואני
ואה בורו ישמעו אמר יי ור'ו

According to this note, the MS. was written in Gerona in the year 4949, i.e. 1189 C.E., in the month of Kislev by one David ben Solomon. On the following page and in a later hand occurs the note:

יאספרה עלאת מחן אלחלם ר' פ
בר שלמה יסכים ולא טעמי השם יסכים הפרהו וב הוא מבני בני

A scroll written by Isaac Aboab is said to be in Safed. See Jewish Encyclopedia, s.v. Safed.
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... i.e. the Kohen Sa'id bought it from the afore-mentioned (?) David ben Solomon. They both appear to me to have been Karaites. This is not the volume mentioned by Ibn Saphir in his account of the Egyptian Synagogue.

6. In the Egyptian Synagogue: portion of the Pentateuch in heroic folio; parchment, 49 x 49 cm., three columns to the page, full Masora, magnificent scribal work, the letters being fully 1½ cm. high, vocalized, but without accents. The text finishes: 'היה לא ואשיה לי הכותנה לעי ויוה עלא שנותמה מעלה לולו (Num. xv. 26), and is complete up to this point. A peculiar feature of the MS. is the occasional arrangement of the text in funnel-shaped form, evidently in order that the page shall end at a certain point. This is notably the case on the last page, which brings the text down to the point where MS. 5 commences 1. The two were wrapped up in one and the same

1 This is not an unknown procedure in Bible MSS., especially if the scribe wishes to begin the text of a book or a poetical extract at the top of a page, or within a certain number of leaves. Another way was to diminish the number of columns to the page (Ginsburg, Introduction, p. 531). Some of the early Hebrew prints follow the MSS. in this also: e.g. the apparently unique copy of the Pentateuch and Haftarot in the Laurentiana (Freimann in Z. H. B., VIII, 145). Usually this has two columns to the page; but, in order that the Song of Moses shall commence a fresh folio, the page preceding has only one column. For the same reason, the page preceding Miriam’s Song is in the form of an inverted spiral. The letters are exceedingly primitive: the alignment wretched—especially in the poetical portions, where the lines are quite rickety. The Parashiyot have been marked in ink on the margin by the letters וס; but in every case the ו is curtailed of its last shaft: a peculiarity I have seen in MSS. Some attempt at punctuation has been made by hand, and there are various Judaean-German glosses (אש = שר; מיר = מיר; בר = בר). The only colophon is כנה יהו, and in one place כנה יהו. Dr. Freimann believes this to be a “Tikkun.” I venture, however, to suggest that the intention was to provide it with vowels and accents by hand. The very primitive character of the mechanical work shows that the printers either lacked the proper implements or were quite new at their business. I take it that they did not yet know how to print the vowels. Exactly the same kind of print is to be found in the unique copy of the יב Orak Hayyim belonging to the British Museum: the water-mark of the paper is the same in both—an outstretched hand supporting a crown. Freimann records a similar water-mark in the Naples Hobat ha-Lebabot of 1489. We have here an interesting bibliographic conundrum.

That vowels and accents were at times added by hand can be seen in
collection of rags, and were evidently intended to form a complete copy of the Pentateuch, despite the difference in size and the difference in the character of the script. Was No. 6 written with the express purpose to complete No. 5? I could find no trace that the last page had been added at a later date.

7. In the Egyptian Synagogue: the Old Testament; parchment, small folio, 26 x 22 cm., two columns to the page, in Spanish-Oriental Rabbinic script, provided with vowel-signs and accents; a beautifully illuminated codex. The greater part of Genesis is missing, and at the end from the middle of 1 Chron. viii, having evidently been sold to some private or public collection. The codex commences now with chap. xxxix. 16. The illumination is done in very delicate work, evidently by a master hand. This is especially true of the borders. The first words of each Parashah are in red ink encircled with various designs, the numbering of the chapters is also in red. At the end of the Parashah the number of verses is given, e.g. מְנַן מִסְפָּר אֶלֶבֶן הַסְּמִים; The MS. is evidently the work of Spanish-Jewish artists. In contradistinction to the illustrations, the text is poorly written and without much care, whole series of verses being at times omitted. A later hand has made the necessary corrections in the margin. The MS. is undated. At the end of the Book of Ezra there is the remark: שבת ארבעת; but this is not in the original hand, and the ink is darker than in the body of the codex. The date, 4520, i.e. 760 C. E., is, of course, impossible in view of the script. A Bible MS. of so early a date would have been written in square characters.

The illuminations and illustrations are exceedingly well preserved. The codex must, originally, have contained as many as sixty; now only forty-five remain. These are:

(1) At the beginning of Deuteronomy, full-page illustration: water issuing from the rock; name all in gold; beautiful border of conventional foliage, in which human figures are to be seen.

another rare parchment print of the Pentateuch, with Haftarot and Megillot, also in the Laurentians, and which de Rossi (Annales, I, No. 27) assigns to c. 1490-1495. The whole has been carefully punctuated and some Masoretic notes added. An attempt has been made to print a few borders and some initials. One notices here, also, the mechanical unripeness.
(2) Moses receiving the staff from heaven.
(3) Moses, with the staff, standing before Pharaoh.
(4) Moses before Pharaoh.
(5) Moses stretches out his hand over the waters.
(6) Pharaoh begs Moses to intercede with God.
(7) Aaron stretches out his rod to smite the dust of Egypt.
(8) The plague of flies comes over Egypt.
(9) Moses prays once more to God.
(10) The cattle of Egypt die.
(11) "And Moses stretched forth his rod toward heaven," Exod. ix. 23. Full-page illustration.
(12) Moses "spreads abroad his hands unto the Lord," Exod. ix. 33. The whole background of the picture is in gold.
(13) Moses brings the locusts over the land of Egypt.
(14) Second picture on the same subject.
(15) Moses "entreats the Lord," Exod. x. 18.
(16) Darkness comes over the land of Egypt: half-page picture.
(17) Death of the first-born: full-page.
(18) Spoiling the Egyptians: three-quarters of a page.
(19) The bones of Joseph are carried up out of Egypt: one-quarter page.
(20) The Egyptians pursuing the Israelites: three-quarters of a page.
(21) The Israelites cross the Red Sea: one-quarter of a page.
(22) Deborah chanting her song of triumph: almost full-page.
The background is made up of dark trees; six figures and a small child are seen in the foreground. The top of the page is beautifully ornamented with foliage.

[Part of the Ten Commandments is written in red ink.]
(23) The beginning of Leviticus has two full-page illustrations, gold on a dark-blue background. The first contains the Menorah and other sacrificial utensils; the second, utensils, the sacrificial altar, and the table of shew-bread.
(24) At the beginning of Leviticus, the words נַעַרְשִׁי are written in gold, surrounded by a border of flowers and human masks; in the corner of the page a man on his knees is seen praying to the angels; the faces, however, are not visible.
(25) At the beginning of Numbers, a picture, somewhat faded, of a man in the field, sowing.
(26) At the beginning of Deuteronomy, the words יִרְבִּי in gold, surrounded by a delicate border of flowers. At the bottom of the page, picture of Moses instructing a group of men.

(27) Joshua receives the staff from God; but only the hand of the Almighty is seen reaching down from heaven. Space is left for another picture, which has, however, not been executed.

(28) At the beginning of Judges, a warrior on horseback, with raised sword, going out to battle: in gold and various colours; surrounded by a delicate border.

(29) At the beginning of Samuel, picture of Elkanah offering a lamb upon the altar. Opposite to 1 Sam. xxxi (ластיחה לחרימים) there is in red: יַלְאָה עֵשֶׂזֶה וַחַיָּה מַהְרָא דּוֹד; and opposite to 2 Sam. i, in red: מִסְרֵר שֵׁי לְעוּזָמִים.

(30) At the beginning of Kings, David on his sick bed: half-page illustration. At the beginning of 2 Kings, on the margin, in red: סֵפֶר שְׁי לָמוּי.

(31) At the beginning of Isaiah, Isaiah preaching before a number of men: half-page illustration in beautiful border.

(32) At the beginning of Jeremiah, the prophet preaching to the people, in border.

(33) At the beginning of Ezekiel, the vision of the prophet, in which four figures are seen; the first has beard and wings, the second has a female face, the third the head of an eagle, the fourth the head of a bird. In the beautiful border the figure of a peacock.

(34) At the beginning of Hosea, the prophet preaching to the people, who are seated around him. The “Twelve Prophets” are treated as one single book.

(35) The first page of the Book of Psalms (הלל) is encased in a beautiful border of twigs and branches. There are two panels on the page. At the top of one, in large letters of gold, are the words עשנה, on a background of blue and red, in which are interspersed fleurs-de-lys. The second panel contains an illustration of the royal singer at his harp.

(36) At the beginning of Proverbs, a somewhat crude illustra-

---

1 There was an evident intent in writing these remarks in red; i.e. דִּינָם = Christian. This is sometimes done when the chapters and verses are noted on the margin. Ginsburg, Introduction, p. 516. MS. Ginsburg 3 (Franco-Italian hand) has the Christian chapters marked on the margin.
tion of Solomon, sitting before a desk and expounding wisdom: seemingly unfinished.

(37) At the beginning of Job the word וּסְתַע in large gold letters. Running along the left side of the page is a sort of pillar, on the top of which Satan is seated, as if he had just come down from heaven. Lower down is a picture of Satan falling from the skies. It is impossible to make out what is above Satan. At first sight it looks like a round red point, out of which things are spouting. Upon closer investigation one discovers hands upon each side. I hazard the suggestion that originally we had here the figure of the Deity resting upon the clouds. But the face and the upper parts have been wilfully disfigured.

(38) At the beginning of Ecclesiastes, the right-hand edge of the page is ornamented with a tree, the uppermost branch of which ends in a human head clothed in a wisdom cap. In the tree itself a pelican is seen.

(39) The Book of Esther is called in the headings שִׁירֵי שָׁם. At the beginning, a three-quarter-page picture of the king sitting in state, holding in his hand the staff of office.

(40) At the beginning of Canticles the word רָשׁ in large gold letters upon a light green background. Along the right-hand side of the page is pictured a beautiful lectern in blue, red, and green, with an open music-book on the stand and a burning candle above it. Along the lower edge of the page there are some bars of music intertwining a staff and three portraits: a king, a shepherd, and a bearded man. Scrolls for the names are placed underneath the first two, but the finishing touches do not seem to have been given. The pictures are excellently executed.

(41) The first page of Lamentations is in two columns, as is the rest of the book, but so arranged as to form the inside of a castle. On either side is a large turret, a smaller one in the middle. The turrets are connected by a bridge, under which water flows. The painting (which is not quite finished) seem to represent the walls of Jerusalem.

(42) At the beginning of Ruth, and occupying one half of the border, is a picture of the heroine, seated and sad.

(43) At the beginning of Daniel, a picture of the hero, seated; some golden vessels are placed before him, containing food; one quarter-page illustration.
At the beginning of Ezra, along the left-hand side, beautiful foliage-work, and, coming out of the tree, the figure of the scribe teaching. Below the tree is a griffin. Nehemiah is part of Ezra; but on the margin, in red: ספר شيء.

At the beginning of Chronicles, on the right-hand side of the page, a scribe seated before a table, with pen and other instruments near by.

8. In the Synagogue Rabbi Jacob Abu Sha'rah in the Darb al-Dahhān: old MS.; paper, portion of the commentary of Isaac Abravanel to the Pentateuch, beginning of the first column, with the commentary of Isaac Abravanel to the Pentateuch (hi&nBD). Incomplete at the beginning and at the end; commencing near the beginning of Parashah Shemini (Lev. ix), and ending at the beginning of Parashah Maṭṭot (Num. xxxix. 2).

9. In the Synagogue Rabbi Jacob Abu Sha'rah: two volumes of the Bomberg Bible of the year 1518. On frontispiece the following remark: "Este Libro es de Jueda Jarm Cassutto Liuº a di 18 tammuz año 5452," i.e. Livorno, 1692.

10. In the Synagogue Ra'āl ha-Nes in the Darb al-Sakalbah: portion of the Lisbon ed. of the Bible, printed on parchment, with the commentaries of Redak and Ralbag; containing Joshua and Judges; in good state of preservation.

11. In the Turkish Synagogue in the Harat Sakallah: MS. of the Mishnah on paper; large folio, two columns to the page. It seems to contain the greater part of the text: no commentary. A few pages at the beginning are missing. Ends in the ninth chapter of Mishpatim.

12. In the Synagogue of Rambam in the 'Atfet El-Hammamim: complete copy of the Pentateuch, each verse followed by the Targum; 2 vols., 43½ x 34 cm., parchment, three columns to the page, Franco-German script, full punctuation and full Masora on the margins and between the columns. The pages were all formerly loose, but they have been mended and the volumes have been bound. Vol. I commences with Gen. i. 3 and ends with Lev. xxvii. 29; vol. II commences in the middle of Num. i. 33 and goes to the end of Deuteronomy. Then come the Haftarot without any Masora. There are a few attempts at illumination in ink. At the end of Deuteronomy, the word חכם is written in tremendous letters, artistically drawn, the final lamed running up the vol. xvii.
whole left side of the page to the upper margin. At the beginning of each Parashah, the first word is slightly ornamented, while the letter ב on the margin is always enclosed in the same line ornamentation. At the end of the Pentateuch the following bill of sale has been written in a later hand: "There is an ornamental bill of sale written at the end of the Pentateuch."

According to this bill, R. Jacob b. 'Abod ha-Kohen of the Maghreb (West Coast of Africa) sold the volume or volumes to R. Isaac l'na for 45 kronen. The transaction seems to have taken place in old Cairo (DHVO) in the year 1495. The witnesses who attest the sale are the scribe Nathan b. Abraham Shinzi, Joshua Paji, or Faji, and Moses Isaias (?)

At the beginning of the second volume is a frontispiece, or perhaps a title-page, very poorly done in ink, and not by the same hand as the body of the MS. An attempt at ornamentation is badly made. Only about a quarter of the page is still legible; the rest having suffered from wet.

---

1 Or כבש?
At bottom of the page in large letters, as if giving the date

and down the right-hand side of these letters I read: 

The letter which I have regarded as part of may be the last letter of and have its proper place after the word . The date must be incomplete, as it makes 1422, which is manifestly too early.

At the end of the second volume, in varied ornamentation, are the words: , i.e. = 860 C.E. This is followed by (see above), and by a design

through the middle of which run the words: . Inside the two lines are the following words: . The first part of this inscription is said to be an oft-cited verse attributed to the Khalifah 'Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb, with in place of .

The second part seems to say that one-quarter of the work on the codex was done with the consent (or money) of the Maecenas that ordered it, and one-quarter at the risk of the scribe. What became of the other half remains in absolute doubt—as does also my interpretation of the words in question.

13. In the Karaite Synagogue: part of a large square folio Bible MS., from Chronicles to end of Ezra and Nehemiah, which last two are considered as one book (at end, ); parchment, 36½ × 33 cm., three columns to the page, eighteen lines to the column, letters each 1 cm. in height. Masora on top and bottom of the

1 I have not been able to verify this statement.
page and between the lines. At end, the following colophon is found: אֶלֹהִים תּוֹמֵךְ יִשְׂרָאֵל. אִם יִשְׂרָאֵל נַחֲנִי יָדָיו לְאֶלֹהַי אֱלֹהִים יִשְׂרָאֵל. בְּרֹגֵי יְשׁוֹעֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל יִשְׂרָאֵל נַחֲנִי יָדָיו לְאֶלֹהַי אֱלֹהִים יִשְׂרָאֵל. הבואות יִשְׂרָאֵל בְּרֹגֵי יְשׁוֹעֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל יִשְׂרָאֵל נַחֲנִי יָדָיו לְאֶלֹהַי אֱלֹהִים יִשְׂרָאֵל. The scribe Zechariah, son of Anan, from the Maghreb (Spain or North Africa), wrote the codex for Isaac, son of Efraim the priest, in the year 4788, i.e. 1028 C.E. Upon the following page the exact day of the month is given: 8th of Tammuz. The inscriptions there read—

1 In the middle: קַלָּאָל הָעַמּוֹת בָּרְכֵהוּ שֶׁלָּם כָּלִים לְיִשְׂרָאֵל. It is evident that the persons concerned are Karaites: the proper name Anan, the expressions יָרְוָה, &c., are quite characteristic.

2 Down the right-hand side: חַלּוֹנֵנוּ וּרְאָתָנוּ בְּרָחַת חָמֶם בְּשָׁמַיָּה. לְאִלָּא לָנוּ עֹלָם.

3 Down the left-hand side: יִסְיָהַה סִימוּ בְּרָחַת אַלְמָא. יִסְיָהַה סִימוּ בְּרָחַת אַלְמָא.

It is evident that the persons concerned are Karaites: the proper name Anan, the expressions יָרְוָה, &c., are quite characteristic.

Upon the fly-leaf there are a number of partly illegible inscriptions: e.g. (1) מַה שְּכַנְּה יִשְׂרָאֵל בְּרֹגֵי יְשׁוֹעֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל... And if Prof. Bacher is right (R. & J., XLIX, 301) that the abbreviation 'b'd denotes only יְשׁוֹעֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל, the resolution of the letters into a specific meaning must be very old, and not merely present-day Moroccan.
According to this, the MS. came by purchase into the possession of Obadiah ha-Kohen son of Obadiah ha-Kohen son of Moses ha-Kohen. The collocation of letters in the text ought to contain the words יִרְיָעְתָּה יִוּדָּה. The letters ... ought to contain the words יִרְיָעְתָּה יִוּדָּה.

(2) ... התיבות אינן כלת במדבר רחל קדשו, the rest is illegible.

(3) Arabic נַן נַרְגָּל נַלְחָל אלְעָדָה אֲלָשָׁרît מֵם מֶלֶךְ אֲלָפֶּים, i.e. it was bought in a legal way from the property of S[a'id] Da'ud.

At the end of the volume are six leaves of Masoretic notes of the usual kind.

14. In the Karaite Synagogue: large square folio copy of the Pentateuch; parchment, 42 × 38 cm., three columns to the page, Masora at bottom and between the columns. The first page contains beautifully interlaced illumination in gold and red, oriental style; the back of the first page and the five following ones are similarly illuminated, the interlacing being composed of selected scriptural passages. Some pages of the text have gilded borders. Exod. xv, Deut. xxxii and xxxiii, i.e. the poetical passages, are encased in beautiful gilt work in the form of a scroll. At the end are fourteen pages of Masora, in part tastefully illuminated. No animal or vegetable forms are used. At the end, in tremendous letters, 1 1/4 cm. high, is the following:

גָּלָה לָאָלַי אָשָׁמָה בּוּבֵרִית
עֵשָׁיָה הָמָכָא בָּהָמָאָדָה
בָּאָמָה לָבְנַלזָלָל ... בּוּבֵרִית
לְלָבְנַלזָלָל ... בּוּבֵרִית
שָׁיָה עָלַי בּוּבֵרִית
אְנַי אַשָּׁמָה בּוּבֵרִית
נָכָּהֵר מָמָרֶיךְ הוּ דַמָּשָׂחָה
לֶמָּּוּת רַבִּי דָּרָא בּוּבֵרִית
יִוְזָּלָמָה מָךְ מוּבָּאָדָה
אָרָאָדָה מוּזָּבָה.

אשתך נכה הכהן המכה בניחת ידך ירחא בנין ובי נוכמה
ונבשו כהה מהכה במעבתם וב�נתם וחקם עליה סכרא של הסכת אבך.
On the last page are the names ישת ב רוח בז ו רוח ישת in enormous characters, each letter made up of a Bible verse. From this we learn that the Bible had been written for David son of Jeshua ha-Levi, and had been also in the possession of his son Jeshua ben David. The scribe's name was Samuel son of Jacob; he also punctuated it and added the Masora. No date is given, but it is certainly as old as the preceding MS. (No. 13), if not still older. It is interesting to see that the word חוץ is already used for Pentateuch or Bible copies not in roll-form.

On the fly-leaf there was an older account of purchase or donation. This has been erased, and over it has been written: קרש לי אלוהים עליה ישראל עפר בני מקרא סופריהם יוחנן וניה לכסות עד התוכנה חוף כל תרנגול הקישר תלבק ולש ולש והז התו התו והז התו התו והז התו התו והז התו התו והז התו התו והזהתו התו והז התו התו והז התו התו והזהתו התו והזהתו התו והזהתו התו והזהתו התו והזהתו התו והזהתו התו והזהתו התו והזהתו התו והזהתו התו והזהתו התו והזהתו התו והזהתו התו והזהתו התו והזהתו התו והזהתו התו והזהתו התו והזהתו התו והזהתו התו והזהתו התו והזהתו התו והזהתו התו והזהתו התו והזהתו התו והזהתו התו והזהתו התו והזהתו התו והזהתו התו והזהתו התו והזהתו התו והזהתו התו והזהתו התו והזהתו התו והזהתו התו והזהתו התו והזзамו קרשות ברוך שלום והקהל יĞב אמן אמן. i.e. it was presented to the Cairo Karaite community by the above-mentioned David ben Jeshua.

15. In the Karaite Synagogue: complete MS. of the whole Bible in square characters; parchment, 29½ x 24 cm., three columns to the page, provided with punctuation, accents, and slight Masora. Is old, but no date is attached. At the end are two pages containing the Megillat Antiochus (מצל בתאנהה), fully punctuated, but without accents. It looks as if this last were part of the Bible.

16. In the Karaite Synagogue: large folio MS. of the whole Bible; richly illuminated, 34 x 28 cm., parchment, three columns to the page, complete, fully punctuated, and provided with Masora on top and bottom of page and between the columns. David ben Joseph Kimhi's "Miklol" is attached to the work in a peculiar manner 1. It is contained in twelve pages at the beginning, nineteen pages at the end, two pages after the Pentateuch, and two pages after the Prophetic Books. The text of the "Miklol" is enclosed

1 The Vatican MS. Ebr. viii (Catalogue, p. 8) has the Skorashim of Kimhi before the Biblical text. In MS. Bodl. Hebr. 2322 the O.T. is preceded by Kimhi's Miklol, the text being continued at the end, as in the case above. See Neubauer, Catalogue, col. 808.
in beautiful gold and coloured scroll-work; sometimes in its place appear oriental windows. In the text itself there are occasional illuminations and beautiful corner pieces. There are, also, whole pages containing representations of altars and of instruments used in the Sanctuary. Initials are to be found scattered throughout the Bible text: all the illuminations being heavily overlaiden with highly burnished gold. At the end, following Kimhi's treatise, are four pages of the usual Masoretic notes. The only extratextual note found is on the fly-leaf, to the effect that the codex was given by Moses ben Solomon ben Moses, known as Ben Phiruz. This is repeated at the end. On the whole a magnificent bit of calligraphy!

17. In the Karaite Synagogue: complete MS. of the Pentateuch; well bound, heroic folio, 45½ x 36½ cm., size of letters 1 cm., two columns to a page, gilded and painted initials, Masora above and between the columns. The parchment was originally larger in size, but it has been cut down by the binder. At the beginning, four pages enclosed in coloured columns containing: (variant readings according to these chief Masorites). On the back of the first page of the text we read:

... The Muzhaf was given to the Karaite Synagogue by one Elisha the Physician, son of Jeshua the Physician. The date, however, occasions a difficulty. The year 455 is the common year 1695. This, of course, cannot be the date at which the MS. itself was written, as it is in every respect very old. It must be the date at which the MS. was presented to the Karaite community in "Dar Simḥah." I do not know where this place is, and I have no works of reference at hand. The Karaite authorities told me that it was in Syria (i.e. Damascus). I examined the inscription a second time: it cannot be in the hand of the original scribe; the writing is more carelessly done and the ink is much blacker than that of the text.

18. In the Karaite Synagogue: complete MS. of the Pentateuch; 1 i.e. וְצָכוֹר הָיֵתָךְ.
huge parchment, square folio, $40\frac{1}{2} \times 44\frac{3}{4}$ cm., three columns to the page, was originally larger, as the pages have been cut by the binder; the letters are 1½ cm. high; there is full Masora on the top and bottom of the page and between the columns; rather crude illuminations at the beginning of some of the parashiyot and between the individual verses in the Shirat ha-Yam (Exod. xvi).

The last pages have been wrongly bound. A most superb MS., on magnificent parchment. At the end, but in a later hand, the following:

On the fly-leaf, and in an old script, is the following:

In the margin, and in an old script:—

In the margin, and in an old script:—

The text continues...
These long colophons are not without interest. They contain a bit of "Kultur-geschichte" which deserves further study. It is interesting to see that all the curses have not prevented the removal of the volume from its original resting-place! The history of this beautiful MS. seems to be that it was written for one Nissi ibn Faḍlān al-Kharaji in Jerusalem (in one place he is called Nissa ibn Faḍlān Kharaji) and given over into the keeping of Sahl ibn Masliyah (MS. has only), in whose family it is to remain for ever. Should the male descent be interrupted, it is to become the property of the Karaites in the Holy City. These Karaites are called in one place, "those who observe the festivals according to the appearance of the Moon," and not according to a fixed calendar—an appellation that I have found often in Karaite books. At a later date, and at the instance of Mašliyah ha-Kohen ibn Sahl ha-Kohen—perhaps a son of the original donor—it was corrected by Mishael ben Uzziel ben Joseph.
ben Hilleli. I am puzzled by the expression מ"ם-duration. Does it mean that the owner lived in "the Court (ר加強) of Ibn Bokhtwai or Bokhtööl"? The Persian name is interesting: as is that of "Bundār"—if it be a proper name—mentioned further on. Mishael ben Hilleli, as a Masorite, naturally causes one to think of the famous Codex Hilleli.

19. In the Karaite Synagogue: part of a Bible MS. on parchment; 24½ x 19 cm., square characters, two columns to the page, fully punctuated, and provided with Masora; in all 77 pp. containing the Haftarot (but incomplete at the beginning), Psalms (complete), Proverbs, and part of Job. Seemingly of the fourteenth or fifteenth century.

20. In the Karaite Synagogue: convolute containing a portion of a MS. of the Pentateuch, from the middle of Parashat Wa-Yikra up to the middle of Parashat Ekeb; on parchment, three columns to the page, 37 x 33 cm., characters about 3 cm. high, Masora above, below, and between the columns. The MS. is going to pieces on account of dampness which is eating the parchment away. In addition:

(a) One leaf of Masoretic notes.
(b) One leaf of a MS. of the Pentateuch, parchment, 25 x 22½ cm., two columns to the page, full Masora; contains a portion of Ha'azinū.
(c) 11 pp. of a Bible MS., parchment, two columns to the page, not old.
(d) One leaf, parchment, three columns to the page, no Masora; containing the beginning of the book of Joshua.
(e) One leaf of the book of Samuel, parchment, two columns to the page, square characters, punctuated.
(f) One leaf of a Pentateuch MS., parchment, Oriental rabbinical script, fully punctuated; containing portion of Gen. xli. 1 et seq.
(g) Two leaves of a Haftarot MS., parchment, punctuated, small fol.; not old.

21. In the Karaite Synagogue: portion of a Pentateuch MS. from the middle of Parashat Lek Leka to the end of Parashat

1 Cf. such names as Bokht-ishō'.
2 Or simply a common noun, "this rich dealer in slaves or horses," i.e. Nissi ibn Faḍlān. See Johnson's Dictionary, s.v., Vullers, i. 266 b, and Justi, Iranisches Namenbuch, p. 72.
22. In the Karaite Synagogue: portion of a Bible MS.; huge folio, 47 × 39½ cm., characters 1 cm. in height, Masora on the sides and at top and bottom of the pages. Occasionally erasures and corrections have been made; contains part of Samuel, Kings, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and part of the minor Prophets; was evidently a Wakf, as here and there the remark is written in large characters: קרש ליהוה לא ימכר לא נгазל. This beautiful MS. is gradually going to pieces, many of its pages sticking together on account of the dampness.

23. In the Karaite Synagogue: portion of a Bible MS.; parchment, 29 × 24½ cm., punctuated, square characters, full Masora; contains portions of Jeremiah and Ezekiel. Gradually disintegrating because of dampness.

24. In the Karaite Synagogue: portion of a Bible MS.; parchment, 29½ × 25½ cm., punctuated, two columns to the page, characters 1 cm. in height, full Masora; contains portions of Jeremiah and Ezekiel. Gradually disintegrating because of dampness.

25. In the Karaite Synagogue: part of a Bible MS.; 40½ × 36 cm., parchment, two columns to the page, punctuated, full Masora. There is an attempt at ornamentation at the beginning of each book. Some letters are done in red, with a little frame around them; one side of the cover is made up of paper fragments containing Talmudic writings. The MS. contains Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the Minor Prophets. At the end of Ezekiel, and in a later hand, the following: קרש ליהוה לא ימכר ולא נгазל המבר ליהוה. In quite a modern hand: קרש ליהוה לא ימכר אלי ישראלי ועל הוא כום. The colophon is not quite clear. Jacob Meborakh bought the book for his son Isaac. But the words are not intelligible. The first date 5126 = 1366; the second 5134 = 1374; if the letters form part of the Ta'rikh it would be 141 = 1381. They may,
however, represent some such expressions as א"ת קרך והוה. The MS. itself must be older than this by several hundred years.

26. In the Karaite Synagogue: part of a Bible MS.; 43½ x 36½ cm., parchment, three columns to the page, fully punctuated, and with copious Masora; from Joshua to the end of Chronicles, some pages missing in the middle. The last page is taken up with the words קירש וליאים א"תל יישראל א"תל נון ומבר וקהו, which are written in tremendous letters, and quite fill up the whole page.

27. In the Karaite Synagogue: part of a Bible MS.; 43 x 38½ cm., parchment, magnificently written in beautiful characters, three columns to the page, plentiful Masora; containing Joshua, Judges, Samuel, and Kings complete; going to pieces because of dampness, the last pages look like a mass of Genizah ruin. On the outside page are the words לארהים בן דוד, in square ancient characters, as old as the text itself. In a much later hand is the following: אלמנעות בן חלף יושע בָּשָׁהְסֵי מִכָּה נְעֹדָה הָדָסִית יstructors. I do not understand, except that it seems to indicate one Joseph [ibn] Musa as owner of the codex. At the end is the following colophon: (1)

The rest is quite illegible, the parchment being turned to pulp. After this follow a few pages containing Masoretic notes. There are attached to the volume a few loose leaves which seem originally to have been at the beginning. On the outside of the first one is the following: הוא מעב לוחית ודרהו realizing אתלšים בלשון ד렙 אנאותו, וחק המב ממעד הגריב היא שלש Rubin DJs.

שָׁתָה וה Marxism אתלšים בלשון דרפא, והחק המב ממעד הגריב היא שלש Rubin DJs.
Some Hebrew Manuscripts in Cairo

The manuscript is very ancient. From the various colophons we learn that the scribe and Masorite was Samuel ben Jacob; and that the four books were not part of a whole Bible, but were intended to be a volume by themselves. The original possessor seems to have been Yahyah ben Jacob. It then passed into the hands of a priestly family: Ha-kohen ben David b. Solomon b. Abraham b. Shabriyar b. Abzon b. Bazarjwai, who gave it to his son David ha-Kohen. We have here, as in a previous case, Persian names. Was the MS. written in Persia? The last, and late owner was one Raphael b. Benjamin b. Eleazar ha-Levi, who has not scrupled to insert his name in an older Ta’rikh.

28. In the Karaite Synagogue: copy of the Pentateuch; 27 × 24½ cm., parchment, two columns to the page, fine characters, full Masora; two pages missing at the beginning; ends in the middle of Ha’azinü (Deut. xxxii).

1 Or Buzurjwai, or better Buzurjöl (see Brockelmann in Z.D.M.G., LIX, 179). On the name see Justi, Iranisches Namenbuch, p. 359 (cf. p. 66, Bazrōo or Bezruyeh). For Abżōn or Abzān, see ibid., p. 2.
29. In the Karaite Synagogue: part of a copy of the Bible; 39½ x 30½ cm., parchment, two columns to the page, sparse Masora, not very old; contains the prophetical books; was originally two volumes, the first commencing with Joshua, the second with Isaiah. A number of leaves are missing in the middle.

30. In the Karaite Synagogue: portion of a Bible MS.; 28½ x 22 cm., parchment, two columns to the page, no Masora, only a few Keres noted; occasional notes on the margin, e.g. to the verse 253 את שערו תѡתנה לארדך we read "אשת שערו תיהא אדך ויהי מִשְׁרֵי מֶשֶׁש מְכַס 1 לַל אֲבָב הָרְבָּה." Contains the Pentateuch from Parashah אבב הרבбо to the end of נס נס, Haftarot according to Rabbanites, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Minor Prophets (incomplete), Esther (incomplete). Not very old, but mouldering away in different places.

31. In the Karaite Synagogue: portion of a Bible MS. containing Judges, Samuel, Kings, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the Minor Prophets (but all more or less incomplete); 30 x 23½ cm., parchment, three columns to the page, full Masora at the top and bottom of the page and between the columns, rather pretty small script. Some of the headings are done in red ink, as are the markings of the Haftarot, which, placed on the side of the page, are encircled in delicate ornamentation. A few pages are in a different hand. Mouldering away in various places.

32. In the Karaite Synagogue: portion of a Bible MS. containing Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Minor Prophets (but very incomplete); 33½ x 26 cm., two columns to the page, no Masora. Mouldering away from one end to the other.

33. In the Karaite Synagogue: portion of a Bible MS. containing the historical books from 2 Sam. vii. 24 on, the greater part of the prophetical books and of the hagiographa; 30½ x 24 cm., parchment, two columns to the page, pretty script, the letters of which are written closely together, full Masora. Mouldering away.

Together with this are portions of other Bible MSS., same size, two columns to the page, parchment. Also a part of Ezekiel and the Minor Prophets, with a commentary written on the margin between the columns. Specimen from Jonah: 1 Comp. MS. Brit. Mus. Add. 9100 (German, 1250) 253 imprisonment שנמ א'ר 253 Ginsburg, Introduction, p. 541. MS. Florence Laurentiana Plut. 3. Cod. 10: סֶל הָרְבָּה אֲבָב אֲבָב אֲבָב גֵּרֵי בָּאָב שְׁרוּן שְׁרוּן שְׁרוּן שְׁרוּן.
34. In the Karaite Synagogue: a part of the Masoretic Bible of Moses ben Asher; three columns to the page, parchment, 42 x 39.5 cm.; containing the portion from Joshua to Malachi, though the beginning is not complete; full Masora, careful punctuation and accentuation. Most of the leaves are loose, and the whole has been placed in a wooden box which is just a little too small, with a glass top. There are a number of pages which formed either the beginning or end of the codex, and which are filled with illustrations of a geometrical character painted in gold: one page contains representations of the altars and utensils used in the tabernacle. The colophon reads 1:—

1 See also Ibn Saphir, I, 14 et seq.; II, 186; Ginsburg, Introduction, p. 241. Part of the colophon as given in E. N. Adler, Jews in Many Lands (Phil. 1905), p. 23, is wrongly given. The MS. is not a *sto nino mpo but a *sto nino mpo; and was not written in *kiri which is not the manner in which Cairo is spelt in Hebrew MSS. but in Tiberias. It is not probable that Maimonides refers to this codex as the model which he followed: the Ben Asher whom he mentions is Aaron ben Moses b. Asher, whose codex was also in Egypt. See Levita, Massoret ha Massoret, ed. Ginsburg, p. 114, and below, No. 70.
The codex was written in the city of Tiberias by the well-known Masorite, Moses ben Asher (ninth century), in the year 897; it is, therefore, one of the oldest dated MSS. of the Bible. Originally it must have been complete, and it is possible that the missing parts are in some collection. Curious is the extravagant manner in which Moses seems to refer to the Masorites, “the company of prophets, chosen of the Lord, holy ones of our God, who under-

1 It is strange to read in Ginsburg, Introduction, p. 475, that “the St. Petersburg Codex is the oldest dated MS. of any portion of the Hebrew Scriptures which has as yet come to light.” The subscription of this Moses ben Asher Codex has been known for very many years—and Dr. Ginsburg cites Ibn Saphir’s book.
stand all secret things, and who disclose the secret of wisdom, the righteous and faithful ones, who have not left out one word of that which was handed down to them, nor have added one word to that which was bequeathed to them," &c., &c., reminding one of the equally extravagant praise in the interesting Genizah fragment published by Dr. Schechter some years ago. But perhaps the Karaites are intended! The second colophon is of peculiar interest, as it bears upon the question whether or no Moses ben Asher was a Karaite: it seems to be cotemporaneous with the codex itself. I understand it to mean that the MS. was written at the request of one Ya'bez ben Solomon, the Babylonian, for his own personal use. We know that there were Karaites in Babylonia, e.g. in Hit on the Euphrates, from which place codex No. 57 (see below, p. 644) came. At a later time he donated it to the Karaite community in Jerusalem, according to the third colophon. The codex, having suffered from use or from want, needed repairing. It was re-bound at the expense of Eliezer ha-Levi ben 'Adiyah ha-Levi in the year 1684, according to the fourth colophon. How it came into the possession of David ben Jepheth who presented it to the Karaites in Cairo is not stated; he left it to the community after his death (אֲנִי נָלֹאַתִי). There is a further difficulty in the fifth colophon. David is said to have been the grandson of one אֲנִי נָלֹאַתִי. What these letters mean passes my understanding.

The following MSS. are part of the collection of books stored in the Sefardic Rabbinate. I have omitted to take note of a few modern ones.

35. Responsa of Rosh: large square MS., paper, Spanish rabbinic script, incomplete; the last responsum is numbered 425.

36. Responsa of Moses b. Maimon: small quarto volume in different scripts; according to the list at the beginning, the MS. contains 288 responsa.

37. Responsa of R. Abraham Monson: square MS. of 435 pp. At the beginning occurs the following: הָעֵם שֶׁיֹּאמַר לָשׁוֹנָה שַׁהֲדוּת בָּלָם בַּאֲרָמִים בֶּךָ מַעַרְבַּת יְזֵרֶה יִירָא שֶׁיֹּאמַר לָשׁוֹנָה שַׁהֲדוּת בָּלָם בֶּךָ מַעַרְבַּת יְזֵרֶה יִירָא שֶׁיֹּאמַר לָשׁוֹנָה שַׁהֲדוּת בָּלָם בֶּךָ מַעַרְבַּת יְזֵרֶה יִירָא שֶׁיֹּאמַר לָשׁوֹנָה שַׁהֲדוּת בָּלָם בֶּךָ מַעַרְבַּת יְזֵרֶה יִירָא שֶׁיֹּאמַר לָשׁוֹנָה שַׁהֲדוּת בָּלָם B'X'nn nuiBTI, the Responsa of Rosh: large square MS., paper, Spanish rabbinic script, incomplete; the last responsum is numbered 425.

36. Responsa of Moses b. Maimon: small quarto volume in different scripts; according to the list at the beginning, the MS. contains 288 responsa.

37. Responsa of R. Abraham Monson: square MS. of 435 pp. At the beginning occurs the following: הָעֵם שֶׁיֹּאמַר לָשׁוֹנָה שַׁהֲדוּת בָּלָם בֶּךָ מַעַרְבַּת יְזֵרֶה יִירָא שֶׁיֹּאמַר לָשׁוֹנָה שַׁהֲדוּת בָּלָם בֶּךָ מַעַרְבַּת יְזֵרֶה יִירָא שֶׁיֹּאמַר L'ITINEX.

VOL. XVII.
38. Sermons of R. Nissim Gerondi (RaN); paper, 8vo, of some age, but incomplete both at the beginning and the end.

39. A collection of Derashot by small 4to MS., not very old.

40. By Jacob Castro: large 8vo MS. in modern hand. On the first page is the following note: . . . The note tells that the MS. was in the possession of a direct descendant of the author: Abraham, son of Isaac, son of Jacob Castro.

41. A short dictionary of rabbinical terms and expressions arranged in alphabetic order. The modern title, "Collectanea," given by the binder of the volume, has no warrant in the text itself.

42. Of Kalonymus b. Kalonymus: modern Oriental hand; incomplete both at the beginning and at the end.

43. Of Abraham ibn Ezra, followed by a letter-book giving formulae for correspondence.

44. The Shulhan 'Aruk, Hoshen Mishpat, together with the Sefer ha-Meharim, quarto; at the end . . . i.e. Meir b. Jacob Prince.

45. A commentary on the Pentateuch: parchment, good Spanish-Oriental hand; based entirely upon the Talmud and Midrash; incomplete, commencing with the beginning of Leviticus and continuing to Deut. xxxiii. Specimen:—

46. A commentary on the Pentateuch: parchment, good Spanish-Oriental hand; based entirely upon the Talmud and Midrash; incomplete, commencing with the beginning of Leviticus and continuing to Deut. xxxiii. Specimen:—
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47. Part of the commentary of David Maimonides on the Pentateuch, from the middle of Parashah IV to the middle of Parashah V: Arabic in Hebrew characters; small 8vo, paper, commencing with the folio numbered 17. In the same volume there is a portion of a commentary on Proverbs, partly on paper and partly on parchment; Oriental script; imperfect both at the beginning and the end. Specimen:

48. A casuistic work arranged alphabetically. Its name is possibly חמשה מאמרות. In different hands.

49. Responsa of R. J. Siyyah (?): incomplete, ending in the middle of No. 614. Each responsum is called מכתב." Each.

50. Discourses of R. Samuel ibn Sid: modern Oriental hand, paper. Note: שמאול נתי. ימי ובא Amendments could have altered the text. The genealogy of the author is given as Samuel son of Mordecai, son of Isaac, son of Samuel ibn Sid.

51. Tosafot of Rabbenu Perez to Baba Kamma: folio, old Syrian script, paper, incomplete at the end.

52. The מכתבים of David Kimhi: 4to, paper, incomplete; commences about half a page before שכר מצא, and ends in the middle of שכר עלים.
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53. Arabic in Hebrew characters, cabalistic, folio. At the end a peculiar secret script, similar to that found in de Pomis' grammar, and in Syriac and Arabic MSS. On the title-page is the following remark: utoh jhah ehaqo adem ally, "This is the Book of our Father Adam, given to him by Raziel the Angel."

54. Commentary on the Pentateuch by Shem Tob ben Isaac ben Shaprut: well written in Oriental Rabbinical script, paper, small 8vo, incomplete, commencing in the middle of Parashat Bereshit, and ending Deut. xxxii. Many passages are introduced with the words 'nKH n^K MYX, e.g.:—

At the end of the book is the following note:—

55. B-nbNnW, the name of the author is not given: small 8vo of 20 folios in a beautiful Spanish-Oriental script. A treatise on Morals containing twenty chapters. After which come 5½ folios with the commentary of Abraham ibn Ezra on Canticles.

56. nU13i1lye*'0, 240 fols., square 4to, in modern Oriental hand.

57. of Abraham ibn Ezra; modern hand.

58. of Joseph ben Emanu-El Ergas (יאראנס):
24mo, 93 fols. Commences with some verses of Gikatillia (売れל, שער והאתייה, שער וחוהא). A treatise on morals: מפריסות, very often in a cabalistic sense; also a large number of Piyyutim, of which there is a list at the beginning.

59. מפריסות, 24mo, incomplete at the beginning; contains a large number of wonderful tales (כְּסָפֶים) and stories (כת三等奖), very often in a cabalistic sense; also a large number of Piyyutim, of which there is a list at the beginning.

60. מפריסות, complete in ninety numbers; gives the formulas for writing Hebrew documents; Oriental modern hand.

61. Controversial work against Christianity, incomplete at the beginning and at the end, small 8vo, in two parts. The second commences:

62. D'ולד, cabalistic: small 8vo, Oriental hand, incomplete.

63. D'ולד, Sermons by an unknown author: large 8vo, modern hand.

64. In the Karaite Rabbinate: 4to volume, the pages of which are all separate and sadly mixed, brought there by a Karaite from Hit on the Euphrates; paper, MS., Arabic in Hebrew characters. It contains:

(a) A portion of the מפריסות of Samuel ben Moses al-Mughrabi: a commentary upon the Pentateuch pericopes in the form of "Questions and Answers." One part is entitled: קראPu פֶּהַרְשָׁה אתא, i.e. Evangelion. I was unable to tell whether the whole or how much of the commentary is extant in the MS.

(b) A portion of the מפריסות of Isaiah ben Uzzia Kohen, called "Ma'allim Fadil." The title-page of the second part runs as follows: נון אַלְפָּיָא די פֶּהַרְשָׁה אתא אִלּוֹא פְּלִיפֶּלָל טְלָוְיָא. I owe this identification to the kindness of Professor Eberhard Nestle.
Then follows: 

The scribe's name is Aaron ben Moses ben Elijah, called Ben Ghalulî. On another page the following superscription is found: This gives the date on which the work was finished as Tishri 1, 5286 = 1526 C.E., which date is certified in various ways (= 3632 of the Flood, = 2842 of the Exodus, &c., &c.). The use of the word תִּשְׁרוּה would seem to refer the date to the composition of the book, though this hardly seems to agree with other data that would place the date of Moses al-Maghrabi about a whole century earlier.

The second work is preceded by an index, of which a specimen is here attached:

Dr. S. Poznański, who has kindly identified this MS. for me, suggests the reading בַּאֲרוּ הַלֹּאְלָה from a place, "Akul," near to Baghdad.
65. In the possession of Mr. Arbib is a MS. which was reported to me as "a work on Medicine by Maimonides." It turned out to be the Hebrew translation of the "Canon" of Avicenna. The MS. is incomplete, containing portions of what were originally two volumes: five leaves containing a part of the table of contents of the second volume, plus 149 leaves; parchment, 26½ x 24½ cm., two columns to the page, in a small, somewhat cursive Oriental script. A large part has been collated with another text: a later hand has noted the variants (introduced by י or ח) on the margin. The MS. must originally have been a work of some art, the initials of the chapters are illuminated in a sober manner becoming a work on medicine.

66. In the possession of Dr. B. Moritz, Librarian of the Khedivial Library at Cairo, ten leaves of a Hebrew Bible in Arabic characters and with Arabic vocalization, containing part of Daniel. Each Hebrew verse followed by its Arabic translation and a sort of Arabic commentary. I suppose that this is part of the British Museum MS. edited some years ago by Dr. Hoernle. In spite of much persuasion I was unable to get sight of these ten leaves, Dr. Moritz alleging one reason after another for his refusal.

67. In the possession of Mr. Scialom Levy: מְלַעֲחַת מְצָרִים: a copy of the so-called Cairo Megillah, made by Mr. Levy's father who
had found an old copy which he afterwards threw away (into the Genizah). This occurred about the year 1844. Mr. Scialom Levy has the privilege of reading the Megillah in the Synagogue on the appropriate day—28th Adar.

APPENDIX I.

68. In the Zaradel Synagogue, Alexandria: MS. of the whole Bible; in square characters, parchment, \(24\frac{1}{2} \times 19\) cm., two columns to the page, Masora beautifully arranged in varying devices at the top and bottom of the pages; the headings of the various books are in gold and colours; eight pages of Masora at the beginning and four at the end in gold, blue, and green framework: altogether, calligraphically a work of art. At the end there is the following subscription: ובראינו אלהינו נואוה אכסף מרינו וד הבה, i.e. “Remember me for good, O my God, Amen! David the priest [who is] known [by the name] Coutinho, Rosh Ḥodesh Tishri 5127.” One would expect קנסיני if my transcription of the name is correct. The year 5127 = 1367, and the provenance of the MS. would be the Spanish Peninsula. Although the colophon is not in the same handwriting as the text, it can well be of the same epoch. Was David the scribe or the owner? The MS. is well preserved and well taken care of. The authorities of the Synagogue seem to be aware of its value: it is kept in a tastefully made cupboard near the Ark.

69. In the Zaradel Synagogue, Alexandria: first volume of a codex of the Bible from Genesis to the end of Kings; parchment, \(30 \times 23\frac{1}{2}\) cm., two columns to the page, very full Masora at the top and bottom of the pages and between the columns; a few headings of the books are illuminated, especially that of Genesis, in which animals and birds predominate. Before the commencement of the texts are the “Different readings of Ben Asher and Ben Naphtali.” No subscription or date is to be found in the whole volume; though it looks older than the preceding. On one of the blank pages is the following note in regard to the extra-canonical books:
Our learned man has been in part misinformed. The book of “Baruch” does not contain “all that is written about him in Jeremia,” but a good deal more. The two books “after the Book of Daniel” are probably Bel and the Dragon. He does not seem even to have heard their name. The book of “Antiochus,” after Malachi, must be the Books of the Maccabees. He then mentions Tobit, “Ecclesiasticus by Jesus” and “Wisdom,” which he ascribes to Philo, an ascription which I believe I have seen in Syriac MSS. The “Book of Nehemiah” must refer to the apocryphal Ezra, which he confounds with the canonical “Nehemiah” of the Church.

70. In the Karaite Synagogue at Jerusalem: complete codex of the Bible in two volumes; parchment, 34.5 x 27 cm., two columns to the page, vowels and accents, full Masora. The first volume is in a modern binding; the second in a peculiar box binding made of iron. Only the first volume is kept in the Synagogue; the second in the dwelling upstairs, because of the intense dampness in the subterranean synagogue (21 x 15 feet), which makes all the books kept there positively mouldy. At the end of the second volume is the following subscription: א"ת [משה רב נחמיהリアルホーウ] א"ת [משה רב נחמיהリアルホーウ] א"ת [משה רב נחמיהリアルホーウ]. In deciphering this inscription I had the help of my learned friend Mr. David Yellin. Though the reading is certain, the proper names are not quite intelligible. The codex was finished in the month Sivan, 5182 = 1422, and

1 Later hand has added a Yod above the מ.
was written and punctuated by one Moses ben Menachem of Seville. I, at first, thought of Burgos: but the nun is certain, and the addition of the Arabic article would be surprising. But some place in Spain is evidently intended, as is seen by the name of the Maecenas for whom the codex was prepared: Mordechai ben Isaac, who was known as Don Mordechai. “Don” in place of a vav is itself peculiar, and the proper name passes my knowledge of Spanish.

On a fly-leaf at the end of the second volume, and in a modern hand, is the following:—

Such model codices are mentioned in the Masora, either in a general way e.g. ת"ש כז"א א"ז (Ginsburg, l.c., p. 469), or they have place-names ת"ש כז"א א"ז (ib., p. 483); or they have place-names ת"ש כז"א א"ז (Spain), ת"ש כז"א א"ז (Jerusalem), ת"ש כז"א א"ז (Sinai); or, again, they were written by some noted teacher and called after his name: ת"ש כז"א א"ז ת"ש כז"א א"ז ת"ש כז"א א"ז (Master) R. Meir of Speyer and R. Meir Abulafia (see Monatschrift, XLVIII, p. 607). Cod. Vatican xiv (complete Pentateuch) was written by Elijah, son of Berschiah ha-Nakdan, in 1399 (Assemani, Catalogue, p. 15). A twelfth-century codex is even assigned to Rabbenus Tam (Ginsburg, Introduction, p. 524). The expression ת"ש כז"א א"ז is still a riddle.
As this has reference to the "muster-codex\(^1\)" of the Masorite Aaron ben Moses ben Asher, I have thought it worth while to give the note complete. It purports to be a copy of the subscription of a MS. of the Bible (called also here "Mikdash-Yah," as in No. 3) belonging to the Karaites at Jerusalem, which itself was a copy of one known as ד'כ ע"נמי, and which was presented to the Karaite Synagogue in Cairo. "Yerushalayim" seems to stand in place of the later expression "Abbeh Yerushalayim\(^2\)." The original MS. was written by no less a personage than Solomon ben Yeruham\(^3\), but punctuated and "Masorated" by Aaron ben Moses ben Asher, to whom the title "Head of the Yeshibah" is given—whether in reality or only in an honorific manner I shall not attempt to decide. It was evidently written for one Israel ben Simhah ben Sa'adyah ben Ephraim of Bassora and presented by him to the Karaite community in Jerusalem,

---

\(^1\) Compare the extravagant expressions above in No. 34.

\(^2\) Or does this refer to the model "Sefer Yerushalayim," so often referred to in Masoretic notes?

\(^3\) Ginsburg, Introduction, p. 242, makes out of him "R. Solomon b. Bevich," basing his description upon an article in Ha-Zofah, 1857, Nos. 47, 48. See also, Ibn Saphir, I, 12, 13. Relying upon a further subscription Ginsburg says that it was transferred "to the community in Egypt for the Jerusalem Synagogue." There was no such synagogue. The reference is simply to the Karaites in Cairo. Two further subscriptions are given in Adler, Jews in Many Lands, p. 163.
and was to be in the especial keeping of the Nasi Josaiahand the Nasi Hezekiah, the sons of the Nasi Solomon ben David ben Boaz. The two keepers of the precious volume were to take it out and show it to the various companies and gatherings on the three great festivals (“Regalim”): and if for any reason they are called away from Jerusalem, they are to entrust it to the care of two other men of probity. Interesting is the additional permission given to show it to learned Rabbanites whenever they want to know any of the minutiae of the Masoretic text, “plene or defective, Ketibh or Kerē (note the passive ‘Kārūy’), open [pārāshāh] or closed, or the accentuation,” as well as the prohibition against showing it to non-Jews (“men in whom is no faith”).

APPENDIX II.

The very short chapter devoted by Kaufmann to illuminated Bibles in Müller and Schlösser’s Sarajevo-Haggadah (p. 261) is quite insufficient. The subject deserves a special and a thorough treatment. To this must be added the description of a British Museum MS. of the thirteenth century with thirty-nine illuminations, of which thirty-six are full-paged (see G. Margoliouth in J. Q. R., XVII, 193). Since writing the above I have had the chance to examine two more illuminated Hebrew Bibles. MS. Casanatense, No. 283, has been, I believe, cursorily described by Dr. Berliner and by Sacerdote (Cataloghi, &c, p. 486). The script is Rabbinic, as in No. 7 above; evidently the stress was to be laid upon the illumination, rather than upon the text—as was not uncommon in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. Unfortunately only the first two pages (ff. 1 b and 2 a) have been treated; though the proper spaces for the full-page illustrations, for the initials and borders have been carefully left. The frontispiece contains a full-page illustration of Adam and Eve on either side of the tree, along the trunk of which the serpent is coiled. The serpent has, in uncomplimentary manner, a female head with long golden hair; this is found in Christian MSS. also, e. g. in the fifteenth-century MS. of Nicholas de Lyra in the Laurentiana at Florence. The background is blue and hills are to be seen in the distance. A roe and a squirrel crouch on the ground. Adam
SOME HEBREW MANUSCRIPTS IN CAIRO

holds an apple in one hand: Eve, what seems to be an opened fruit. The figures are excellently drawn and delicately painted—but with a sexual realism that is quite unwonted.

The border has four medallions: (1) containing the sun as a human face; (2) an idyllic scene, in which a hocking man, resting his hands upon what seems to be a club, turns a frightened look towards an admonishing figure, youngish in appearance, whose face is crowned with an aureola, from which the rays of the sun stream. I take this to represent the Almighty chiding Cain; (3 and 4) are heraldic devices, which are fully explained by Sacerdote. The first page of the text has the letter Beth in gold upon a red background. The border has also four medallions: (1) the moon; (2) a landscape with two trees and what looks like a grasshopper in front; (3) a burning furnace out of which fire issues; (4) a medallion, upheld by angels, containing three beehives, above which is a dove with an olive-branch in its mouth: the heraldic device, if I am not mistaken, of one of the great Italian families. At the right-hand corner of the right-hand column is a medallion in the form of a standard, containing the letters פך (i.e. פך פך פך פך). The MS. was written in Florence in 1455.

Of special interest is the representation of God, if my identification is correct. I believe that there was originally another one in the thirty-seventh picture of the Cairo MS. This must be taken as a possible commentary on what Mr. I. Abrahams has to say upon the subject in the Jewish Chronicle for April 21, 1905.

I have also examined MS. Plut. 3. Cod. 10 in the Laurentiana at Florence: 4to MS. on parchment, containing the Pentateuch, Haftarot and Megillot with Targum and Rashi. The Megillot are in the order: Canticles, Ruth, Lamentations, Ecclesiastes, Esther. Then comes אֱלֹהִים מֵאַלְמָנָה אֵשׁ לֹא מִשָּׁלֶם אֵשׁ מֶלֶךְ אֵשׁ מִשָּׁלֶם אֵשׁ מֶלֶךְ, divided off for the various persons who are to be “called up.” The Targum is added for the days of Passover, and for the first and second days of Shebuot. At the end of the Haftarot is the superscription חֵן וַיָּוֹם מִשְׁפָּר שֶׁל הַמַּעַרְכָּה לֹא יְמִינֵהוּ לֹא יְמִינֵהוּ לֹא יְמִינֵהוּ לֹא יְמִינֵהוּ לֹא יְמִינֵהוּ לֹא יְמִינֵהוּ לֹא יְמִינֵהוּ. I have no books at hand to verify this variant of the famous saying. The writing is German, square in character; the Targum in smaller square script, the Masora in very minute square, Rashi in Rashi script. The Masora all over the page is
very full. Elongated letters are sparingly used; letters being added to fill out the lines. When the Tetragrammaton is written [כ], it is written out on the margin. There are many corrections. The illuminations are:

1. The first word of each Parashah has a coloured background and border.

2. Beginning of Genesis, a half-page: gold flower-work very delicately done upon a red background. The word בְּרֵאשִׁית in dark blue.

3. Pen and ink sketch of Jacob's dream: Jacob asleep, one angel going up, one coming down the ladder. By the side a mediaeval castle.

4. At the end of Genesis, the Masora is worked into beautiful interlacings of green, red and gold.

5. Beginning of Exodus: branches and leaves encircling the whole page. The Rashi heading is also illuminated.

6. In the appropriate place, pictures of the appurtenances of the Tabernacle—altars, menorah, &c., somewhat crudely executed.

7. At the beginning of Numbers, half-page of Masoretic notes in a circular illuminated setting: but the work is crude. Here and there an attempt is made to draw a griffin.

8. To Numbers xiii (sending forth of the spies), there are illustrations at the top and bottom of the page, showing the position of אַשְׁרִי אֱוֹדָם and אֵין כְּנֶסֶת. The first is surrounded by castles; the second has as a prominent feature some hills, on the top of each of which is a castle. But the hills quake and are unsteady.


10. Deuteronomy: beautiful three-quarter page illumination in red, blue, green, and gold. The Masora is also illuminated.

Among the Masoretic notes in the MS. the following may be mentioned. To the word נַחֲלָתָה לְאָכָל יִרֵכְלֵם, לֶפֶסַט הָוֹסֶפֶת שֶׁמֶן is written as one word; there is no break in Gen. iv. 8. At the end of Genesis is the note: בֵּין שָׁמְר וַתְּסֹר עִרֵי לְהוֹזֵק יִקְשׁוּ לְבָרָךְ שֶׁשָּׁמַע שֶׁשָּׁמַע הִבְנֵי שֶׁשָּׁמַע. At the end of Leviticus, the words זֵעַר לְהוֹזֵק יִשְׁמַע הַכָּל בֵּין שָׁמַר וַתְּסֹר מִלְם לְבָרָךְ שֶׁשָּׁמַע וַתְּסֹר שֶׁשָּׁמַע. Various model codices are mentioned: to
Gen. xix. 23. Again Gen. 1. 24


MS. Brit. Mus. Add. 21160, c. 1300, with Masora elaborated into human figures (p. 625).

MS. Brit. Mus. Or. 2091, Germany, c. 1300, with Masora in the form of grotesque animals (p. 663).

MS. Brit. Mus. Or. 2201, Toledo 1246, has Song and Blessing of Moses in illuminated borders (p. 668).

MS. Brit. Mus. Or. 2348, Yemen 1469, has oriental designs in colours (p. 683).

MS. Brit. Mus. Or. 2626–28, Lisbon 1483, richly illuminated, with ninety borders (p. 708).

MS. Brit. Mus. Or. 2696, Germany 1300; letters in gold and illuminated borders (p. 719).

Codex Ginsburg i, Avignon 1419, illuminated initials (p. 740).

Richard Gottheil.

Cairo, February, 1905.
As early as 1837 Abraham Geiger is on record as advocating a conference of like-thinking, progressive rabbis for the discussion of the essentials of Judaism and the consideration of the practical religious problems that were demanding solution. Individuals had given expression to the necessity of freeing the religion of the accumulated mass of outgrown forms wherewith it was burdened; they had likewise called attention to the facts that in the changed conditions of their life thousands of Jews were disregarding the commands of rabbinical Judaism, and that the cleft between what passed as the authoritative official expression of the faith and the practice of the people was growing wider and wider. Geiger, therefore, felt that the need for a gathering of religious leaders was imperative in order that some conclusion as to how the difficult situation was to be met might be arrived at; his ideas of the purpose of such a conference are set forth in an open letter written on May 10, 1837, while he was still rabbi in Wiesbaden, and entitled "The Rabbinical Assembly; Epistle to a Friend in the Jewish Ministry." In this communication he says that the conference is not "to formulate a new Judaism nor to assume synodal authority; it is to afford

---

1 This paper forms the fifth of the series on "The Reform Movement in Judaism."

honest men the opportunity of discussing the best methods of conducting their office, and is to be a beginning towards a resuscitation of the wellnigh vanished spirit of Judaism."

He shows how this form is being disregarded here and that precept there, how one coreligionist believes that the service of God demands the punctilious observance of every iota of the traditional ritual, while another entertains altogether different views, and believes that the salvation of the faith depends upon its being delivered from the rigidity of formalism ("Formenstarrheit"): all this was giving rise to unutterable confusion, and the people were drifting helplessly, and each one was like to become a law to himself: "If, however, a number of rabbis make unanimous declaration as to the non-essentiality of this or that observance the bonds of formalism will be loosened."

Hence, even though such a conference were only deliberative and not authoritative, it would nevertheless give a mighty impetus to the progressive movement; the people would go forward with greater confidence if they knew that their leaders had agreed upon a standpoint that expressed a conception of Judaism based upon the spirit and not merely upon the observance of unnumbered forms, many of which were no longer religiously significant. "I confess," he concludes, "that I cannot conceive how we can hold up our heads if we will not stand courageously for our innermost convictions; I cannot rest satisfied to continue to wear a mask any longer, politic as such a course would be undoubtedly. I leave it to your own conscience to decide how friends of truth and integrity will judge us, and by what name posterity will stigmatize us if we continue to speak high-sounding phrases but to enact weak deeds." Here Geiger was a pioneer; this was the first call for a rabbinical conference to consider the present condition of Judaism: the gathering took place at

1 Wiss. Zeitschrift, III, 321.
2 Ibid., 327.
3 Ibid., 331.
4 Jewish Encyclopedia, art. "Rabbinical Conferences." The Bavarian
Wiesbaden in August, 1837, and was attended by Geiger, A. Aub of Baireuth, M. Bloch of Buchau, J. A. Friedländer of Brilon, E. Grünebaum of Landau, M. Gutmann of Redwitz, S. Herxheimer of Bernburg, A. Kohn of Hohenems, I. Löwi of Furth, J. Maier of Stuttgart, L. Stein of Burgkunstadt, M. Wassermann of Mühringen, and B. Wechsler; M. Hess of Eisenach arrived too late. True, the conference accomplished little, much less than Geiger expected. The only practical results of the meeting consisted, first, in the adoption of a resolution that studies on subjects of practical import should be published in Geiger's theological magazine, and that thereupon all the rabbis who were in attendance should give expression to their opinions on these subjects through the same medium; and, secondly, in the appointment of a commission, consisting of Löwi, Maier, and Stein, to prepare a manual for domestic devotion. Still, even though the results were so meagre, it was an achievement to have brought together a number of Jewish leaders. Geiger recognized clearly that one of the greatest needs of this disturbed time in Jewry was that the guides of the congregations should arrive at some agreement on the subjects of practical moment that were agitating individuals and communities. Although the Wiesbaden conference exerted scarcely any influence, still was the idea of its originator to be vindicated brilliantly some time later in the assembling of the famous rabbinical conferences of Brunswick, Frankfort, and Breslau in the years 1844, 1845, and 1846, which form the subject of the present essay.

District Assemblies held in 1835 were not rabbinical conferences in the strict sense, as laymen also participated in them.—J. Q. R., XV, 520.

1 The only account that we have of this conference is to be found in a letter written by Geiger to his friend Jacob Auerbach: see Nachgelassene Schriften, V, 99.

2 A letter written from Frankfort sets forth the hopes which this gathering had aroused in the hearts of the friends of progressive Judaism: see Wiss. Zeitschrift für jüd. Theologie, III, 475; see also Jost, "Geschichte des Judenthums und seiner Sekten," III, 352.
Each day wellnigh in that stormy time brought evidence from here, there, and everywhere in Germany of the difficulties encountered by Jews of living the new life in the world into which emancipation had thrown them, and carrying out faithfully the commands of rabbinical Judaism. Many had cut the Gordian knot by simply disregarding the legislation of the codes, but there were thousands who were troubled honestly and sincerely, and who were looking anxiously for a way out of this cul de sac: the conflict between religion and life had to cease; the problem cried for solution: who so qualified to solve it, if indeed solved it could be, as the religious and theological experts? The seven years succeeding Geiger's initial effort disclosed the necessity for the gathering of these experts more and more clearly; the ranks of those who could not fulfil conscientiously every jot and tittle of the rabbinical codes were swelling day by day, many had ceased to be affiliated with the synagogue, and were Jews in name only; the demand was imperious for the reconciliation of the life of the Jew with his religious professions. Hence when, in the beginning of the year 1844, Ludwig Philippson, the editor of the most widely circulated Jewish publication of the time, issued a call for a rabbinical conference, his words met with an instant and sympathetic response; the time seemed to be ripe now. In this call Philippson wrote as follows: "Let us speak plainly. The issue is no longer the permissibility or non-permissibility of this or that synagogue institution, of this or that alleviation for civil and social life; the issue before us is concerned with the entire content of our religion, which we must present and strengthen in its purity and divinity in order to rescue it


2 See the addresses of various communities to the Frankfort Conference, Protokolle, 243, 249-53, 260-6, 269.
from deadening rigidity on the one hand and from benumbing unbelief on the other. Judaism is weakening in its hold upon its followers day by day, and every layman is asking us, What are you doing? The objects of the conference shall be—(1) to bring the rabbis into closer relation and acquaintanceship; (2) to promote unanimity in the conduct of the rabbinical office; (3) to further the founding of communal institutions; and (4) to take counsel together on all Jewish affairs."

The readiness wherewith a large number of rabbis declared themselves to be in sympathy with the object of this call showed their eagerness to contribute towards solving what was becoming an intolerable condition of affairs for those who felt that many Jewish institutions did not comport with the religious conceptions of the generation, and that these institutions demanded a thoroughgoing and comprehensive reform. It must never be forgotten that the conferences were intended to be erected upon the broad foundation of fitting the essentials of Judaism to the practical requirements of the new life whereupon the Jews had entered, and which was as different from the existence of the Ghetto centuries as the cramped life of these centuries had been from the freedom of the Palestinian commonwealth of old. Short as the conferences came of fulfilling this great expectation, yet this was undoubtedly the hope of the great majority of the men who were instrumental in calling them into being.

1 Allgemeine Zeitung des Judenthums, VIII (1844), 27. In a leading article that appeared several weeks later entitled "Annual Rabbinical Conferences" (ibid., 117), Philippson states that the idea to issue a call for a conference was suggested to him in a letter that he had received from Dr. Max Lilienthal from Riga, Russia, on Nov. 26, 1843, wherein the writer requested him to call such a meeting; he had received also a communication from Rabbi Levi of Giessen, written on Jan. 2, 1844, containing an article advocating the organization of a rabbinical conference, and urging that he (Philippson) should take the initiative in the matter. Ibid., 118.
THE BRUNSWICK CONFERENCE.


Geiger, who was prevented from being present at the opening session of the conference, addressed a letter to the members, in which he urged that this first conference be merely preparatory and not resolutory—that it concern itself with practical issues, and not with theoretical discussions, and that it avoid laying down any hard-and-fast rules.

J. Maier, of Stuttgart, was elected president of the conference. In his address of acceptance he recommended, as had Geiger in his letter, that the conference bear in mind constantly the practical requirements of the day, and confine its attention to solving as far as it could the vexing problems that were agitating Jewish life. The rabbinical conference was expected to become a permanent institution; hence it was necessary to declare at the very outset what its purpose was to be; the first paragraph of the rules governing the conference defines this as follows: "The rabbinical conferences have as their purpose that the

1 Allgemeine Zeitung des Judenthums, VIII (1844), 337-9.
members shall take counsel together in order to determine by what means the preservation and development of Judaism and the enlivening of the religious consciousness can be accomplished. 1 The discussion of this paragraph touched the all-important question of the authoritative character of the conference. Was the conference simply to discuss and deliberate upon questions of importance, or was it also to pass resolutions and render decisive opinions? If the latter, in how far could these be considered binding on the congregations? Would the congregations accept the decisions of the rabbis? In a word, was the conference to become a new body of authority for Judaism, or were its deliberations to be purely academic and without practical import? Some very interesting opinions were enunciated during the lengthy discussion: the general feeling seemed to be that the conference had not a synodal character, that its resolutions could not be enforced, and that at best any rabbi present who voted with the majority on any question was bound morally to carry out such resolution in the practical administration of his office; 2 on the other hand, it was held that the very fact that certain resolutions had been adopted by the conference would give strong support to any rabbi who might need such support, and that after all the chief thing was the confidence of the people; if the people had confidence in them their work would prove to be of a lasting character, and would receive an authoritative stamp; if not, all their efforts were in vain. This was expressed excellently by Holdheim, who said: "The purpose of our gathering is to work for the preservation and development of our holy religion; all our deliberations are concerned herewith, and we pass resolutions as to how this is to be accomplished. Have we any synodal justification? No; we as little as the rabbis of former times. What gave them their power was the confidence of the congregations,

1 Protokoll der ersten Rabbinerversammlung abgehalten in Braunschweig, XIII; Braunschweig, 1844.
2 Ibid., XVI, 18.
and this confidence was reposed in them because they were scholars and adepts in the law. The same holds with us. In a later discussion he expressed himself again on this question of authority: "All the talk about a Talmudical Judaism is an illusion. Science has decided that the Talmud has no authority dogmatically or practically. Even those who will not acknowledge this go beyond the Talmud. The question is, Who gives us the right to change the liturgy? This question requires an unequivocal answer. The Morgen Stern (The Men of the Great Assembly) have authority only for their age; what they ordained was timely, and on this the sanction of their ordinances rested. We have the same authority for our age if we give utterance to the consciousness of our age, but "even though the Talmud is not authoritative for us we do not wish to disregard the intellectual activity of two thousand years. We say merely this: Anything which upon unbiased, careful criticism contradicts the religious consciousness of the present age has no authority for us." As to the real significance of the decision of the majority for the individual rabbi, Samuel Hirsch said well: "Our conference must have a moral consciousness and must state that it has this, so that a rabbi who has voted with the majority can refer to the resolutions of this assembly. He must be empowered to say: 'Although this or that may be in opposition to a paragraph of the Schulchan Arukh, I teach or do it, and thus many rabbis have voted with me, to whom I can refer.'" The whole discussion, as in fact did all the discussions, showed in what an unsettled state Jewish opinion and practice were; with scarcely an exception the men who had assembled at Brunswick desired reform; the question

1 See also his "Geschichte der Berliner Reformgemeinde," 113.
2 Protokoll, 55: cf. also his aphoristical statement, "Der Talmud spricht aus seinem Zeitbewusstsein und für dasselbe hatte er Recht; ich spreche aus einem höheren Bewusstsein meiner Zeit und für dasselbe habe ich Recht."—Ceremonialgesetze im Gottesreich, 50, Schwerin, 1845.
3 Protokolle, 66.
4 Ibid., 16.
was merely how much? Broadly speaking, the rabbis present might have been classed in three divisions—first, representatives of what might be called the orthodox-reform party, if so paradoxical a term is permissible, i.e. such as demanded that if any changes were made this must be done consistently with the Talmudic-rabbinical standpoint; they were not opposed to slight changes, but these must not affect the existing structure of Judaism as based on Talmud and Schulchan Arukh. This party was represented but slightly, by three advocates at the most. Secondly, there was the reform element, which was in a great majority; for them Talmud and Schulchan Arukh were authoritative no longer; they claimed that Judaism, as legalistic rabbinism, had lost its power over the present generation, and that the spirit of the religion must be emphasized as over against the formalism into which it had degenerated; they held that Judaism in its fundamental concept as the ethical monotheism was what it had always been at bottom; this fundamental concept had been obscured by accretions of forms; these had to be cleared away to such an extent as they no longer fed the religious nature, and their place had to be taken by such religious forms, ceremonies, and institutions as were in accord with the religious outlook of the modern Jew; such traditional ceremonies and institutions as still possessed vitality were, as a matter of course, to be retained, and if necessary to be interpreted accordingly. Thirdly, there was what might be termed the party of compromise, who desired to march under both banners; they wished to make haste very slowly, to preserve the traditions, and yet satisfy the needs of the new time which they could not help but recognize; such were opposed to any declaration of principles or to any positive expression that might indicate a break in any way with the consensus of Jewish tradition.

The character of the conference as a reform gathering, however, appeared constantly during the discussions. Thus, when Schott, the leading representative of the rabbinical
party, denounced the tendency to abrogate existing customs, and asked, "Shall we negate always?" Holdheim answered him by saying that what Schott called negation was really affirmation in the light of the declared purpose of the conference, viz. "the preservation of Judaism." "The preservation of the essential," he claimed, "is conditioned by the excision of the non-essential. The healthy portion can be saved only by the removal of the diseased part." Hess stated that until the conference would declare boldly that the Talmud had no significance dogmatically they would have no basis for their resolutions. As to Schott's claim about their negative attitude, he would say that the reproach of being destroyers is more applicable to the rigid rabbanites, since they deny that the consciousness of the age is a moving force with many Jews of the present day; they were responsible that so many had become alienated, as for example in Frankfort. In the discussion on the liturgy, Samuel Adler used the following strong words: "What right we have to reform! the traditional right to modify the Biblical ceremonial according to temporal and local conditions. The question was asked often whence we obtained that right. From the people. The free will of the people recognized the Talmudists, the free will of the people will recognize us also. We too are Talmudists. Hence we can insist on this same right." And during the discussion on the Sabbath, Gotthold Salomon declared that they must seek to save the Sabbath as soon as possible, and strive to harmonize the Sabbath laws with life and the age; for "life must be regulated by and permeated with religion. The age is also a Bible through which God speaks to Israel." These expressions illustrate in the main the spirit of the conference; it was emphatically of a reform tendency; the orthodox and the conservatives were in such

1 Protokolle, 44.


3 Protokolle, 91; J. Q. R., XVII, 339 note.
a minority that they were almost a negligible quantity; the spirit of the nineteenth century was breathing new life into the ancient faith, and the dry bones were being resuscitated; Ezekiel's vision was being interpreted anew.

This being the first large gathering of Jewish theologians since the inception of the reform movement, it was but natural that voices should make themselves heard demanding that the conference state what the fundamental principles of Judaism are; for it was felt by these that such a declaration of principles was necessary in order to give the conference the proper foundation whereon to build. It was the same sentiment as had actuated the members of the Society of the Friends of Reform in Frankfort when they contended that, in order to clear the controversial atmosphere in which Judaism was enveloped at that time, it was requisite to formulate in as brief a space as possible the essential fundamentals in which all Jews of modern views could agree. True, the question of formulating a declaration of principles was not one of the set subjects of discussion at the conference; still it was referred to a number of times in the course of the various debates. In the discussion on the Prayer-book Bodenheimer, who was of a markedly conservative tendency, contended that before any intelligent action could be taken on the subject of determining what prayers are expressive of the religious convictions of the people to-day the question as to what the Jewish articles of belief are had to be settled. He claimed that the greatest confusion existed here, that even Maimonides contradicted himself, that Chasdai differed with him, and that Abarbanel in his turn differed with Chasdai. He suggested, therefore, that a commission be appointed to formulate a statement of the fundamental articles of Jewish belief. In this he received the endorsement of Hess the radical, who advocated likewise the appointment of a commission for the drafting of a confession of belief which should state what

1 J. Q. R., XVII, 327.  
2 Protokolle, 48.
the conference considers the essence of Judaism, and in what it conceives the relation of the moral to the ceremonial law to consist. The rabbi of Luxemburg, Samuel Hirsch, expressed himself in a manner diametrically opposed to this; he too was a radical in many of his opinions, and the wide difference between him and Hess on this vital subject is most suggestive of the character of the conference and the difficulty of reconciling the many individual views represented; he declared that he was opposed to the proposition to appoint such a commission, because "we have no articles of belief in the commonly accepted interpretation of the term, viz. that we should or must believe what cannot be known or comprehended." Holdheim too took strong ground against the formulation of any creed: "Every Jew is obligated by his birth; Judaism is inalienable, and does not depend on the acceptance of any dogma according to this or that interpretation." Formstecher sided with Bodenheimer and Hess; he averred that in all things there must be a principle from which to proceed: else there can be no results. "We require a principle in our relations with our congregations: else our work will be open to suspicion always, and some passage from some Hebrew book will always be able to be cited against us. . . . . I do not demand a creed, as Hirsch maintains against me, but we must have a principle, a rule of procedure, by which we must be guided." In more or less direct wise the debatable subject of creed and dogma was touched upon in these various utterances: Are there dogmas in Judaism or no? is still a favourite theme of discussion. Is a set creed compatible with or foreign to the spirit of Judaism? remains to this day an unsettled point of debate; there can be no doubt that

1 Protokolle, 53.
2 Ibid., 54.
3 Ibid., 56.
4 Author of the work "Die Religion des Geistes."
5 Protokolle, 66.
6 Geiger held that there are dogmas in Judaism, but no creed as a condition of salvation, Israelit des Neunzehnten Jahrhunderts, VII (1846), 222;
a set creed is a great obstacle in the path of the progressive development of a religion, and that therefore reform Judaism must always be impatient of a set creed; twenty years later he wrote, "Es ist in Wahrheit zum Heile für das Judenthum, dass es in ihm nicht zur dogmatischen Fixierung irgend eines, und sei es auch des unzweifelhaftesten und des unzweifelstesten Gedanken gekommen ist, zum wahren Heile des Judenthums, dass der einzelne Jude oder jüdische Theologe nicht 'seinen Glaubensstand' an dem Glaubenstande der Gesammtheit zu messen hat und danach seine Angehörigkeit zu beurtheilen ist, inwiefern er sich selbst als mit der Judenheit noch eng verbunden erachtet, auch bei der Abweichung in wesentlichen Fragen von der herkömmlichen und noch geltenden Auffassung sich im innigen Zusammenhange mit dem in der Judenheit herrschenden Geiste weiss." Jüdische Zeitschrift für Wissenschaft und Leben, VII, 9; see also ibid., I, 279. Holdheim taught likewise that Judaism has dogmas but does not make their acceptance a condition sine qua non of salvation as does Christianity; "Geschichte der Entstehung und Entwicklung der jüdischen Reformgemeinde in Berlin," 225 ff. See the interesting debate on this subject by the members of the directorate of this congregation, ibid., 226 ff.; also Holdheim, "Religionsprinzipien des reformierten Judenthums," Berlin, 1847, "Die heilige Schrift hat sich nie in einem Bekenntnisse fixirt usw." Hess in a leading article in his Israelit des Neunzehnten Jahrhunderts claimed that a creed is not objectionable if it be understood that the statement of creed is merely a consensus of opinion, and that it is left to each one to hold that conception of Judaism which appeals to his thought and conscience; in other words, a creed must not be made the measure of salvation, but is to be considered merely as a definition or declaration of principles, VI (1845), 330-1. S. Stern, the virtual founder of the Berlin Reform Congregation, contended that the "definite formulation of principles contradicts altogether the thought of development whereon reform builds"; quoted in Holdheim, "Geschichte der Berliner Reformgemeinde," 229; see also his article "Die Aufgabe der jüdischen Gemeinde zu Berlin für die Gegenwart" (1844), in Freund's Zur Judenfrage in Deutschland, II, 359. For further discussion of this question see L. Löw, "Jüdische Dogmen," in Gesammelte Schriften, I, 133-76, Szegedin, 1889; S. Schechter, "The Dogmas of Judaism," J. Q. R., I, 48-61, 115-27; B. Felsenthal, "'Gibt es Dogmen im Judenthume?'" Year Book of the Central Conference of American Rabbis, VIII, 54 ff.; M. L. Margolis, "The Theological Aspect of Reformed Judaism," ibid., XIII, 192 ff.; F. Perles, "Bousset’s Religion des Judenthums im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter kritisch untersucht," 113-16, Berlin, 1903; O. J. Simon, "Authority and Dogma in Judaism," J. Q. R., V, 231-43; H. Hyamson, ibid., 469-82.

1 See the author's "Tendencies of Thought in Modern Judaism," New World, IV, 610, Boston, 1895.
still Formstecher was correct in the main when he urged that the conference should formulate a declaration of principles. Such a declaration was necessary, particularly in view of the decided differences between the traditionalists and the reformers on a number of controverted points. Such a declaration need not nor should it have been regarded as of a fixed character; any future conference should have been considered at liberty to modify it as soon as the opinion of an age concerning any article of such a declaration should have undergone a change. A creed is fixed and binding, a declaration of principles is fluid; possibly, however, the reformers as a body had not yet reached that unanimity of opinion which would have made such a declaration possible. Twenty-five years later the idea to which Formstecher had given expression at Brunswick was carried into practical effect when the conference of rabbis at Philadelphia adopted as the working basis of the conference a statement of principles. This was not a new formulation of a creed, for most of the men present at that conference were reformers of an advanced type, and would, therefore, not have given their suffrages to the manufacture of any creed; that they adopted a declaration of principles is indication sufficient of the essential difference between this and a statement of creed binding upon the individual as a necessary condition of salvation. Although the Brunswick conference adopted no declaration of principles, still there was an approach to this in the action touching the answers given by the French Sanhedrin to the questions of Napoleon in 1807. Philippson had moved at the afternoon session of June 14 that the conference approve the attitude taken by the Sanhedrin for two reasons; first, to give assurance to the various governments of the patriotic attachment of the Jews,

1 See the author’s “Progress of the Jewish Reform Movement in the United States,” J. Q. R., X, 82.
2 Israelit des Neunzehnten Jahrhunderts, VI (1845), 194–7.
3 Appendix I to Protokolle, 94–8.
and to show that there is nothing in Judaism at variance with the best and highest interests of the state; and, secondly, to evince by this approval that the conference was the successor in spirit of that notable assembly. By basing upon the French Sanhedrin, the first gathering of Jewish representatives resulting from the changes superinduced by the political emancipation of the Jews which was one of the forerunners of the religious emancipation, viz. the reform movement, the conference, whether consciously or unconsciously, declared itself the official voice of the modern spirit. Philipson's motion was referred to a commission consisting of Holdheim, Salomon, and Frankfurter, who reported at the session of June 18. The conference endorsed the answers of the Synhedrin, making slight changes and additions here and there. The consideration of the question as to whether the intermarriage of Jew and Christian was permitted caused a stormy debate. The French Sanhedrin had declared that a marriage between a Jew and a Christian which had been solemnized by a civil officer must be considered valid; the commission of the conference reported thus: "Marriages between Jews and Christians, marriages between monotheists generally, are not forbidden." Hess desired the insertion of the additional words, "and the rabbi is permitted to solemnize them"; however, he received no support in this extreme attitude. S. Adler declared himself as opposed to the adoption of this paragraph because it did not fall within the scope of a rabbinical conference: "How will the permission of intermarriage aid towards the reawakening of the religious spirit?" he asked pointedly. However, he went on to say: "If they were to make a declaration on the subject, their approval of intermarriage must be coupled with the demand that the children born of such marriages must be reared in the Jewish faith." This was the sense of the majority, and the report of the commission was amended to read: "The

1 Appendix I to Protokolle, 92.
marriage of a Jew with a Christian, marriage with adherents of monotheistic faiths in general, is not forbidden, if the laws of the state permit the parents to rear the children of such a union also in the Jewish faith."

The answer to the question concerning the sentiment entertained by the Jews towards the land of their birth or adoption expresses excellently the political creed of the modern Jew: "The Jew is bound to consider the land to which he belongs by birth and civic conditions as his fatherland, to protect it, and to obey all its laws." That the members of the conference would take this stand was foreshadowed at a previous session during the discussion of a proposition submitted by Dr. Mayer of Hechingen on "Efforts towards the Emancipation of the Jewish Church." In this discussion the opinions of the rabbis present on the religious and political elements, as far as they touched Jewish thought and practice, were given expression to. Holdheim, with his usual perspicacity, declared that the religious principle must be kept clearly distinct from the political. "It is difficult," said he, "to keep the two separate, because they have been connected closely for so long a time. For this very reason it is important that two things which have been joined so improperly should be sundered finally. When and how shall this separation take place? That we cannot determine here and now, but it is the task of the present age. We do not grant that there is such a thing as a 'Christian state,' and certainly we should not speak of a 'Jewish state,' or of the overlapping of the religious and the political in Judaism. . . . Let the Jewish clergyman concern himself with religious instruction; that is plain! only let there be clearness, clearness in our religious conceptions." Holdheim expressed here the thought that he gave voice to in many different forms in his published writings, both before and after this conference; the separation of the religious and political

1 Protokolle, 73. 2 Ibid., 78, 79. 3 Ibid., 29.
4 "Das Religiöse und Politische im Judenthume," Schwerin, 1845;
elements became in time one of the marked features of the reform movement; the separation of church and state, and all that this implies, is written large on the programme of reform Judaism, which, therefore, has no sympathy with a movement like Zionism that combines the political and religious elements. So also Frankfurter declared that nothing was of greater importance than that they keep the religious and the political clearly distinct; "religiously speaking, we form a closely-joined community, not over against the state, but within the state; but in all broadly human and political activities we consider ourselves subjects and members of the state on each and every count." The special subject under discussion was the supervision of Jewish schools. Dr. Mayer of Hechingen had proposed that the governments should be petitioned to place the Jewish day schools under the supervision of the rabbi instead of a non-Jewish official, as was the case in many instances; the conference negatived this by a large majority, the sentiment being that such a demand would assume the appearance of political separatism.

The most important and lengthiest debate during the sessions of the conference was on the question of the reform of the liturgy. The debate was occasioned by the motion of Dr. Joseph Maier of Stuttgart, the president of the conference, that a commission be appointed to report to the next conference on the following six points: (1) Whether and in how far the Hebrew language was necessary for the public religious services, and, even if not necessary, whether its retention appeared advisable for the present among the Jewish congregations of the German fatherland? (2) In how far the dogma of the Messiah and all kindred doctrines must receive recognition in the prayers? (3) Whether the repetition of the נאמרו השנים (the eighteen benedictions) was necessary, and whether the Mussafim


1 Protokolle, 27.
must be retained? (4) In what manner the קראות התורה ופrière (the reading from the Law and the calling up to the Law) could be arranged so as to cause less disturbance than at present, and to further congregational devotion and edification? (5) What steps could be taken to make the נסילת לולב וחק SOFTWARE (the blowing of the ram’s horn on the New Year’s Day, and the shaking of the palm-branches on the Feast of Tabernacles) less objectionable to the aesthetic sense? (6) Whether the organ is permissible in the synagogue?

These questions involved so many points which were the subjects of heated controversy that it cannot excite wonder that the discussion that ensued upon their presentation to the conference touched most of the subjects that emphasized the differences between traditionalists and reformers. The public service is the official expression of the religious convictions of the community, therefore it is almost as a matter of course the first point to which the attention of reformers is directed. As has been shown, the earliest efforts of the new movement in Judaism had been directed towards a reform of the public services; the main attention, however, had been paid to aestheticizing the service, of making it decorous where it had been disorderly, of excising פיי גליים, and thus shortening it, of introducing choral music and the German sermon; but less thought had been given to the matter of making the prayers express the principles of the reform movement. So much was involved in this reform of the ritual, so many points of detail, that it is not surprising that the men of that time who were in the very thick of the controversy could not see the forest because of the trees. The six questions upon which the discussion in the Brunswick conference was based indicated excellently the difficulties which a comprehensive reform of the liturgy was compelled to encounter. Inasmuch, however, as the motion was simply to refer these questions to a commission to report to the next con-

1 J. Q. R., XV, 490.
ference, and the discussion on this report will have to receive detailed consideration in its proper place, it is unnecessary to reproduce here the opinions expressed at this conference on the points at issue. Sufficient to say that the recommendation to elect such a commission was acted upon favourably, and the following rabbis were constituted members thereof—Joseph Maier, Levi Herzfeld, Levi Bodenheimer, Samuel Holdheim, and Gotthold Salomon.

Another subject that aroused prolonged discussion was the so-called oath *more Judaico*1. Whenever a Jew appeared as a witness before a court, and the oath was administered to him, the whole proceeding was extremely humiliating to the self-respect of the Jewish witness; he had to go to the synagogue accompanied by the judge, the rabbi, and ten Jews above the age of thirteen, and, decked with the *tallith* and the *tephillin*, had to take the scroll of the law upon his arm; the rabbi had to impress upon him the solemnity of the oath; the witness then spoke a set formula and had to give assurance that he would not attempt to have the oath abrogated by a Jewish ecclesiastical court, and that he would not consider it annulled by the *Kol Nidre* prayer spoken on the eve of the Day of Atonement; that he did not consider the Christian an idolater, &c. Much was written at this time by Jewish scholars on this subject2, and attempts were made to have

1 Protokolle, 33-42.
2 Allgemeine Zeitung des Judenthums, III (1839), 293; IV (1840), 123, 133, 158, 166, 174, 189, 307; Israelitische Annalen, II (1840), 243; Zeitschrift für die religiösen Interessen des Judenthums, I (1844), 301; Israelit des Neunzehnten Jahrhunderts, V (1844), 277, 347 (Holdheim); ibid., 375 (Einhorn); ibid., VI, 917 (Holdheim's answer to Einhorn); Allgemeine Zeitung des Judenthums, IX (1845), 194 ff., 274 ff., 289 ff. (Einhorn's answer to Holdheim); Die Reform des Judenthums (a magazine which was edited by A. Adler and H. Wagner in the interest of the rabbinical conferences, and appeared only one year, 1846), 9, 17. See also Frankel's book, "Die Eidesleistung der Juden in theologischer und historischer Beziehung," Dresden, 1847; Leopold Stein, "Der Eid *more Judaico*, wie solcher bei den Gerichten der freien Stadt Frankfurt noch in Uebung ist," Frankfurt a. M., 1847; D. Rothschild, "Der Eid der Juden," Brilon, 1847; cf. also Allgemeine
this barbarous mediaeval proceeding abolished; possibly the most famous case was that in which Cremieux, the future senator of France, defended M. Isidor, at the time rabbi of Saverne, and later chief rabbi of France. Isidor had refused to permit the administration of the oath *more Judaico*, had locked the door of the synagogue, and had declared that he would never permit such a profanation of God's name. This case aroused so much attention that it was the beginning of the final abolition of the oath *more Judaico* in France. The Brunswick conference took a firm stand on this subject, and declared that "the oath of a Jew in the name of God is binding without further ceremony." The conference declared further that the *Kol Nidre* prayer was unessential, and the members present promised to use every effort to eliminate it from their services on the coming Day of Atonement.

Zeitung des Judenthums, X (1846), 188-91, 206-7, 220-2, 248-9, 261-3, 616, 667; XIV, 137. For a historical sketch see "Zur Geschichte des Juden- eides," in L. Geiger's *Juden in Berlin*, 265-80, Berlin, 1871. The oath *more Judaico*, though abolished in lands where the Jew has received the rights of man, was still administered in Roumania as late as 1904: *Jewish Chronicle*, Aug. 19, 1904.

1 Israellische Annalen, II (1840), 57; *Die Reform des Judenthums*, 9.

2 Protokolle, 41.

3 This prayer, which is spoken at the opening of the service on the Eve of Atonement in congregations which use the traditional liturgy, is one of the favourite objects of attack of anti-Jewish writers; they declare that thereby the Jew absolves himself from all vows and promises that he might make during the coming year; however, Jewish authorities have always interpreted this to refer to such vows as the individual assumes voluntarily, and in which no other persons or interests are involved; in other words, "the formula has reference only to such vows in which the relation of the individual to his conscience or his Heavenly Father is involved." Still, because of the misinterpretation to which it was liable, it was important to eliminate it from the liturgy. As early as the fifteenth century Isaac ben Sheshet wrote to another rabbi to make the attempt to abolish the *kol nidre*, saying, that if he were to do this he would gain the praise of all wise men (Resp., 394); quoted by Geiger in Freund's *Zur Judenfrage in Deutschland*, 3-4. See also Geiger, *Nachgelassene Schriften*, I, 134-6; *Revue des Études Juives*, XXXIX, 78; *Jewish Encyclopedia*, art. "Kol Nidre." Many congregations throughout Germany acted upon the recommendation of the
While the Jews were separate alien communities with no political rights or affiliations, they had their own jurisdiction, and were governed in many vital relations of life, as marriage, divorce, and the like, by their own laws. When they were striving for civil emancipation and were being incorporated in the body politic in various states, it was found that their traditional laws came into conflict frequently with the laws of the land. Reforms were necessary. It was for this reason that Jolowicz presented a resolution calling for a revision of the Jewish marriage laws. Holdheim moved that a commission be appointed to report to the next conference a plan for the reform of the marriage law, this being demanded urgently by the conditions and circumstances of the time. This was agreed to, and Holdheim, Herzfeld, Maier, Bodenheimer, and Geiger were elected members of this commission.

Shortly before the convening of this conference the Jewish world had been agitated by the circumcision controversy. An echo of this agitation sounded in the conference hall when Hess introduced the following resolution: "Be it resolved by this conference that, although it has learned with pain that some co-religionists observe no longer a command so universally considered sacred as circumcision, yet it declares against all external coercion and exclusion as has been demanded by a number of rabbis, and expresses the opinion that those who do not observe the command of circumcision are to be considered members of the Jewish religious community despite this, and as admissible to the taking of the oath, the giving of testimony, and the contracting of marriage with a Jewess." The resolution was disposed of by the endorsement of the suggestion of the president to the effect that since this matter was the subject of such bitter discussion in Jewry just at this time it be passed over, it being inadvisable to

Brunswick Conference and eliminated the Kol Nidre prayer from the service on the following Day of Atonement.

1 J. Q. R., XVII, 340 ff.
give occasion to the play of passion on the floor of the conference.

At the closing session of the conference Dr. Samuel Hirsch proposed that the conference take steps to reconcile the differences between Jewish doctrine and practice by the abrogation or the amelioration of a number of Sabbath and dietary laws. He stated that the matter would not be so grave were the Sabbath laws disregarded only in the household economy, but that the public desecration of the Sabbath demanded that something be done to save the situation. If the members of the conference would address themselves to this subject in full earnestness they would give evidence to the world that they are not negativists and destroyers, but conservers and builders. Schott, the ultra-conservative, held that no action was necessary on their part, "since the Sabbath laws do not conflict with their duties as men and citizens, rabbinism having permitted certain necessary ameliorations." A. Adler, after declaring that the modern point of view is altogether different from that of the Talmud, proceeded to say that "there is a cleft between life and the traditional Sabbath observance. We must reconcile this difference, not continue it." Herxheimer called attention to the difficulties which were confronting the rabbi constantly because of the inconsistency between his preaching and teaching and the practice of his people. This would continue until life and profession would be reconciled.

Holdheim declared flatly: "We cannot adopt the rabbinical conception of the Sabbath. We must ask our conscience what is the intent of Sabbath observance. Perhaps we can preserve Sabbath observance without Sabbath rest"; and Salomon exclaimed: "We must attempt to save the Sabbath as soon as possible, and to reconcile the Sabbath laws with life and with our age. For after all the object of religion must be to regulate and permeate life."

1 Protokolle, 87-8. 2 Ibid., 89. 3 Ibid., 90. 4 Ibid., 91.
So important a question, possibly the most important among the practical problems in Jewish life, demanded the most thorough discussion and consideration; this it could not receive in the closing hours of a conference. A Sabbath Commission was therefore elected to report on the subject at the coming conference; the commission consisted of Geiger, A. Adler, S. Adler, Wechsler, and Kahn.

The conference adjourned on Wednesday, June 19, after determining to meet at Frankfort-on-the-Main on July 15 of the following year. No event in that agitated period stirred the Jewish communities more than did this conference. Denunciations fierce and invectives severe were hurled at the rabbis who had met at Brunswick. The conference was assailed as negative and destructive. Attacks by opponents called forth defences by friends; articles in newspapers, essays in magazines, pamphlets appeared in rapid succession; scathing criticism\(^1\) on the one hand and admiring laudation\(^2\) on the other characterized the temper of the writers; the orthodox accused the conference of having undermined the very foundations of Judaism, the reformers acclaimed it for having given voice bravely to the true spirit of Judaism. I can refer to the more important of these controversial publications only.

Most unexpected was the criticism of the conference by Ludwig Philippson, who had been mainly instrumental in calling it into being; the conference had travelled a path far different from that which he had expected and hoped that it would take. In discussing its work, he wrote that it was unfortunate that the conference had developed a critical tendency instead of devoting itself to the task of reviving and creating; it criticized existing institutions, but paid no attention to organizing other institutions which the practical needs of the people required; had the conference been a scientific congress, learned criticism would

---

\(^1\) David Cassel, "Woher und Wohin?" 12, Berlin, 1845.

have been in place, but the conference was intended to contribute primarily towards awakening and strengthening the religious consciousness of the people, and in this province the critical spirit can accomplish nothing. He regretted beyond measure that the principle of compromise (Prinzip der Vermittelung) did not guide the deliberations of the conference; this represented his standpoint; those who were guided by this principle wished to build on historical foundations, recognizing the needs of the present and having an eye to the future, but they would not abrogate existing customs and ceremonies until they had something positive to take their place; the misfortune was that the conference was dominated by such as had an abstract ideal of positive religion, which they pursued without regard for the past, and for whom nothing had any value except that which comported with the demands of cold reason and the critical faculty. Philippson was of a decidedly practical bent; he felt that reform must move slowly and accommodate itself to existing conditions; it was his firm conviction that if the conference would call into being practical institutions like a rabbinical seminary, a publication society and the like, it would do much more for the religious advancement of the people than by the discussion of abstract religious ideas. The philosophical principles of the reform movement received but little consideration in his writings; he praised the conference for not having formulated a declaration of principles, and stated that in future conferences the conservative element must be strengthened for this alone would ensure their efficacy, authority, and beneficial influence.

The individual criticism of the conference which aroused the greatest attention was that of Zacharias Frankel. He

1 Allgemeine Zeitung des Judentums, VIII (1844), 385.
2 Ibid., 387.
claimed that the members of the conference were not impressed sufficiently with the significance and gravity of their task, that they were not careful enough in their utterances and proposals, and that they did not keep in view the religious state of the people. He held that a rabbinical conference cannot pass resolutions, only a synod can do this; a conference can only discuss and deliberate. The Brunswick conference discussed the weightiest matters; in a number of instances the members showed their unpreparedness and incapacity. Thus in the discussion on the mixed marriage question the attitude of the French Sanhedrin had been misrepresented; the Sanhedrin had not declared that "the marriage of a Jew with a Christian is not forbidden," as the conference had reported, but that "the marriages between Jews and Christians which had been performed in accordance with the laws of the civil code are binding civilly, and although they cannot be solemnized religiously, they are not anathema." He also blamed the conference for applying the scalpel of criticism to customs and ceremonies close and dear to the heart of the people; what the people consider edifying and binding must be respected; the conference had made the mistake of keeping in view only the "age," and not the "faith"; the members had spoken constantly of the spirit of the age, but did not bear in mind the warm religious sentiment of the people who still clung to many a form and custom in which the religious philosopher, standing on the advanced intellectual outposts of the time, recognizes only a meaningless survival of the past, but which may yet have power to move and edify. Frankel's attack called forth many answers, notably from Holdheim 1, Maier 2, the president of the conference, and Samuel Hirsch 3, all of

1 "Die erste Rabbinersammlung und Herr Dr. Frankel," Schwerin, 1845.
3 "Erwiderung auf Herrn Dr. Frankel's Angriff gegen die Rabbinersammlung," Orient, V (1844), 376-82.
whom defended the conference warmly. The first named
took pains to show how fallacious was Frankel's argument
that the members of the conference should not have
criticized such religious forms and beliefs as were close
to the heart of the people, and still had power to move
them; superstitions often have this power, shall super-
stitions never be attacked for this reason? who are the
better judges of what is the truth of religion, the people
or the religious guides? the time-server has his hand on
the people's pulse, the true leader, worthy of the name,
will not be deterred in his course, no matter what the
people may believe or think. Even Frankel stated in
another connexion that everything is not as it should be
in Jewry, and advocated certain reforms because of the
conflict between life and the faith\(^1\); but there is no such
conflict, Holdheim goes on to say; the conflict is between
life and the Talmudical interpretation of the faith, between
life and rabbinical formalism and ceremonialism, and not
between life and Judaism; there must be a thorough reform
of traditional rabbinical Judaism and the conflict will
disappear from the life of the modern Jew. Frankel him-
self is not clear; now he advocates reform, and again he
decries it; let him be honest and not attempt to attain
to a supreme position in the estimation of the common
people by such palaver to the effect that what still appeals
to the bulk of the people has religious validity; the
majority rule is not the gauge by which the truth is to
be measured.

Dr. Maier, the president of the conference, in his defence
touches the same point; he says that if Frankel's con-
tention be true that the popular sanction of religious forms
and institutions must guide their observance or discon-
tinuance, the function of religious leaders would be that
of grave-diggers who have only to bury decently what has

\(^1\) Holdheim refers evidently to Frankel's article, "Über Reformen im
Judenthume," in Zeitschrift für die religiösen Interessen des Judenthumes, I (1844),
1-27.
disappeared from the life of the people; he puts this apt query to Frankel, "Suppose that it had so chanced that instead of becoming chief rabbi of Dresden you had become chief rabbi of Moldavia or Wallachia, where Chassidism which finds religious edification and satisfaction in the observance of senseless cabbalistical customs is rampant—Chassidism which considers holy and God-pleasing many acts that true piety is backward in even mentioning—would you hesitate for one moment in attacking and removing these customs, even though, to use your own phrase, 'they had received popular sanction and acknowledgment'? The revealed will of God is the incontestable standard for reforms, not the will of a party, even though that party form for the nonce an overwhelming majority."

Every command, every institution whose retention can only harm the essence of religion, and which has either no foundation in Scripture or was ordained for a certain time that is past, or a certain political phase that has ceased, must be surrendered or changed, even though Talmud and Shulchan Arukh declare it to be Mosaic and of eternal validity; on the other hand, every command, every institution which strengthens the true content of religion must be retained, even though it emanate from the latest teachers of the people. The acceptance of such recommendations and proposals made by the religious leaders depends not on them. They cannot force this acceptance, for they have no police power, nor have they the slightest wish to exercise such power. Theirs it is only to fulfil the duties of their office and to show the people the way." This, continues the president, was the standpoint of the conference. 1 A number of men had gathered "to take counsel together as to what must be done for the preservation of the religion, and they had paid especial attention to those religious institutions and

1 Frankel answered Maier in an article entitled "Schreiben an den Herrn Kirchenrath Dr. Maier in Stuttgart," Zeitschrift für die religiösen Interessen des Judentums, II (1845), 161-82.
customs, the reform of which was necessary and urgent.” After reviewing and rebutting Frankel’s criticisms of the specific points in the proceedings of the conference, Maier closes his defence thus strongly: “as a matter of fact the rabbis of the old thoroughly orthodox school were far more careful, honest, and honourable than those of the chiauro-scuro type of to-day. The former declared art and science, in short all culture except that of a purely religious character, as absolutely incompatible with Judaism, and characterized every Jew who read a German book as a heretic; this attitude was consistent and intelligible; the latter however advise that modern schools be attended by Jews, and the arts and sciences be cultivated by them, but denounce all such as advocate a reform of the ritual and the cult, because these do not harmonize with modern culture—this attitude is inconsistent and unintelligible. But history adjusts every inconsistency, and we may be sure that the present inconsistency in Judaism will be adjusted, even though dozens of Frankels strive against it with might and main. As for you, my friends and brothers, who are not concerned for your own aggrandizement, but for the weal of our co-religionists: not for the realization of selfish plans and opinions, but for the preservation of our religion: be you not misled by appearances like this which I have just discussed. The struggle of light with darkness is still on, but victory must follow as surely as does the day and dawn.”

Much as some other writings that the conference called forth deserve detailed mention, notably the answer of Dr. Samuel Hirsch to Frankel, mentioned above, and the pamphlet of Dr. Gotthold Salomon, they must be passed by with a mere reference in order that space may be given to the most famous of all the publications resulting from the deliberations and recommendations of the conference. The protest of seventy-seven orthodox rabbis of Germany,

France, and Hungary aroused as great commotion at the time as did the conference itself. The protest was in the form of an address to the faithful in Israel, and the words of the prophet Ezekiel, xxxiii. 6-7, were placed at the head of the document as the motto. It was in the main a fierce denunciation of the conference and its members. Some of its salient sentences read, "Judaism is slandered by men who call themselves its protectors and its teachers." "No authority is respected, not even that of the two thousand year old Great Synod, among whose members even the last of the prophets were numbered. The barriers of truth are battered down; the Talmud with all the traditional divine law contained in it is vilified in the most unsparing manner, and its fall is gloated over." The protest speaks of the members of the conference as desiring to erect in the place of the hegemony of the Talmud "the throne of Karaism or possibly the rule of the idol of convenience and sensuality." The protest proper is worded thus: "After carefully conducted written negotiation and conscientious probing of all the proceedings of said conference, we, the undersigned, have united to inform you, the faithful in Israel, that all the resolutions of the so-called Brunswick rabbinical conference—with the sole exception of the one that defines the political attitude of the Israelites towards the state, in which is to be included also the resolution declaring for the sacred inviolability of the oath—are opposed to true Judaism, and are therefore false and condemnable for the believing Israelite; that a destructive spirit of revolution and sectarianism breathes through the proceedings; that the work which has been projected for a future conference is of the same condemnable character; and that we regard it therefore as the duty of every truly believing Israelite not only not to take part in such proceedings, but also to oppose such novelty-seeking efforts by every legally permitted means."

The signers of the document (which reached later the
number of one hundred and sixteen) acknowledge the
growing indifference in Israel, and declare it to be the duty
of the religious leaders to do all they can to stem it, but
they denounce the method of the reformers as false; in-
stead of invoking the divine aid to save the ship of Judaism
which is tossing about in agitated waters, they think
to ensure its safety by throwing overboard one divine
law after the other. “O the fatuity of those blinded leaders
in Israel! . . . . . Neither we nor any person have the
power to abrogate even the least of the religious laws.”
They then call attention to such incidents in the past as
the idolatry of the people during the first commonwealth,
the apostasy preceding the Maccabean uprising, the forma-
tion of the Sadducean and Karaite sects; all these have
passed away with the exception of a few thousand Karaites
while the observers of the Law still exist and flourish.
“Therefore, ye faithful in Israel!” the protest concludes,
“do not permit yourselves, because of the scarecrow of
religious decay which has been set up, to be misled to
sanctioning reforms and innovations which result only in
increasing this decay. Turn hopefully with us to Him who
desires the well-being of all his children on earth, praying
that He may heal soon the sickness of our age which is
suffering from materialism, and that He may bring back
to the true faith the erring in Israel 1 . . . . . Until then

1 What this true faith from the orthodox standpoint is conceived to be
was stated most clearly in a remarkable manifesto issued shortly after this,
viz. on March 31, 1846, by S. Godscheaux, grand rabbi of Colmar, and
L. M. Lambert, grand rabbi of Metz; this document was as follows: “It
has become necessary that every Israelite be informed fully concerning
the tactics of those who under the high-sounding names of reformers,
and progressivists, preach atheism and irreligion, and who under the
hypocritical pretence of making our religion more imposing and beautiful,
really desire to sacrifice it to the advantages and indulgences of material
life. Therefore we address ourselves anew to you, cherished brethren of
Israel, and give you herewith a brief résumé of the fundamental principles
of the Jewish religion as they are designated in the Talmud, and as
our fathers have observed them:—

(a) The divine law is immutable and eternal like its Author; neither
time nor conditions can change, much less abrogate it.
let us guard our very ancient religious fortresses faithfully, and protect it against those who approach it in the guise of friends in order to undermine its foundations undisturbed. The protest was signed among others by such paladins of orthodoxy as N. M. Adler of Hanover, B. Auerbach of Darmstadt, Jacob Bamberger of Worms, Seligman Bär Bamberger of Würzburg, Jacob Aaron Ettlinger of Altona, Samuel Freund of Prague, Samson Raphael Hirsch of Emden, E. L. Teweles of Prague, G. Tiktin of Breslau, and S. A. Trier of Frankfort.

This protest may be considered an official document of

(b) The oral law is as truly the word of God as the written law.
(c) All institutions and regulations which were introduced into Judaism with the purpose of protecting the law are as unchangeable as the law itself.
(d) No assembly and be it of all the rabbis, yea be it of all Israel in conjunction with all the rabbis, has either the authority or the right to abrogate or to change the least portion of the law, whether oral or written, or the introduced institutions or regulations.

These are the principles of the true Israelitish belief in which our fathers lived, and for which they died; every reformatory attempt to change these constitutes rebellion against the religion binding upon all the children of Jacob, and leads to the way of destruction.” Allgemeine Zeitung des Judenthums, X (1846), 290-1.

So also the constitution of the famous orthodox congregation of Frankfort-on-the-Main, presided over for many years by Samson Raphael Hirsch, the greatest of the orthodox leaders of Germany in the nineteenth century, defines its standpoint as follows: “The old Jewish religious legislation which forms the fundamental statute of every Jewish community has given the Israelitish congregation also the fundamental rules for its religious guidance, and nothing could nor can obtain validity in it which is not in accord with this religious legislation as it has been handed down to us in Thora, Talmud, and the rabbinical codes of the Shulchan Aruch.”

1 Other protests against the Brunswick Conference were issued by the rabbinate of Krakau, see Israelit des Neunzehnten Jahrhunderts, VI, 86; by Rabbi Nathan Marcus Adler of Hanover (later of London), and Hirsch Lehren of Amsterdam, ibid., 30, and by D. Deutsch, rabbi in Sorhau, Upper Silesia מפגש פרחים (Gathering of an Assembly) "oder Protestation gegen die Rabbinerversammlung," Breslau, 1846. This was a protest against both the Brunswick and Frankfort conferences. See also “Kritische Bemerkungen zu den Protokollen der ersten Rabbinerversammlung,” Literaturblatt des Orient, 1845, nos. 48, 64, and 80.
the party of tradition. "Neither we nor any person have the power to abrogate the least of the religious laws"; this sentence sums up their position. In their eyes the Brunswick reformers were traitors and worse to the cause of Judaism. Their cry was the same as that of the rabbis who over half a century previously had denounced Mendelssohn's German translation of the Pentateuch and Wessely's plea for secular education, and later the Hamburg Prayer Book and Geiger's attitude. For them Judaism was a closed chapter; at any rate they were consistent; they considered modern influences of whatever kind as inimical to Judaism; their opposition to the Brunswick conference was justified from their standpoint, and one can understand and even sympathize with this opposition if that standpoint is borne in mind. But they were enlisted in a lost cause, the day of rabbinism and shulchan-arukhism was past for the Jew living in modern surroundings. Judaism was demanding a new reading, and even though the Brunswick conferees did not render that new reading completely, still were they nearer the true understanding of the underlying principles of the faith than were their bitter though sincere opponents; the Brunswick conferees lived in the present, and appreciated the changes that had come upon Jewry, the signers of the protest lived in the past and could not, I will not say would not, see those changes.

The protest called forth many counter-replies; from Mannheim, Giessen, Karlsruhe, Worms, Heidelberg, and other communities came addresses signed by many names upholding the conference, and denouncing the attitude of the seventy-seven; a brief extract from one of these addresses will serve to indicate the spirit that pervaded all of them: "In the present critical phase of Judaism we await only beneficial results from the efforts of the rabbinical conference; its published proceedings

---

1 Israelit des Neunzehnten Jahrhunderts, VI (1845), 128.
2 Ibid., 215.
3 Ibid., 222.
4 Ibid., 159.
enlist our full sympathy, and we look forward with the greatest confidence to its future transactions which we expect will free our sublime religion from the excrescences of past ages, and set forth its truths in a manner suited to the time wherein we are now living."

Thus the Brunswick conference, as could not fail to be the case, was condemned bitterly in some quarters and commended strongly in others; the published proceedings offer but a faint reflex of the spirit which animated the conference; many who attended did so at great sacrifices, being impelled by the longing to contribute towards a solution of the difficulties that were besetting Judaism. This conference did pioneer work; it grappled with vital problems; the members were sincere in their presentation and discussion of these problems; the solution was not to be expected in a week, many of the problems there touched upon have not been settled to this day; the question of Hebrew in the service, and the Sabbath questions, are still the fruitful subjects of debate. In truth, the members of this conference could do no more than indicate a programme for future conferences, and this they did by appointing commissions to report on vital subjects at coming meetings. One of two courses was open to them, either the theoretical or the practical; had the conference resolved itself into a committee of the whole to consider and perfect plans for the founding and maintenance of practical institutions like a rabbinical seminary, a publication society and the like, as Philippson and also Geiger desired, it would have aroused less opposition and

1 From an address signed by sixty Jews of Worms, Israelit des Neunzehnten Jahrhunderts, VI, 159. Mention must be made also of the pamphlet issued by Dr. A. Adler, entitled "Die sieben und siebzig sogenannten Rabbiner und die Rabbinerversammlung," Mannheim, 1845; this in its turn called forth a defence of the signers of the protest from K. . . . . m (supposedly R. Kirchheim) in the form of an open letter, entitled "Offener Brief an A. Adler, Mitglied der Braunschweiger Rabbinerversammlung als Antwort auf sein Sendeschreiben an die 77 sogenannten Rabbiner u.s.w.," Bockenheim, 1845.
have set in motion useful and needed agencies. But under the circumstances this could have been but one phase of its activity at best. It is difficult to see how, in that period of storm and stress, any gathering of rabbis could have avoided the consideration of those burning questions in Jewish life that the Brunswick conference discussed; for even though the discussions were theoretical and academic they had also a distinct practical bearing. Principle is all important; the Jewish communities required a clear understanding of the principles of Judaism as they found expression in the liturgy and the public institutions of the faith, and who was to discuss and determine upon these principles if not the religious leaders? This the rabbis assembled at Brunswick did, and for that reason this conference is so important an incident in the history of the reform movement.

David Philipson.

Cincinnati O., U.S.A.

1 Holdheim, "Geschichte der Berliner Reformgemeinde," 25.
GLEANINGS FROM THE YEMENITE LITURGY.

Some useful work has already been done on this field of Hebrew studies, but very much remains yet to be accomplished. The edition of the Yemenite Service Book (Jerusalem, 1894–8)\(^1\), a masterly description of which by Prof. Bacher appeared in the *Jewish Quarterly Review* for April, 1902, may at first sight seem to make further work unnecessary; but the problem is in reality far removed as yet from its ultimate solution. The printed text gives us only a redaction of the Yemenite Liturgy made by Yaḥya b. Joseph ibn Salīḥ in the latter half of the eighteenth century, together with the same author's Commentary on it. In order, therefore, to obtain information on the earlier and more original form of these Services, we must turn our attention to the MS. sources at our disposal. Another shortcoming of the printed text consists in the fact of its representing only one definite form of the Yemenite Liturgy, namely that of Ṣan'ā and its neighbourhood; but the MSS. show that there existed—and probably still exists—a considerable diversity of liturgical use in different Yemenite localities. Ṣan'ā\(^2\), it is true, must be regarded as the most important centre of Jewish life in Yemen; but a thoroughgoing study of the Services now under consideration ought to include some notices of liturgical forms different from those of Ṣan'ā.

\(^1\) It should be noted, however, that a new edition, partly based on fresh materials, is now in the press at Jerusalem. The first part appeared in 1903.

\(^2\) On Ṣan'ā as a city and centre of South Arabian life in general, see Yacut's *Geographisches Wörterbuch*, ed. Wüstenfeld, III, pp. 420–5.
The most important contributions to the study of the Yemenite ritual in its MS. forms are, of course, those of Dr. Neubauer (Bodl. Catalogue, nos. 1145 and 2498, and Monatsschrift for 1871, pp. 320-6) and Prof. Stein- 
schneider (Berlin Catalogue, I, nos. 89, 91, 103, and Anhang, pp. 117-30; II, end of Vorwort). In addition to the other literature on the subject given by Prof. Bacher at the beginning of his article in the Jewish Quarterly Review already referred to, must now be mentioned Dr. Pinkas Heinrich's, Fragment eines Gebetbuches aus Yemen (Wien, 1902). The largest collection so far known of Yemenite liturgical MSS. is, however, found at the British Museum; and after having—so far as my ability goes—made a complete study of the materials there preserved, I may be allowed to place before the readers of this Review a series of notes, short texts, and alphabetical lists of Piyyūtim, calculated to amplify our knowledge of the subject, and to throw light on various matters connected with the theme. Descriptions of the MSS. have just appeared in the second volume of the Museum Catalogue of the Hebrew and Samaritan MSS., and I should wish the materials now offered to be regarded as supplementary to the information, necessarily limited, given in that work.

A.

It will be useful, first of all, to classify the Museum MSS. belonging to this section, the more so as such a classification may at the same time serve as an opportunity for noting down some special features of the Services under consideration.

1 See also Dr. S. Poznański's description of the Vienna edition of the Yemenite Liturgy in J. Q. R., XVII, 189-92.

2 Mr. E. N. Adler's considerable collection of the same services no doubt also deserves careful study.

3 It almost goes without saying that no liturgical studies can be systematically carried out before an alphabetical arrangement has been effected of all the Piyyūtim, which are in the Catalogues necessarily given in the order in which they occur in the MSS.
I. Of the fourteen MSS. belonging to the Yemenite rite, Or. 2227 must be regarded as forming a class by itself. In substance it indeed belongs to the same category as the MSS. to be noted under (II), but it shows a systematic arrangement of its own. After the portions for week-days and festa, &c., it has a long section, extending from fol. 33 b to fol. 96 a, which in this complete form is peculiar to itself. It may be described as a general guide to the Services of the Yemenite Synagogues. It begins with a chapter relating to the times of prayer (גחט נפי יפמפ חקוף אטפאה אנגחל). This is followed by a chapter on certain conditions which render a person unfit for prayer (גחט טגאת אטפאה אנגחל), including prayers for week-days both public and private; prayers for the Sabbath-day, שאר שאר, &c. Next comes a chapter on persons who say their prayers without proper preparation (מק，则 מחא רחב), and after chapters on Biblical lections throughout the year, and benedictions and minor offices (including העברת, Marriage Service, &c.), the section concludes with the Passover-night Service (רוי רוזיס ולפיו), followed by טויטל ופזיד, עריבר רורוס, עריבר נטשיל, and so on.

This MS. is the finest in the Museum collection, and as it is, apart from Or. 1470, which contains the Haftaroth only, also the oldest (having been written in San'a in 1540 A.D.), it will be granted that it for more reasons than one deserves the place of honour in this interesting section of liturgical MSS. It will be seen later on that the two short texts on the Calendar and on Repentance included in this paper have been taken from this MS.

II. To the next and longest group belong Or. 2418, 2389, 2390, 2417, 2673, 1480, 1479. All these contain, like Or. 2227, the order of Services for the whole year, although several of them have their own special characteristics.

1 An account of Or. 4113, included in the number of MSS. here given, will be found in the Catalogue, II, p. 395.
One of the most remarkable differences between the printed editions and the MSS. consists in the order of the rmaj; for instead of the old Spanish mmy beginning: אזורוכך בעבר ייחנה, preceded by the printed text (second portion), all these MSS. have Abraham ibn Ezra's וּנְאָמְרָנָה, preceded by the same author's נְאָמְרָנָה וּנְאָמְרָנָה (see Zunz, *Ritus*, p. 114). Only in one of these MSS. (Or. 1480) are both 'Abodahs found, the first being given as a sort of afterthought at the end of the MS., with Moses ibn Ezra's וּנְאָמְרָנָה beginning וּנְאָמְרָנָה in addition to נְאָמְרָנָה. Not less remarkable is the fact that instead of the rmaj; appearing in the MSS. in its proper place in the Services for Hebrew worship, it is given separately in quite a different part of each respective MS. This circumstance might be taken to justify the opinion that the Yemenites originally used no rmaj; at all for Hebrew worship, but that this portion of the Service was introduced at some later period through outside influence from one direction or another. As the Yemenite Services are commonly grouped with the Spanish branch, one would have expected וּנְאָמְרָנָה to have been adopted in preference to any other rmaj; in Hebrew worship. A composition of Ibn Ezra's was, however, as the work of a Spanish poet, found suitable enough to compete with וּנְאָמְרָנָה, and in earlier times—as it seems—to retain its position, sole and undisputed.

Among the invariable features belonging to this group of MSS. (including Or. 2227) are (1) a section on the Calendar entitled: כֶּלֶסֵת חָסִיבִים וּלְעַלְוָנָה, or כֶּלֶסֵת חָסִיבִים וּלְעַלְוָנָה; (2) a series of formulae entitled: נְאָמְרָנָה וּנְאָמְרָנָה וּנְאָמְרָנָה. Instead, however, of enumerating the other common features of this group, the reader's attention may now be drawn to some special characteristics of one or other of the MSS. belonging to the same class:—

a. Or. 2389 is distinguished by a very long series of שְׂרְיָה וּצְרָמָה, containing no fewer than 186 numbers. This list accordingly shows more effectively than any of
the other lists of "Hymns and Praises" in the group the very considerable extent to which Spanish Piyyütim of the best period have been utilized by the Yemenites, although native compositions, with Hebrew and Arabic used alternately, are also well represented.

b. The chief peculiarity of Or. 2390 consists in an entirely new form of the sixth קיי (viz. קיי יר) of אָנָה. As the text of this piece is given in full further on, no further remark on it need now be added.

c. Or. 2673 (written in 1663 נס"נ רמש) exhibits to a fairly considerable extent diverse forms of the ritual introduced by וס and מחר, several hymns of the Kabballistic school just named being embodied in the Service. These are also the only two MSS. of the group which have the ינ"ו רוש (also embodied in the printed edition).

III. Or. 6354 and 6355 must, mainly on account of their contents not covering the Services for the whole year, be classed by themselves. Or. 6354 begins with וּרְאֵה and ends with בּוֹזח (only the beginning וּרְאֵה being preserved). Or. 6355 begins with כֶּלֶם and ends with a series of short miscellaneous offices (including ירְבָּח הַלְּבָנָה, וּרְאֵה, and כֶּלֶם).

IV. Or. 4113 only contains סְלָחֵת לֵילָה, a series of pieces embodied in one form or another in all the MSS. of group II.

V. Or. 1470 (a very fine MS. written in 1484) contains

1 An account of the more salient divergences of different uses might be given on another occasion. Notes indicating such divergencies are found in several other MSS. of the group.

2 These offices are by no means a very common feature of Yemenite Service Books.
the Haftaroth for the whole year: Hebrew text (provided with the sublinear vowel-points and accents, and accompanied by the Massorah Magna and Parva) and the Targum (provided with the superlinear punctuation) in alternate verses. It should be noted that the Haftaroth here given differ in a good many points from both the Sephardi and the Ashkenazi use.

VI. Or. 4112 is a roll of the sixteenth century containing the well-known texts of שבר הבן טעמי; I. זכרות פֶּרֶךְ בסוד ועֲרָבִי; II. קְצֵץ חֵן.

VII. Entirely different from all the MSS. already named is Or. 4114, containing the Diwan known as that of Joseph Shabbezi (וסף). Similar MSS. have been described by David v. Günzburg in Steinschneider's Festschrift, and Prof. Bacher in Berliner's Festschrift. Or. 4114 is, however, more extensive than these; and, with the permission of the editors, I may perhaps be able to give in a future number of this Review alphabetical lists of the pieces contained in the MS., together with the acrostics or any other evidence of authorship.

B. AN INTRODUCTORY CHAPTER ON THE CALENDAR.

This short text, taken from Or. 2227, but embodied in a more or less modified form in MSS. of group II, is—as will be seen at a glance—similar in nature to the earlier portions of such works as תבショ, חרב עולים of Abraham b. David, and similar compositions. It might on account of its Arabic form be placed by the side of the earlier portion of the כרמים אֲלַחְסַריאָא published by Dr. Neubauer in Anecdota Oxoniensia, Semitic Series, vol. I, part IV. The Yemenites, in fact, showed much discrimination in beginning their calendar computations with an introductory chapter on chronology. The practical value of the Jewish calendar lies, of course, in the means it provides for finding the dates of fasts and feasts, and for determining the cycle of Biblical lections throughout the year; and as these
sacred observances hang together with events narrated in Biblical history, it is clear that chronology must form an integral part of the system.

As for the contents of the text here given, it will suffice to note down a summary of its chief chronological data. The student will, of course, compare these with the other chronological works at his disposal. In the present place only a note or two of comparison will be given at the foot of the page.

The chief data are as follows:

(1) The time that elapsed between the creation of Adam and the exodus was 2448 years; but Adam was created one year after the creation of the world, and it, therefore, follows that the exodus took place 2449 years after the creation.

(2) A period of 480 years passed between the exodus and the building of the first Temple.

(3) The first Temple lasted 410 years.

(4) The ḥurvat, or lying waste of the Temple, continued for seventy years.

(5) The second Temple lasted 420 years.

(6) Ezra died in the forty-first year of the second Temple, this being at the same time the beginning of the rule of Alexander the Great, when the custom of dating documents began among the Jews.

This text is also valuable from another point of view. It begins with the statement that the year in which this part of the calendar was composed (or first embodied in the calendar) was A.M. 5089 (A.D. 1329). This date, therefore, takes us back into comparative antiquity, and it is

---

1 It may here be noted that the Karait computation as given in the Brit. Mus. MS. Or. 2536 places the exodus at 2446 (or 2444) after the creation.

2 This difference in date between the creation of the world and that of Adam is a refinement peculiar (so far as the Museum MSS. go) to Or. 2227.

3 The Yemenite tradition, therefore, knows nothing of a son of Ezra, during whose religious administration the arrival of the Greeks took place (see e.g. אָֽשֶׁר הַעֲשָׂר, Amsterdam, 1711, fol. 70a).
not impossible that the Yemenite Liturgy, in essentially the form in which we have it now, was redacted at about that time. A Liturgy in a simpler form, containing all the essential elements of the תורם, of course existed in Yemen many centuries before; but it may well be that early in the fourteenth century a new departure was made in the direction of transforming the תורם into a kind of מושב, and of combining it with a calendar, definite liturgical directions, and formulae for marriage-contracts, letters of divorcements, and various business contracts. If this be so, this introductory chapter on the calendar will have to be regarded as a document of very great importance for the history of the Yemenite Liturgy. But another point is yet to follow. At the end of the Arabic text another date is given. There a period of 5268 is stated to have passed from the creation to the time of writing. A.M. 5268 = A.D. 1508. It is clear, therefore, that the introductory chapter prefixed to the calendar computations in Or. 2227 passed through a fresh redaction in 1508, the MS. itself belonging to 1540, that is, only thirty-two years later. This circumstance would seem to make it more certain still that A.D. 1329 was a fresh starting-point for the Yemenite Liturgy; for a redactor of 1508 would hardly have left the earlier date at the beginning of the chapter, if that date had not been regarded as an integral part of the document in its original form.

The text itself may now follow:

Or. 2227, fol. 188 b (six lines from bottom).

המשם עלינו

יתביה מי תואריך אלעבשל עליך הזאת ולע אלים אלהים וממשה

ס各样ם אתılmış אתאלים ומשנה נבריק קרוי

משלח אתמל ימי ויהי עליך אלים שהמה היה אלים ימי ומתמית

ס各样ם אתמלך ימי ויהי עליך אלים והמה משלים אתמלך ימי ויהי עליך אלים ומשנה

ולהמשם אתالمع אין נש יפה. תנה אתימיה לילם אליאנס והלאתורה

וכלל אין אדום והראשה אעש מאיה וולחן 중국 אולר שט. ויושן שט
אם יש לנו Mayıs ארצים różnych. ניסים והם רוצים להvox את האוכל כימי והמשת菌. ניסים והם רוצים להvox את האוכל כימי והמשת菌. ניסים והם רוצים להvox את האוכל כימי והמשת菌. ניסים והם רוצים להvox את האוכל כימי והמשת菌. ניסים והם רוצים להvox את האוכל כימי והמשת菌. ניסים והם רוצים להvox את האוכל כימי והמשת菌. ניסים והם רוצים להvox את האוכל כימי והמשת菌. ניסים והם רוצים להvox את האוכל כימי והמשת菌. ניסים והם רוצים להvox את האוכל כימי והמשת菌. ניסים והם רוצים להvox את האוכל כימי והמשת菌. ניסים והם רוצים להvox את האוכל כימי והמשת菌. ניסים והם רוצים להvox את האוכל כימי והמשת菌. ניסים והם רוצים להvox את האוכל כימי והמשת菌. ניסים והם רוצים להvox את האוכל כימי והמשת菌. ניסים והם yansים להvox את האוכל כימי והמשת菌. ניסים והם yansים להvox את האוכל כימי והמשת菌. ניסים והם yansים להvox את האוכל כימי והמשת菌. ניסים והם yansים להvox את האוכל כימי והמשת菌. ניסים והם yansים להvox את האוכל כימי והמשת菌. ניסים והם yansים להvox את האוכל כימי והמשת菌. ניסים והם yansים להvox את האוכל כימי והמשת菌. ניסים והם yansims להvox את האוכל כימי והמשת菌. ניסים והם yansims להvox את האוכל כימי והמשת菌. ניסים והם yansims להvox את האוכל כימי והמשת菌. ניסים והם yansims להvox את האוכל כימי והמשת菌. ניסים והם yansims להvox את האוכל כימי והמשת菌. ניסים והם yansims להvox את האוכל כימי והמשת菌. ניסים והם yansims להvox את האוכל כימי והמשת菌. ניסים והם yansims להvox את האוכל כימי והמשת菌. ניסים והם yansims להvox את האוכל כימי והמשת菌. ניסים והם yansims להvox את האוכל כימי והמשת菌. ניסים והם yansims להvox את האוכל כימי והמשת菌. ניסים והם yansims להvox את האוכל כימי והמשת菌. ניסים והם yansims להvox את האוכל כימי והמשת菌. ניסים והם yansims להvox את האוכל כימי והמשת菌. ניסים והם yansims להvox את האוכל כימי והמשת菌. ניסים והם yansims להvox את האוכל כימי והמשת菌. ניסים והם yansims להvox את האוכל כימי והמשת菌. ניסים והם yansims להvox את האוכל כימי והמשת菌. ניסים והם yansims להvox את האוכל כימי והמשת菌. ניסים והם yansims להvox את האוכל כימי והמשת菌. ניסים והם yansims להvox את האוכל כימי והמשת菌. ניסים והם yansims להvox את האוכל כימי והמשת菌. ניסים והם yansims להvox את האוכל כימי והמשת菌. ניסים והם yansims להvox את האוכל כימי והמשת菌. ניסים והם yansims להvox את האוכל כימי והמשת菌. ניסים והם yansims להvox את האוכל כימי והמשת菌. ניסים והם yansims להvox את האוכל כימי והמשת菌. ניסים והם yansims להvox את האוכל כימי והמשת菌. ניסים והם yansims להvox את האוכל c
C. A NEW FORM OF THE PRAYER.

This form of the prayer appears to be, so far as the present writer has been able to ascertain, unique, although it is not impossible that it may be found in some other Yemenite MSS. that have not yet been fully described. It will be seen that it begins like the usual text, but after about the fourth part of the whole passes into an entirely different form. Its ascetic tone is similar to that of (see e.g. Jellinek, יבניה מקדש, II, 120 sqq.) and similar compositions. Different parts of it are no doubt to be found in various compilations (more especially in works aiming at principles ofUSHWA). A translation will hardly
be required, the Hebrew being so very clear and simple. It will for the present purpose suffice to edit the text without further comment. Others may perhaps later on collect the parallels from divers sources. It would be interesting to know the date at which the work in its present form made its appearance.

Or. 2390, fol. 22 b.

It is to be noted that the MS of Amram Gaon has additions to the text taken from the text of the Additions to the Talmud. A comparison should also be made with the Hebrew text, which is more familiar to the scholar.
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In the MS. 1

For 2

For 3

So the MS.
In the MS. in one word, like וָאֶלֶף noticed before, it thus becomes a kind of proclitic of the noun following.

MS. וָאֶלֶף.
D. An Introductory Chapter to Selihoth.

This is taken from Or. 2227, but is found in several other MSS. of group II. It will suffice to indicate the main features of the chapter. A point is made at the outset of the importance of faith in the efficacy of repentance. If, so the argument runs, the sinner does not believe in the possibility of his restoration to Divine favour, he would continue in his bad courses, seeing that there is no help for him at all. But if he knows that he can by means of repentance return to his former state of moral healthfulness, he may make an effort to reform his

1 MS. נסייה.
 life. Touching on the old problem why Providence has ordered things in this way and none other (מעניון), the answer to this and similar questions is that so it was willed and that so Divine wisdom decreed it (כאמרה). Man's conduct is declared to be in man's power. The justice of God in distributing rewards and punishments is thus vindicated. Nothing escapes the Divine eye, not even the weight of the smallest insect (הוהי נ函)². It was for the purpose of guiding man into ways of repentance that the Day of Atonement, as well as the feast of נין ליקס, and the intervening days of penitence were instituted. The object of blowing the trumpet is to rouse up men from their sluggishness and faulty lives and call them to a new and better life. Regarding the collections of תעודות סוד that follow the נין the writer says that the learned poets have composed many pieces bearing on repentance, but only some of these have been brought together in this place, the entire number of pieces being too great to be included in the collection. He then gives some forms of confession suggested by certain Biblical passages. At the end the duty of reconciliation to men with whom one may be at variance is insisted on. If the person wronged has died, pardon should be asked at the grave in the presence of ten other men.

It would be interesting to ascertain the time when this piece was composed. The suggestion is made here that its date is either about 1329 or 1508 (see under B), but further investigation is necessary.

Or. 2227, fol. 103 b.

1 Thus agreeing with the well-known maxim: עלון כדת הנפשות זכרית חקמי.

2 Thus laying full stress on the doctrine of הערת עדים פסחא.

3 For (changed) תאריה.

4 Or. 2227, fol. 103 b.
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For 3rdly. * In Or. 2389, fol. 49 b: ד.

Read א"ה. * The words in brackets are omitted in Or. 2389.

VOL. XVII. 3 A
In Or. 3389: emancipation of those who were still in the Yishuv, the religious élite and the military leaders, and the reorganization of the Yishuv as a whole. This process led to the formation of a new Jewish state, the State of Israel, in 1948.
The introductory chapter given under D, is followed in Or. 2227 by a series of ni'rb which generally bear the title: בָּרְדוּ הַלַּחפָּה, and it therefore seems appropriate to give now an alphabetical list of these pieces, together with indications of authorship, &c. In order, however, to make the series complete, pieces not found in Or. 2227 have been added from other MSS. of the Museum Yemenite.

E.
collection. It is only necessary to remark that where no MS. is mentioned by the side of a piece, Or. 2227 must be understood as the source. In all other cases, the MS. from which the piece is taken is named, although it must be understood that the piece in question may also be found in one or more other MSS. of the collection. It should also be mentioned that pieces found in Zunz are left without indication of authorship unless the MS. itself names the author. Information supplied by the MSS. themselves is in all cases given by way of supplying the evidence which such information affords.

The same as •••••••• in Zunz, Literaturg., p. 398, but here only and :.

Apparently the same as •••••••• in Zunz, Literaturg., p. 684.

Sometimes •••••••• in vers. 3–4, the piece consisting of four verses.
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To be distinguished from אכוסポイント שלาน of Benjamin b. Zerah. The present pieces show the acrostic רמא. Comp. Zunz, Literaturg., pp. 394, 677. In Or. 2418 the acr. רמא is shown.

Acr. רמא in vers. 2-4, the piece consisting of four verses.
THE JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW

7io THE JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW

1. See Pinaker, 'ךו, p. 121.
2. First four letters double.
3. But see Zunz, Literature, p. 400 (assigned to ןךךך).
Three verses beginning p'Veas; then double i'h, followed by *w panpm törö[""]3nirjmrp. * Acr. rmrrwas; end, rmjyrwup: Comp. Zunz, Literaturg., p. 343.
* But in reality by nt-i'soiwm Hip:sp'anotei.See Zunz, Literaturg., p. 31a.
* On the authorship see Zunz, Literaturg., p. 31a.
* In Zunz, Literaturg., p. 367: r'rmo. 
* But in reality the author is 'msoi. See Zunz, Literaturg., p. 408.
THE ARABIC PORTION OF THE CAIRO GENIZAH AT CAMBRIDGE.

(Tenth Article.)

FURTHER SA'ADYĀH FRAGMENTS.

The following group of articles will comprise the fragmentary remnants of various treatises by Sa'adyāh1 hitherto only known by their titles. It is regrettable that these fragments can only be published in a rather sporadic fashion, instead of collectively and systematically. This is, however, unavoidable for various reasons, firstly on account of the dispersion of the treasures of the Cairo Genizah amongst different collections, resulting in the dismemberment of works formerly complete or nearly so, which leaves little hope of their ultimate reunion. The difficulty of determining smaller fragments in detached collections is thus greatly increased. Secondly, the work of arranging the Taylor-Schechter collection, the largest of them all, is so far from completion that a workable survey of the whole, at least as far as the Arabic fragments are concerned, is at present out of the question. The only course possible to pursue in the meanwhile is to publish fragments as soon as they are discovered and examined, and students will be best advised to defer utilizing these fragments for the purposes of history of literature till all the fragments are catalogued. There are still numbers of fragments left which are probably of Sa'adyānic origin, but which

require further careful study before a definite judgment can be pronounced on them. The present instalment contains two Sa'adyah fragments, the authenticity of which can hardly be doubted, with several more to follow in the next article.

XXV.

Treatise on "Forbidden Marriages."

Paper, four leaves, 18 x 14 cm.

The first question to consider is that of the authenticity of the fragment. It is known that Sa'adyah composed a work with the above-mentioned title. We may, therefore, open the line of argument by the statement that the fragment deals with the same subject. The next point is its anti-Karaite tendency, evinced by two passages, in one of which the community of Rabbanites is placed in contrast with the "Karaite seceders." More definite in favour of Sa'adyah's authorship are the following points:—The fragment contains on the first page four passages in the O.T. with relative constructions in which the relative pronoun is omitted. Three of these passages coincide with Sa'adyah's published translations, whilst of the fourth (Ezek. xx. 25) no translation of his has as yet been discovered. Other points of great weight are the author's quotation of his commentary on Exodus, and his habit of rendering striking expressions of the Hebrew original, as far as possible with a formation of the cognate Arabic root. An example of this is shown in our fragment in the term מַפֶל (Isa. xxxvii. 6), which is translated by יִפְלָה. The same term is employed by Sa'adyah in the detailed discussion on Ezek. xx. 27, which occupies a prominent place in the fragment. If we also point out that the verses Lev. xviii. 6-23, which form the fularum

1 See p. 720.
2 יִפְלָה.
3 See v. 23; Num. xv. 30; Isa. xliii. 28; li. 7, and Ibn Janah, Kitab al Upil, ed. Neubauer, col. 124.
of the whole treatise, agree with Sa'adyah's translation of the Pentateuch; and, finally, that the method of argumentation is strikingly similar to that employed by Sa'adyah in other of his undoubted works, there is no reason left for ascribing the fragment to another author.

We must return for one moment to the Commentary on Exodus mentioned above. The existence of this Commentary, and indeed of the whole Pentateuch, is rendered certain not only by Sa'adyah's own reference to it, but by a fragment in the Cambridge Genizah comprising the verses Exod. xxxv. 27–xxxvi. 35. The authenticity of this fragment cannot be doubted for a moment. Not only is the translation that of Sa'adyah, but the interpretation contains a reference to his treatise on the "Oral Laws." It is not surprising that a similar reference is to be found in the introduction to his version of the Pentateuch, but one would not expect it in so remote a subject as the Commentary on the Book of Proverbs. The commentary of chap. ix, vv. 13–18, consists of a short but sharp lecture against heretics and Karaites. As there is sufficient evidence to show the intimate connexion between Sa'adyah's anti-Karaite monographs and his Bible commentaries, this must needs lead to a revision of the classification of his works in general. It seems, indeed, that the usual classification into biblical, halakhic, polemical and philosophical writings is too mechanical. It appears more probable that the bulk of his works followed a distinct and well-arranged plan, in the centre of which we find his translation and commentary on the Bible, and from which radiated monographs on various chapters of the Jewish law code which

1 Ed. Derenbourg, p. 170 sq., with a few variations.
2 See Introduction to the Translation, p. 4.
3 There is also a fragment of Sa'adyah's commentary on Leviticus in the T.S. collection.
4 See Poznański, J. Q. R., X, p. 259. An identity with the Kitâb al Amândî (Bacher) is out of the question, cf. below, no. XXVI.
5 P. 34, cf. Comment. to Proverbs, p. 52.
6 Ed. Derenbourg, pp. 4, 51 sq.
needed special protection from Karaite interference. To combat this Karaite interference was perhaps the main-spring of Sa'adyah's literary activity. The fight had not only a religious, but also a political aspect. Karaism was less odious to Mohammedan eyes than Rabbanism. The Mohammedan charge of the falsification of the Tör ah, e.g., did not apply to the former. The thorough education of the Rabbanite masses appeared to Sa'adyah a work of the utmost importance, and he performed this task in a most systematic and scholarly way. It will scarcely be possible to do him full justice till most of his missing writings have been discovered. The influence he exercised on Oriental Jews was not equalled by any of his successors, including Maimonides, who addressed himself to the initiated rather than to the masses. It would be unjust to look upon Sa'adyah's polemical treatises as dictated by mere delight in academic dispute. Karaism was a powerful factor in his age, and so little on the wane in the following generations, that two hundred years afterwards Judah Hallévi conceived the necessity of renewing the combat.

A rather lengthy quotation from Sa'adyah's treatise on "Forbidden Marriages" has been known for some time, but it is taken from a different, and probably later, part. Our fragment, which is fortunately a coherent piece, seems to represent an earlier portion of the treatise, containing a large section of the introduction and the beginning of the discussion of the subject itself. The treatise seems to have been of considerable extent, and the subject is treated with great care and thoroughness.

The fragment opens with the second of three replies to a query on the phrase, "Laws [that] were not good" (see above). The third explanation, which the author prefers to any other, is that the phrase refers to the laws of the Tőrah. It is not, however, the word of God, but placed into the mouth of the unbeliever. He then explains the

1 See Poznański, ibid. Steinschneider, Arab. Lit., p. 49.
syntactical position of the words 'נְזִיָּה' (Ezek. xx. 27), and quotes several cases in which it refers to the preceding passage. The whole is an interesting piece of biblical exegesis. After this the subject of forbidden marriages is opened by an explanation of the five technical terms employed in the Pentateuch.

T-S. 8 Ka. 103.

1 Read בָּשָׁר, Isa. ii. 7.
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בעיה והאמנולאא עא ברהיה סא דא ילאפנא לאלאקפל
עלאללא אמלאמלא ר' לאעיא יראמא עלאריד יא קסא (א) עאלברוא
מקח הב מ' רלן א' ייב[ו] המוסמא על יסא עכללו מנוקל עגאנד זר רביינו
נלאלקפל עאן עריהו' ע' וקיאל עלה蝰 או דואע מיטרא עכללאמ לאקפוס
עאלקרוא אocese דק קאלש עגאנד וואיב'. יואריוו יאנ חקיה
תקימ' וואסא א' מייסא ע' הראיא אלאקרב עליה עמעד מקריה
קלק יאצנוא עלא🎌becקארוא עושה עלאבקא' עאן וקנוד יאנ' וס
טמאזנ במעי פעלגי וי קפומיא בןלא' ילך עכלללאעל עלא.HandleFunc.

וילך יא זאן דק שאמ' גבל איה מרטן | פוקל מ' שראיא עלא嵫
יאאר עעשא 'א' ויה' ויע' ומפק עואז ולאלפס זיויו' בוי מ' ס
קאלא מ' עלאןוראה עאן שעומ' קכל' עיה' עכלל עואר' הפר', יאסא
אנאצאן יוא על ע' עכלל מפה' עאן מסחא עואר ע' ذو תומסח
שסק התרון לובל יאנ וואזעבטת חותן: יאנ חורה הידס'ל.

אות חורה נון' יאן חורה בוק עלאᡠבוקו' ילך.

דק בלהiscrim עלאשיניי ו'יקנה דק ח theres עלאקזע עלאזאגママ.
ככלו פרש כמנה עריפ פרואיב' ב' עבג הל' וומרא סימס סנה.
ואאריאה יוקרא עלאפרות עלאסאנתה יביע עלאkoneksiי' מיה מילך
טנואע מיסימי ויוריכ ל Angry קכל' בטש עלאסקא' ון אנבייניא עלאלה קד

Arabisch fol. 37v

Arabisch fol. 38r

Arabisch fol. 39v

Arabisch fol. 40r
as I explained to them that the matter is so. The meaning of the verse Ezek. xx. 25 is: “I gave laws which are not good for them,”
the relative pronoun being omitted [in the original]. Similar verses are Exod. xviii. 20; Isa. xliii. 5; Ps. lxxi. 18. We also said in our Commentary on Exodus (chap. xxi) that if a slave chooses freedom, God makes him happy and lauds him, a case for which we found other corroborative verses in the Bible. But if he makes an evil choice, God allows him to be unhappy, and reprimands him as well since he practiced laws which were not good, so God did the same, reprimanding him at the same time severely. These two instances entail the explanation of the next verse (Ezek. xx. 26): "I polluted them in their own gifts," which means that they are disobedient infidels.

since they did this in disobedience.

The third answer is the one which I like best of all, viz. that the Fol. r verse Ezek. xx. 25 refers to the laws of the Pentateuch. These are not, however, God's own words, but the words of the unbeliever which God cites, and an absurd utterance concerning the law of God. They assert that this is a statute in which there is no good, and from the practice of which no profit accrues. God, however, put them to nought in an unmistakable manner. He maintains that these sacrifices are not holy but in impurity, because they consist of fat and blood. So God says in his anger (v. 26): "They assert that I . . . . , but I polluted them, &c." We are aware that these two verses are only quoted by God . . . . because he says immediately afterwards (v. 27): "Therefore, son of man . . . . yet in this, &c." The meaning of לֵעַנֵי is . . . . "contumely," as in Isa. xxxvii. 6; li. 7. Fol. a The word נַחֲלָה in Ezek. xx. 27 refers both to what precedes and what recto. follows. The end of the sentence, however, contains neither a blasphemy nor any absurd statement concerning God. This arises from v. 28 . . . . from which follows that נַחֲלָה refers to the preceding passage.

We now say that the prophet uttered the verses 26 and 27 first, and says in reference to them נַחֲלָה which should stand prior to them, as if he wished to say: "And also your fathers blasphemed me, and said [that] I gave them statutes that were no good, and that I polluted them." He places the disavowal at the end and not at the beginning, in order that the repugnant character of the sentence and the protest should be as emphatic as possible. The words נַחֲלָה mean: Notwithstanding all they have done, they blasphemed me, too, and make absurd statements concerning me. Prior to this group of verses the prophet had stated twice with regard to the laws of scripture that "if a man do he shall live in them" (vers. 11 and 13 (21)), just as is said in the Pentateuch (Lev. xviii. 5). He then points out that they
violated all these laws and assert something opposed to me. If we refer נא to what precedes, the construction is like Lev. vii. 35 (with reference to ver. 34); Lev. xi. 46; xii. 7; xiii. 59; xv. 32, &c.

Now I come to the subject of forbidden marriages, a chapter which causes a large amount of misunderstanding, both among the general people [of the Rabbanites?] and the sectarians [Karaite]. Each party holds its own opinions on the matter, relying on a mass of corroborative material, and supported by fundamental principles on which they construct theories. They are all, nevertheless, mistaken, and overlook the tradition handed down to the whole people by the prophets of God. I will first set forth what appears to me new in the matter, and then the arguments advanced by each party in support of either

Now we Rabbanites are the first class of Israelites, who derive their appellation from the prophets of God; who follow their footsteps and preserve their tradition for future ages. These sectarians, however, differ from each other. I must first reproduce the explanation given us by the prophets . . . and recount the sum total of forbidden marriages mentioned in Bible and Tradition. This will be followed by those added or deducted by the innovators, and to show their error.

The first thing to do is to interpret the verses relating to forbidden marriages, seventeen in number. [Here follows the translation of Lev. xviii. 7-23.] Here I insert a discussion of the five terms employed in connexion with performing forbidden marriages, viz. רב, לא, נָבַש, שֵׁב, לָא (Lev. xx. 18, 19), which all express cohabitation.

רַב is employed when speaking of a person living with his family, as in Deut. xxii. 14; Isa. viii. 3; Gen. xx. 4, instances which render its meaning clear.—Ľ is has various other applications, as in 1 Sam. ix. 15; xx. 12, 13; Ruth iv. 4; being opposed to Mic. iii. 7. Such is the meaning of לא in connexion with forbidden marriages, the verb being employed in the same way as hearing and speaking.—For see Gen. xxxix. 7; 1 Sam. xiii. 11; Num. v. 20.—לה is applied to an organ of the body affected by some action. Thus one may say that knowledge reaches the heart by means of sight, as in Eccles. i. 16, or when a sound reaches a man's sense [of hearing] . . . .
XXVI.

THE TREATISE ON THE "TRADITIONAL LAWS."

Paper, two leaves, 19 x 16 cm.

The reference contained in the preceding pages to the [אליינו] [לְאֵלָי] affords an opportunity of publishing a fragment which possibly belongs to this work, and of the contents of which nothing is known but a few short quotations. The smallness of the fragment renders the establishment of its authenticity much more difficult than of any other; there are, however, some points which make for great probability. In the first instance, the traditional code is the object of discussion, particularly in the latter half. The doctrine of the necessity for prophets in order to explain not only the practice of traditional regulations, but also that of the "rational laws" (אגנץ אֶלֶּקֶף), coincides with a remark to be found towards the end of Sa'adyah's Introduction to his Translation of the Pentateuch. The prayer is used as an example in both places.

The fragment seems to belong to the introduction of the treatise, because it explains the method to be employed in the discussion. Its polemical character is shown in the attempt to refute what they urge against the necessity of prophets to explain the practice of the law. There can be little doubt that "they" means the Karaites, and the author's reply fits well into a controversy on the necessity for the oral law code.

T-S. 8 Ka. 104.

1 See p. 714. * See Poznański, l. c. 3 Ed. Derenbourg, p. 3 sq.
TRANSLATION.

I say that slaying an enemy gratifies the slayer and causes pain to the slain; seizing money or another's beloved gratifies the holder, but gives pain to the robbed person. In the opinion of him who adopts this view, every action of this kind must be at the same time judicious and injudicious. It is judicious because it gratifies the slayer, the thief, and the seducer; it is injudicious because it gives pain. Every course which leads to contrast and contradiction is absurd. Occasionally this contrast can be neutralized in a person by one act, if he e.g. eats some poisonous food which tastes well, but kills him. This would be a case of judicious and injudicious acting at the same time.

In part two I speak of what is lawful according to reason; but the law commands part of it, forbids part of it, and leaves the remainder lawful. An instance of this is [given by] the distinction of certain days, as the Sabbath and festivals; or the distinction of a certain person, as a prophet or leader; the abstention from certain foods, keeping aloof from cohabiting with certain persons, and

1 ... and 3 on the margin.
3 B 2
avoiding the touch of certain unclean matters (?). These principal laws with their details and accessories, we were commanded by our Lord to uphold . . . , and we show the advantage to be gained thereby. For the majority of them I find several causes of compensation and advantage. I have cause to uphold some, viz. those which best subdue man's passions, and above which the wisdom of God is apparent.—One of the advantages of selecting a certain time for leaving off work is the desire for rest after much toil; to have an opportunity for study and increased prayer; to render people free to meet and hold intercourse; to reflect on matters of religion and expound them, &c.—One of the advantages of the distinction of a certain person is to receive his instruction, to ask his intercession; for people to incline towards godliness that they may attain something like his own rank; or that he make it his care to improve mankind if possible, &c.—One of the advantages of the prohibition to partake of certain animals is lest man resemble the Creator, since one cannot give up eating that which resembles him, nor profane him; further lest man worship anything of this kind, because it is impossible for him to worship what was given to him for food, nor what renders him unclean.—The advantages of [the regulations of] abstaining from certain cohabitations are [taught] by the example of embracing a married woman, as stated above. With mother, sister, and daughter, one is often alone by necessity. The desire is to repudiate marrying them, not seduction; further lest a relative be tempted by a fair face, or an ugly person remain isolated, when it is noticed that her relatives have no desire for her.—The advantages of the [regulations concerning] clean and unclean things that man should be humbled by his guilt . . . . or (?) to concentrate his thoughts on devotion.

In this manner if thou followest the majority of traditional laws, a motive can be discovered. The advantages of tracing the causes of a thing are many, but the wisdom and omniscience of the Creator is higher than man can conceive, as is written in Isa. lv. 9.—Now since I said all this in reference to the two classes of laws, viz. the rational and traditional ones, I must explain the necessity for [divine] messengers and prophets. For I have heard . . . what they say . . . . people's want of prophets whose intelligence is sufficient for them to distinguish the good and bad. I returned to gauging the time and saw that . . . . if the matter were as they assert, would not the Creator have taught so, and would he not have sent messengers, as he does nothing without reason? Then I studied it closely and found that man urgently needed prophets, not for the knowledge of the traditional laws alone, but also for the rational laws. For the practice thereof only
becomes perfect through the prophets by whom people abide. One instance of this is that God ordained his creatures to show gratitude without any further definition; but prophets called it prayer, and appointed for it special times and words, and a special condition and direction of the face. Another instance is that reason rejects immodesty, but a distinct line is drawn, how a woman is guarded against a man till she becomes his lawful wife; whether this depends upon a word alone, or her consent or that of her parents alone, or two witnesses or ten, or in presence of all the inhabitants of the town, or upon the instruction of a teacher.

HARTWIG HIRSCHFELD.
PHILO OF ALEXANDRIA

De Decem Oraculis.

The Decalogue is the natural sequel to the "lives of the patriarchs," which constitute the unwritten laws of the Jewish nation. Accordingly, it must be carefully expounded and no allegorical meaning, which can be discerned lurking in it, passed over.

The first question to be considered is, "Why was the Law given in the desert?" The answer is plain. Cities are full of untold evils, offences both against God and against man. Further, the soul of the man who is about to receive holy laws must needs be purged of those deep stains which a motley crowd of men has produced long retirement is needed before spiritual nourishment can be taken with any advantage, just as in the case of bodily sickness. In the third place it was necessary for the people to receive and grow familiar with their new constitution before they settled in their new home and had to put it in practice. Some allege yet another reason, which is very near the truth: the people needed some proof that these laws were divine oracles and not human inventions, and found it in the miraculous support, which God bestowed upon them in the barren wilderness. But all these are only reasonable conjectures: God alone knows the truth.

The laws in question are of two kinds—according as they are declared by God himself or through the prophet

1 This article is one of a series in which various of the Philonean writings will be summarized.
Moses. The first are general principles, the second particular applications. Naturally then we must first consider the first class, that is the Decalogue.

The people—men, women, and children—were assembled together, and God spake to them ten words or oracles. The number ten, δέκα, is the most comprehensive of all numbers, and owes its name to the fact that it contains (δέκασθαι: δέκα) within itself every kind of number and progression of numbers—arithmetical, geometrical, and harmonic—and represents the whole universe, inasmuch as it is the sum of 1 (the point) + 2 (the line) + 3 (the plane) + 4 (the solid). Moreover, there are ten so-called categories:—substance, quality, quantity, relation, action, passion, possession, situation, time, and place. But such considerations belong to a mathematical (or logical) treatise, and the question of God's voice is more germane to our present purpose. Let no one suppose that God is as a man and spake as a man. This voice is miraculous—a special creation which gathered strength on its way, so that those afar off heard as well as those close at hand, but all with their souls and not with their ears.

But why are the commandments formulated in the singular (Thou), when a multitude was present? Readers of the Holy Scriptures may learn from this that each individual who keeps the law and obeys God is as precious as the whole Nation, nay more, as the whole world. Another reason is that commands and prohibitions are more impressive if addressed to each individual in the audience. Again, every human king and tyrant may learn from this to despise none of his subjects, not even the meanest, since God the king of kings deigned to address himself to every one of the mortals assembled before him. So I will be affable to all who differ from me only in fortune not in nature.

The attendant circumstances, the thunder, lightning, voice, cloud, and fire are all wonderful, for it was right that, when God's Power approached, none of the parts of the universe should rest, but all be moved together to
render service. Notice, too, that the people saw the voice (Exod. xx. 18), since what God says is not word but deed.

After this preface we reach the Decalogue itself, and find it divided into two groups of five oracles each. The first and primary group begins with God the creator of the universe and ends with parents the procreators of individuals. The second and secondary contains all the prohibitions. Each oracle must be considered by itself.

Now the best and the beginning of all things is God, and the best and the beginning of virtues is piety. But a grave error has taken possession of the majority of mankind in respect of a matter which might reasonably be supposed to be implanted beyond the reach of error in the minds of each one. Thus some have deified the four elements earth (Kore, Demeter, Pluto), water (Poseidon), air (Hera), and fire (Hephaestus); others the sun (Apollo), moon (Artemis), and the stars fixed and the planets (e.g. Aphrodite and Hermes); others only the heaven; others the whole universe. This is to put the slave in the place of the master, to honour the temporal as if it were the Eternal, the created as the Creator. Let us reject these follies of the impious and all their words by which they who might be saved are destroyed, and engrave in our hearts the first and holiest of the commandments to acknowledge and honour one, the most high God. These polytheists and idolaters are like ships without ballast that can never make their port, worse and more miserable than those whose bodily eyes are blinded. Why are the craftsmen who make the idols left to live and die without money or honour, while the idols are tended and worshipped by the noblest of the land? Why not revere the hand that fashioned them, or the tools? The best of prayers and the end of happiness is assimilation to the divine. Yet the idolaters would reckon such a prayer a curse. The Egyptians go further. Not content with images they deify animals. If they stopped at the worship of the ox, the ram, and the goat they might plead, with some show of reason, that these
animals are most serviceable to man. But when they worship lions, crocodiles, and poisonous asps they pass all bounds. And can anything be more ridiculous than their cult of the dog, cat, wolf, ibis, hawk, and fish. So much for the second commandment, the prohibition of idolatry, which Philo does not clearly distinguish from the first which proscribes polytheism.

The position of the third commandment will be understood by the clear-sighted. A name is always second to the thing it denotes, just as the shadow follows a body. Multifarious are the sins of men in this respect. It is best and most rational to refrain from swearing, every word being as good as an oath. Next best is to swear truly. Avoid the necessity of taking an oath if possible; if it cannot be avoided then be very cautious. An oath is no light matter though conventionally regarded as such: it is the taking God to witness in respect of a disputed point. Remember that conscience is at once accuser and judge, and if unsatisfied will plague a man till he break off his miserable life. Even the worst of men would hesitate to go to a friend and call upon him to testify to something which he did not witness as if he actually had witnessed it. The friend would refuse and repent of his friendship, you say. But what else does the perjurer when he calls upon God to witness to a lie? Soon or late justice exacts the penalty of such a crime.

The fourth commandment enforces the holy observance of the sacred Sabbath. Some nations keep the seventh day from the new moon as a feast, but the Jews keep it every week. In the week of Creation God himself observed it, and in this as in all else man must follow God. On the seventh day man also must rest from his work and devote himself to philosophy, considering all his actions during the previous six days in order to the correction of all faults already committed and the prevention of such in the future. What else is the meaning of the Scripture that God rested on the seventh day, having
accomplished the work of creation in the six, since God is independent of time?

The fifth is the border-line between the two groups. It is the last of the sacred duties inculcated in the first, and links on with the duties toward men contained in the second. Procreation is akin to creation. Some men are content with performing their duties towards God, others with accomplishing their duties towards man. In either case they are convicted in one court of justice, human or divine. To our parents we owe what we can never repay. Men who disregard this natural obligation should imitate the beasts, who repay the services bestowed upon them. House-dogs protect and die for their masters when any danger suddenly overtakes them. Shall a man be less grateful than a dog? Storks put to shame sons who honour not their parents. A man who is impious towards his immediate and visible parents cannot be pious towards his invisible Father.

So much for the first and diviner pentad. The second group, of prohibitions, begins with the sin of adultery as the greatest of crimes. Its source is the love of pleasure, and it necessitates a partnership of teacher and disciple in sin. Not only the body but also the soul of the adulteress is alienated from her husband. By this sin, all the more deadly because it is secret, untold evils are produced. The innocent children of such illicit unions are absolutely destitute of parent or parents.

The second commandment of this group forbids murder. Man is pre-eminently a sociable and gregarious animal, and the manslayer therefore breaks the law of nature. Further, the murderer is guilty of sacrilege as having despoiled the most sacred of God's possessions, since man in virtue of his soul is akin to the heaven and, as most believe, to the Father of all.

The third (i.e. the eighth) commandment is directed against the thief, who is the public enemy of any city. Some, the greater thieves, dignify their crimes with the
titles of sovereignty. Such a tendency should be nipped in the bud, for a habit long indulged is stronger than nature.

False witnesses are condemned in the fourth (i.e. the ninth) as guilty of many grievous offences. First, they corrupt truth, man's most sacred possession. Secondly, they co-operate with wrongdoers. Thirdly, they defeat the ends of justice and mislead the judges.

Last of all, covetousness is forbidden. This is the most grievous disease which the soul can suffer; for the covetous man endures the tortures of Tantalus, ever yearning for the unattainable; and it is the source of all the ills of mankind.

These ten words are summaries of all the laws. For example, the fourth commandment, which deals with the observance of the seventh day, sets forth the principle which regulates all the feasts, including the so-called Pass-over, when the whole nation dispenses with the priests and on one day in the year celebrates its own sacrifice.

Such, then, are the laws which God himself proclaimed in person; whereas the particular applications of these general principles were delivered through the perfect prophet who was inspired to that end. No penalties are attached thereto, since the Lord is good and is to be considered as causing no evil but only good. Yet sinners are not thus promised immunity: God knew that his assessor, Justice, who watches human affairs, would not rest, being naturally a hater of evil, but would welcome as a kindred function the punishment of offenders. The great King is charged with the common well-being, while his underlings take vengeance of sinners. Indeed God is the prince of peace, his servants chieftains of war.

*Quod Liber sit quisquis Virtuti studet.*

The treatise *That the good man is free* begins with a reference to its lost companion, *That the evil man is a slave,*
which recalls the preface to the Acts of the Apostles. Its thesis—one of the Stoic paradoxes—seems to Philo to need some apology, which he bases on the Pythagorean maxim, "Do not walk on beaten tracks." The true philosopher obeys this oracle, and strikes out a new path for himself. The unclean may not enter it, that is all who have not tasted education or have tasted it amiss, perverting the beauty of wisdom into the shame of sophistry. Such cherish still the popular notions of wealth and poverty, slavery and nobility, which to the philosopher are simple madness. Blinded in mind, they are slaves of opinion, dependent on the senses whose judgment is always corrupted and unsure. They will submit their bodies to the physician, but never their souls to the wise. Yet so they might unlearn their ignorance and gain also knowledge, man's peculiar possession. It remains then that all the youth everywhere should dedicate the first-fruits of their prime to education and nothing else, and therein spend their strength and their age, leaving no part of their lives to be regretted when once they become hierophants of the mysteries.

The next step must be the strict definition of the terms of the proposition. "Slavery" and "freedom" are of two kinds—bodily, and of the soul. The masters of the body are men of greater strength, and bodily freedom is therefore security from such: the masters of the soul are vices and emotions, and freedom of the soul or mind effects release from their domination. But of course we are concerned only with the latter, since bodily freedom is a matter of chance or fate. Setting aside then all popular conceptions, we say with Sophocles, God is my ruler immortal. For indeed only he is free who has God alone as his chief, and he is chief of all other, being entrusted with all earthly affairs as the mortal vicar (διδαξεως) of the great immortal King.

Now any one who goes into the heart of things knows that nothing is so close akin to freedom as independence
of action (ἀφορμαία). Wicked men are hampered by avarice, ambition, and lust, but the good man has learned to disregard the behests of all such appetites and emotions—even the last infirmity of minds that would be free, the fear of death. The philosopher endures the buffetings of chance and defies the threatenings of men. It is with him as with the boxer who patiently bears all the blows of an active antagonist until he wearies him out and wins the fight and the crown. He stands firm, supported by unwavering reason, and is subject to no compulsion, though his life be passed in what men count a subordinate position. Even slaves become sometimes the masters of their owners. I myself have seen slave girls conquer their lords by beauty and grace of speech. Is a man the master of a lion in virtue of his ownership?

There are many other ways in which one may learn the freedom of the good man. The test of true happiness leads to the same conclusion. If we regard the good as friends of God, pagan poets and the Jewish lawgiver agree in acclaiming them as not merely free, but kings of kings. Indeed, the latter, who is reputed a student of naked philosophy, actually dared to call the man possessed by divine love and worshipping the Absolute alone, no longer man but God (see Exod. vii. 1). Surely such an one is happy, for God is no weak champion nor neglectful of his friends.

Moreover, in cities the subjects of oligarchies or tyrannies endure slavery, whereas men living under the protection of laws and constitution are free. And so with men generally. If anger, lust, or any vice have dominion over them they are slaves. But that man is free who lives with Law, not this or that particular code, but right reason, the fountain-head of all law, graven not on paper or on stone, but in the mind incorruptible as itself. Shall the laws of Solon and Lycurgus be held to guarantee the freedom of Athenians and Spartans and not Reason the freedom of the wise?

Intercourse on terms of equality (ἰσογορία) is another
plain proof of the freedom of the good. Only musicians speak freely with musicians, and so through all the list of experts. And the converse is equally true on this line of reasoning, as Zeno says, "Shall not the wicked howl for it if he contradict the good man?" borrowing from the Jewish Law (Gen. xxviii. 40), which reckons slavery the greatest boon for the fool.

In my judgment the arguments already alleged are enough to prove the proposition. But it is quite easy to show by a syllogism that the wise or good man is free in his life and in all his actions. And if we are asked for living examples we can find them now as well as in the past. Of course they are not common, for all good things are rare, and such men naturally avoid the wicked world, despairing of its amendment. We must search for them as we search already for precious stones and metals. But the quest of virtue does not involve journeys over lands and seas, as the wise lawgiver of the Jews says, "It is in thy mouth, and in thine heart, and in thine hands" (Deut. xxx. 11), hinting by symbols at words, actions, and plans, all which need cultivation. They who despise leisure produce immortal shoots, the virtues which bear, or, as some hold, constitute happiness. Such labour is distasteful to the generality of mankind, and so the world is full of wealthy and famous men and of pleasure-seekers, while there are few prudent, righteous, and good. Yet, though the latter be rare, they do exist, as Greece testifies with its Seven Wise Men. Nor is the barbarian land destitute. Persia has the Magi, India the Gymnosophists. In Palestine and Syria are the Essenes, more than four thousand in number, namesakes of Holiness (ἁδείατωτος). These worship God as few others, sacrificing no victims, but seeking (ἀξιούντες) to make their own minds holy (εὐσεβεῖς). They avoid cities for fear of the contagion of vice, and live in villages. Some till the ground, others practise arts which make for peace. They eschew hoards of silver and gold and large estates. All they wish is to provide for the neces-
sities of life. No man is slave among them; all are free and minister in their turn. The relation of master and servant they regard as not merely unjust, but unnatural, for all men are born brothers. With regard to philosophy, they leave logic to the word-hunters; physics, save in so far as it relates to the existence of God and the creation of the world, they regard as too high for men; but ethics they work out, using as trainers the laws of the fathers, which it is impossible for mortal man to understand without divine inspiration (κατωκορήσ). These laws they learn daily, but especially on the seventh day. For the seventh day has been accounted holy, and on it they forgo all other tasks and come to the holy places, which are called synagogues, where they sit according to age in rows, the young at the feet of the old. Then one takes the books and reads, and another, one of the most experienced, comes forward to expound what is not common knowledge in accordance with traditional symbolism. And so they are instructed in piety, sanctity, righteousness, economy, polity, understanding of the truly good, bad, and indifferent, all determined by the threefold rule of love of God, of virtue, and of man. Such is their love of man that they hold their homes and goods as common to all the brotherhood.

But if communities are rejected as witnesses we can point to individuals. Calanus, the Indian gymnosophist, for example, was summoned by Alexander the Great to prove to the West the wisdom and virtue of the East. He refused, and when threatened with compulsion, replied, "What worth shall I be in the eyes of the Greeks if I am compelled to do what I do not wish," and his letter is to the same effect. Euripides puts the same sentiments in the mouths of Hercules and of Mercury, who dominated the master who bought him.

But some one will object to my citing the heroes, who were demigods, in evidence. Well, Anaxarchus and Zeno the Eleatic recked nought of terrors or tortures, triumphed
over fire and sword. Boxers in their hope of victory will endure to the death, and shall not the athletes of the mind reckon as little of the body, and be ready to die for liberty, that with mind unenslaved they may accomplish their fated paths?

Death may be the end of their struggle, as in a fight between two equally matched combatants, but is such death for the sake of freedom less noble than death for the sake of a crown of olive or parsley? History has many examples of men, women, children, and whole nations who preferred death to slavery, and refused to humble themselves before their conquerors. Noble souls, like Diogenes the Cynic, like Chaereas of Alexandria, like Theodorus the atheist, have something royal about them, and their splendour is not dimmed by misfortune.

One can find examples of this freedom of the wise as of all other human virtues in the brute creation. Gamecocks, for example, will not yield though they are beaten; as Miltiades knew when he shamed the Athenians into facing Persia by a main. Shall the wise and good yield the prize to birds?

Freedom is renowned among all the ancient nations, and for it they fought. The Athenians approve themselves clearest sighted of all Greeks in this, that, when they send an embassy to the Eumenides, they exclude all slaves and all evil-livers. So as the pupil is to the eye, as the power of reasoning to the soul, thus is Athens in Greece. Not long since I saw them rising to applaud that sentiment of Euripides, “the name of freedom is worth all: having this the poor man is rich.”

If the wise man is threatened with slavery let him, like Antigenides, reply “then I will teach my master moderation.” Banishment, fines, blows, death, have no terrors for him. But conscience can make slaves of nobles of long lineage, and asylums cannot, like the refuge for virtue, protect refugees from the shafts and arrows that fly from the ambushes of the passions. The freed man is freed only in name—
as well might the herald proclaim him grammarian, geometrician, or musician, when he has never even dreamed of such arts. The nature of a man's soul decides his condition. All are enslaved by lust, fear, anger and grief, or else have overcome these myriad masters. As for those who are neither conquerors nor conquered, whose souls are like those of young children, must be nursed, fed first with tender food instead of milk, i.e. general education, then with the stronger meat of philosophy, till they come to man's estate and reach the happy goal, life in conformity with Nature.

De Cherubim.

"And he cast out Adam" (Gen. iii. 24). Above (ibid., 23) the phrase was "sent out," and the difference is not without real significance. He that is sent out is not prevented from returning; but he that is cast out by God suffers eternal banishment. The first, not yet marked by vice, if he repent may return home to virtue from which he fell away; but the second, oppressed by incurable disease, must endure eternal and undying torments, condemned to the abode of the ungodly, there to suffer unmixed and continual misery. So Hagar left Sarah, who is Queen Virtue, twice and only once returned (Gen. xvi. 6 ff., xxi. 14). Her second and eternal flight follows the change of name and the appearance of Isaac, for then the natural philosopher and his wife had been transformed in soul as in name, and there was no more place with them for ordinary culture and her sophist son.

When Adam was cast out, the fiery sword and the Cherubim took up their abode over against Paradise. This phrase over against is used in three senses: of an enemy (Gen. iv. 16), of a litigant in court (Num. v. 18), and of a friend (Gen. xviii. 22 f.), as here. But what are the Cherubim and the turning fiery sword? Perhaps they are the outer and inner spheres, which contain respectively
the fixed stars and the seven planets and revolve continually in opposite directions, the sword being the eternal revolution of the whole heaven. Or, according to another interpretation, the Cherubim are the two hemispheres of the earth and the sword is the sun. But once my soul, which is wont to be divinely inspired oftentimes and so to speak like an oracle what it does not know, told me a worthier story. And this, if I can, I will recall and relate. It told me that the one God who really is has two high and chief powers, Goodness and Authority; and by Goodness he begat the universe, by Authority he rules that which was begotten, while third, midway between both and uniting both, is Reason. These, then, are the Cherubim and fiery sword, wherefrom the intent mind may win the virtues of love and fear of God, and follow the guidance of Reason.

"Now Adam knew his wife; and she conceived and bare Cain, and said, I have gotten a man by means of God. And she also bare his brother Abel" (Gen. iv. 1 f.).

Those to whose virtue the lawgiver testifies—Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Moses—are not introduced as knowing their wives. Woman stands for sense-perception, and knowledge consists in alienation from sense and body; so that the lovers of wisdom will be shown as rejecting rather than choosing things of sense. Moreover, the wives of such, though nominally women, are really virtues—Sara, Rebecca, Leah, and Sepphora the bird. But if we are to speak of the conception and birthpang of virtues the superstitious must shut their ears or depart. For our instruction is addressed to mystics worthy of most holy rites who practise true and real piety unadorned, without arrogance. The rest possessed by incurable evil, who measure sanctity and holiness only by pomp of words, pettiness of names, and unreal conventions, may not have us for hierophant.

Here, then, we begin the rite. Man mates with woman, male with female, following nature. But virtues must not have a mortal husband. Yet if they receive no additional
seed from any other they will wellnigh conceive sometimes of themselves. Who then is he that sows good seeds in them save the Father of that which exists, unbegotten and begetting all things? He sows then, or rather gives his own child which he sowed, for God begets nothing for himself, wanting naught but all things for whoso needs to receive. I will put forward the holy Moses a credible surety for what I say. He introduces Sarah as conceiving at the time when God visits her in her desolation (Gen. xxii. 1), bearing no longer to him that visited her but to him that yearns to obtain wisdom, who is called Abraham. Of Leah, he says more plainly, that God opened her womb (Gen. xxix. 31)—and this is the duty of the husband: but conceiving she bare not to God, who alone is self-sufficient, but to Jacob, so that virtue receives the divine seed from the First Cause, but bears to one of her lovers who is preferred to all her suitors. So again, when the allwise Isaac beseeches God, Perseverance or Rebecca becomes with child of the suppliant; and without prayer or supplication Moses when he took Sephora finds her with child by no mortal at all (Exod. ii. 22).

These facts, ye mystics, whose ears are purged, take to your souls as holy mysteries in very deed: never speak them to any of the uninitiated: store in yourselves and guard this treasure wherein are laid not corruptible gold and silver but the fairest of all possessions, knowledge of the First Cause and Virtue, and thirdly of the offspring (γεννήματος) of both. But if you meet one of the initiated, lest he know any new mystic rite and hide it, cling to him until you are plainly instructed therein. For I was initiated into the great Mysteries by Moses whom God loved; nevertheless, when I saw the prophet Jeremiah and knew that he was not only a mystic but also a capable hierophant, I hesitated not to frequent his company. And he, being for the most part in an ecstasy, delivered an oracle as in the person of God, saying to (πρός) peaceable virtue, “Hast thou not called me house, and father, and
husband of thy virginity?" (Jer. iii. 4). This plainly shows that God is both house, the incorporeal place of incorporeal ideas, and the father of all things (τὸν πατὲρκός) as having begotten them, and the husband of wisdom who casts the seed of happiness for the race of mortals into good and virgin soil. For it is fitting that God should converse with the unpolluted, untouched, and pure nature which is truly virgin, unlike us. The association of men makes virgins women; but when God begins to associate with a soul he declares that virgin which was woman before, since he removes the low and unmanly lusts which made it effeminate and introduces instead sincere and inviolate virtues. At any rate he will have no converse with Sarah before she quit all that is womanish and return to the rank of a pure maiden.

But perhaps it is possible that even a virgin soul should be shamefully polluted by intemperate passions, and so the oracle has safeguarded God, speaking of him as husband not of a virgin, but of virginity, which ever remains unchangeable and unchanged. So then it is fitting that the unbegotten and unchangeable God should sow the ideas of immortal and virgin virtues in the virginity which never changes its fashion into that of woman. Why then, O soul, since thou oughtest to be a virgin in God's house and cling to knowledge, shouldest thou forsake these and welcome sense which makes thee effeminate and pollutes thee? For so wilt thou bear a Cain, an ill possession.

But who is this Cain? The usual formula "and he (she) called his name" is not given as in the case of Seth (Gen. iv. 25). And this is the more noteworthy in the case of the first-born. Surely the custom is to specify the sex of the child and to give its name. Why then is it neglected here? The best explanation which can be given is this. All the rest of mankind give names to things which differ from the things, but Moses always uses the name which is the thing itself and expresses the nature of the thing. So when our mind—Adam—meets sense-
perception—Eve—she conceives that which is sensibly perceived—colour, sound, scent, savour, or body—and having conceived brings forth Opinion. For thanks to this union the mind fancies that all things which it sees, hears, smells, tastes, touches, are its own possessions, as if it was the discoverer and artificer of all. There was a time when Mind had no connexion with Sense, and had no organ of sense by which it could grasp external things. But God willed to offer it the means of apprehending not only incorporeal things but also solid bodies. So he completed the whole soul by knitting to that part already made the other section which he called generically Woman and specifically Eve—Sense in fact. And, united with Sense, Mind perceived clearly what before was dark, and like Alexander thought that all he perceived was his and not God's. How foolish was the thought the untrustworthiness of our senses proves.

So the boasting of Laban is perfectly ridiculous when he says "the daughters are my daughters, and the sons my sons, and the cattle my cattle, and all that thou seest are mine and my daughter's" (Gen. xxxi. 43). The daughters are the arts and sciences of the soul which are received from Mind. The sons are the particular reasonings of the soul. The cattle are the senses. All then are God's possessions, not thine own. If this lesson be not learned thou wilt ever be enslaved to harsh mistresses, to opinions, lusts, pleasures, crimes, follies, false thoughts. For if—Scripture says—the slave answer and say, I love my master and my wife and children, I will not depart free, he must go to the judgment seat of God and have his ear pierced, that he may not receive divine hearing to the freedom of his soul.

To the fool who says "I will pursue and overtake, I will divide spoils; I will satisfy my soul; I will slay with my sword; my hand shall prevail" (Exod. xv. 9), I would reply thus:—every creature that fancies he is pursuing is being pursued by disease, age, death, and a host of evils. He
that thinks to overtake and be master is mastered and overtaken, compelled to endure whatever he purposed to inflict. It is God's peculiar function to act, and no creature may assume it. If only mortals realize that their part is to suffer and endure they will be ready to bear the heaviest calamities, actively as well as passively, as a man co-operates in the shaving of himself, or as an athlete guards himself against a beating. And this being so, it is clear that no mortal can be lord of anything, that those who are called masters are such in appearance only, not in reality; and as there is a subject and slave so there must needs be a lord and master in the universe.

The one God, who is really ruler and governor, says "All things are mine" (Num. xxviii. 2). He that has learned this and is able to keep and guard in mind will offer to God a fair and spotless sacrifice, namely faith, in no feasts of mortals. For God has claimed the feasts for himself, offering this doctrine to the devotees of philosophy. And the doctrine is this: only God really feasts, for he only rejoices and is at peace, since only he is free from grief and pain and weariness—the perfect goal and source of all happiness and goodness. So the Sabbath is God's Sabbath or Rest, not men's (Exod. xx. 10, &c), for rest is not inaction but tireless energy, and only God remains invariable and unwearied in his working. To him, then, belong Sabbaths and all feasts.

Consider our famous festivals. We must pass by the various institutions among various Greek and barbarian nations, based on various legends, all having as their end vainglory. Not the whole lifetime of man would suffice to define the inherent absurdities of each: but their general features may be briefly outlined. At every feast there is licence and licentiousness of every kind: day is turned into night and night into day: virtue is derided as harmful, vice is grasped as profitable. Such are the feasts of the reputed happy, and so long as they practise their unseemliness at home or in profane places they sin less
grievously methinks. But when, like the rush of a spreading torrent, it forces its way into the temples' holiest places, it casts out the sacred things and makes the sacrifices unholy, degrades the mysteries, destroys all purity and holiness, turns all worship of God into a vulgar jest. They cleanse their bodies with baths and purifications, but the passions of the soul wherewith their life is stained they neither wish nor attempt to wash away. Clad in white they are eager to walk to the temples in spotless raiment, and yet are not ashamed to bring into the shrines a polluted mind. If the victim be not perfect it is driven away, while they go on with the sacrifice with blemished souls, mutilated and bereft of wisdom, self-control, righteousness, and piety.

We must not like them suppose that God sees only external sensible things. Invisibly God enters the region of the soul. Let us prepare it as best we may to be a worthy abode of God: else he will imperceptibly depart from us. It is the King of kings, God the governor of the universe, who for gentleness and love of man reckoned his creatures worthy of visitation, and descended from the bounds of heaven to the uttermost parts of earth to benefit our race. What manner of house shall we prepare? Only a worthy soul is fit house for him. So then when we speak of the invisible soul as an earthly house of the invisible God we say rightly, and according to the Law. But in order that the house may be firm and fair to see, the foundations of good breeding and instruction must be laid, virtues with fair deeds must be built thereon. When the race of men has such a house made ready, the earth, and all that is therein, shall be filled with good hopes of a descent of God’s powers; and they, bringing laws from heaven and ordinances for sanctification and consecration, shall come at their father’s command. They sit down and consort with virtuous souls, and sow in them the happy race, even as they gave to Abraham the wise for their sojourn with him, Isaac, a perfect boon.
All things then are God's, and the purified mind rejoices in nothing more than in the confession that the Governor of all is its master: to be God's slave is the greatest boast—more precious than liberty, wealth, power, and all that mortals love. To his hegemony this true oracle testifies, "The earth shall not be sold as freehold, for all the earth is mine, because ye are strangers and sojourners before me" (Lev. xxv. 23). Does not this plainly prove that all things are God's by possession, and only granted to creatures for use? No creature is independent of other creatures: all are parts of the universe which God has created. God therefore has assigned to himself alone the sovereignty over this universe, and allotted the use and enjoyment thereof to the creatures who are subjects to him and to each other. I, who consist of soul and body, who seem to possess mind, reason, and sense, find none of them my own. Where was my body before birth? Whither will it go when I depart? Where are the different ages of this apparent personality? Where is the babe, the boy, the youth, the full-grown man? Whence came the soul? How long will it live with us? What is its essence? When did we get it? Before birth? Nay, we were not then in existence. After death? But then we who are thus and thus embodied shall be so no longer, in a bodiless state we shall be rushing to regeneration. Nay, even now when we live, we are rather ruled than rulers, known rather than knowing. For the soul, which we know not, knows us and lays commands upon us which we obey as servants their mistress, and when it will departs to the Ruler, leaving our house destitute of life, and if we constrain it to stay, vanishes. Is the mind then the seat of my personality—the mind that is found to be no mind in ecstasy, melancholy, or old age? Is reason my possession, or the organs of sense? Experience shows that I am not lord, but slave, of my senses. All that we have and use is not our own, not glory, nor wealth, nor honours, nor authority, nor functions of body and soul,
nor even life itself. If we realize that we have the use of these things we shall care for them as God's possessions, premising that it is a law that the maker may reclaim his own when he will. So shall we assuage our pain at their removal. But as it is, the many think that all things belong to them, and grieve exceedingly for their absence. It is then not only true, but a great source of consolation, that the world and all that is therein are the works and possessions of the Creator. And the possessor has granted to us his own work because he does not need it: but the user does not possess it because there is one lord and master of all, who will rightly say, "Mine is the whole earth—all creation is mine—and ye are strangers and sojourners before me."

As compared with each other men who have come into being are reputed to be sprung from the soil, and noblemen, all enjoying equal honour and equal rank, but as compared with God they are in the position of strangers and sojourners. Each one of us has come into this world as into a foreign state, wherein before birth it had no part, and being come each one sojourns until he exhaust the allotted time of life (πάντα βίω). At the same time, however, an all-wise doctrine is introduced that only God is really a citizen, all creatures being strangers, citizens only by a loose use of the word. Wise men know that this rank is boon enough, for no fool is so much as a sojourner in God's city, but an exile therefrom.

Scripture does not say by whom the land shall not be sold. The object of the omission is the advantage of the initiated reader. You will find, if you look closely, that even those who are said to give, rather sell than make presents, and those whom we suppose to receive benefits are really bought. The givers are in quest of a return of praise or honour, seek a recompense for the favour, and therefore really make a bargain under the specious title of a gift, while the recipients repay the boon. But God does not sell, he gives, pouring forth the continual
streams of benefits, seeking no return, for he needs naught, and no creature is capable of recompensing him.

The conclusion of the whole matter is that all things are God's possessions, and therefore that the mind is wrong in regarding the offspring of its union with sense as its own.

J. H. A. Hart.
THE ARABIC ORIGINAL OF THE REPORT OF R. NATHAN HABABLI.

My friend Dr. Alexander Marx, who also has rendered me valuable assistance in the preparation of this article, some time since drew my attention to a fragment now in the library of the Jewish Theological Seminary in New York, belonging to the Genizah Collection of Taylor-Schechter (T-S. Loan 48). The fragment consists of one leaf, paper, size 12 x 7, written on both sides in Hebrew characters. The handwriting is oriental with a turn to cursive. The language is Arabic. A part of the upper margin, unfortunately that containing the beginning of the fragment, is torn off. In several places the MS. has suffered, but the words can still be deciphered. In the upper left-hand corner we still read the words ... مكتب تعرب عرب, and under it مَنْ أَلْعَلِهْ يَدْ وَهِىْ. On the lower margin a few words are still visible, written—like those of the upper margin—in a different, very careless hand. The ink is very much faded. I believe I can discern a group of letters—אַסְבָּלָלָתָוֹת בֶּבְּחֵיתוֹ—which I cannot explain, but I feel no certainty even about the letters. At any rate, both these and the words in the upper margin have scarcely anything to do with the text. Upon examining the contents of the MS. I found that it was the Arabic original of a part of the well-known report of R. Nathan Hababli on the Academies in Babylon (Neubauer, *Mediaeval Jewish Chronicles*, II, 78 f., beginning

---

1 I am indebted to Professor Schechter for the permission to use the MS.
2 Possibly 'א. Apparently an abbreviation for יד.
with 78, 20 and ending with 79 penultima, with the words
(השבץ שערתו פדובא).

Up to this time the Hebrew report has been considered
the original. But in my opinion the original character of
the Arabic cannot be doubted.

1. It is to be presumed that a native of Bagdad, such as
R. Nathan apparently was, used Arabic as the language of
his narratives.

2. The Arabic is written in a very pure style, and reads
most fluently.

3. A number of additional words and phrases, some of
essential character (see later), are to be found in the Arabic,
which would be quite impossible in a translation.

4. The Hebrew, though in general fluent and free from
the distressing Arabisms which mar the philosophical style
of Hebrew translations, betrays in several places the
influence of the Arabic. Confining ourselves to the part
to which our MS. offers the text, we find so obvious an
Arabism as in Neubauer, 79, 8, below, \( \text{אֶלֶף אַיָּה} \ldots \text{נָעַץ בָּנָטָס} \)
(79, 19), "they should do homage to him" = \( \text{בְּגֶרֶדֶת רֵאָשָׁה} \)
(verso, 1. 12), is explicable only if we remember that \( \text{עַד} \) means also "to write." \( \text{סִלָּה} \) \( \text{עֶדֶר} \) \( \text{עָלֶי} \) \( \text{מְסַפְּרָם} \)
(78, 8, below) \( \text{לִמְכַּע} \) \( \text{עַל} \) \( \text{קִנּוֹת} \) \( \text{לָמַּן} \) \( \text{לָמַּן} \) \( \text{לָמַּן} \)
(79, 19) is better Arabic than Hebrew. The peculiar idiom
\( \text{לִמְכַּע} \) \( \text{עַל} \) \( \text{קִנּוֹת} \) \( \text{לָמַּן} \) \( \text{לָמַּן} \) \( \text{לָמַּן} \)
(78, 6, below) \( \text{לִמְכַּע} \) \( \text{עַל} \) \( \text{קִנּוֹת} \) \( \text{לָמַּן} \) \( \text{לָמַּן} \) \( \text{לָמַּן} \)
(78, 6, below) \( \text{לִמְכַּע} \) \( \text{עַל} \) \( \text{קִנּוֹת} \) \( \text{לָמַּן} \) \( \text{לָמַּן} \) \( \text{לָמַּן} \)
(78, 2, paenultima) \( \text{לִמְכַּע} \) \( \text{עַל} \) \( \text{קִנּוֹת} \) \( \text{לָמַּן} \) \( \text{לָמַּן} \) \( \text{לָמַּן} \)
(78, 15), sound rather Arabic than Hebrew. The Biblical
expression \( \text{אֵּּלֶּה} \) \( \text{מִלְּוֵי} \) \( \text{אֲבִיר} \) \( \text{מִלְּוֵי} \) \( \text{אֲבִיר} \) \( \text{מִלְּוֵי} \)
(79, 10) applied to a town is probably

\[ \text{איָרָן} \text{מִלְּוֵי} \text{אֲבִיר} \]
suggested by the Arabic لِبَنَّ, meaning both a country and a city, a word which our text actually contains (verso, 15).

In view of the first-rate importance of R. Nathan Hababli’s text as an historical source I give in the following also an exact English translation of the Arabic text, accompanied by some explanatory remarks, for the benefit of non-Arabists.

It will easily be seen that the Hebrew is not a slavish translation of the Arabic, but rendered a little freely, taking more regard to the spirit of the Hebrew language, and here and there even assuming the character of a paraphrase. The deviations from the Arabic will be noted more fully hereafter. Here I should like to bring into prominence only the most important of them as far as they are of historical value.

Recto: L. 1, רָנָע תִּפְרַז confirms the additional words of the MS. (Neubauer, 78, 21). L. 4. The addition יִתְנָה יִבְנָאֵל gives us a most valuable indication of the geographical position of Pumbadita (see p. 756, n. 3). Ibid. The great chronological difficulty of the Hebrew text, ascribing forty years to the presidency of Kohen Zedeq (cf. Grätz³, V, p. 391), is removed by the Arabic, which merely states that the quarrel took place in the fourth year of his presidency. L. 6. According to the Arabic the Exilarch claimed also the right of sending dayyânîm to Khorasan on his own authority, whereas this had been done before by the academy of Pumbadita¹. L. 10. The Arabic text has fortunately preserved the names of the two sons of Natira—Sahl and Ishâq. They are of course identical with Sahl and Ishâq of the Natira family mentioned in the Genizah fragment published by Harkavy (in Berliner’s Jubelschrift, hebr. Abteilung, p. 34 ff.)². The

¹ Cf. Neubauer, 86, 17: among the privileges of the Exilarch is also counted the fact that he was מַלְכֵי אֲשֶׁר יֶלֶדֶת רְבִּיתָו.

² I venture the hypothesis that the author of the Natira fragment is the R. Nathan of our fragment. Both show a most intimate knowledge of the things reported about and a great love for details, and both display
designation of Natira, the son-in-law of Pinehas ben Yosef, as "the father of Sahl and Ishâq," is of great interest. For this expression is intelligible only if at the time of the report Natira senior was dead, and was therefore better described as the father of the well-known brothers Sahl and Ishâq then flourishing. This is in perfect agreement both with the fact that in his report on Saadia (Neubauer, 80, 6, below) R. Nathan speaks of the sons of Natira, who continued the anti-Exilarchic policy of their father, and with the statements in Harkavy's fragment, according to which Natira senior must have died 916 (see p. 749, n. 2). As it is stated in the beginning of the report that R. Nathan had witnessed only in part the events related by him, it is most natural to assume that he was only a contemporary of Natira's sons, and an eye-witness of the struggle between Saadia and the Exilarch, while in his account of Kohen Zedeq he relied on what "he had been partly told." L. 13. The additional word רותב, "several months," is not without importance in fixing precisely the chronology of the events reported there (cf. Grätz 3, V, p. 393). It implies that 'Uqba had lived in Karmafin some time before he happened to meet the Sultan. L. 17. Instead of the indefinite גנ the Arabic has "Kisra," and mentions also the name of his concubine, both in perfect agreement with the Arabic sources (see p. 757, n. 10, and p. 758, n. 1). Verso: L. 6. According to the Arabic 'Uqba was prohibited from entering only the city of Bagdad. It seems to be

exact knowledge of the whereabouts of the Natira family. It would be quite strange that at the same time there should have existed two different men writing on Bagdad, on the same period and the same circle, almost in the same style and manner. I think it is rather probable that both fragments belong to one book bearing on the "history of Bagdad" (see p. 753). As the number of words on a page of both fragments is almost the same (the number of lines on a page is not indicated by Harkavy), I should not wonder if it were not the same MS. The only difficulty is that the date suggested by the Natira fragment (about 930, see Harkavy, l. c., p. 35) differs from that implied by ours (about 945). But perhaps there is some mistake in the numbers.
a misunderstanding on the part of an editor, who mistook
בב for Babylonia (see p. 752 and p. 759, n. 4). L. 8. The
Arabic has three or four years, instead of the four or five
the reading of the edition רוחי (instead of רוחי in the
MS.), and shows also more exactly the degree of their
relationship: their fathers were brothers. L. 10. According
to the original one of the chief motives of Kohen Zedeq in
refusing to recognize the new Exilarch was his ambition
and his dread of David ben Zakkai's interference.

In spite of the fact that some of the events reported by
R. Nathan Hababli go back to oral information, his trust-
worthiness and exactitude can hardly be overestimated.
He is thoroughly familiar with the things he reports about.
He knows them down to their minute details. Even where
he has to rely on oral reports his exactitude is admirable.
This impression made upon us by the Hebrew version is
strengthened still more by the Arabic original. As said
above, he knows the sons of Natira by name, and mentions
them in the order of age. He states exactly the geo-
 graphical position of the places he is speaking of. He
knows for whom the statues near Karmin were erected,
and also gives an exact description of them. It has not yet
been noticed that his report about the figures is confirmed
by the Arabic sources in almost every detail¹. These cir-
cumstances are of great importance, for they are apt to
confirm still more our confidence in him, and give him the
advantage over the younger authority Sherira where he
is in contradiction with him.

It has already been mentioned that the beginning of the
fragment is most unfortunately torn off. On the right-
hand corner, however, we can still discern the words
הא אלישר אביך אסף בן. But the handwriting is different
from that of the MS., the ink likewise, and I do not
think that this mutilated superscription can claim great

¹ See the notes to the translation.
authority. At any rate, it is obvious that the fragment began here, the lines on this page beginning a little lower down than on the next one. It has been convincingly maintained by Isaac Halevy (Doroth Harishonim, III, 2, p. 75 f.) that the paragraph on the "prerogatives of Sura, as compared with Pumbadita" (Neubauer, 77 f.), preceding the account on 'Uqba, does not belong to the report of R. Nathan Hababli, which is introduced by the words אֶזֶר אֲמוֹר רָ' נַתָּנֵיהָ.

This view is strongly supported by our manuscript, for otherwise it would be a strange coincidence that R. Nathan's report in our MS. begins on a new page, and in a way distinctly marking a new paragraph which introduces the report of R. Nathan. On the other hand, it may easily be seen that the language, which is an excellent Hebrew and highly characteristic, is the same in both. Besides the general congruence in style, cf. expressions like p. 77 penultima רע שמתכוסה חותם and 83, 6 רע שמתכוסה חותם פנין נטול קספה בריתם, and 78, 18 חותם וספירה וחתם, וספירה וחתם עשת ממשה ברכתו וספירה וחתם עשת ממשה ברכתו, 78, 19 קספה הברית, and 82, 7 קספה הברית, 78, 13 קספה הברית. We have, therefore, to assume that the two pieces were worked out and put together by a compiler. The hand of a compiler can also be seen in the introductory remarks לע"ונ תומכי רבנן ותומכי רבנן, 78, 20, 83, 5, 86, 13. As to the question whether this compiler was at the same time the translator of our text, it can scarcely be inferred with any certainty. The fact that the Arabic אֲזַהְרָא רַבָּא הָבָא הָבָא (verso, 6) is rendered in the Hebrew by אַלָּא יֵכַּל לַמְלָכָה לְבָל rather points to an editor who mistook לְבָל for Babylonia and added the words לְבָל לַמְלָכָה. Perhaps the conjecture may be allowed that somebody who was writing on the history of the academies compiled different sources 1, one of them being R. Nathan of Bagdad, who had written on the history of Bagdad (see p. 749, n. 2).

1 The piece on the prerogatives of Sura to be found in the יָעַל הָבָא, as quoted from the יָעַל הָבָא of Samuel Hanagid, differs too greatly from Neubauer, 78, 3 ff., to be a quotation from it, or vice versa. Both probably go back to a common source.
The question whether the report of R. Nathan was put down by him in writing, or, as Halberstamm (Yeshurun, V, p. 753 note) maintains, was transmitted by him orally, can hardly be decided. Judging from the expression (86, 5) or (87, 1) we would rather be inclined to assume the former. I have the impression—it cannot claim to be more than an impression—that the words "history of Bagdad" represent the title of the book of R. Nathan, to which, if my conjecture (p. 749, n. 2) be correct, belonged also the fragment on the Natira family.

The Arabic original suggests many a new question in connexion with the extremely complicated problem of R. Nathan Hababli. But these I have to leave to historians proper.

Text 2.

Recto.

The MS. has no vowels at all, and very rarely diacritical points.

The letter before the p is perhaps m. A remnant of נ?מ?•?

There is space for one short word, perhaps יִבְּשׁ.
THE JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW
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Verso.
ARABIC REPORT OF R. NATHAN HABABLI

Translation

| ... of the history of Bagdad of what he had been partly told Recto, 1 |
|... the Exilarch 'Uqba of Davidic origin came to Northern Africa. 2 |

1 Space in the MS.
2 The extended below the line.

Possibly read כהנאם.

Supply from the Hebrew ודה. Possibly also אֶפְּדָהוּ.

6 υ is still visible. Supplied from the context.

7 Sic. Possibly read מִגְּדָהוּ.

8 not quite certain. There is still place for two letters. Perhaps מְנ. See p. 760, n. 9.

9 A very slight trace of a letter which might indicate an י. Probably י which fits in exactly.

10 A stroke at the end of the line in the MS., and a space at the beginning of the next line.

11 Prof. Theodor Nödeke, with the kindness so characteristic of him, read the proof of this article and added a few explanatory notes. These are included in brackets and marked at the end by N.
3 | [He had occupied?] \(^1\) the supremacy for many years, the number of which he (R. Nathan) could not make out. Kohen Zedeq ben Yosef \(^2\) had been in charge of the academy in Pumbadita (i.e. Anbar) \(^3\) in his (Uqba's) days for about four \(^4\) years, when a difference of opinion and quarrels \(^5\) broke out between them, on account of the jurisdiction of Khorasan. For the jurisdiction of Khorasan had in olden times belonged to Pumbadita, whence the dayyanim used to be sent thither \(^6\), and all the tax \(^7\) on her revenues used to go to Pumbadita. Uqba, however, wished the dayyanim to be sent to her (Khorasan) by himself, in order to take possession of her \(^8\) and get hold of her revenues for himself alone \(^9\) to the exclusion of Pumbadita. But Kohen Zedeq, the head of the academy of Pumbadita, protested against it. Among those who assisted Kohen Zedeq against him (Uqba) \(^10\) were Yosef ben Pinehas and his son-in-law the husband of his daughter Natira, the father of Sahl and Ishaq \(^11\), together with some of the most prominent men of the land. At last Uqba was banished to a place called Karmisin beyond Bagdad \(^12\) about five days' journey to the East \(^13\), on the way leading to Khorasan \(^10\), while Amram ben Shelomoh was the head of the academy of Sura. Uqba had been in Karmisin for several months \(^11\) when the Sultan left Bagdad \(^12\) to take a pleasure trip to Karmisin,

\(^1\) See p. 753, n. 4.
\(^2\) The Hebrew has erroneously יבש Rather.
\(^3\) The Hebrew is missing in the Hebrew. The identity of Pumbadita and Anbar is confirmed by the itinerary of Benjamin of Tudela where לפי (ed. Asher, II, 69) and פי (p. 53, J. Q. R., XVII, 292, ווא) are to be read פי. [I notice that Grätz, V, 389, n. 1, has already this correction.] In accordance with this the conjecture of de Goeje, Z.D.M.G., 39, 10, that Pumbadita (on account of the reading פי) is identical with פי is out of the question. On the position of Pumbadita cf. Berliner, Beiträge zur Geographie und Ethnographie Babyloniens, p. 57, and de Goeje, loc. cit., p. 10 ff.
\(^4\) The Hebrew יבש Perhaps the translator misread for ארעי.
\(^5\) See Introduction, p. 749.
\(^6\) שורר querelle (Dozy).
\(^7\)_tax. Cf. the explanation in Dozy.
\(^8\) Missing in the Hebrew. Literally: from it (Pumbadita) a dayyan would go out to her (Khorasan).
\(^10\) Missing in the Hebrew. See Introduction, p. 750.
\(^12\) The Hebrew only ב. The reading of the edition ה was Bagdad. See p. 752.
because there were old monuments and springs and trees, and all the saffron of Bagdad used to come from there. Outside of it (Karmisin), at a distance of nearly half a mile, there was a place called Shafaran, which had a hanging hall of two men's height in excavated form, containing the statue of Kisra.

1 Arabic. In the same way Ibn Rustah (tenth century, ed. de Goeje, p. 270) in mentioning this place says "Springs," literally "waters." For a similar description of Karmisin cf. Ibn Hauqal (wrote 977, ed. de Goeje, p. 356), and Yaqut, III, 250 ff.; IV, 69 f., 112. Mas'udi (died 956), Murâq ad-Dahab, II, 215, Ibn Hauqal, I, 1, Muqaddasi (wrote 985), ed. de Goeje, p. 339, Ibn Rustah, I, pp. 166 and 270. For particulars see the following notes. The Hebrew has here more the character of a paraphrase.

2 *See p. 754, n. 1.

3 "Springs," literally "waters." For a similar description of Karmisin cf. Ibn Hauqal (wrote 977, ed. de Goeje, p. 356), and Yaqut, III, 250, has one parasang, Ibn Rustah, p. 166, three, Ibn Hauqal, I, 1, eight parasangs. There seems to be some contradiction. I am not in a position to state the exact relation between a mile and a parasang at that time. According to the Talmud a parasang was equal to four miles. Cf. Kohut, *Aruch Completum*, s. v. *nār*. [This is also the usual way of counting in Arabic. N.]

4 The hall, as well as the figures of Khosrau, Shirin, and the horse described in the following lines, are often mentioned by Arabic writers: Yaqût, III, 250 ff.; IV, 69 f., 112. Mas'udi (died 956), Murâq ad-Dahab, II, 215, Ibn Hauqal, I, 1, Muqaddasi (wrote 985), ed. de Goeje, p. 339, Ibn Rustah, I, pp. 166 and 270. For particulars see the following notes. The Hebrew has here more the character of a paraphrase.

5 *See p. 754, n. 1.

6 The vocalization is not certain. I did not find any references to this place in the Arabic sources. Instead of that we very often find the name "qaṣr Shīrin," "the castle of Shīrin" (Yaqût has a special article on it, IV, 112), which the Persian king built for Shīrin, and where she used to spend the summer, Ibn Rustah, p. 270.

7 *See also Dozy.* The hall seems to have been arch-like, since Ibn Rustah (p. 166) and Yaqût (III, 250; IV, 69) call it a ṭāq, "an arch-like building." Cf. the following note.

8 Arabic ṣif. Cf. the foregoing note. I am not clear about the exact meaning of this architectural term. I think it means excavated (in the rock), and is identical with Ibn Rustah's statement (p. 166) that it was "an arch-like building hewn out of the rock." As ṣif occurs a second time in line 18, I do not believe that the correction ṣif would be justified.

9 *This word is doubtful.* See p. 754, n. 2.

10 The king alluded to is the Sassanide Khosrau II Parwēz, "the
and the statue of Sirin, his concubine, and under him (the king) on the ground, the statue of a horse, also excavated and hollow, the water which came from the mountain entering through its mouth and flowing out through its tail. And the Sultan used to ride to this place every day on horseback. Then 'Uqba made up his mind to place himself before him and to salute him. The first salutation he addressed to him was considered elegant by the secretary of the Sultan, and he wrote it down for himself. On the following day he delivered another salutation, which did not resemble the preceding. The secretary of the Sultan wrote down this (salutation) too. In this way he went on [for a whole year], delivering every day a salutation which did not resemble the others, and the secretary writing down all of them. After the lapse of a year the secretary told his story to the Sultan, and that he had not duplicated any salutation during the year, and he asked him...

victorious" (in Arabic, "Abarwāz," see the writers mentioned above), reigned 590-627 P. C. (Nöldeke, Aufsätze zur persischen Geschichte, p. 124).

1 The pronunciation of the name is usually given as Shirin with a ʃ, but the codex of Ibn Rustah (p. 270) always has Sirin. This seems to have been the pronunciation in Bagdad. Shirin being a Persian word (meaning "sweet"), there is the same difference in pronunciation as that between the usual Karmisin and Karmāšin (= Karmānāš), Ibn Rustah, p. 166. Shirin was famous for her beauty (cf. also Mas'ūdī, II, 232), and, though a Christian (Nöldeke, Aufsätze zur persischen Geschichte, p. 125), she was the favourite concubine of Khosrau.

8 Since we know from Ibn Rustah that the hall was very high, a staircase of 250 steps hewn in the rock leading from the bottom to the top, it would be more natural to translate "and at the bottom of it (the hall)." But on the other hand, we know that Khosrau was represented riding on his horse (Yaqūt, III, 250, 252, Ibn Ḥauqal, 1.1., Mas'ūdī, II, 215), and R. Nathan has hardly left out this detail.

3 I am not certain about this translation. It might also mean on a pedestal or substructure. Besides, it would be natural to expect ǂ instead of ܨ.

4 The name of this famous horse was Shabdāz or (pronounced with the imāla) Shabdēz (see the above-mentioned sources. Yaqūt has a long article on it, quoting several poems in its praise, III, 250 ff.).

5 See p. 757, n. 8.

6 In this detail R. Nathan differs from Yaqūt (III, 250) and Ibn Rustah, who maintain that the water came from the figure of a man, standing on a side (Ibn Rustah). According to Mas'ūdī (p. 215), Ibn Rustah, and Yaqūt, there was a large number of different figures in the hall, of birds (Ibn Rustah), of men, women, footmen, and horsemen (Yaqūt, III, 250).
and the Sultan looked at him and considered his words... and he granted him this, and he returned. This, however, was a heavy blow for Natira... effort to banish him, and did not stop intriguing until he was banished a second time and [decrees?] were issued publicly against him that he might never enter Bagdad, and in case he entered it, Islam should be more appropriate for him. But no city of the cities of the East could offer him a foothold, and he made up his mind to emigrate to Maghreb. And the supremacy remained unoccupied for about three or four years, until it became hard for the nation, and they spoke to David ben Zakkai, who was the cousin of 'Uqba on their father's side, in order to appoint him. But Kohen Zedeq did not like his appointment, being jealous of his supremacy, and being afraid on account of what had been done to 'Uqba. So the academy of Sura appointed him in Bagdad.

1 * سَيْلُ used of a king, "qui accorde quelque chose dans un diplôme." Dozy.
2 لِفْلَأ "employer des moyens subtils, p. e. la ruse, la flatterie." Dozy.
3 شُهْرْ ْيُ "publier, promulguer, faire proclamer par un écrivain public." Dozy. It seems that the reading of the edition pan e»d (instead of the MS.) has something to do with the Arabic * جِيْ "qui accorde quelque chose dans un diplôme." Dozy.
4 Here there is a serious difference between the Arabic and the Hebrew, according to which he was banished from the whole kingdom. Since it is impossible that the translator should have mistaken * جِيْ in this way, it is to be assumed that the misunderstanding goes back to the Editor. See pp. 750 f. and 752. The MS. adds also 79, 12 * جِيْ which is not to be found in the Arabic. [Perhaps misread for 1.
5 The Hebrew has 1 * حَصِيرًا. I am not quite certain as to the meaning of the Arabic phrase. Perhaps it means that he would be forced to accept Islam. [I know of nothing better though it looks very strange. The Hebrew translator has certainly taken offence at the expression. The excommunicated person is probably forthwith handed over to Satan. N.]
6 The plural ْبُنْدَاُنَّ has usually the meaning of "cities" (see Freytag and Lane), and this translation is more in accordance with the statement that he was excluded only from Bagdad. The translator who has ْبُنْدَاُنَّ misunderstood ْبُنْدَاُنَّ. Cf. also p. 748 f.
7 At that time in the hands of the Fatimides who were entirely independent of the Eastern Caliph. [The Arabs of Iraq, however, just as the Jews of Babylonia in earlier times, consider Syria and Palestine a part of Maghreb. N.]
8 The Hebrew has four or five.
9 The Hebrew has only ْبُنْدَاُنَّ.
10 Missing in the Hebrew.
Thereupon he wrote\(^1\) to Sura, to the ordained scholars and to the | 12 students regarding this matter, and commanding them to bless him 13 and to acknowledge his supremacy. And | the ordained scholars and 14 the "tannaim"\(^2\), together with all the students, went down from 15 Sura to a place | by the name of al-\(\text{Kasser}\)\(^3\), a beautiful town to the 16 south of Bagdad, there being between itself and | Sura six \(4\) miles, this 17 (al-\(\text{Kasser}\)) being the town of David ben Zakkai and (the place of) his 18 origin\(^4\). Then they bless[d him] | and acknowledged his supremacy. Despite 19 all this Kohen Zedeq contested his supremacy, and | did not | 20 grant him the least thing thereof, remaining in this attitude for 21 about three years. And Nissi\(^5\), the head of the "Kalla" assembly, 22 | as the Nahrawânite\(^6\), was blind\(^7\), and he used to mediate 23 between them in order to settle the quarrel during those | three | 24 years, until he once came to him in the night. He used to open 25 every lock by a word [of his ?]\(^8\) | and had opened that night 26

\(^1\) Grammatically "he wrote" can refer only to David ben Zakkai. But the Hebrew is more logical in referring to it to the head of the Academy of Sura, and reading וַיְמֹאמֶר לְאָנוּ.  
\(^3\) "Kasser" is undoubtedly qasr Abi Hubaira, which is oftten called al-qasar and lay in the near vicinity of Sura, see Yaqüt, 4, 123, 17.  
\(^4\) The Hebrew edition has seven, the MS. ten miles.  
\(^5\) The Hebrew has וַיְמֹאָמֶר שָׁנָי, the Biblical expression probably suggested by the word שִׁנָּי. See p. 748.  
\(^6\) The Hebrew edition has וַיְמֹאָמֶר, the MS. וַיְמֹאָמֶר. Since later on (79 penultima) both the edition and the MS. (the latter according to the information of Dr. Marx) have וַיְמֹאָמֶר, it is to be assumed that the editor took וַיְמֹאָמֶר to mean "known by miracles," regarding the fact related in the succeeding lines as a miracle. See note 9 on this page. On the name וַיְמֹאָמֶר, Zikhron lorishonim, V, p. 757.  
\(^7\) From Nahrawâne, half a day's journey to the east of Bagdad (Neubauer, 85, 17).  
\(^8\) I found nowhere the euphemistic use of יָמָ֚וּ.  
\(^9\) See p. 755, n. 8. The Hebrew has וַיְמֹאָמֶר, the MS. וַיְמֹאָמֶר which can mean only: he used to open all the locks in Babylon with the Shem (Hamephorash). This strange translation suggesting the wonder-working character of the man may have been caused by a misunderstanding, the translator probably having misread וַיְמֹאָמֶר instead of יָמָ֚וּ. The meaning is not quite clear to me, on account of the missing word. Perhaps he wants to say that being blind, and having special difficulty in opening doors, Nissi only had to call his name to have other people open them for him. At any rate, the original does not suggest anything miraculous. [To me it seems that the author refers to a miracle
fourteen locks closing gates, some of them the doors of Kohen Zedeq, until he stood before him and found him studying in the middle of the night. And Kohen Zedeq was frightened by him and strongly impressed by his coming and the reason of his visiting him. And he said unto him, O head of the Academy! I unfastened no less than fourteen locks before I reached thee. And he said unto him: What dost thou mean thereby? He said unto him: I beseech thee to bless the Exilarch and acknowledge him. And he conceded this to him, and he confirmed his hope and did not disappoint him.

I. FRIEHLAENDER.

which at bottom has been caused by some misunderstanding. "To open all doors" probably meant "to overcome all obstacles." N.

¹ The edition has fourteen, the MS. four.
THE ITINERARY OF BENJAMIN OF TUDELA (continued).

HEBREW TEXT.

 woods are with them always, all the time, they never left them, even in their journeys. For they were always there, always in their hearts, always in their minds.

...and they continued to walk and to travel and to transport themselves from place to place, always seeking new lands and new experiences.

The Hebrew text is transcribed and translated as follows:

"משס וו היה לֶמוֹרָא, אַי מַתָּא מַחֲסִי שָׁוָה שֶׁסִּתְּרָה. לְוַלֹּא וַרְשָׁי, שַׁעֲרֵי שֶׁרוֹבּ, וִיהִי בִּלְוַלֹּא וַרְשָׁי, שַׁעֲרֵי שֶׁרוֹבּ, וִיהִי בִּלְוַלֹּא וַרְשָׁי, שַׁעֲרֵי שֶׁרוֹבּ, וִיהִי בִּלְוַלֹּא וַרְשָׁי, שַׁעֲרֵי שֶׁרוֹבּ, וִיהִי בִּלְוַלֹּא וַרְשָׁי, שַׁעֲרֵי שֶׁרוֹבּ, וִיהִי בִּלְוַלֹּא וַרְשָׁי, שַׁעֲרֵי שֶׁרוֹבּ, וִיהִי בִּלְוַלֹּא וַרְשָׁי, שַׁעֲרֵי שֶׁרוֹבּ, וִיהִי בִּלְוַלֹּא וַרְשָׁי, שַׁעֲרֵי שֶׁרוֹבּ, וִיהִי בִּלְוַלֹּא וַרְשָׁי, שַׁעֲרֵי שֶׁר

The text continues in this manner, with the Hebrew text being transcribed and translated as above. The notes at the bottom of the page provide commentary and corrections to the transcription, indicating the significance of certain words and phrases.
THE ITINERARY OF BENJAMIN OF TUDELA

A page from a document in Hebrew and Latin, discussing various topics and textual notes. The page includes marginal notes and corrections, typical of historical or scholarly text analysis.
The document appears to be a page from a book or a journal, written in a language that is not immediately identifiable. The text is densely packed and appears to be a transcription of a speech or a discussion, possibly involving religious or philosophical content. The layout suggests it is from a volume focused on Jewish studies or literature.
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[Text content]
The text appears to be a page from a document, possibly a religious text or a historical document, written in Hebrew. The text contains a series of verses or paragraphs, each starting with a number followed by a letter and a verse number. The text is written in a traditional script, typical of Hebrew manuscripts.

Due to the nature of the content, a detailed transcription and translation are not feasible without specialist knowledge in Hebrew script and language. However, the overall structure suggests it could be a passage from a larger work, possibly a Bible or a Talmudic text, given the formatting and style.

The page is part of a larger document, and the continuation of the text is indicated by the numbering and formatting, suggesting a sequential flow of thought or narrative.
The text appears to be a page from the *Jewish Quarterly Review*, containing a column of text written in Hebrew script, followed by a series of notes and corrections in English. The notes and corrections are written in a smaller font size and are intended to clarify or annotate the primary text. The text seems to be discussing a historical or literary topic, possibly related to Jewish history or scholarship.

The page contains a mix of Hebrew script and Latin characters, indicating it is a translation of Hebrew text into English. The notes provide context and commentary, suggesting that the text is from a scholarly journal dedicated to Jewish studies.
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Here the following, preserved in E A, has fallen out, by dittoey, in BM and R after : (E)

This passage reads thus in A : O R adds

So R; BM. This is added to the text by R, and continues as follows: BM

In BM the text is as follows: A

VOL. XVII. 3 E
TRANSLATION.

Thence it is a day and a half to Sura, which is Mata Mehasya, where the Heads of the Captivity and the Heads of the Academies dwelt at first. Here is the sepulchre of R. Sherira, and of R. Hai his son of blessed memory, also of R. Saadiah Al-Fiuni, and of Rab Samuel the son of Hofni the Cohen, and of Zephaniah the son of Kushi, the son of Gedaliah the prophet, and of the Prince of the House of David, and of the Heads of the Academies who lived there before its demolition.

Thence it is two days to Shaffathib. Here is a Synagogue which the Israelites built from the earth of Jerusalem and its stones, and they called it Shaffathib, which is by Nehardea.

Thence it is a day and a half's journey to Al Janbar, which was Pumbedita in Nehardea. About 3,000 Jews dwell there. The city lies on the river Euphrates. Here is the Synagogue of Rab and Samuel, and their house of study, and in front of it are their graves.

Thence it is five days to Hillah. From this place it is a journey of twenty-one days by way of the desert to the land of Saba, which is called the land of Al-Yemen, lying at the side of the land of Shinar which is towards the North.

1 The Talmud (Sabbath, 11 a) speaks of the destruction of Mata Mehasya, and Sura took its place as a centre of learning.
2 See Berliner, pp. 45, 47, 54, and 57, for particulars derived from the Talmud and Midrash as to the several centres of Jewish learning in Babylonia.
3 This synagogue is repeatedly mentioned in the Talmud. Zunz (Note 255) omits mentioning Aboda Zarah, 43 b, where Rashi explains that Shaffathib was a place in the district of Nehardea, and that Jeconiah and his followers brought the holy earth thither, giving effect to the words of the Psalmist: "For thy servants take pleasure in her stones, and favour the dust thereof" (Ps. cii. 14).
4 Benjamin visited the various seats of learning in the neighbourhood, and thus came again to Nehardea, which has been already mentioned on p. 53. Rab Jehuda not Rab is there associated with Samuel.
5 Asher, at this stage of Benjamin's narrative, has the following note: "For the illustration of that portion of our text which treats of Arabia, we refer the reader to the Rev. S. L. Rapoport's paper, 'Independent Jews of Arabia,' which will be found at the end of these notes." No such account appeared in the work, but in the Bikkurim Haittim for the year 1824, p. 51, there appears an interesting essay in Hebrew on the subject by Rapoport, to which the reader is referred. It is a matter of history that the powerful independent Jewish communities which were settled at
There dwell the Jews called Kheibar, the men of Teima. And Teima is their seat of government where R. Hanan the Nasi rules over them.

Yathrib, afterwards called Medina, and in the volcanic highlands of Kheibar and Teima called the Harrah, were crushed by Mohammed. Dr. Hirschfeld, in the Jewish Quarterly Review, vol. XV, p. 170, gives us the translation of a letter found in the Cairo Genizah, addressed by Mohammed to the people of Kheibar and Maqna, granting them certain privileges from which the Jews, who were allowed to remain in their homes, benefited. Omar, the second Caliph, broke the compact, but allowed them to settle at Kufa on the Euphrates. Although pilgrims pass annually up and down the caravan tracks to Mecca, the information respecting the old Jewish sites in the Harrah is most meagre. Edrisi and Abu-l Fida throw no light on Benjamin’s account. In the year 1904 an able work by Mr. D. G. Hogarth appeared under the title of The Penetration of Arabia, being a record of the development of Western knowledge concerning the Arabian Peninsula. He gives a full account of the European travellers who have described the country. Niebuhr, who visited Yemen in 1762, repeated the statement made by the Italian traveller Varthemath that there were still wild Jews in Kheibar. The missionary Joseph Woolf visited Arabia in 1836, and he gives us an account of an interview he had with some of the Rechabites. No weight, however, can be attached to his fantastic stories. W. G. Palgrave, who resided for some years in Syria as a Jesuit, where he called himself Father Michael (Cohen), was entrusted in 1862 with a mission to Arabia by Napoleon III in connexion with the projected Suez Canal; he was one of the few visitors to the Harrah, but he makes no special reference to the Jews. Joseph Halevi made many valuable discoveries of inscriptions in South Arabia, which he traversed in 1869. He visited the oppressed Jewish community at Sanaa in Yemen; he further discovered traces of the ancient Minaean kingdom, and found that the Jews in the Nejran were treated with singular tolerance and even favour; but he was not able to tell us anything respecting the Jews of the Harrah.

C. M. Doughty was, however, more successful when visiting this district in 1875. Of Kheibar he says “that it is now a poor village whose inhabitants are a terrible kindred, Moalems outwardly, but, in secret, cruel Jews that will suffer no stranger to enter among them.” See C. M. Doughty’s Arabia Deserta, vol. II, p. 129. “Teima is a Nejd colony of Shammar; their fathers came to settle there not above 300 years past. Old Teima of the Jews, according to their tradition, had been (twice) destroyed by flood. From those times there remain some great rude stone buildings. It is now a prosperous open place” (vol. I, p. 296).

The only writer that casts any doubt upon Benjamin’s record about Arabia is the R. Jacob Safir who visited Yemen and some of the Arabian ports in the Red Sea in the year 1864. See chaps. xv and xliii of Ibn Safir, Lyck, 1866. Dr. L. Grünhut, in his introduction, Die
It is a great city, and the extent of their land is sixteen days' journey. It is surrounded by mountains—the mountains of the north. The Jews own many large fortified cities. The yoke of the Gentiles is not upon them. They go forth to pillage and to capture booty from distant lands in conjunction with the Arabs, their neighbours and allies. These Arabs dwell in tents, and their home is in the way of the desert. They own no houses, and they go forth to pillage and to capture booty in the land of Shinar and Al-Yemen. All the neighbours of these Jews go in fear of them. Among them are husbandmen and owners of cattle; their land is extensive, and they have in their midst learned and wise men. They give the tithe of all they possess unto the scholars who sit in the house of learning, also to poor Israelites and to the recluses, who are the mourners of Zion and Jerusalem, and who do not eat meat nor taste wine, and sit clad in garments of black. They dwell in caves or underground houses, and fast each day with the exception of the Sabbaths and Festivals, and implore mercy of the Holy One, blessed be He, on account of the exile of Israel, praying that He may take pity upon them, and upon all the Jews, the men of Teima, for the sake of His great Name, also upon Tilmas the great city, in which there are about 100,000 Jews! At this place lives Salmon the Nasi, the brother of Hanan the Nasi; and the land belongs to the two brothers, who are of the seed of David, for they have their pedigree in writing. They address many questions unto the Head of the Captivity—their kinsman in Bagdad—and they fast forty days in the year for the Jews that dwell in exile.

There are here about forty large towns and 200 hamlets and villages. The principal city is Tanaæ, and in all the districts together there are about 300,000 Jews. The city of Tanaæ is well fortified, and in the midst thereof the people sow and reap. It is fifteen miles in extent. Here is the palace of the Nasi called Salmon. And in Teima dwells Hanan the Nasi, his brother. It is a beautiful city, and contains gardens and plantations. And Tilmas is likewise a great city; it contains about 100,000 Jews. It is well fortified, and is situated between two high mountains. There are wise, discreet.

Reisebeschreibungen des R. Benjamin von Tudela, Jerusalem, 1903, p. 16, refutes Safir's statements.

In Hogarth's work, p. 282, is shown a print of the Teima stone, with its Aramaic inscription, considered to belong to the fourth or fifth century B.C., and on p. 285 there is Doughty's interesting sketch of Kheibar.

It is clear that, when speaking of the population of some of these places, the whole oasis or district is intended, and not a particular town.
and rich men amongst the inhabitants. From Tilmas to Kheibar it is three days' journey. People say they belong to the tribes of Reuben, Gad, and the half-tribe of Manasseh, whom Shalmaneser king of Assyria, led hither into captivity. They have built strongly-fortified cities, and make war with all other kingdoms. No man can readily reach their territory, because it is a march of eighteen days' journey through the desert, which is altogether uninhabited, so that no one can enter the land.

Kheibar is a very large city with 50,000 Jews1. In it are

1 In reading through the foregoing account of the Jews in Arabia, it is quite clear that Benjamin never visited the country, nor did he pretend to have done so. In the words of Mr. C. R. Beazley (The Dawn of Modern Geography, p. 252), "It is no longer, for the most part, a record of personal travel; it is rather an attempt to supplement the first part 'of things seen,' by a second 'of things heard.'" But Beazley is wrong when he characterizes as "wild" the account of the Jews of Southern Arabia "who were Rechabites." Does Benjamin say so? There is no such reading in the MS. of the British Museum. The student, it is thought, will by this time have come to the conclusion that it is the oldest and most trustworthy of our available authorities. The whole misconception has arisen from the fact that the unreliable MS. E and all the printed editions have transposed the letters of -Q'3 and made Ml of it Rapoport, in the article already referred to, seems to suspect the faulty reading: to justify it, he connects the men of Kheibar with the Rechabites and the sons of Heber the Kenite, basing his argument upon Jer. xxxv, Judges i.16, 1 Sam. xxvii. 10, and 1 Chron. xxvii. 10.

Neither Zunz nor Asher makes any comments upon this chapter of the itinerary. Graetz gives an abstract of Benjamin's account; he, as well as all other writers, is unable to identify Tilmas, but is of opinion that Tanae must be Sanaa, the capital of Yemen, which, however, is twenty-five days' journey beyond Kheibar. It is well known that Yemen has, since Bible times, harboured a Jewish population, who—notwithstanding all oppression, intensified under Turkish rule—inhabit many of its towns and villages to the present day. It is comparatively accessible, owing to its proximity to the sea. We must cherish the hope that Great Britain, now that it claims the Hinterland of Aden, will extend its protection to the Jews.

The volcanic highlands (Harrah) of Kheibar were always inaccessible, owing to their being surrounded by waterless deserts and fanatic Bedouin tribes.

R. Abraham Farissol, who flourished at the beginning of the sixteenth century, writes that there was a large number of Jews in the district, who lived in tents and in wooden houses or huts. His contemporary, David Reuben, who crossed from Arabia to Abyssinia and came to Europe in 1524, pretended to be brother of Joseph, king of the tribes
learned men, and great warriors, who wage war with the men of Shinar and of the land of the north, as well as with the bordering of Reuben, Gad, and half-Manasseh in the desert of Chabor (Kheibar). Benjamin takes care to qualify his statement as to the origin of the Jews of Kheibar by adding— וַיַּפְרְדָּם— "people say they belong to the tribes of Reuben, Gad, and the half-tribe of Manasseh, whom Salmanasser, King of Assyria, led hither into captivity."

I would here mention an interesting work of Dr. R. Dozy, Professor of History and Oriental Languages at Leyden, *Die Israeliten in Meccn*, 1864. By a series of ingenious inferences from Bible texts (1 Sam. xxx, 1 Chron. iv. 24-43, &c.) he essays to establish that the tribe of Simeon, after David had dispersed the Amalekites who had already been weakened by Saul, entered Arabia and settled all along in the land of the Minaeans and at Mecca, where they established the worship at the Kaaba and introduced practices which have not been altogether abandoned up to the present day. Dr. Dozy further contends that after Hezekiah's reign numerous Jewish exiles came to Arabia.

Hommel, in two articles in Ersch and Gruber's *Encyclopaedia*, under "Bedouins" and "Anzah," gives full particulars respecting the Anizah, otherwise Anassat, tribe—that they were in the habit of joining the Wahabees and other Bedouin tribes in attacking caravans and levying blackmail. The Turkish Pasha at Damascus had to pay annually passage-money to ensure the safety of the pilgrims to Mecca. On one occasion two of their sheiks were decoyed by the Turks and killed; but the Anizah, aided by other tribes to the number of 80,000, took ample revenge by pillaging the Mecca caravan on its return. They seized a quantity of pearls and the women were said to have attempted boiling them with the rice. Seetzen (Journey through Syria, &c., I. ch. i. p. 356) says, "In Kheibar are no Jews now, only Anassat." Layard and other modern writers often refer to the Anizah Bedouins. Travellers go in dread of them in the Syrian desert and all along the Euphrates. Doughty mentions that they, more than any other tribe, resemble the Jews both in appearance and disposition.

Ritter (*Geographie*, vol. XII), in quoting Niebuhr, makes mention of the widespread Anizah tribe of Bedouins who were anciently known to be Jews. He further states that the Jews of Damascus and Aleppo shun them as they are non-observant Jews, considered by some to be Karaites. Does all this give ground for any presumption that they are or were crypto-Jews, the descendants of the former Kheibar Jews, possibly also of those whom Omar allowed to settle at Kufa?

This lengthy note may fitly be closed with the following mysterious remark in Doughty's usual quaint style (vol. I, p. 187) in connexion with the murder of a Bagdad Jew who tried to reach Kheibar: "But let none any more jeopardize his life for Kheibar! I would that these leaves might save the blood of some; and God give me this reward of my labour! for who will, he may read in them all the tale of Kheibar."
tribes of the land of Al Yemen near them, which latter country is on the confines of India. Returning from their land it is a journey of twenty-five days to the river Virae, which is in the land of Al Yemen, where about 3,000 Jews dwell, and amongst them are many a Rabbi and Dayan.

Thence it takes five days to Basrah (Bassorah) which lies on the river Tigris. Here there are 10,000 Jews, and among them are scholars, and many rich men. Thence it is two days to the river Samara, which is the commencement of the land of Persia. 1,500 Jews live near the sepulchre of Ezra, the priest, who went forth from Jerusalem to King Artaxerxes and died here. In front of his grave is a large synagogue. And at the side thereof the Mohammedans erected a house of prayer out of their great love and veneration for him, and they like the Jews on that account. And the Mohammedans come hither to pray. Thence it is four days to Khuzistan, which is

1 It will be seen further on (p. 95) that Benjamin speaks of Aden as being in India, “which is on the mainland.” It is well known that Abyssinia and Arabia were in the Middle Ages spoken of as “Middle India.” It has been ascertained that in ancient times the Arabs extensively colonized the western sea-coast of the East Indies. Cf. the article “Arabia,” in the ninth edition of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* and Supplement.

2 The Casanatense MS. here interpolates: “Thence it takes seven days to Lusis, where there are 2,000 Israelites.” Asher substitutes for Lusis Waset, a place near the Tigris. There must be some misunderstanding here, as it takes more than seven days to reach the Tigris from Yemen by land.

3 See Dr. Hartwig Hirschfeld’s account of a Fragment of a Work by Judah Al-harizi, being a description of a pilgrimage through Mesopotamia with a view to visit Ezra’s grave. The Arab geographer Yakut locates the grave in the village Maisan on the river Samara near the place where the Euphrates and Tigris unite (*J. Q. R.*, vol. XV, 683). Layard writes as follows:—“We stopped at the so-called tomb of the prophet Ezra, about twenty-five miles from the junction of the Tigris and Euphrates, at Korna. The building, which is of a comparatively modern date, consisted of two chambers, an outer one which was empty, and an inner one containing the tomb built of bricks, covered with white stucco and enclosed in a wooden case, over which was thrown a large blue cloth fringed with yellow tassels with the name of the donor embroidered on it in Hebrew characters. No trace of either the large synagogue or of the mosque mentioned by Benjamin now exists, and it may be doubted whether the present building covers the tomb which was seen by the Hebrew traveller. We could find no ancient remains near it, as the Tigris is constantly changing its course, and was still eating away the bank of alluvial soil, upon the edge of which the building stood. It is highly
Elam. This province is not inhabited in its entirety, for part of it lies waste. In the midst of its ruins is Shushan (Susas), the capital, the site of the palace of King Ahasuerus. Here are the remains of a large structure of great antiquity. The city contains about 7,000 Jews and fourteen synagogues.

In front of one of the synagogues is the sepulchre of Daniel of blessed memory. The river Tigris divides the city, and the bridge connects the two parts. On the one side where the Jews dwell is the sepulchre of Daniel. Here the market-places used to be, containing great stores of merchandise, by which the Jews became enriched. On the other side of the bridge they were poor, because they had no market-places nor merchants there, only gardens and plantations. And they became jealous, and said "All this prosperity enjoyed by those on the other side is due to the merits of Daniel the prophet who lies buried there." Then the poor people asked those who dwelt on the other side to place the sepulchre of Daniel in their midst, but the others would not comply. So war prevailed between them for many days, and no one went forth or came in on account of the great strife between them. At length both parties growing tired of this state of things took a wise view of the matter, and made a compact, namely, that the coffin of Daniel should be taken for one year to the one side and for another year to the other side. This they did, and both sides became rich. In the course of time Sinjar Shah-ben-Shah, who ruled over the kingdom of Persia and had forty-five kings subject to his authority, came to this place.

He is called Sultan-al-Fars-al-Khabir in Arabic (the mighty Sovereign of Persia), and it is he who ruled from the river Samara unto the city of Samarkand, and unto the river Gozan and the cities of Media and the mountains of Chafton. He ruled also over Tibet, in the forests whereof one finds the animals from which musk is obtained. The extent of his Empire is a journey of four months. When this great Emperor Sinjar, king of Persia, saw that they took the coffin of probable that the tomb seen by Benjamin of Tudela had long before been carried away by the river." Layard's Early Adventures in Persia, Susiana, and Babylonia, vol. II, p. 214. See also an elaborate note of Dr. Benisch, p. 91 of his edition of Pethacia's Travels, and L. J. Benjamin II, Eight Years in Asia and Africa, p. 167.

1 As for the river Gozan see p. 51, note 3. The mountains of Chafton, referred to also in pp. 77, 78, would seem to include not only the Zagros range but also the highlands of Kurdistan.

2 Marco Polo, book II, chap. xlv, says of Tibet: "In this country there are many of the animals that produce musk. The Tartars have great numbers of large and fine dogs which are of great service in catching the musk-beasts, and so they procure a great abundance of musk."
Daniel from one side of the river to the other, and that a great multitude of Jews, Mohammedans and Gentiles, and many people from the country were crossing the bridge, he asked the meaning of this proceeding, and they told him these things. He said "It is not meet to do this ignominy unto Daniel the prophet, but I command you to measure the bridge from both sides, and to take the coffin of Daniel and place it inside another coffin of crystal, so that the wooden coffin be within that of crystal, and to suspend this from the middle of the bridge by a chain of iron; at this spot you must build a synagogue for all comers, so that whoever wishes to pray there, be he Jew or Gentile, may do so." And to this very day the coffin is suspended from the bridge. 1 And the king commanded that out of respect for Daniel no fisherman should catch fish within a mile above or a mile below.

1 The reputed sepulchre of Daniel is situated between Schuster and Dizful in Persia, close by the river Shaur, an affluent of the Karun river, which is supposed to be the Ulai of the Bible, Dan. viii. 2. It is within sight of the vast mound which denotes the site of Susa, the ancient Shushan. Here Mme. Dieulafoy in 1881 made extensive excavations of the palace of the Persian kings, many relics of which are now on view at the Louvre in Paris.

The tomb of Daniel has been fully described by Layard—see Early Adventures, vol. II, p. 295. It is of comparatively recent date, not unlike the shrines of Mussulman saints, and is surmounted by a high conical dome of irregular brickwork, somewhat resembling in shape a pine cone. The reader is referred to the beautiful pictorial illustrations of Daniel's reputed tomb, of the ruins of Susa, and of Schuster and its bridges in Mme. Dieulafoy's La Perse, la Chaldée et la Susiane, Paris, 1887.

There is nothing to connect the building on the banks of the Shaur with the tomb of Daniel save the Mussulman tradition. There are many legends connected with the reputed sepulchre, one of which is to the effect that the men of Susa diverted the river in order to bury Daniel's coffin in its bed.

Mr. E. N. Adler, in his recent work Jews in many Lands, Jewish Publication Society of America, p. 224, in describing Samarkand, writes as follows: "Tradition has it that Tamerlane had seen the tomb at Susa in Persia, with a warning inscribed thereon, that none should open its door; and so he broke it open from behind, and found it written that Nebi Daniel was there buried. The impetuous conqueror had the sarcophagus removed with all reverence, and carried it with him to his own capital to be its palladium. The sarcophagus is over twenty yards long as beseems a prophet's stature. It has been recently covered by a brick chapel with three cupolas, but photographs of the ancient structure can be had in Samarkand. It is grandly placed at the edge of a cliff overhanging the rapid river Seop. The local Jews do not believe
Thence it takes three days to Rudbar where there are about 20,000 Israelites, and among them are learned and rich men. But the Jews live there under great oppression. Thence it is two days to the river Vant, where there are 4,000 Israelites. Thence it is four days to the land of Mulehet. Here lives a people who do not profess the Mohammedan religion, but live on high mountains, and worship the Old Man of the land of the Hashishim. And among them there are four communities of Israel who go forth with them in making war. They are not under the rule of the king of Persia, but reside in the high mountains, and descend from these mountains to pillage and to capture booty, and then return to the mountains, and none can overcome them. There are learned men amongst the Jews of their land. These Jews are under the authority of the Head of the P. 77 Captivity in Babylon. Thence it is five days to Amadia, where there are about 25,000 Israelites. This is the first of those communities that dwell in the mountains of Chafton, where there are more than 100 Jewish communities. Here is the commencement of the land of Media. The Jews belong to the first exile which King Shalmaneser led away; and they speak the language in which the Targum is written. Amongst them are learned men. The communities reach from the province of Amadia unto the province of Gilan, twenty-five days distant on the border of the kingdom of Persia. They are under the authority of the king of Persia, and he raises a tribute from them through the hands of his officer, and the tribute which they pay every year by way of poll-tax is one gold amir which is equivalent to one and one-third maravedi. This tax has to be paid by all males in the land of Islam who are over the age of fifteen. At this place (Amadia), there arose this day ten years ago, a man named David Alroy of the city of Amadia. He studied under Chasdai the story, nor do they quite disbelieve it, for I went with two who prayed there at the grave of the righteous."

1 The reader will recollect that reference to this sect has already been made on page 27.

2 Amadia is an important city in Kurdistan in the villayet of Bagdad, north of Mosul. Ben Virga and R. Joseph Hacohen, the author of Emek Habacks, state that 1,000 Jewish families lived in the city at that time. It is strange that in all the MSS., including Asher's text, this city is called Amaria instead of Amadia. The mistake doubtless arose from the fact that the copyists mistook the מ for a מ. The scribe of the British Museum MS. had made other errors of this kind, writing מ for מ, מ for מ, מ for מ, מ for מ, מ for מ, &c.

3 The author of Emek Habacks gives the date of the Alroy tragedy as 1163. It should, however, be antedated by a few years. Benjamin must
the Head of the Captivity, and under the Head of the Academy Gaon Jacob, in the city of Bagdad, and he was well versed in the Law of Israel, in the Halachah, as well as in the Talmud, and in all the wisdom of the Mohammedans; also in secular literature and in the writings of magicians and soothsayers. He conceived the idea of rebelling against the king of Persia, and of collecting the Jews who live in the mountains of Chafton to go forth and to fight against all the nations, and to march and capture Jerusalem. He showed signs by pretended miracles to the Jews, and said “The Holy One, Blessed be He, sent me to capture Jerusalem and to free you from the yoke of the Gentiles.” And the Jews believed in him and called him their Messiah. When the king of Persia heard of it he sent for him to come and speak with him. Alroy went to him without fear, and when he had audience of the king, the latter asked him “Art thou the king of the Jews.” He said, “I am.” Then the king was very angry, and commanded that he should be seized and placed in the prison of the king, the place where the king’s prisoners were bound unto the day of their death, in the city of Dabaristan which is on the large river Gozan. At the end of three days whilst the king was sitting deliberating with his princes concerning the Jews who had rebelled, David suddenly stood before them. He had escaped from the prison without the knowledge of any man. And when the king saw him, he said to him “Who brought you hither, and who has released you?” “My own wisdom and skill,” answered the other; “for I am not afraid of you, nor of any of your servants.” The king forthwith loudly bade his servants to seize him, but they answered “We cannot see any man, although our ears hear him.” Then the king and all his princes marvelled at his subtlety; but he said to the king “I will go my way”; so he went forth. And the king went after him; and the princes and servants followed their king until they came to the river-side. Then Alroy took off his mantle and spread it on the face of the water to cross thereon. When the servants of the king saw that he crossed the water on his mantle they pursued him in small boats, wishing to bring him back, but they were unable, and they said “There is no wizard like this in the whole world.” That self-same day he went a journey of ten days to the city of Amadia by the strength of the ineffable name, and he told the Jews all that had befallen him, and they were astonished at his wisdom.

have passed through Egypt on his return journey some time before Sept., 1171. See note a, p. 1. He here tells us that the Alroy catastrophe took place just ten years before his visit to Bagdad and the neighbourhood. It is clear therefore that 1160 is the latest date when this event could have taken place.
After that the king of Persia sent word to the Emir Al-Mumenin, the Caliph of the Mohammedans, at Bagdad, urging him to warn the Head of the Exile, and the Head of the Academy Gaon Jacob, to restrain David Alroy from executing his designs. And he threatened that he would otherwise slay all the Jews in his Empire. Then all the congregations of the land of Persia were in great trouble. And the Head of the Captivity, and the Head of the Academy Gaon Jacob, sent to Alroy, saying, "The time of redemption is not yet arrived; we have not yet seen the signs thereof, for by strength shall no man prevail. Now our mandate is, that thou cease from these designs, or thou shalt surely be excommunicated from all Israel." And they sent unto Sakai the Nasi in the land of Ashur (Mosul) and unto R. Joseph Burhan-al-falak the astronomer there, bidding them to send on the letter to Alroy, and furthermore they themselves wrote to him to warn him, but he would not accept the warning. Then there arose a king of the name of Sin-el-din, the king of the Togarmim, and a vassal of the king of Persia, who sent to the father-in-law of David Alroy, and gave him a bribe of 10,000 gold pieces to slay him in secret. So he went to the house of Alroy, and slew him whilst he was asleep on his bed. Thus his plans were frustrated. Then the king of Persia went forth against the Jews that lived in the mountain; and they sent to the Head of the Captivity to come to their assistance and to appease the king. He was eventually appeased by a gift of 100 talents of gold, which they gave him, and the land was at peace thereafter.

1 This Turkoman may have been the Prince of Arbela who in 1167 joined Saladin in his successful invasion of Egypt. He was remarkable for his great strength and courage (see Bohadin's Life of Saladin, Palestine Pilgrims' Text Society, p. 51).

2 The accounts given by Ben Virga in Sheret Jehudah, and by Joseph Hacohen in Emek Habacha, are evidently based upon Benjamin's record, and throw no fresh light on this Messianic movement. Asher, vol. II, note 300, promises but fails to give the contents of an Arabic document written by a contemporary, the renegade Samuel Ibn Abbas, which the savant S. Munk had discovered in the Paris library; a German translation of this document appears in Dr. Wiener's Emek Habacha, 1858, p. 169. The name of the pseudo-Messiah is given as Menahem, surnamed Al-Ruhi, but Munk satisfactorily proves that he is identical with our David Alroy. Being a young man of engaging appearance and great accomplishments, he gained considerable influence with the governor of Amadia, and had a considerable following among the Jews of Persia. With the intention of occupying the castle, he introduced a number of his armed adherents into the town, who were careful, however, to conceal their weapons. The governor detected the conspiracy, and put Alroy to death. The
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From this mountain it is a journey of twenty days to Hamadan, which is the great city of Media, where there are 30,000 Israelites. In front of a certain synagogue, there are buried Mordecai and Esther.

M. N. ADLER.

excitement among the Jews lasted for a considerable time. Two impostors, with letters purporting to emanate from Alroy, came to Bagdad, and worked upon the credulity of the community. Men and women parted with their money and jewellery, having been brought to believe that on a certain night they would be able to fly on angels' wings from the roofs of their houses to Jerusalem. The only thing which made the women feel unhappy was the fear that their little ones might not be able to keep pace with them in the aerial flight. At daybreak the fraud was discovered, but the impostors had meanwhile decamped with their treasure.

The chronicler adds that the year in which this occurred was called The Year of Flight.

De Sacy, in his Chrestomathie Arabe, I, p. 363, gives a similar story, the authorship of which he ascribes to Schahristani.

1 Asher, vol. II, p. 167, n. 304, gives expression to a keen desire for further particulars as to this tomb. Dr. J. E. Polak, formerly Physician to the late Shah of Persia, gives the desired information, p. 26, in an interesting work on Persia. He writes as follows: "The only national monument which the Jews in Persia possess is the tomb of Esther at Hamadan, the ancient Ecbatana, whither they have made pilgrimages from time immemorial. In the centre of the Jewish quarter there is to be seen a low building with a cupola, on the top of which a stork has built its nest. The entrance is walled up for the greater part; there only remains below a small aperture which can be closed by a movable flat stone serving the purpose of a door and affording some protection from attacks, which are not uncommon. In the entrance hall, which has but a low ceiling, are recorded the names of pilgrims; also the year when the building was restored. Thence one gains access into a small four-cornered chamber in which there are two high sarcophagi made of oak, which are the monuments of Esther and Mordecai. On both of them are inscribed in Hebrew the words of the last chapter of the Book of Esther, as well as the names of three Physicians at whose expense the tomb was repaired."

Lord Rolandshay gives the most recent account of the tomb. An illustration of this traditional tomb will be found in the article "Esther" in the Jewish Encyclopedia.

The Casanatense MS. interpolates here a passage, which Asher renders: "Four days from thence stands Dabaristan on the river Kizil Ozun; it contains about 4,000 Jewish inhabitants." See p. 78. Taberistan is a district north of Teheran, south of the Caspian Sea.

(To be continued.)
NOTES ON OLD TESTAMENT HISTORY.

It has been said that those who make history rarely write it, and those who write it rarely understand it. To this it must be added that those who write about it not infrequently fail to take into account the circumstances in which the history was made and the conditions under which it was put into writing. The history of the children of Israel is one of unique complexity chiefly because it is a religious history. As it has come down to us, it is so beset by internal difficulties that scholars have found themselves obliged to subject the evidence to a searching criticism which has been largely destructive. But if the result has been that it is now possible to trace the steady growth of Israel's religion and institutions, can it be denied that the reconstruction of her history, which is now generally adopted by critics, is no less full of problems? Yet, one believes that the work of literary criticism has not been in vain. Its results have been built up slowly and gradually, and the fact that there is practical unanimity among the critics themselves is (though it may savour of flippancy) a significant indication that they may be generally accepted. The "foundation" has been laid, and all are agreed upon the "structure," but there are many details of "architecture" and "decoration" wherein the builders and workmen are not yet in harmony. A glance at any of the recent histories of Israel proves this in a moment. It is notably the earlier traditions, the origins of Israel, which are especially obscure, and although some may fear that the evidence is too isolated and scanty to permit of any attempt to trace the first steps, this is no reason why the endeavour should not be honestly made.

It is this pre-monarchic period which I propose to consider, to notice certain narratives and certain historical difficulties which appear to invite attention. The studies which follow are all more or less independent of each other, although all bear directly upon the origins of Israel. I have throughout endeavoured to avoid fettering myself with preconceived theories or fancies, and have regarded the opening sentences of this paper not so much as a canon for the "higher critic," but as a warning when one passes judgment upon the historical questions one attempts to investigate.
Five years ago I published a series of conjectures on the literary analysis of 2 Samuel, in the course of which I ventured to propose a fundamental reconstruction of the narratives it contained. I had at the same time practically completed other notes upon the earlier narratives, but these seemed to lead to such far-reaching conclusions that I was unwilling to "rush into print" until I had seen the result of the earlier article. In the meantime I have not unnaturally found myself anticipated in several particulars, although in several cases I find that I have arrived at the same results as others on entirely different grounds. But the chief cause of delay has been naturally the publication of Professor Karl Budde's Bücher Samuel in Marti's Kurzer Hand-Commentar (1902) where this scholar did me the honour of subjecting my article to a close but invariably courteous criticism, which rendered a reconsideration of all my theories an indispensable preliminary to the publication of the later notes. I must confess at the outset that I have found no reason for departing from my main conclusions, although Budde's careful and sometimes severe criticisms have indicated weak spots in my arguments¹, which I gratefully acknowledge. I shall proceed, therefore, in the first section to recapitulate as briefly as possible the chief results contained in the article of 1900, with a few remarks upon the earlier chapters of David's life in 1 Samuel, and shall then endeavour to notice the objections that have been raised to my theory.

I. THE LIFE OF DAVID.

The series of chapters known as the "court history of David" (2 Samuel ix-xx, continued in 1 Kings i, ii) has invariably been regarded as one of the best specimens of early Hebrew literature: continuous, the work of one almost contemporary writer, and, with rare exceptions, entirely free from interpolations and signs of redaction. It was precisely this section which I found occasion to attack; the chief problem being whether it was (as it purported to be) an account of the history of David's last years, or whether it did not

¹ Notably in my attempt to find support in the linguistic data, in my discussion of ch. vi, and in several small points of detail. On the other hand, Budde himself has perhaps gone too far in endeavouring to minimize the indications of unevenness which were noticed, and has not shown that boldness which marked his invaluable critical labours upon Judges and 1 Samuel.

consist of a number of old narratives, originally distinct, belonging to various parts of the king's reign. It was primarily on historical and not on literary grounds that reconstruction was proposed. Any one who has read (let us say) the legends of King Arthur is aware that an impression of literary unity alone is no sound argument in favour of the genuineness of a piece of writing, and there appeared to be no a priori grounds for the conviction that the general view of the literary unity of the court history was unassailable. From a consideration of many internal difficulties, therefore, it was suggested that even as the chronicler wrongly supposed that David became king of all Israel immediately after the death of Saul (1 Chron. xi), so it was the incorrect view of some redactor of 2 Samuel that this event occurred as the necessary sequel to the death of Saul's son Ishbaal. We can correct the chronicler by the Books of Samuel; we can only conjecture that the latter give expression to an inaccurate view from a study of the internal evidence. One knows how later tradition idealized David and magnified his achievements; could one feel confident that the first step had not already been taken in 2 Samuel? One realized that the man who was the first king over all Israel, the first to unite the north and south, must have been a favourite figure in popular tradition. One has only to observe how the Bedouin of Syria and Palestine treasure the stories of old-time heroes in order to appreciate what David's personality must have meant to the sons of Israel; and when one perceives how the most impossible of all supernatural deeds are voted genuine by the existence of this or that place, one will scarcely assume too readily that the vivid local colouring of any particular story is prima facie evidence of its authenticity.

From a consideration of the evidence it was suggested that the revolt of Absalom must have preceded the great wars. The narrative (2 Sam. xv-xx) scarcely seemed to represent David as king over all Israel, and it appeared more probable that it was simply a rising in which the southern clans of Judah took part. Absalom had been at Geshur, a south Palestinian district 1, whose king was his maternal grandfather, the two leading men were Judaean, and the rebels met at Hebron (p. 159 sq.). Tradition had associated with it the northern tribes, partly because at some period they had no doubt tried to withstand David's yoke, and partly, also, to give effect to that feeling of national unity which (to take an example) transformed the exploits of local "judges" into matters of national moment. In consequence of this theory, chs. v-viii, xxi-xxiv were regarded

---

1 Not the Aramaean state (pp. 153, 160), "in Aram," xv. 8, being treated as a gloss.
as originally forming a distinct source, and the remaining chapters were arranged provisionally: ii-iv (Ishbaal); ix (Meribbaal); xiii-xx (Absalom's revolt); x-xii (Ammonite war). Incidentally, this seemed to lead to two interesting corollaries. In the first place, when David fled to Mahanaim we are told that "Shobi the son of Nahash of Rabbah of the children of Ammon" was among those who brought David furniture and provisions (xvii. 27). The incident is the more valuable since Ammon and Saul's kingdom could not have been on friendly terms after 1 Sam. xi. But the passage is difficult in the original Hebrew, and, as Prof. H. P. Smith (International Critical Commentary) remarks on the words "and Shobi": "It is possible that a verb once stood here." "Shobi" is a curious name, for which no plausible explanation has been proposed, and one is tempted to read נבוי ("and . . . brought") for יבשון, and assume that "son of" was inserted to make sense after the verb had become illegible or corrupt (p. 164 sq.). Now, if it was really Nahash who received David so kindly, it is not surprising that when he was subsequently succeeded by his son Hanun, David should have been anxious to show his gratitude in a practical manner (x. 2; see below, p. 793, n. 2).

In addition to this, the birth of Solomon is now brought immediately before the revolt of Adonijah, an appropriate position considering the details of the intrigues in 1 Kings i-ii, and the reference to the king's promise to Bathsheba (i. 13, 17, 30), which may have been made shortly before. It is possible that the story of Bathsheba was originally independent of the Ammonite war, and after it had been brought into its present content the two chapters (x-xii) may have been placed earlier for one of two reasons. Thus, it is possible that when v-viii was introduced, it was desired to place the Ammonite war nearer to the other wars in ch. viii; or again it is possible that pragmatical motives have been at work. The latter seems the preferable view.

With Bathsheba and the birth of Solomon a new element of discord was introduced into the inevitable jealousies of the harem, and if she were indeed a granddaughter of the wily Ahithophel she may have been an adept at schemes and intrigues. At all events, we may couple Adonijah's revolt with the appearance of Bathsheba; a clearer motive for his action could not be expected. But if tradition knew of the earlier revolt of another son, might it not have concluded that this too originated after the birth of Solomon? Tradition knew, too, of the stain which besmirched the king's honour, and if David's success were due to his piety, his misfortunes must have been due to his sins. Sin and the punishment for sin act...
and react upon one another in life and in tradition. The revolt of a dearly loved son might be viewed as a punishment for David's adultery, and the death of Absalom would purge the king's guilt and prepare the way for Solomon. Certainly Adonijah's revolt, in spite of its far-reaching consequences, did not fasten itself upon the people's imagination as did that of Absalom, but yet where could we find a more important dissension among the military authorities and the priestly representatives? A closer study of 1 Kings i-ii appears to show that its obvious close connexion with the preceding chapters is not original; it is rather the work of an editor than of an early writer (pp. 172-4). If it is the aim of 1 Kings ii to remove from Solomon's shoulders the bloodshed incurred when he established his throne, every care has been taken to bring 2 Sam. xv-xx into close touch with it. Among other obscure details, perhaps the most striking are the passages relating to Joab. The treacherous murder of Abner and Amasa led to his fall (ii. 5), but the context deals entirely with Absalom's revolt (vv. 5-9), and the two crimes were apparently separated by many years. The episodes have a certain resemblance to each other (p. 168), and, although the story of Amasa is at present obscure, there is no doubt that according to Oriental custom Joab acted rightly in avenging the death of Asahel. H. P. Smith observes that "by tribal morality David as kinsman of Asahel was bound to take blood-revenge as much as Joab himself," and in spite of David's denunciation the death of Abner undoubtedly facilitated his move to the throne. Joab's expostulation (2 Sam. iii. 24 sq.) is in perfect harmony with his sturdy uncompromising character as exemplified in xix. 5-7. The latter passage has been taken as an indication that the general had the "old" king in his power, or it is assumed that his influence was increased after the episode of Uriah the Hittite. But there is nothing to show that David was afraid of Joab; the fact that he is said to have replaced him by Amasa points to the contrary. And if we choose to assume that Joab was degraded because he had killed Absalom (xviii. 14), it is remarkable that no allusion is made to this in David's charges to Solomon. Hence I was tempted to conjecture that during the (alleged) redaction steps were taken to give effect to a feeling of bitter hostility towards the sons of Zeruiah.

Animosity towards Joab, an emphatic representation of David's

1 So, not only could Absalom's death be regarded as a penalty for David's crime, but efforts could be made to remove the stain upon Solomon's birth (p. 156 sq.), and finally the steps by which Solomon came to the throne might be viewed not, as taken upon the king's responsibility alone, but as directly due to David's last charges.
good will to the house of Saul, and the desire to throw back as early as possible the date of his accession to the kingship over all Israel, appear to have been the leading motives, and as a general result of my criticisms I ventured to draw two main conclusions (p. 177): (1) the union of Judah and Israel under one king did not occur at an early date in David's reign; and (2) those narratives which reflect a close relationship between Judah and Israel (or Benjamin) previous to this union do not go back to the oldest account of David's life, but are more probably due to an Ephraimite source. These passages tend to combine the histories of David and the house of Saul, and emphasize the king's consistent generosity towards the unfortunate dynasty (based partly upon a friendship which was said to subsist between David and Jonathan). They also betray here and there a marked bitterness towards Joab. Further, subsequent history shows how loose was the bond uniting north and south; and the ease with which they separated after a few years of joint rule under David and Solomon favours the view that Judah previous to this union had never stood in any close relationship to Israel (or Benjamin).

The bearing of these conclusions upon David's history in 1 Samuel was briefly indicated at the close of the article, and it was pointed out that according to the investigations of Budde it was significant that the source of his life at Saul's court was almost wholly Ephraimite; in his life as an outlaw the Judaean narrative predominates, and in his fortunes as an independent chieftain (xxvii, xxix sq.), the sources are wholly Judaean. We can, in fact, distinguish three separate phases: (1) David, the son of Jesse of Bethlehem, a familiar figure at the court of Saul, son-in-law of the king, and the favourite of the people. (2) David, the outlaw, with a few hundred men, never free from danger, and continually hunted by the relentless Saul. To this we must add the important fact that he has the sole survivor of the priestly family on his side. (3) Finally, we have the David who goes to Ziklag with his two wives and his men, "every man with his household." Here he establishes a footing in the country, and by politic gifts to the sheikhs south of Hebron took the first step which led to Jerusalem. It is to be observed that these three situations appear to take David further and further south, and sever ever more irretrievably his early association with Israel. Arguing from (1), we should have expected David to become king over Israel at an earlier period than the tradition itself supposes. We hear no more

1 The Chronicler in this respect is more consistent in his view that men of all the tribes of Israel fell away from Saul and came to David at Ziklag (1 Chron. xii).
of his parents—a redactor has taken the precaution to send them to Moab, the country against which David waged war some—how many?—years later. If we can easily bridge over the gulf which separates (3) from David at Hebron, the narratives scarcely allow us to fill the gaps between (1) and (2), (2) and (3) in a satisfactory manner. H. P. Smith suggests that 1 Sam. xxv "may have followed immediately upon xix. 18-24 in a life of Samuel"; the former chapter is of a distinctive character compared with its surroundings, but the gulf between the two can scarcely be bridged over. Again, since xxvi and xxiv are duplicates, and xxiii. 19-29 (David among the Ziphites) is to be connected with xxiv, whilst xxiii. 15-18 is "a distinct insertion," it follows that xxvii. 1 is to be joined to xxiii. 14. The latter verse reads like a summing up of the history, so far as relates to this part of David's life, and the constant danger of his position is the prelude to the desperate step he took in throwing himself upon the mercy of the Philistines (xxvii. 1). These indications suffice to show the scantiness of the several traditions. But many of the incidents are extremely obscure. If David delivered Keilah from the Philistines, and the place was not in Judah, by whom was it occupied? and is it natural that he should willingly incur the anger of the Philistines by this hostile deed? Is it not strange, also, that the five Philistine princes marched north to Shunem and Jezreel to fight Saul whose home was in Gibeah of Benjamin, and that David's presence is not noticed until they reached their destination?

The site of Ziklag is unfortunately unknown, although if it was given to David by Achish, king of Gath, it was presumably near Gath. But this does not agree with Josh. xv. 31, xix. 5, and a more southerly site is required. If xxvii. 8, 10 means anything at all, it must signify that David's raid against Geshurites, Girzites (?), and Amalekites would not have commended itself to Achish, whilst a raid against the steppes of Judah, of the Jerahmeelites, and of the Kenites would lead Achish to believe that David "had broken finally with Israel and would be his perpetual vassal" (H. P. Smith). In other words, the latter are Israelite, the former conceivably Philistine. Nor is it easy to see the relation these bear to the geographical indications in xxx. 14, where the Amalekites retaliate by ravaging not merely Ziklag, but also the steppes of the Cherethites and of the Calebites. And finally, when David sent of the spoil to the

1 This outlandish name may be for Ḥalusa (Cheyne), but if we may infer that it must have been to the south of Hebron, one is tempted to conjecture that Ḥalusa is a corruption of Isaac (ʾissa) or Isaac-ʾel (ʾissaʾel), on the analogy of Joseph-ʾel and Jacob-ʾel.
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cities of the Jerahmeelites, the Kenites, and other cities extending to Hebron, are we to infer that these were the districts despoiled by "the enemies of Yahweh" (xxx. 26; cp. Exod. xvii. 16), or did he use the recaptured booty to win the hearts of other clans by tactful gifts? It is easy to say that all these are the heterogeneous elements of which the (later) tribe of Judah was composed, but is that very satisfactory?

The question of the "Philistines" will come up for consideration in a subsequent section. For the present, it is enough to observe that, although we hear much of the Philistines in North Judah and Benjamin, we have no old traditions regarding the expulsion or subjugation of the Canaanites from that district (2 Sam. v. 6-9 excepted). As for Achish, one may wonder whether the superscription to Psalm xxxiv with its mention of Abimelech is a mere error. Abimelech was "king of the Philistines at Gerar" (Gen. xxvi), and David's visit to Achish of Gath is curiously reminiscent of Isaac's visit to Abimelech at Gerar and the covenant between them. We may at all events feel sure that if tradition associated David's youth with the south of Judah, and actually sent him to the wilderness of Paran, there must have been some definite object in view. Paran is practically the district around Kadesh; it is associated with the Levites; Bethlehem (the traditional home of David) appears on two noteworthy occasions closely connected with Levites (Judges xvii. 7; xix. 1); the chronicler has associated with David's life the inauguration of Levitical and priestly classes—are these three facts independent of each other, or can any connecting link be found?

I shall now proceed to notice the objections that have been raised against my theory of the composition of 2 Samuel by Professor Budde and private correspondents; they are based partly upon literary, and partly upon historical grounds, and I shall endeavour to summarize them as fairly as possible. My attempt to find in 2 Samuel Judaean and Ephraimite narratives as in 1 Samuel may be willingly given up as a general principle, and, were I presenting the theory anew in full, I would feel more attracted by such a literary scheme as H. P. Smith has adopted in his commentary.

1 I notice that Winckler (Gesch. Israels, II, 183) has felt the same difficulty as regards Achish, king of Gath, and suggests that he has taken the place of a king of Musri, that is of a district further to the south of Palestine.

2 xxv. 1, LXX, has Maon, clearly the easier reading (cp. xxv. 2 sqq.), but how are we to account for the text? The more obvious reading is not necessarily original.

3 Budde's own labours on Judges and Samuel have perhaps prejudiced him. To argue that z in A is not a sign of an Ephraimite source because
(1) In the first place, it has been pointed out by several that "it is incredible to believe that David's history should have been so obscured or glossed during the comparatively short interval between David and the date of the Judaean narrative (middle of eighth century)." To this it is to be observed that it is not to the earliest narrator, but to a later redactor, that the present arrangement is due. No one will suppose that the famine and pestilence in 2 Sam. xxii and xxiv fell between Sheba's revolt and that of Adonijah, and even as it is allowed that later theory has obscured the lives of Samuel and Saul, so, later theory, too, according to my argument, must be held responsible for the position of Absalom's revolt.

(2) Again, it is said that the chronological difficulties involved are too serious, and if (as was argued) the Geshur to which Absalom fled was in South Palestine (cp. Josh. xiii. 2), they are only increased; David (it is objected) could not have become the son-in-law of the king of Geshur until he had himself become king, therefore not before he was anointed at Hebron; Absalom was not the firstborn, and we must allow time for David to strengthen his position before he could make such an alliance; Absalom could not have been very young when he revolted, and hence it follows we must allow anywhere between twenty and thirty years for David's reign in Hebron; this leaves no time for his deeds as king over Israel, indeed he would be too old to conduct campaigns against Ammon, Moab, and Edom, and it is strange that the history of the north is blank all these years; finally, at the time of the revolt of Absalom David was an old man, too old to go out to war.

In connexion with these objections, as regards the "king" of Geshur who (as a support to the theory of the Judaean revolt under Absalom) I took to be a south Palestinian and not a Syrian chief, Budde holds that since Geshur is omitted from the list of Syrian allies of Ammon (2 Sam. x. 6), there is reason to infer that David had married one of its princesses, and he remarks that it must first be made probable that a necessarily small tribe of the southern steppes had a "king." As for David, he observes, it was of no small importance for him to ally himself with a "real king," and this would not have been for him a difficult task.

It occurs elsewhere in B, C, and D which are Judaean, is not convincing if B, C, and D are in their turn also Ephraimite. Occasionally, also, the linguistic criteria (upon which I laid undue weight) may be successfully removed by ingenious emendation. So двух "spies" (a sign of E) in xv. 10 is replaced by двух "messengers," or the word is "einfach als falsche Ausdeutung zu streichen."

1 So years ago Stähelin thought of the south Geshur (Leben David's, 1866, p. 29).
In reply to this, I must confess that I see no sound reason for the supposition that a “king” of the northern Geshur would be a greater potentate or a more helpful ally than one of the south. It is good policy for a king to strengthen or increase his influence and position by useful alliances, and since David had married Abigail of Caleb, and Ahinoam of Jezreel, and had sent round presents to the sheikhs of the country south of Hebron, it seemed not improbable that David had also married into the south Geshur. “King” of course must not be pressed too far. There was a king of Arad (Num. xxi. 1), seventy kings fed under Adoni-bezek’s table (Judges i. 7), and they were plentiful in Canaan (Joshua x sq.). One does not regard them as “real kings,” their power can be comprehended best by comparing the authority of the Canaanite chiefs in the Amarna Tablets. After all, David’s position at Hebron was not a grand one, and a “real king” might hesitate to give his daughter in marriage to one who a few years before had been a roving outlaw.

Next, the chronology. Was Absalom born at Hebron (iii. 2–5)? If the framework of the notice be correct, one must allow that Amnon and Chileab were born at Hebron, although David was already married to Abigail and Ahinoam some time before he went to Ziklag, and there he is said to have lived sixteen months (1 Sam. xxv. 42 sq., xxvii. 7). But the passage is admitted to be an interpolation, and Budde places it before v. 13–16, and this being so, it is only natural that the editor should have brought his list into harmony with the context by means of the opening and closing statement that the sons whose names he quotes were born at Hebron. Moreover, if David only passed seven or eight years at Hebron, how old were these sons when he moved to Jerusalem and made them (and also the sons born at Jerusalem) serve as priests (2 Sam. viii. 18)? Is it necessary to insist that Absalom was born at Hebron?

Clearly we do not know how old Absalom was when he revolted, and if Jehoash and Azariah could reign at the age of seven and sixteen respectively, I do not think the question is one that could be profitably investigated. Certainly, it was eleven years after the murder of Amnon according to the chronology, but it seems extremely probable that the data are not genuine. It seems rather inconsistent

1 In ch. xxv which leads up to David’s marriage with Abigail he is represented as the chief of a band of roving followers, but he goes down to Ziklag with his two wives, and a band of men “every man with his household” (xxvii. 3). Will it be held that there is no gap between the two situations?

2 The eleven years is reduced to nine by arbitrarily supposing (with Budde) that the four years of xv. 7 (so LXX) include the two of xiv. 28.
to accept them because they tell against the theory of the early date of the revolt, and to reject the notices in ii. 11 which imply a period of five and a half years between the death of Ishbaal and David's accession to the throne in Jerusalem, and thus incidentally support the argument that from a historical point of view ch. v. 1-3 does not follow immediately after iv. On these grounds, it is not necessary to assume that David reigned "twenty to thirty years in Hebron"; the narrative of the revolt may give one the impression that Absalom is a young impetuous man, but "impressions" alone can scarcely serve as evidence. At all events it cannot be admitted that David is here represented as an old man and that he would be far too old to wage the wars against Ammon and Moab which I have placed later. For, firstly, is it reasonable to expect one to fix the age at which a king must be supposed to be too old to go to war? Secondly, even after a skirmish with the Philistines David was adjured not to go out to battle again lest the "light of Israel" be quenched (xxi. 16 sq.). Finally, if David is dissuaded from taking part in the battle against Absalom (xviii. 3, see Budde, ad loc.) there are other motives at work. David was unwilling to take a hand in fighting with his beloved son, the loss of Absalom meant more to him than the glory of victory; and, if this be not enough, the verse seems to imply that the king could send out reserves if necessary. David left Joab to conduct the war against Abner (ii-iv), but this is not usually taken as an event in his old age. Will it, therefore, be seriously maintained that the energetic king who conducts operations in xv-xix, and who (according to Budde) took his wives with him in his flight to Mahanaim (see p. 796 below), was old and feeble like the David of Adonijah's revolt (1 Kings i)? If, as is usually held, the latter follows upon Absalom's rebellion, is it not at least striking that now (and only now) the narrative takes pains to show that the king had reached a good old age (1 Kings i. 1-3)?

No doubt the chronological notices in xiii-xv represent some scheme, and the most probable appears to be that according to which Solomon was twelve years old when he came to the throne (p. 160). But such notices are not rarely suspicious, and if they are to be rejected it is perhaps enough if one can lay the finger upon their probable origin.

(3) Again, as regards the proposal to place the Ammonite war after the revolt, certain counter-arguments have been put forward. Budde (Sam. 246 sq.), for example, deems it more probable that the Ammonite war preceded the revolt. But this is not the only possible solution. The Ammonite war, as the notices in xiii-xv show, was a part of David's career as a king of nine years preceding the revolt. The revolt, as the notices in iv-xv show, was a part of David's career as a king of seven years following the revolt.

1 Nor need the blank in the history of the northern tribes from the death of Ishbaal to the time of David's supremacy over all Israel, prove a stumblingblock. Are there no blanks in the history of Israel?
first relations between David and Ammon were warlike, and that later they became on a more friendly footing; if Nahash king of Ammon died in the early part of David's reign, his son Hanun might very well have been old enough to ascend the throne a few years later; naturally David cultivated friendly relations with one who would be Ishbaal's foe, and the reference in x. 2 has no deeper meaning; but now that David had no longer a rival, but held the sovereignty, the Ammonites would regard him as an enemy, and his treatment of Moab and Edom would make them suspicious. All this (according to Budde) speaks for the early part of David's reign. Subsequently, it is observed, when Ammon was no longer a separate state, we actually find that Shobi, the brother of the vanquished Hanun, is not called "king," clearly because he is only David's governor. The refutation thus appears complete in every detail.

In reply to these objections, one must confess that they are to an extent as hypothetical as the reconstructions I suggested, and the question must turn rather upon the degree of probability. Nahash was king of Ammon (1 Sam. xi) before David appears upon the scene, and it has been argued that he must have been dead however early the revolt occurred. This is scarcely a question of the age to which kings live, and it seems much more remarkable that Achish, the king of David's early youth, should have lived to a few years after his protegé's death (1 Kings ii. 39)\textsuperscript{1}! Again (in the absence of evidence) it is surely a matter of opinion whether warlike relations precede friendly, or vice versa, and whether x. 2 has some subtle allusion or is merely diplomatic etiquette\textsuperscript{2}.

It is of course not unlikely that the Ammonites would resent David's increased power, and the same has been said of the Philistines, who (it is supposed) allowed David to war with Ishbaal, and only intervened when he had conquered and become king over the whole land\textsuperscript{3}. But would not Edom and Moab also rise in arms? Surely if

\textsuperscript{1} The follower of the tradition will observe that Saul reigned only two years (1 Sam. xiii. 1), but the tradition is not reliable.

\textsuperscript{2} The critics are at variance: H. P. Smith supposes that Nahash had helped David in his early struggles. Budde now says "es handelt sich um feststehende Gebräuche." Winckler in 1895 (Gesch. Israels, I, 213) was convinced that the reference was only to neighbourliness. In 1900 he seems to have changed his views (II, 181). Cheyne (Encyc. Bib., col. 3258) notes that "The statement that he (Nahash) had 'shown kindness' to David has been much discussed. The 'kindness' cannot have been passed over in the records, and yet where does the traditional text mention it?" So much depends upon whether one is supporting or contesting existing theories.

\textsuperscript{3} On pp. 150, 152, 154 it is argued that the fights with the Philistines
the traditional view is to be followed, it is only right that some attempt be made to sketch a plausible sequence of events. One knows that the great wars are summarized in 2 Sam. viii. The chapter ends with a passage “which evidently marks the conclusion of a section of the narrative” (H. P. Smith). The “impression” gained is that v–viii owe their position here to an editor who has collected much miscellaneous matter, similar as regards contents to that which is found in xxi–xxiv. There, they are admittedly out of chronological order, and it is scarcely less doubtful that the incidents in v–viii are not to be viewed as consecutive. Their position suggests an early part of David’s reign. The “impression” left by ch. viii is that we have a concluding panegyric, probably of different periods. These successful wars against the Philistines, Moabites, Ammonites, Syrians, Edomites (and ver. 12 adds the Amalekites!) were obviously not waged at one time, simply because each viewed David’s step with jealousy and hostility. If David adopted a natural policy his defeated foes in one war would be his mercenaries or allies in the next; to assume that they rose against him each in turn would be unreasonable.

To wage these wars, large armies of seasoned troops were required, whereas David fled from before Absalom with a mere bodyguard consisting perhaps of foreigners (xv. 18). It would not be unnatural to suppose that (adopting the current view) the northern tribes submitted to David’s yoke in order to fight a common enemy, and only revolted when the land was at peace, but it has yet to be proved that they actually did revolt (see below, p. 798). And if we assume that they did join with Judah, it is strange that although they disappear from the narrative in a state of half-suppressed hostility (xx. 2), Joab leads the bodyguard—and not an army—through their territory as though nothing had happened. Moreover, David’s wars had raised Israel to the position of the greatest of the western states, whereas the whole tenor of the early stages of the revolt unmistakably emphasizes his desperate position. Resistance was out of the question until he had collected a few warriors to his side. But where—following the traditional view—were the decimated Ammonites, the despoiled Moabites, the subjugated Philistines, and that inveterate foe, the Edomites? They neither attempted to regained in v, xxii, xxiii were to be placed at an early date before David became king of Israel.

1 Or editors, the introductory notice being twofold (v. 3 and v. 1, 2; P. 154).
2 4,000 according to Josephus (Ant., vii. 101), and the moderate estimate (contrast e. g. 1 Sam. xi. 8) invites confidence.
their independence nor did they join cause with Absalom. This was no sudden rising; widespread preparations had been made beforehand, and yet at the critical time the hostile peoples are quiet.

As an incidental part of the reconstruction, the theory proposed "ganz aus der Welt zu schaffen" the unfortunate Shobi to join the unlucky Vashni in the tents of Minnith and Pannag'. To infer from the absence of such a title as "king of Ammon" that the land was no longer independent is hardly justifiable; the passage mentions homes not official designations (xvii. 27). Even Hanun himself is not called "king" of Ammon, and the war in x-xii is not with Hanun the king but with the Ammonites. One does not infer that when "Hiram, king of Tyre, sent messengers to David" (v. 11) that the latter had not yet become king; allowance must be made for the narrator's style and fancy (contrast viii. 6 and 10).

It has also been objected that xvii. 27 presupposes ix, and Meribbaal could not have been taken from the care of Machir of Lo-debar until David had settled in Jerusalem, and had become king of Israel, ergo Absalom's revolt must be placed later in David's reign. This brings us to a difficulty in the narrative which has to be faced, whether the new theory or the traditional view be accepted. No doubt Machir's friendliness to David at Mahanaim was intended to be viewed as a grateful return for the king's kindness to Meribbaal (ix), even as the troubles which befell the king were regarded as a fitting retribution for his fall in the matter of Bathsheba and his treatment of the sons of Saul (xxi). But as analogy shows, it is not the original writer but the later reader who loves to associate cause and effect and point a moral to the tale, and, further, the "impression of literary unity," in other words, the intimate connexion of the narratives one with the other, is due to editorial skill. One learns from experience that cross-references and the like are the work of the editors, not of the contributors! Contrast for example the simple straightforward passages in 1 Sam. ix. 1-14, 15—x. 1 with the cross-references x. 5-8. The fact that Saul's rejection at Gilgal (1 Sam. xiii. 8-15) points back to x. 8 does not make it genuine, and if the account of his anointing (x. 17-27) is connected with chaps. viii, xii, and xv, it is not assumed that viii-xv inclusive are therefore by one hand. The indications of redaction in the court history are certainly less superficial than in 1 Samuel, but a careful study of the book seems to prove their presence. To notice one insignificant example: when we find that the reference in Nathan's speech to Absalom's conduct (xii. 11) is

\[1\] See the Encyc. Bib. on these names.

\[2\] But "lord" (יְהֹוָה), x. 3.
regarded as a gloss, I must maintain my former suggestion (p. 162) that the act in question (xvi. 22, cp. xv. 16, xx. 3) is alike intrusive. The passages fit in loosely, and have all the appearance of being interpolated. Budde, if I understand aright, concludes from the specific reference to David's concubines that David in his hurried flight took his wives with him. Thus we are to suppose that the "aged" king, supported only by a mere bodyguard, flees in haste from the capital, but takes the precaution to remove his wives. Or, may we not rather believe that the story of the revolt as it passed from mouth to mouth was made the vehicle for inculcating a lesson? We know what Absalom's act meant to the Oriental mind, it was simply a step which the successful usurper took as a matter of right; and it seems far more probable that when the narratives were made an object lesson, popular tradition should have made David suffer in a characteristic manner in return for his treacherous conduct towards Uriah the Hittite.

Tradition, possibly an Ephraimite one, but in all probability of comparatively late origin, saw in David's extremity a fitting punishment for the blood of the house of Saul (xvi. 6-8; cp. xxi). The instrument is one Shimei, a Benjamite, and the part which this tribe plays in the revolt is not free from obscurity. Shimei himself could muster a thousand tribesmen (xix. 17), no inconsiderable gathering considering the period. Meribbaal, too, appears to have hoped to seize the opportunity to build up the fortunes of Saul's house, and if he explains his behaviour with a very intelligible excuse (xix. 24-30), he is nevertheless condemned to lose half his estate. But there is no concerted action; they are merely independent lay figures; and whilst Shimei's outspoken language represents what some thought of David's dealings with the Gibeonites, Meribbaal's humble attitude is an acknowledgment of the king's favour to the son of an old friend. The emphatic manner in which certain narratives insist upon David's good will towards the house of Saul may reflect the sentiments of conquered tribes anxious to point to an early covenant bond between conquered and conquerors, but the attitude of David in xxi is so entirely distinct and archaic from a religious point of view that it must strike one as representing an older tradition. Budde, still maintaining his original reconstruction, places xxi. 1-14 before ix, and finds in the words of Shimei (xvi. 7 sq.) and the appearance of Meribbaal (xvi. 1-4, xix. 24-30) support for his view. Whatever we

1 It would be equally justifiable and rash to assume that Bathsheba and Solomon accompanied the king, and with more justice, inasmuch as Absalom (it might be argued) would be only too glad to put the young child out of the way!
may think of David's covenant with Jonathan, there is no difficulty in assuming that David's inquiry should follow as soon as possible after the death of Ishbaal (iv). If xxi intervenes, we must allow an interval of at least three years (ver. 1), which makes David's kindness somewhat belated. Here, the Gibeonites have demanded and received seven of Saul's descendants, and have executed their vengeance upon them. We may treat ver. 7 as a gloss or not, but it is at least plausible to imagine that if seven sons could be found, the whereabouts of Jonathan's son could hardly be quite unknown. The sequel, with the pathetic picture of Rizpah, is well known, but it is not until this juncture that David thinks of interring the remains of all the survivors in the sepulchre of Kish, the father of Saul. Nor does it seem quite appropriate, to our ideas at least, that after seven sons had thus met their fate, David should inquire whether any more were left. May one not believe that when xxi. 1-14 found a place in 2 Samuel, Shimei was assigned his present somewhat unnatural rôle (p. 170 sq.), and that when the story of Meribbaal formed part of the present narratives, he too had to find a place in the revolt (p. 169 sq.)?

Again, is it "only natural" that David fled to Mahanaim (so Budde), or is it not rather remarkable? If, following the tradition, Israel was up in arms against the king, why should he take refuge in Ishbaal's capital? And if, following the theory, he was not yet king, why flee to Mahanaim? Could he hope for succour here? Had it been Ammon, we could understand his motive. But supposing this belongs to an early date, before war broke out with Ishbaal, might this not be a good reason for his generous sentiments towards Saul's descendants? The problem would be simplified if it could be agreed whether Israel did or did not take part in the revolt. Judah alone is prominent throughout; the men of Israel (like Aaron in the older narratives) appear only to disappear. If one considers the preparations for the revolt, how Absalom sowed disaffection among men of the tribes of Israel (xv. 2-6), and after four years' delay (so LXX) sent round messengers to rouse Israel to action, it is scarcely conceivable that this is the true account of the commencement. Although

1 "Is there yet any that is left of the house of Saul, that I may show him kindness for Jonathan's sake" (ix. 1).
2 No doubt the three years in ver. 1 may be easily rejected henceforth, but will this remove the difficulty?
3 If Meribbaal lived at David's court knowing full well the fate of his relatives, is not his grateful acknowledgment in xix. 38 a little forced?
4 It was suggested that ver. 7 contains the oldest account of the commencement of the revolt. On its possible object, see p. 160 sq.
the hostility of the tribes is patent (ver. 13), and they come to Jeru-
salem with Absalom (xvi. 15), yet Hushai counsels the young prince to
gather the people from “Dan to Beersheba,” and to this advice “all
the men of Israel” agreed (xvii. 11–14). After the battle it is the
men of Judah who have to be reconciled, for “Israel” had fled to
their tents (xix. 8), and when Judah came to Gilgal to escort the
king, only “half the people of Israel” were present (xx. 40). Even
at this moment there was hostility between Judah and Israel, and
when Sheba the Benjamite seized the occasion to raise a fresh revolt,
“all the men of Israel went up from following David and followed
Sheba” (xx. 2). But they are heard of no more. Sheba’s followers
are his clansmen only, as small a gathering as that of Shimei, and
there is nothing to show (as far as the present narratives are concerned)
whether the ill-feeling had died down by the time we reach 1 Kings i.
Hence not only was it held that the size of the revolt had been
exaggerated, but the present position of Sheba’s revolt was merely
due to redaction (p. 166 sq.). “It would have been madness,” as
H. P. Smith admits¹, “to revolt after the suppression of Absalom,”
and, apart from the question of probability, the present literary form
of the passage points to the work of an editor. To this Budde dissents.
The suggestion that Sheba’s revolt had been appended by a redactor
who had in his mind the story of the parting of the two kingdoms
(1 Kings xii. 16–20) is rejected; the reverse, according to Budde, is
more probable. But it is not surprising that popular tradition should
have brought together revolts of different periods and by different tribes,
and if it will be admitted that Sheba’s rising represents an attempt
of Benjamin to contest the authority of David the situation becomes
more clear. David’s army has sunk down to the bodyguard again
(xx. 7), and Budde’s objection that David’s men would scarcely
pursue Sheba and his clan through the length of North Israel
applies equally to the traditional view, which represents Israel as
parting from Judah in hostility. Surely it is more remarkable that
David should have fled to Mahanaim to escape Judah and Israel, and
that Saul and his servant wandered about in search of some lost asses
in a country which was groaning under the yoke of the Philistines
(1 Sam. ix. 16).

In conclusion, it is not amiss that we should remind ourselves of
Robertson Smith’s words, nearly thirty years ago, in his article
are not so constructed as to enable us to decide in chronological
order the thirty-three years of David’s reign over all Israel.” They
represent a view which is very generally admitted and the questions

¹ Old Testament History, p. 149, n. 2 (Edinburgh, 1903).
I have raised imply that we should probably include also the seven years that David was king over Judah at Hebron. Whatever opinion may ultimately be held regarding the sequence of events and the extent of redaction, it is only right that those who take the traditional or even the "moderate" position should endeavour to offer some reasonably consistent scheme. The life of David is the turning-point in early Hebrew history, and on that account the narratives require the closest examination from the historical as well as from the literary side. These involve a discussion of the situation before David's time, the lives of Saul and Samuel, and the stories of the Book of Judges, a consideration of which will be undertaken in the following sections.

Stanley A. Cook.

(To be continued.)
A THIRTEENTH-CENTURY HEBREW-FRENCH GLOSSARY.

The MS. on which this publication is based was designated by Arène Darmesteter as the most considerable and interesting of the Hebrew-French glossaries. Of such MSS. there are, as the same scholar established, in all nine, which are spread over the libraries of Paris, Basel, Parma, Leipzig, Oxford, and Turin (see Revue des Études Juives, XLII, 59). They follow the text of the Hebrew bible in the order of the Biblical books; they give the French equivalent of single words, and form the richest source for the knowledge of Old French. Their importance is especially due to the fact that they emanate from a period which has left but a small number of French writings. At the same time, they present the French words in Hebrew transcription with, for the most part, careful indication of the vowel-points, so that we obtain a firm grasp of the method of enunciation. As sources for the history of the French language these glossaries connect themselves with Rashi's Bible commentaries, but the former naturally include a much larger mass of words than do the latter. The wealth of material now made accessible to critical investigation by the important work of MM. Lambert and Brandin may be seen from the enumeration that the 213 pages of the main part of the work contain on an average ninety-six glosses each. There are thus in all not much less than 20,000 French words, and even allowing for the frequent repetitions, the volume provides a very considerable number of words and word-forms.

In the Introduction, the editors describe the work, the publication of which they had undertaken. As to the contents of the MS., they
quote the account given by Arsène Darmesteter in *Romania*, I, pp. 146-76. This account was, however, defective, for it makes the Glossary close with Ezra and Nehemiah, and makes no mention of Chronicles, with which in fact the MS. concludes. Noteworthy is the order of the Biblical books in the Glossary. After the Pentateuch follow the Five Scrolls, just as in several of the oldest editions of the Hebrew Bible (see Ginsburg, *Introduction*, p. 4); these Scrolls are given in the order of their liturgical use, beginning, however, with Koheleth—the first Scroll read after the New Year Festival. For this modification in the order of the Scrolls Ginsburg cites no parallel. The Prophetic Books stand in the order assigned in the Baraitha, *Baba Bathra*, 14b; thus Jeremiah precedes and Isaiah succeeds Ezekiel. First among the Hagiographa comes Job—here again Ginsburg's tables (ibid., p. 7) offer no parallel. The note in which the compiler of the work is named occurs in the middle of the MS., at the close of the Prophetical Books. The editors infer from this that the Prophets originally stood at the end, and that the present arrangement of the MS. is due to the binder.

The author of the Glossary describes himself in the note just alluded to as Joseph, son of the holy (i.e. the martyr) R. Simson. He completed "these *Le'asim* on the twenty-four books" (לעימים על ספרי חמשת המינים) in Kislev, 5001 (i.e. November-December, 1240). The editors suggest the identification of the martyr Simson with a Jew of that name burnt at Bray in 1191. As regards the linguistic character of the glosses, Darmesteter pronounced it Burgundian. The editors devote a whole chapter (pp. ix-xv) to the question of the dialect, and, as a result of penetrating examination—rendered difficult by the composite character of the sources of the Glossary—express the conclusion (p. xii): the dialect of the writer is a mixture of the dialects of Lorraine, Champagne, and (Burgundian) Franche-Comté. He must, therefore, have belonged to one of these departments. Certain linguistic phenomena lead the editors to pronounce in favour of the Haute-Saône.

The editors of Joseph b. Simson's glosses have omitted all such portions of the MS. as go beyond the French equivalents of the Biblical expressions. In the MS. the Hebrew words are sometimes explained by short notes. Such notes are especially frequent in the Prophets and Hagiographa (p. iii); here and there authorities are cited; besides the French exegetes of the eleventh and twelfth centuries and the Gaon Saadya, the MS. quotes Spanish authors, Menachem, Dunash, Ibn Ezra, and Parchon (p. ii). It is a pity that these notes and citations were not partially at least reproduced in an appendix. But the editors have kept strictly to their design of
treat the French glosses of Joseph b. Simson as a contribution to
the history of the French language. And since they make their
appeal in the first instance to romance philologists, they print the
glosses in French and not in Hebrew characters. The onerous task
of transcribing the glosses from the Hebrew script was relieved by
the systematic precision with which the writer had transcribed the
French consonants and vowels into the corresponding Hebrew. On the
subject of this "Transcription" the Introduction (pp. v–ix) supplies
clear information. The editors felt compelled to withhold the original
Hebrew forms of the glosses so as to keep the size of the volume
within reasonable limits. This method of reproduction appreciably
reduces the utility of the edition for the study of other glosses
of the kind, for the Hebrew form of the French words is not always
recognizable with ease in their French transcription. Yet this is an
insignificant drawback in relation to the very remarkable help which
the work of MM. Lambert and Brandin provides for the study of
North-French Biblical exegesis. We are now in possession of
a repertory of the French words which served for the explanation
of the Biblical text, and this repertory must include the larger part
of all such words used elsewhere for the same end. The following
figures show in what numerical relation the glosses of Rashi stand
to the present Glossary. In his recently published brochure (Die
altfranzösischen Ausdrücke im Pentateuch-Commentar Rasis, a. M., 1905), Dr. A. Berliner explains in alphabetical sequence about
250 words. The glosses to the Pentateuch in the present volume
number about twenty times as many (they exceed 4,800). The French
words common to Rashi and Joseph b. Simson on Genesis have already
been collected by Professor Brandin (Revue des Études Juives, XLII,
52 f.). The list of parallels cited here (p. ix) consists of fifty words;
but the number of glosses on Genesis in Joseph b. Simson exceeds 1,500.
In Exodus Rashi uses over forty, in Leviticus over twenty, in Numbers
eighteen, in Deuteronomy fourteen words (in all about 150), which
are also to be found in Joseph b. Simson. In Rashi's Commentary
to the Pentateuch there are thus about 100 words which are not
included in the present Glossary. From the preceding facts it is
obvious that Rashi's to'asim contributed only in a comparative small
mass to the material of the Glossary, and that we must regard the
glossaries as a particular branch of the literature of the French
school, which arose side by side with the commentaries written in
Hebrew and aimed at directing the translation of the Bible into
the vernacular.

Now that we for the first time possess such a Glossary to the whole
Bible, the thought forces itself upon us that the Glossary is at
bottom nothing other than the abbreviated transcript of a translation of the Bible used for educational purposes, though only orally transmitted. The Glossary is, in a certain sense, the skeleton of a French translation, such as grew up among the French-speaking Jews for use in the education of the young. It was only because such translations were of exclusively didactic use, pointing to no need of a vernacular rendering for liturgical or literary purposes, that the written fixation of the whole translation was omitted. At all events, no traces or remains of such a complete version have so far come to light. On the other hand, there arose works, such as the Glossary which is here for the first time made accessible to us, which served as helps for teaching the Bible. That these glossaries arose from oral translation is proved not only by their form, which points to a close association with the Biblical text, but also by their contents. For we do not find here—what we should expect in a merely lexicographical work—the meaning of a word without regard to its inflection, but we do find an exact translation of every form precisely as it occurs in the text. The procedure is thus the same as in the case of interlinear translations, except that here not every single word of the text is rendered, the translation being limited to such words as present some lexicographical, grammatical, or exegetical interest with the exclusion of those parts of the text which offer no such interest or present no difficulty. We can, therefore, regard the Glossary before us as an abbreviated interlinear translation of the Bible. Naturally, divergent views made themselves felt in an orally transmissive French rendering, and this Glossary gives a number of instances in which the same word is translated in varying ways. Thus in the Book of Job there are more than twenty double translations. Admittedly, Joseph b. Simson had older glossaries before him which he used as sources. The varying translation of single words he introduces (p. iii) with the expressions: לא תאמר אערא (יו וארק= יואדו שאר) or even שאר אערא. That he did not include in his Glossary all variants is inferable from what has been already said above as to the relation between this Glossary and Rashi's Commentary. From the French words in Samuel b. Meir's Commentary to the Pentateuch Joseph b. Simson has not derived a single one (with perhaps the exception of Exod. v. 9 to ישוע). In his rendering of Deut. xxviii. 68 may be seen an instructive instance of our glossator's adoption of a rendering expressly rejected by Rashi: והבתמיות بلעוה וארו הוא (מיו וארו) ויא נביא לארת הבתמיות בלעוה וארו יא מיו וארו היאנימ. Our Glossary nevertheless provides with the rendering, "é seréz porvonduz (Ye will be sold)," i.e. precisely the passive sense rejected by
Rashi. This was apparently a traditional translation which not even Rashi's expression of opinion could drive out of circulation. In this instance Rashi undoubtedly designed his note in opposition to a current translation.

As a characteristic of this work, the editors adduce (p. iv) the circumstance that the Hebrew texts are often in exactly written: "Il commet aussi des étourderies en écrivant inexactement les mots hébreux, par exemple ויהי (Gen. iii. 8) pour ויהי, traduit logiquement par porala au lieu de poralaon.

But a closer examination of such divergences from the text shows that they are not always due to the glossator's carelessness. It appears rather that instead of the actual word in the text an analogous Biblical word is cited and translated. This is the case with the instance ויהי (Gen. v. 22) for ויהי cited by the editors. Other examples are: Exod. xxiii. 29 (for ויהי from Deut. vii. 22; Lev. xxvii. 18 (for ויהי from Lev. xxv. 31; i Sam. xv. 28 (for ויהי from Gen. xix. 16; I Kings xviii. 13 (for ויהי from Gen. iii. 8; Jer. xvi. 9 (for ויהי from Jer. vii. 34; ib. xxxix. 6 (for ויהי from Jer. xiii. 27; Exod. xxiii. 7 (for ויהי from Deut. xxxii. 22; Hag. i. 4 (for ויהי from Jer. xxii. 14; Job x. 3 (for ויהי from Zech. vii. 10; ib. xx. 28 (for ויהי from Mic. i. 4; Ps. cxviii. 31 (for ויהי from Prov. vi. 3; ib. cxxxix. 3 (for ויהי from Num. xxii. 30. In these passages another word is cited and translated from another text explanatory of the text in hand, and it is possible that the glossator by oversight omitted, in reproducing what lay before him, the citation and translation of the word actually concerned. But it is equally probable that the glossator did this in the instances given (and others which I have not adduced) by design rather than by oversight.

In one case, the editors have rightly perceived this, viz. in i Sam. ii. 4, where ולאר is not translated by the glossator, but in place of it זאר (Psalm xviii. 40) is cited and translated. This gloss to the omitted ולאר the editors place, with the Biblical reference, in brackets. They should have followed the same course with the other passages which I have adduced. Once, the glossator replaces the text by a word of post-Biblical origin. This occurs on Jer. xxxiii. 6, where for ויהי we have זאר (taken from the liturgy). But often enough the glossator cites the text in variants to the common text, which variants are known to us also from other evidence. Thus, Song of Songs i. 17 (for זאר; Judges v. 16 (for זאר; Jer. xxxiii. 3 as well as זאר (both cited and translated); Hos. x. 10 (for זאר; Job xvii. 1 (for זאר;
Besides such variants, which occur in other sources, there are some which are merely due to the inattention of the copyist or author, and have no influence on the translation (e.g. Prov. iii. 18 for the reading is "םייחו", but the Masoretic reading is translated). But there are others which, though we have no other evidence for their occurrence, are undoubtedly to be regarded as variants to the received text. Thus, in Neh. ii. 13 (for "םילא") the glossator cites "ט"ו"פ", rendering it "étoupe"; and this is the same French verb which is often used in the Glossary in the sense "to close," "shut up," as e.g. in the rendering of "םייחו" (Gen. viii. 2) where the editors transcribe "םייחו" but where we should probably read "םייחו". In 2 Chron. xx. 37 (for "םייחו") we have "םייחו" which is rendered by the same verb as is used in translating in Exod. i. 7. In Gen. xlii. 24 (for "םייחו") we have "םייחו" (cf. ver. 27); 2 Sam. xvii. 13 (for "םייחו") rendered as the verb elsewhere); Isa. xxxiv. 13 (for "םייחו") rendered as the verb elsewhere); Zech. xi. 5 (for "םייחו") rendered as the verb elsewhere); Ps. xlix. 6 (for "םייחו") rendered as the verb elsewhere); Dan. ii. 34 (for "םייחו") rendered as the verb elsewhere); Est. i. 6 instead of the single word "םייחו", the two syllables are written and translated as separate words ("םייחו", "םייחו", and "םייחו", "םייחו", which, however, must be amended into "םייחו")—the same word which is used in rendering "םייחו" in Gen. xxxvii. 3, and which, according to the index (p. 273), signifies "étoupe de laine?". A "Notaricon" significance obviously underlies this separation of the word.

For the history of the Jewish exegesis of the Bible, as well as for the history of Hebrew lexicography, these products of the North-French school supply an unusually valuable source. The work deserves further investigation from this point of view. At all events, we can deduce what apprehension of the Biblical text and what interpretations of its words obtained currency. The editors note that the glosses sometimes point to the influence of the Midrashic exegesis, as, for instance, in Lev. iv. 22, where (as in Rashi ad loc.) "םייחו" is translated in the sense of "םייחו" ("benuré"). I content myself here with some details from the glosses to Job which throw light on the exegetic principles of the glossator or on his methods of translation. Job i. 3 (for "םייחו") is translated as the word as (Gen. xlii. 5, etc.) is used for "םייחו", i.e. "property." In Gen. xxvi. 14 the rendering of
is different.— i. 6 וַיְנַשְׁהֲךָ = "lu nuyzor," the injurer. Also elsewhere הָנַשֶּׁה (verb or noun) is rendered "injure"; so Num. xxxii. 22 ("a nuyre"), Ex. iv. 6.— iii. 1 שָׁמַע = "hucha," "cry," "speak aloud"; the same word serves to translate שָׁמַע (Exod. xv. 21), שָׁמַע (1 Sam. ix. 17),只能说 (2 Kings i. 12), and is used for שָׁמַע ("answer") and its derivatives when the meaning "answer" is inappropriate.— iii. 5 מִסְרִים is rendered by the similarly sounding "meriène" (= méridienne); the "noon-demon" is intended (see Rashi ad loc.)— v. 7 יִצְוָה = "charbon" ("coal"); so in Hab. iii. 5.— v. 21 יְזָר = "an zéremont" is rendered by the same French as is used for וַיַּזְר (Job xi. 7), as also in ix. 23; thus taking it from שָׁמַע ("wander about," "examine").— ix. 10 מְסְרִים = "trélemont" ("narrative," "report").— xii. 19 מְזָר = "méra" ("princes," following Rashi).— xv. 34 מְזָר = "felon"; so also to xx. 5 and xxxiv. 30. Elsewhere the same word in Job (viii. 13, xiii. 16) is rendered by "lozonjore" ("perverse"), as also Isa. ix. 16; Ps. xxxv. 16; on the other hand, הָבָל (Ps. xiv. 1, lxi. 1) = "felon," and "felonies" serves as the translation of וַיְנַשְׁה (Ps. xix. 4) and of וַיְנַשְׁה (Ps. cxxiv. 5).— xvi. 3 שְׁמִי = "avelylér" ("be silent")— xviii. 2 שְׁמִי = "teyséz" ("be silent"), on the basis of Rashi's explanation (part 1).— xx. 14 וָיִת = "kospas" (circle"); so in Isa. xi. 22; Prov. viii. 27; Job xxxvi. 10. The same French is used for מְסְרִים (Prov. ii. 9; Isa. xxvi. 7).— xxviii. 6, 16 מְסְרִים = "kristayl." The same word renders מְסְרִים (Gen. ii. 22; Num. xi. 17). In Exod. xxxiv. 10 מְסְרִים = "sapir."— xxviii. 18 מְסְרִים = "or"; but "or" is probably here to be referred to מְסְרִים, which word would then have a double translation.

As regards the linguistic character of the glosses, the editors point out (p. xi, n. 2) that very few foreign (non-French) words are used. Equally rare are the Hebrew expressions used in translating: I refer to such expressions as had been adopted into the speech of the Jews of France as current equivalents for the Biblical words. Thus, e.g., "tefilin" (Exod. xiii. 16; Deut. vi. 8) for כְּסֵפַת (Onkelos) as translation of סְבָך, Ezek. xlii. 19 ("le ongle de ma'arab"); מְסְרִים for מְסְרִים (Ps. lxxxix. 13). The editors (loc. cit.) also refer to "bezim," but do not give the reference. This extremely small number of non-French elements in the glosses demonstrates the degree of purity with which the Jews of France, in that period of spiritual activity, used the mother tongue, and employed it in translating the Scriptures. (It is worth noting that in translating מְסְרִים the word "senagoge," synagogue, is twice used, Num. xv. 26 and Ps. lxxxi. 1; in the latter verse the Vulgate also has "synagoga.")

The great service rendered by MM. Lambert and Brandin in
investigating and editing the glosses of Joseph b. Simson is increased by the very complete index which they have appended. This index (pp. 225-90) is a dictionary in which the glosses are translated into modern French. It is an indispensable help for the use and study of the glosses by those who are not familiar with Old French. Preceding the index is a critical apparatus to the Glossary: "Lecons du manuscrit et corrections diverses (pp. 215-24). The whole is completed by a "Tableau de concordance entre le manuscrit et l'imprimé" (p. 291 f.), and a list of "Errata" (p. 293 f.). The latter would have been increased by further revision, for despite the great care which has been exercised in the edition there are not wanting more or less important misprints, only a part of which are corrected in the "Errata." In the section on Job (pp. 148-66) I have noted the following misprints: p. 150, 40, for יד read יד; 154, 1, for יד read יד; ib. 40, for יד read יד; ib. 91, for יד read יד; 156, 39, "on se[n]ora" is given as the translation of יד (Job xvii. 16). Perhaps we should read "onseynes" which is used to render הנה (Gen. xxi. 11; Exod. xvii. 8; Num. xii. 1). In the index I have not found this "se[n]ora."—156, 82 is wrongly repeated in number 84; ib. 89, for יד read יד; 159, 34, for יד read יד. —A few other corrections are: p. x, l. 6, for Gen. xv. 12 read xv. 2; line 7, before 28 supply xix; p. 18, 38, "ionke" (= yonc), the rendering of רכש (Exod. ii. 3), does not appear in the index under i, but under y. —P. 29, 20, "réynemont" (= רביעי) (Exod. xxviii. 15) is missing from the index. —P. 35, 27, the note of exclamation after הנה is superfluous. —P. 38, 64, add the number of the verse (25). —P. 41, 48, for vii read viii. —P. 45, 48, for xxxii read xxvii. —P. 48, 77, before 18 supply v. —P. 54, 59-66, the chapters and verses are altogether omitted. —P. 68, 18, for xxii read xvii. —P. 70, 76, the note of exclamation is superfluous. —P. 121, 48, for xxxix read xl.

The book is produced, so far as externals are concerned, in a splendid style, which is worthy of a work in which the editors have rendered conspicuous service to two branches of study, romance philology and mediaeval Jewish literary history. The writers may be sure of the lively gratitude of students of both these branches.

W. BACHER.
CAETANIS ANNALS OF ISLĀM.


In spite of the splendid array of modern works on the history of Islām, its unsolved problems are still numerous. It was impossible for individual scholars who tackled the subject to do much more than publish the results of their studies in somewhat condensed form with references to their sources. The above-mentioned work departs from this procedure inasmuch as it forms a repertorium, not only of the sources but also of the latest researches in this field. The reader is also given the material from which the historical conclusions are to be drawn. The great difficulty in eliciting the true facts which accompanied the birth of Islām and controlled its first steps, lies in the fact that the whole of the material at the disposal of the student was handed down by Moslim authors and collectors, and has therefore a strong theological colouring. Legends and traditions were invented, not only to fill up the lacunae of history, but also to render the biography of the founder of Islām miraculous and superhuman. This is all the more unfortunate as the early history of Islām is inseparably connected with an important chapter of Jewish history. No Jewish records of the happenings of this period in the Arabic peninsula exist, except in a few poems. But even these, handed down through many generations by word of mouth, were finally preserved by Moslim litterateurs, who took care to strip them of nearly every national sentiment. It is a generally accepted fact that the North Arabian Jews in pre-Islamic times had become Arabs in aught but religion. That this denationalization was not quite so complete as appears on the surface, may perhaps be inferred from the mutilated poem printed in the earlier part of this number.

In his introduction, which fills nearly half of the present volume, the author gives an admirable survey of the history of Arabia prior to Mohammed, a history in which fact and fiction are indissolubly mixed up. Strange to say, he entirely omits to mention the Jews of the pre-Mohammedan epoch. A true comprehension of the rise of Islām is however impossible, without taking into account the existence of the Jews throughout the Hijāz. They, and, in a smaller measure, the few Arab tribes which had adopted Christianity, were responsible for the gradual weakening of paganism in the peninsula. In contra-
distinction to the Arabian Jews, the spiritual life of the Christian Arabs has left no trace whatsoever, and their influence on their countrymen seems to have been nil. The author's description of the relations between Mohammed and the Medinian Jews after the Hijra is not free from some misapprehensions, although it must be admitted that a true appreciation of the actual state of things is beset with difficulties. It cannot, indeed, be denied that their conduct was distinguished neither by political foresight nor unity of action, but as they could not submit to Islam, and would not compromise, their fate was sealed. To charge them with slander is unjustified, and if any one is to be blamed for bad faith, it is not they, but Mohammed.

Prince Caetani's work is quite a literary event. When all the twelve volumes he has promised are completed, the world will possess a work of reference invaluable for students of comparative history of religions. The author's intimate acquaintance with the literature involved, as well as of many works which only indirectly bear on the subject, enabled him to treat his subject with thoroughness. The splendid get-up and the large and clear print greatly enhance the pleasure of studying this fine book.

H. HIRSCHFELD.
BIBLIOGRAPHY OF HEBRAICA AND JUDAICA.  

March—June, 1905.

ACHAD HAAM, "Am Scheidewege" (Berlin, Jüdischer Verlag). Price 5 M.

E. ACHELIS, "Der Dekalog als katechetisches Lehrstück" (Giessen, Töpelmann). Pp. 75. Price 1.50 M.

E. N. ADLER, "Jews in Many Lands" (Philadelphia, Jewish Publication Society of America).

[The same work will shortly be published in England by Messrs. Macmillan for the Jewish Historical Society of England.]


AMERICAN JEWISH HISTORICAL SOCIETY. Publication No. 12 (for 1904). (Jewish Publication Society of America, Philadelphia.) Presidential Address (C. Adler); the Inquisition in Peru (E. N. Adler); the Jews of S. Carolina from the earliest settlement to the end of the American Revolution (L. Hothner); Judah P. Benjamin (M. J. Kohler); Calendar of American Jewish Cases (A. M. Friedenberg); the Jews in Boston till 1875 (J. Lebowich); a history of the Jews of Mobile (A. G. Moses); a Jewish Army Chaplain (M. S. Isaacs); the development of Jewish Casuistic literature in America (J. D. Eisenstein); Jewish heretics in the Philippines in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries (G. A. Kohut); Outline of a plan to gather Statistics concerning the Jews of the United States (W. B. Hackenberg). Notes. Necrology. Pp. xiii, 205. Price 2 dollars.


1 I am indebted for my knowledge of several of the entries in this list to Dr. I. Elbogen of Berlin.
adopted for the Establishment of the Union of the Israelites of America (1841); I. L. Lessner (1845); Appeal of Berlin Genossenschaft (1845); S. Holdheim and S. Stern's comments on above Appeal; M. Hess (1845); Address by Berlin Genossenschaft (1846); the Friends of Reform at Worms (1848); L. Philippson's Plan of a General German Synod (1848); I. M. Wise's Call (1848); L. Philippson (1849); Call for German Synod (1849); I. M. Wise (1856); B. Felsenthal (1856); Protest of Baltimore against Cleveland Conference (1855); L. Stein (1856); I. M. Wise (1857); S. Holdheim (1857); Z. Frankel (1857); A. Geiger (1865); Alliance Israélite on Synod (1867); Resolution of Cassel Conference (1868); from Minutes of Cassel Conference (1868); A. Geiger (1868); Jewish Chronicle (1868); Editorial in Occident (1868); Invitation to Synod by Adler, Philippson, and Aub (1869); Jewish Chronicle on Synod (1869); L. Philippson (1869); B. Wechaler (1870); M. Lazarus (1871); E. G. Hirsch (1880, 1881); I. M. Wise (1881); J. K. Gutheim (1881); H. G. Enelow (1900); J. Silvermann (1903); J. Voorsanger, M. Margolis (1903); J. Krauskopf, Committee on Synod, B. Felsenthal, M. Heller (1904); S. Schechter, D. W. Amram, A. M. Cohen, M. M. Cohn, S. S. Kiser, E. Lederer, M. A. Marks, J. H. Schiff, H. Weinstock (1905). Pp. 161.
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